has a new car ready for delivery and go through that car with you and point out manufacturing defect after defect which has not been corrected.

Mr. DEVINE. Of course, we are getting into a small segment of automobiles that are brandnew, going from the manufacturer to the dealer that we are trying to take care of in this legislation.

I think you should be commended for your interest.

I do know, however, that across the United States there are 16 or 18 States now that have compulsory vehicle inspection which does not necessarily relate to you, but all automobiles.

If my recollection is correct, it is variously predicted that from 4 to 9 percent of the motor vehicle accidents and fatalities are the result of defective equipment. We understand that, in that connection, it is very difficult to determine what defect caused an accident but I wonder if we are not referring here to the 1 percent and not the other 5 or 6 or 8 percent that do involve mechanical defects?

Mr. MULTER. I concede that it is a small percentage we are addressing ourselves to but that small percentage affects human bodies and human lives. If we can save one life by the enactment of a bill like this, I think we will have done a good job. Incidentally, with reference to inspections I think the laws of most of the States—I am not familiar with those outside of New York—but in New York that inspection is required after the automobile has been on the road and used. It is not required of the new car. If it is required of the used car, the car that has been driven around, why should not inspection be required in the first instance before the car gets out on the road? That is what my bill would seek to do, require the manufacturer to certify that he has really driven this car, or had it driven, and that it is now ready to operate on the road.

Mr. DEVINE. In connection with your provision in this one bill relating to the sealing of speedometers, I do not quite follow your testimony—I have not examined the bill too closely—but in the event it is discovered that the seal is broken, who is going to be prosecuted?

Mr. MULTER. I think that anyone can file a complaint. I am sure that the prosecutor would not act on his own but almost anybody could file a complaint, either you or I, as the purchaser of the car, could file a complaint.

Mr. DEVINE. The same rules of evidence would apply. You have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a certain individual is responsible for tampering with the speedometer.

Mr. MULTER. I think that both Mr. Schenck and you are making a good point as to the tampering with the speedometer. It may be that the bill goes too far in trying to prevent tampering. I think everybody would agree that we should prevent it, but in attempting to prevent it, we want a good bill to do the job and not one which will just stir up a lot of litigation.

It may very well be that that part of the bill requires considerable study and improvement.

Incidentally, I do not pretend that either of these bills is the last word. I hope that the committee can improve them and I hope that the bills can be improved upon by those who testify, particularly those representing the manufacturers, the automobile dealers, and so on. They can give you some ideas as to how to improve these bills. I think that we go a long way if we just take that part of H.R. 883 which calls for the sealing of the speedometer at the factory. That will eliminate one of the evils.

Mr. DEVINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 13, 1959

The Senate met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend Lawrence H. Mitchelmore, pastor of the Presbyterian Churches of Long Beach and Ilwaco, Wash., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we give Thee the praise. In Thy presence we confess our shortcomings. We ask Thy blessing upon the intents, the plans, the deliberations of these, Thy servants, who seek to follow Thee. In the areas wherein it is so easy to stumble and miss Thy purpose, direct our paths. In our struggle to do Thy will, help us express our concern for our fellow men by deeds, as well as words. Give us vision to see Thee.

Bless this Nation, O Father. Grant us the power to be great in Thine eyes, that "the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts may be acceptable in Thy sight" for in the name of Thy Dear Son, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. NEUBERGER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 9, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7165) for the relief of Filip Lewensztejn (Harry Lipa Levenstein), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7165) for the relief of Filip Lewensztejn (Harry Lipa Levenstein), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

Morning business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—PROPOSED PROVISION AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, THE JUDICIARY (S. DOC. NO. 37)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1959, in the amount of $685,000 for the legislative branch; and for the fiscal year 1960 a proposed provision and a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $18,000 for the judiciary, and proposed supplemental appropriations in the amounts of $3,435,000 for various agencies in the executive branch, and $80,602 for the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON MASS TRANSPORTATION SURVEY OF THE WASHINGTON REGION

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council on the Mass Transportation Survey of the Washington Region (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Compensation Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of James E. Tangney-Sanborn, of Chicago, Ill., relating to constitutional processes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the State Bar Association of North Dakota, relating to decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and its treatment as an independent branch of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of Portland, Oreg., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide home rule in the District of Columbia; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA WILDLIFE FEDERATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the North Dakota Wildlife Federation, in annual convention in Williston, relating to water development projects, and so forth.

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

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the Small Watershed Flood Prevention Act, commonly referred to as Public Law 566 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out water development projects designed to minimize flooding of agricultural lands; and

Whereas such development may include land use practices designed to increase water absorption of soil, channel deepening and straightening, establishment of retention dams and others; and

Whereas there does exist, in our area, many natural water reservoirs whose potential for flood water storage should be utilized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Wildlife Federation meeting in annual convention in Williston this 7th day of June 1959, That the Soil Conservation Service, designated as the Secretary's agent in this matter, be urged to place more emphasis upon land use practices designed to increase soil permeability and the storage potential of natural reservoirs and less emphasis on development of floodways and costly retention dams; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Soil Bank Service (Mr. Don Williams), Gov. John Davis, and to the members of the State's congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the Federal Government is presently encouraging the drainage of agricultural lands by supplying Soil Conservation Service engineering and agricultural stabilization and conservation funds for cost-sharing; and

Whereas such drainage expands the acreage devoted to production of crops, many of which are now in surplus; and

Whereas such expansion of croplands is inconsistent with land use under the conservation reserve of the soil bank program; and

Whereas subsidized drainage is unfair to the majority of farmers; those not having land which qualifies for drainage subsidies, yet are forced to help pay the cost of a practice which results in greater surpluses and a further depressed market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Wildlife Federation in annual meeting in the city of Williston, this the 7th day of June 1959, That the Congress be urged to terminate drainage as a practice qualifying for Soil Conservation Service engineering or Federal cost assistance; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the State's congressional delegation and to the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, D.C.

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas a surplus of farmers are today engaged in producing surplus agricultural commodities from lands not presently needed to produce human needs in food and fiber; and

Whereas such surplus production results in hardship to both producer and consumer in depressed markets for the one and costly storage for the other; and

Whereas such depressed markets have made it necessary to bolster farm economy through price supports and other forms of subsidy; and

Whereas there presently exists a program which enables farmers to divert land from crop production to conservation uses which banks fertility in the soil until the day of need, increases habitat for farm game and will, if perpetuated, shrink supply to balance with demand, thus stabilizing markets, such program being the Conservation Reserve Soil Bank Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Wildlife Federation meeting in annual convention this 7th day of June 1959 in the city of Williston, N. Dak., That the Congress be and is hereby urged to perpetuate the conservation reserve program of the Soil Bank Act by extending the authority of the act past 1960 and authorizing funds adequate to retire the needed acreage to meet the objective of this program; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the congressional delegation from North Dakota, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF STATE BAR ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the State Bar Association of North Dakota, relating to criticism of the Supreme Court, and so forth.

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

"Whereas criticisms by certain members of the bar of various decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the area of civil rights and internal security have been widely interpreted as criticism of the Supreme Court itself by the organized bar: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That this association, while defending the right of the profession and, indeed, of all other citizens to criticize or comment on particular decisions, hereby declares that the Supreme Court of the United States is the keynote to our independent judiciary which is the foundation of the rule of law in our country and calls on all members of the bar to sustain the independence of the Court as an institution and its authority to interpret the Constitution and laws of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the executive director of this association be and hereby is directed to mail copies of this resolution to the Chief Justice of the United States, the President of the United States, the president and president-elect of the American Bar Association, the chairman of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, the Honorable MILTON YOUNG, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted by the members of the State Bar Association of North Dakota at its annual meeting held in Fargo, N. Dak., on June 26, 1959, and hereby forwarded in accordance with the instructions contained therein.

LYNN G. GRIMSON,
Executive Director.

PROBLEMS OF THE TURKEY INDUSTRY—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter addressed to me by the North Dakota Turkey Federation, of Fargo, N. Dak., signed by Albert Akason, president, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1395, relating to the turkey industry.

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

NORTH DAKOTA TURKEY FEDERATION,
Fargo, N. Dak., June 16, 1959.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER: The board of directors of the North Dakota Turkey Federation at their quarterly meeting held at Fargo, N. Dak., in May, voted unanimously to oppose Senate bill 1395 introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and others.

While the intent of the sponsors of Senate bill 1395 is sincere, and the objectives of the legislation is laudable, we the turkey growers of North Dakota cannot support it, for the following reasons:

Throughout the years, the turkey industry has gone through many changes and has made much progress. Those changes and advancements have been made without controls or restrictions. Those changes and advancements have been made through individual prerogative and initiative. The North Dakota group feels that the turkey industry has not reached the pinnacle of progress. They feel that the legislation would stifle the individual's constitutional right to the pursuit of happiness and might hinder the normal growth of the industry.

It is hard to visualize any enabling legislation with the resulting marketing orders without production controls, even though they are not spelled out in the proposed legislation. Marketing orders without production controls are meaningless—controls are undesirable.

Turkey production, like other farm commodities, shifts constantly to areas of economical production. Any attempt to safeguard present production areas would be both ridiculous and costly.

It is hard to visualize an economic, practical, or unprejudiced administration of the enabling legislation under the proposed act. Such an act may help to place the industry in the hands of a few large, highly specialized operators in limited areas.

Utopia in the turkey industry, a system that would provide everyone with a guaranteed, continuously profitable enterprise, is neither possible or desirable.

It is felt that the end product of Senate bill 1395 would be adding another bureau to the Federal Government, for administration purposes. The cost of government is too great now. To add another tentacle to the octopus would not be to the best interests of the turkey industry or to agriculture as a whole.

The North Dakota group is in favor of any cooperative effort to improve the industry if the effort does not interfere with the right of the individual to plan his own operation in any manner suitable to him.

During these days of change in agriculture many of our North Dakota farmers are finding that turkeys are a good source of supplemental farm income. Turkey production is a good thing for North Dakota agriculture and will continue to be so because of our low-production costs. Therefore, we must oppose anything which could restrict the choice of the individual farmer to conduct his operation as he sees fit.

Sincerely,

ALBERT AKASON,
President.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL CATHOLIC RESETTLEMENT COUNCIL—TELEGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed to me by the National Catholic Resettlement Council, signed by Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, chairman, embodying a resolution adopted at a meeting of that council in the city of New York, relating to World Refugee Year.

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

NEW YORK, N.Y., *June 18, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

At a meeting today in New York the National Catholic Resettlement Council representing 13 nationality groups and diocesan resettlement directors of the United States passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the United Nations has proclaimed World Refugee Year to run from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has urged wholehearted support of this endeavor by all American citizens and voluntary agencies; and

"Whereas the free world looks to the leadership of the United States of America in international affairs; and

"Whereas there are many thousands of refugees in Europe, the Middle East, and Far East who need the help of the free world to build new lives either in their present country of residence or overseas; be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress and administration be urged to make a generous appropriation of funds looking toward permanent solution for many of these refugees; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That Congress be asked to authorize the admission of refugees from all of the areas mentioned above on a nondiscriminatory basis; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That all individuals, groups, and organizations be urged to cooperate to the fullest in attaining the objectives of the World Refugee Year."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 1798. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to eliminate the payment of premiums on deposits of trust funds by fiduciary banks in uninsured banks (Rept. No. 490).

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

S. 1173. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to exempt real estate loans guaranteed by States from its provisions (Rept. No. 489).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 7789. An act to amend paragraph (b) of section 401 of the National Housing Act, as amended (Rept. No. 491).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment:

S. 162. A bill for the relief of Henri Polak (Rept. No. 493);

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Ma Bong Ching (Rept. No. 494);

S. 1558. A bill for the relief of Theopi Englezos (Rept. No. 495);

S. 1684. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Skogen Woods (Rept. No. 496);

S. 1773. A bill for the relief of Alan Alfred Coleman (Rept. No. 497);

S. 1792. A bill for the relief of Lilia Alvarez Szabo (Rept. No. 498);

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Marguerite Fueller (Rept. No. 499);

S.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling for the flag of the United States to be flown at half staff on the occasion of the death of the last surviving veteran of the War Between the States (Rept. No. 511);

H.R. 1509. An act for the relief of Leon Oswald Dickey (Rept. No. 500); and

H.R. 5963. An act for the relief of Ivy May Lee (Rept. No. 501).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day" (Rept. No. 492).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1104. A bill for the relief of Pak Jae Seun (Rept. No. 502);

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of Yee You Gee (Rept. No. 503);

S. 1648. A bill to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 512);

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of Evagelia Eliopulos (Rept. No. 504);

S. 1719. A bill for the relief of Lushmon S. Grewal, Jeat S. Grewal, Gurmale S. Grewal, and Tahil S. Grewal (Rept. No. 505); and

S. 1724. A bill for the relief of Tse Man Chan (Rept. No. 506).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Voison Whitley and James Georges Whitley (Rept. No. 508);

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John M. Cica (Rept. No. 509);

S. 1946. A bill for the relief of Vincente Solvia Empleo (Rept. No. 510); and

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens (Rept. No. 507).

RESEARCH ON OCEANOGRAPHY AND REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON OCEANOGRAPHY — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the resolution (S. Res. 136) relating to research on oceanography and the report of the Committee on Oceanography to the President. The vote of the committee in favor of this resolution was unanimous.

The resolution endorses oceanographic research programs recommended by the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences, the Navy, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of Commerce. It urges the executive branch of our Government to study and initiate a long-range program, particularly in view of the intensive mapping of the ocean floor by Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators PASTORE, MONRONEY, SMATHERS, THURMOND, LAUSCHE, YARBOROUGH, BARTLETT, HARTKE, MCGEE, SCHOEPPEL, BUTLER, COTTON, CASE of New Jersey, MORTON, and SCOTT, be added as cosponsors of the resolution.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we are a long way behind in this field, and I hope this resolution will be the start of the collecting of information that may be vital to our survival.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the resolution, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has unanimously reported out Senate Resolution 136.

Basically the resolution urges an expansion of our oceanographic research.

The resolution was prepared in consultation with the chairman and staff of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.

The Committee on Oceanography is composed of eminent scientists from oceanographic institutions and universities, assisted by panels of other scientists and oceanographic experts representing a broad cross-section of the Nation.

I may say that these men are gravely concerned over our lag in studies of the oceans.

Such studies, as Senate Resolution 136 states, are vital to defense against enemy submarines, to the operation of our own submarines with maximum efficiency, to rehabilitating our languishing commercial fisheries, to our knowledge of factors affecting our weather and climate, and to our commerce and navigation.

The air above us and the waters of the oceans covering 71 percent of the earth's surface both are neutral, and familiarity with their phenomena is equally important to our welfare and security.

When Soviet Russia launched Sputnik I on October 4, 1957, we suddenly became aware that we had not pursued our own space program with sufficient vigor.

Secretary of Defense Forrestal had touched on possibilities on an earth satellite in 1948, and the President had announced plans for one in 1955, but neither the administration nor the Congress pressed this enterprise with a sense of urgency until Russia won the first lap in the space race.

Since then the United States has spent about a billion dollars on advancement of our space sciences exclusive of military applications.

During the fiscal year just ended we expended approximately $375 million. We are appropriating $485 million or nearly half a billion dollars for this program during fiscal 1960.

Forecasts have been made at congressional hearings that a billion dollars annually will be required to keep pace with competitors in the field of space science in the years to come as we race the Soviet to the moon, first with lifeless rockets and ultimately with manned spacecraft, then reach on to arid Mars, cloud-shrouded Venus and beyond.

As a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and of the Senate Appropriations Committee I support this scientific effort and our space program.

I am prepared to vote such funds as are necessary to prevent dominance of the space above us by any hostile power.

But had it not been for Sputnik I, I greatly fear that we would still be dallying in the space program.

We are dallying in our support of the oceanographic sciences.

We are dallying in our oceanographic research despite the fact that Soviet Russia now has four times as many submarines as we have, more in fact than all the other nations of the world combined; more research ships, more oceanographic scientists, and is conducting complex scientific studies in every ocean.

Many of us are convinced that the initial attack in any future war will come from the skies or from the invisible waters beneath the surface of the ocean.

Attack from the skies by missiles, rockets, or warplanes, would necessarily be launched from enemy bases several thousand or more miles away.

Missile attacks from the ocean could be launched by submarines hovering off our shores or hiding just beyond the rim of our Continental Shelf.

The truth is that we know little about the oceans 100 miles beyond our own coasts, although, as the Committee on Oceanography states:

"The submarine armed with long range missiles is probably the most potent weapon system threatening our security today."

In 1958 the Federal Government expended $17.4 million on basic and applied oceanographic research, including expenditures for ocean studies in connection with the International Geophysical Year in which, I regret to say, Soviet Russia's effort was more spectacular than our own.

Supplementing Federal funds, $6.2 million were contributed for ocean research by States, industries and foundations, for a total of $23.6 million. The basic research share of the total was not over $9 million and the key to our knowledge of the ocean is basic research.

The program of the Committee on Oceanography, which includes both basic and applied research, calls for an estimated expenditure of $58,360,000 the first year, $64,630,000 the second, $72,380,000 the third, $70,620,000 the fourth, $71,950,000 the fifth, a peak of $73,930,000 the sixth, then dropping in the final 4 years to $68,890,000; $56,910,000, $57,080,000, and $57,060,000.

If this seems a high price to pay for increased security to our coastal areas with their teeming ports and cities, to our commerce and our fisheries, may we note that the first year's costs would be 12 percent of what we will spend this fiscal year on space sciences, 15.2 in the peak year, and the average year 13.4 percent.

More than half of this expenditure would be for new ships and expanded shore facilities, capital outlays that will have long-range value, be of national benefit, and be dispersed among the States bordering our oceans and the Great Lakes. I do not think that is too much to pay to protect our seas, our coasts and our ocean resources and to build our economy.

Not only Soviet Russia, but Japan, Communist China, Canada, France, the Union of South Africa, and many other countries are expanding their ocean research with new ships, new laboratory facilities, and an increasing number of trained oceanographic scientists.

Soviet Russia, however, has definitely taken the lead in this expansion.

Russia at the close of 1958 was using 106 ships in her research program extending through all oceans. Since then she has added at least two more.

Russia's research ships include several of more than 5,000 tons, with special equipment and helicopter platforms. She has the world's only research submarine, and the only nonmagnetic research vessel.

The United States has a maximum of 58 including tiny craft suitable for bay work only, and less than half of these are employed in such work exclusively. The Committee on Oceanography listed only 45 research ships of all types, and most of these were small, old and inefficient.

Russia has between 800 and 1,000 oceanographic scientists, the United States less than 600. Those employed by the United States are dispersed among 10 agencies, and most of the basic research is carried on by scientists working with private and State institutions supported by Navy or other Government funds.

"Soviet effort in oceanography is massive, of a high caliber, and is designed to establish and demonstrate world leadership," states Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Research and Development.

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, warns:

"The military posture of the Nation is as much affected in this modern age by the more than 70 percent of the earth's surface covered by water as by the outer atmosphere not dramatized by visions of space travel."

What is needed to correct our present deficiency?

Top priority in my opinion should be given to these three: ships, training, equipment.

Navy scientists G. G. Lill and A. E. Maxwell put ships first.

"Because of the threat of the Russian submarine," they say, "the possession of a suitable research fleet by the United States is of burning importance."

We do not have such a fleet now.

The Russian research fleet includes the 12,000-ton icebreakers *Ob* and *Lena*, 6,000-ton *Mikhail Lomonosov*, 5,546-ton *Vityaz*, 5,000-ton *Pole*, 3,000-ton *Sevastapol* and *Okean*, and 1,500-ton *Diamond* and *Equator*. I do not have the tonnage of the new Soviet research submarine, *Severyanka*, or the nonmagnetic vessel *Zarya*.

The *Vityaz*, which visited San Francisco last December, has 12 laboratories that were inspected by U.S. scientists and claims 3 more. The United States has one reconverted ship now with six laboratories, and the maximum on any other American scientific vessel is four.

The *Vityaz* has 65 scientists aboard, three times as many as any American research craft can carry. The *Vityaz* has now been assigned to the Indian Ocean and is being replaced in the Pacific by two new ships of which we do not yet have a description.

No doubt they will probe along our Pacific Coast from the Aleutians to Valparaiso, Chile, as did the *Vityaz*. It is not unlikely that the Soviet scientists know as much or more about our western off-shore waters and the bottom topography as we do ourselves.

The *Mikhail Lomonosov*, designed and constructed exclusively for deep sea research in 1957, alone displaces more tonnage than all of America's ships engaged in basic research. She cruises the Atlantic and recently visited the waters off Laborador. She has 16 laboratories for specialized research.

Only one ship originally designed for research has ever been built in the United States, the *Atlantis* at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on Cape Cod, Mass., and it was constructed in 1931. The *Atlantis* has a displacement of 298 tons.

Until November the largest basic research vessel in America was the *Vema*, displacing 533 tons, a one-time auxiliary schooner built in 1923 and at Columbia University's Lamont Geological Observatory.

The *Vema* was followed by the *Horizon* and the *S. F. Baird* at the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, La Jolla, Calif., both 505-ton former tugs built in 1944, and by the *Sranger*, a 300-ton ex-yacht.

Woods Hole also has a one-time cutter of uncertain vintage, the *Crawford*, 280 tons.

The University of Washington's Department of Oceanography has the *Brown Bear*, a 270-ton converted coastal freighter built in 1934.

Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College has the 243-ton *Hidalgo*, built in 1944; Scripps the 200-ton *Orca*, a former patrol boat, and Woods Hole the 200-ton *Bear*, which like Washington's *Brown Bear* was once a coastal freighter.

The University of Miami's Marine Laboratories conducts research in the 80-ton *Gerda*, a one-time North Sea trawler but the youngest ship of all, having been built in 1949, and Scripps has a 111-ton one-time purse seiner, the *Paolina T.*, constructed only a year earlier.

Chesapeake Bay Institute of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, has the 32-year-old *Joan Bar II*, displacing 60 tons; New York University's Department of Oceanography and Meteorology has the 28-ton *Action* built in 1930, and the Narragansett Marine Laboratories of Rhode Island University has the smallest craft of all, the 12-ton *Lil Joy*, one-thousandth the size of Russia's *Ob* or *Lena*.

All of these ships continue in operation, but our basic research fleet has recently been joined by the 1,800-ton *Chain*, a converted submarine rescue ship assigned by the Navy to Woods Hole.

A similar vessel, the *Snatch*, will be put in service this fall at the Scripps Foundation.

This is our basic research fleet, all, as indicated above, except the 28-year-old *Atlantis*, reconversions and all inadequate for the work ahead.

The Navy, which supplies the ships and much of the funds for their operation, wants to replace them.

"Many of them have limited range or are unsafe for oceanographic work in sea States greater than three and four," the Navy advises.

"They are noisy, making it difficult or even impossible to perform sound-propagation studies.

"Most of the ships are too slow, which is costly in scientists' time and in Navy funds.

"There has been no program for the replacement of our research fleet as the ships become old and unsafe, either on the part of the scientific institutions contracting

with the Navy or on the part of the Navy itself.

"If we are to get ahead of the Russian submarine menace and stay there a 10-year program must be implemented. We have a 25-year replacement program to accomplish within the 10 years."

Not only Russia but Japan is building new and specially constructed research ships while the United States relies on converted trawlers, tugboats, discarded coastal cargo vessels, and auxiliary naval craft drawn from our mothball fleet, all of war or prewar vintage.

"The Japanese have one of the finest research fleets in the world built largely for oceanographic research in connection with their fisheries," the Navy report continues.

"These nations are conducting much the same type of research at sea as we are, and they have better ships with which to do it.

"We may assume that nations which are willing to invest large sums of money in research ships also have the skilled scientists to use them properly."

Three studies to date have pointed the urgent need for new oceanographic information. They are:

The Hartwell report: A study of oversea transportation problems, which is very much the concern of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Lamplight report: A study of the Navy's role in continental defense.

The Nobska report: A study of the Navy's problems in antisubmarine warfare.

What do naval scientists say about these reports? They reply:

"Our research fleet is not capable of obtaining the information demanded by the first two reports."

"With reference to the Nobska report they are more explicit.

"The Nobska report," they state, "carefully points out the need for well-designed research ships."

States the report: "Submarines cannot function properly in strategic areas without adequate knowledge of currents, bottom topography, sound velocities, ocean temperatures, and weather.

"We are now ill-equipped to provide the knowledge because we lack ships capable of working in the Northeast Atlantic, the North Pacific, and the Indian Ocean."

In December the Russians announced:

"In 1959 a study of all of the northern part of the Pacific Ocean as far as America will be made. Complex investigations of the Indian Ocean are imminent. Many scientists will be engaged in making a meridional intersection of the Atlantic Ocean on the *Ob* and on the *Lomonosov*.

"Ahead of us are the major theoretical works on the study of the regularities for the distribution and the dynamics of the physical, chemical, biological, and geological phenomena and processes of the world ocean which are the basic tasks of oceanology."

This is a challenge. The Russians have the ships and scientists to carry it out.

Will the United States meet it? To do so will require new ships, more and advanced equipment, more highly trained personnel.

It is the intent of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as expressed in Senate Resolution 136, that these necessities be provided and that we do meet the Soviet challenge in the oceans.

I have quoted at some length from Navy reports, which of course, deal with oceanographic research in relation to military operations.

The Committee on Oceanography also placed some emphasis on this phase of the problem. It said:

"The problems involved in military operations in the sea are enormous. We will not be able to navigate under the oceans with adequate precision until our knowledge is greatly expanded.

"Nor will we be able to detect submerged submarines efficiently unless we learn far more about the ocean depths than we do now.

"We will not be in a position to negotiate an adequate international submarine control and monitoring system until we have the ability to make the oceans transparent so that we can track all submarines in the ocean, both our own and all others.

"To accomplish this we must place greater national emphasis on research in the marine geophysical sciences, on surveys of the ocean background against which tracking must be accomplished, and on development of effective devices to achieve such oceanwide surveillance."

Then the report states bluntly:

"Our oceanographic research ships are inadequate for the job that must be done. Our knowledge is now largely limited to waters 100 miles from shore and even here it is inadequate for present and future needs."

Private and State institutions which conduct most of the basic ocean research undertaken by the United States, either at their own expense or with the support of the Department of the Navy, National Science Foundation, or other Government agencies, are well aware of this fact.

The Navy and the Coast and Geodetic Survey know it.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Fish and Wildlife Service knows it.

The Maritime Administration knows it.

Senate Resolution 136 affords an opportunity for the Senate of the United States to demonstrate that it is equally aware of the enormous task to be done.

The United States has 12,255 miles of ocean coastline.

One-sixth of all the waterborne commerce of the world crosses this coastline in times of peace.

Nowhere in all the world is there a greater concentration of industry and wealth than along our Atlantic coast, with 9 port cities ranging from 250,000 to 8 million population.

Russia with 27,122 miles of coastline fronting the oceans and the Baltic Sea has only 5 ports with more than 250,000 population, 1 on the Pacific, 1 on the Arctic, and 3 on the Baltic.

Our 1,293 miles of Pacific coastline south of the Canadian border has 7 cities with populations ranging from 250,000 to 2 million.

On our 1,659-mile gulf coast, Houston and New Orleans top 600,000 and the twin Florida cities of St. Petersburg and Tampa approximate 250,0000.

In addition there are 40 coastal cities with populations of 50,000 to 250,000, any one of which could be a target for missile-firing submarines.

America has a dozen great port cities on the Great Lakes, now open to navigation by ocean vessels. The American shoreline of these lakes is 3,774 miles but there is no danger of enemy submarines.

There is such danger, however, in our upcoming new State of Hawaii, crossroads of the Pacific, with its capital, Honolulu, topping a quarter of a million. Enemy submarines entered Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and future enemy submarines, many times larger than the Japanese pigmy craft of that "day of infamy," could find ready shelter along its 775 miles of coastline.

Alaska has 6,640 miles of coastline, much of it yet to be surveyed.

Canada has the world's longest coastline, 33,065 miles, more than half of it along the Arctic and embracing its islands, and of negligible benefit to commerce or economic progress.

Russia ranks second but 15,972 miles of its coastline also fronts the Arctic, and 9,790 miles the Pacific coast.

With half of her coastline in the frozen Arctic, a third along frigid Siberia, and most of the rest fronting protected inland waters, the peace-loving world might expect that Russia would be content to rule the largest contiguous land empire since Genghis Khan which she does now.

Instead, it is now obvious that Soviet Russia aspires to also rule the oceans.

To survey the waters along our 12,255 miles of ocean coastline and out from our coasts to the edge of the Continental Shelf the Coast and Geodetic Survey has 14 ships.

An official inspection team of 3 Government agencies 2 years ago found 11 of these ships "obsolete, overage, inefficient, or a combination of these."

"Dry rot so extensive in some places that whole sections of frames could be crumbled out of hand," the report said of the 48-ton *Wainwright* based at Southwest Harbor, Maine.

"Frames 4, 5, 6, 11, and 12 and planks B through L on the port side, and frames 3, 4, 4, 6, and 7 and planks B through Q on the starboard side were rotted," it said of the *Hilgard*, also 48 tons and at Southwest Harbor, as well as noting many other defects.

Propulsion shaft difficulties had been encountered on the 50-ton English-built *Scott* at Norfolk, Va., and it was being converted for coast pilot work.

"Deterioration of the ship's structure has progressed to an extent that it cannot be effectively restored to sound condition and any further utilization must be under carefully controlled conditions in protected waters," the report said of the 29-year-old 46-ton *Sosbee* at Tampa, Fla.

The 32-year-old *Cowie*, displacing 128 tons and at Norfolk, was found infested with "the fungus that causes wood rot," and had other structural weaknesses. "No potential utilization in an extended charting program," the inspectors commented.

The 150-ton *Lester Jones* at Ketchikan, Alaska, was found "structurally sound but operationally inefficient," as was its sister ship, the *Patton*, at Anacortes, Wash.

Inner bottom plating of the *Gilbert* at Woods Hole, Mass., was extensively corroded, and it had been necessary to replace most of its machinery. "The ship has no potential utilization as an independent surveying unit in an extended charting program," the report stated.

"Shell plating of the underbody has extensive heavy pitting—external rivet heads have wasted away flush with the shell plating," said the report on the *Hydrographer* at Boston, one of the Survey's larger ships, displacing 1,100 tons and built 30 years ago.

Many other disabilities were noted and the report added that "this ship cannot be considered safe for operation in unprotected waters for more than 5 years."

A number of pages were required to detail the disabilities of the 330-ton *Bowie* at Cordova, Alaska, built in 1943 at Greenport, Long Island, drydocked for repairs at 2-year intervals until 1950, and annually each year thereafter.

"In 1953, rot was noted in the forward end of the bilge keels; in 1954 the hull sheathing was removed because of worm infestation and rotten planking was found underneath," the report commented. "In 1955, the deteriorated sections of the hull were renewed and the worst sections of the planksheer were repaired with graving pieces. In 1956, the mast step was observed to have deteriorated and on further investigation the step, deck planking, and deck beams underneath were found rotten to the extent that the entire structure had sagged several inches. Rot existed in the hull planking and frames around the fathometer well. In 1957, 950 feet of hull planking was replaced."

Then came the inspection.

"Rotten frames and planking on the main deck outboard of crews' toilet and washroom spaces and underneath the shower were

found * * * frames 12 to 14, starboard side, and adjacent planking are soft; No. 2 bilge stringer in this area was found infested and one fastening has deteriorated; frames and floor portside under forward crew compartment are infested in scattered localities. The steel watertight bulkheads where accessible for examination were observed to be deteriorated with extensive scale and rust formation in the bilge areas where they cannot be reached for maintenance."

A score of other defects were detailed and a similar verdict pronounced on the condition of *Bowie's* sister ship, the *Hodgson*, at Ketchikan, Alaska.

All of these ships are still in operation. There have been no replacements.

This leaves three ships only in condition to efficiently perform the duties Congress has assigned to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. These are the *Explorer*, *Pathfinder*, and *Pioneer*, 1,850, 2,000, and 2,600 tons, respectively, the first two built at the Lake Washington Shipyard, Houghton, Wash., in 1940, and the *Pioneer* is on detached duty with the Navy.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey is charged with many duties in addition to charting our 12,255 miles of coast and the waters over the Continental Shelf, including investigations of the earth's magnetism "to furnish magnetic information essential to the mariner, aviator, radio engineer, and others," seismological observations and analysis of earth motions, particularly those under the sea, to give advance warning of tidal waves.

"When we do seismographic work," one scientist said wistfully, "we can use only one ship. The Russians never use less than five." Since his remark the Soviet press has announced a flotilla of eight ships being sent to the North Pacific to study the frequent earth movements in that area.

At the same time they will have many other large, modern, research ships investigating the ocean currents, the ridges and canyons that lie beneath them, the temperatures and salinity, acquiring knowledge of vast importance to undersea operations in peace or war.

The Committee on Oceanography has recommended that 10 new ships be constructed for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, 2 of 2,000 tons displacement, 6 of 1,200 to 1,500 tons, and 2 of 500 tons. This resolution supports that recommendation.

Weak as we are in facilities for basic oceanographic research we are at a greater disadvantage in the field of applied research, so important to our fisheries and our economy.

Soviet Russia, Japan, Red China, Canada, South Africa, West Germany, Norway, Scotland, France, and other nations are expanding their fisheries research fleets as our own shrinks and ages under the freezing indifference of the Budget Bureau.

The Committee on Oceanography bluntly charges in an official report that the agency which deals with our fisheries is "retrogressing rather than progressing in its ability to engage in basic programs involving ship operations."

Facts bear out this accusation.

Fisheries research vessels—and this includes exploration—have been retired from the New England coast, the South Atlantic States, the Gulf of Mexico, Hawaii, and the Great Lakes.

This has reduced the research fleet of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to 16 vessels of which only 4 are ocean-going, the 390-ton *Hugh M. Smith*, built in 1945; the 371-ton *Black Douglas*, built in 1926; the 350-ton *Delaware*, built in 1937; and the 200-ton *Charles H. Gilbert*, built in 1952, the only ship over 100 feet in length built since 1947, and the only ship of over 100 tons built since 1950.

Not only has the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries been denied funds for new construction, but the Bureau of the Budget has starved the Bureau for funds with which to maintain and operate the ships they have, necessitating it turning over two of its ships to State agencies.

Seven of the ships not named above are under 50 tons.

As a result of our neglect in fisheries research and exploration our fisheries catch is declining, our commercial fishing fleet is shrinking, and employment in this important industry is dropping.

In 1950 we had 161,000 fishermen actively employed on the high seas and 4,900 others were working on fishing boats but not engaged in fishing. There were 102,000 shore workers engaged in handling the catch that our fishermen brought in from the ocean.

Last year the number of fishermen had shrunk to 138,888, that of transportation workers to 3,000, and that of shore workers to 96,000. This year I am told there has been a further sharp decline as foreign fisheries vessels including giant trawlers and factory ships invade our historic fishing grounds.

Soviet Russia has factory ships up to 3,500 tons and "mother" ships for her fishing fleets of over 11,000 tons displacement. She has fisheries research ships of over 5,000 tons. She is fishing off Newfoundland and Labrador, on the fringes of Bristol Bay, Alaska; north and south of the Aleutians, in the mid-Atlantic, the South Atlantic, and the North Atlantic, and everywhere her fishermen go they are accompanied by fisheries research and exploratory vessels.

At the recent meeting of the Permanent Commission of the International Convention on Overfishing, held in Dublin, Ireland, the Soviet delegation reported that the U.S.S.R. is operating about 100 fisheries research vessels with about 1,000 scientists and technicians aboard them.

Japan's Federal Government operates 30 research vessels, three of them over 1,000 tons, and is planning a 2,000 ton atomic-powered fisheries research ship.

Japan, of course, has led the world in its fisheries catch for many years.

Soviet Russia is rapidly overcoming our hold on second place if, in fact, as her own records claim, she has not done so already.

Red China is in third place. While other nations increase their fisheries range and catch ours declines and our production last year was lower than in 1936.

We do not begin to produce the fish that we consume. Since 1940 fisheries imports have trebled in pounds and eight times in value. The retail value of imported fish last year was more than half a billion dollars, more than half that of our domestic catch.

Fisheries has become the forgotten industry of our economy and virtually nothing has been done to revive it.

If this situation continues it will not be surprising if we see Russian ships within the next few years fishing off the California coast for tuna, the Columbia River and Puget Sound for salmon, the New England coast for haddock and cod, and the gulf coast for shrimp and snapper.

As long as they stay outside our 3-mile limit they are in international waters, and they have now extended their fisheries research to every ocean and every part of every ocean.

Whether they are fishing for fish or information I do not know, but we have no fisheries research vessels to compete with them.

The largest ship of the Bureau of Commercial, Fisheries entire fleet, the 371-ton, 153-foot-long *Black Douglas*, stationed at La Jolla, Calif., is 33 years old and capable of operating only light gear.

The other oceangoing vessels in the Pacific, 128 feet and 112 feet long, are at Honolulu. Alaska has a 40-foot boat and a 58-foot craft, and a 93-foot boat operates out of Seattle.

In the Atlantic the top ship to March 9 of this year was the *Albatross III*, operating out of Woods Hole, Mass. Like the *Black Douglas*, *Albatross III* was 33 years old. Unlike its Pacific Ocean sister, *Albatross III* was retired for age and is out of service. There are no plans for its replacement. This leaves the 22-year-old, 147-foot side trawler *Delaware* the only oceangoing fisheries vessel operated by the Government in the Atlantic.

The Bureau's three remaining ships on the Atlantic coast, small craft of 40, 48, and 50 feet, are necessarily confined to quiet waters and to limited research in biology.

Of the three small boats on the Great Lakes, none are over 60 feet, and one of these was recently abandoned. "Dry rot in hull prohibits use by reason of safety," was the official Bureau death sentence pronounced on the *Musky* at Sandusky, Ohio.

Three boats, the largest only 100 feet long, comprise the Nation's research fleet in the Gulf of Mexico.

None of the ships were designed or built for research. All were obtained from agencies which had constructed them for other purposes after they had lived out their usefulness with the agency that built them.

The Committee on Oceanography proposes expansion of the research facilities of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries so that the fisheries resources of the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean, Bering Sea, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, and other adjacent waters may be adequately explored and their fisheries resources developed.

This will benefit both our commercial fisheries and the consuming public, the latter through increasing the supply of domestically produced fisheries products and by decreasing dependence on foreign supply.

The Committee on Oceanography recommends construction of at least 14 new research vessels for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, 2 of 1,200 to 1,500 tons, and 12 of 500 tons, and it proposes that this construction program, because of its urgency, be completed not in 10 years but in 6 years.

The Committee also calls for biological surveys, taxonomic development, research in the genetics of marine organisms, studies of the marine environment, marine product utilization, pond fish culture and brackish water farming, parasitism and diseases affecting marine life, estuarine production, and marketing economics.

Senate Resolution 136 commends this program.

The resolution commends also proposals of the Committee on Oceanography that the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education cooperate in encouraging the training of more oceanographic scientists, that the Maritime Commission lend its talents to the design and construction of scientific ships, and that our laboratories and shore facilities for both basic and applied research be expanded.

This is a large program.

It is large primarily because of our neglect in this scientific field in recent years and because the needs of this program are today imperative to our welfare and security.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables prepared by the Committee on Oceanography which summarize its estimates of the costs of the entire program in 1958 dollars by years.

Table I breaks down these costs by activity, table II by agency. The agencies are listed by their initials, so for purposes of clarity may I say that the first column in table II is the Navy, the second, the Coast and Geodetic Survey; third, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries; fourth, Maritime Administration; fifth, National Science Foundation; sixth, Office of Education; seventh, Atomic Energy Commission, and eighth and last, the Bureau of Mines.

(See exhibits I and II.)

"EXHIBIT I

"TABLE I.—*Summary of budgets for new oceanographic activity* [1]

[Millions of 1958 dollars]

Year	Education and manpower	Ships	Shore facilities (research)	Shore facilities (surveys)	New devices	Radio-activity in oceans [2]	Resources	Total
1960	0.80	39.80	1.50	0.76	7.40	3.08	5.02	58.36
1961	.80	40.45	2.70	1.52	9.50	2.95	6.71	64.63
1962	.80	45.30	3.90	3.00	9.60	4.35	5.43	72.38
1963	.80	35.95	6.60	4.50	10.90	2.95	8.52	70.22
1964	.80	33.65	10.50	6.00	10.50	2.95	7.55	71.95
1965	.80	29.00	12.60	7.50	10.50	2.95	10.58	73.93
1966	.80	20.55	13.50	8.26	10.50	4.39	10.93	68.89
1967	.80	10.45	13.20	8.26	10.50	2.95	10.75	56.91
1968	.80	10.45	13.20	8.26	10.50	2.95	10.92	57.08
1969	.80	10.45	13.20	8.26	10.50	2.95	10.90	57.06
Total	8.00	276.05	90.90	56.32	100.40	32.43	87.31	651.41"

[1] Not including special funds for basic research projects involving extensive international cooperation such as the proposed year-long international expedition to the Indian Ocean (estimated cost: $2,000,000).
[2] Plus ship time charges of $11,700,000 to be subtracted from other categories.

"EXHIBIT II

"*Table II.—Summary of budget for new oceanographic activity by agency* [1]

[Millions of 1958 dollars]

Year	Navy [2]	C. and G. S.	B. of C. F.	MA	NSF	O. of E.	AEC	B. of M.	Total
1960	28.78	5.83	7.97	5.45	6.40	0.50	3.08	0.35	58.36
1961	28.83	6.09	13.86	3.80	8.35	.50	2.95	.25	64.63
1962	30.40	9.75	12.83	1.65	12.65	.50	4.35	.25	72.38
1963	33.80	8.70	12.42	----------	11.60	.50	2.95	.25	70.62
1964	35.22	9.30	11.75	----------	11.98	.50	2.95	.25	71.95
1965	32.68	9.20	15.03	----------	13.32	.50	2.95	.25	73.93
1966	27.45	9.88	12.38	----------	14.08	.50	4.35	.25	68.89
1967	20.36	6.43	12.20	----------	14.22	.50	2.95	.25	56.91
1968	20.36	6.43	12.37	----------	14.22	.50	2.95	.25	57.08
1969	20.36	6.43	12.35	----------	14.22	.50	2.95	.25	57.06
Total	[3] 278.24	[3] 78.04	[3] [4] 123.16	10.90	[3] 121.04	5.00	[5] 32.43	2.60	651.41"

[1] Not including special funds for basic research projects involving extensive international cooperation such as the proposed year-long international expedition to the Indian Ocean (estimated cost: $2,000,000).
[2] Not including military research and development operations.
[3] Less payments by AEC totaling $11,700,000 for ship time.
[4] Includes recommended expenditures by the International Cooperation Administration and the State Department, for projects involving international cooperation and technical assistance to other countries.
[5] Plus $11,700,000 for ship time, averaging $1,170,000 per year.

Senate Resolution 136 makes no recommendations as to budgets for the proposed program. These are matters to be determined by the appropriate committees of Congress in consultation with the agencies affected, and, I presume also, with the scientists who at the sacrifice of so much of their time and effort have prepared their unprecedented report.

Reasons may present themselves why certain activities recommended by the Committee on Oceanography should be given high priority or advanced ahead of the Committee's projection. There may be reasons why others may receive less immediate attention. Administrative as well as cost problems are involved.

One of the difficulties which Congress faces in preparing or adopting legislation in this field is that in the executive or administrative branch of our Government there is no centralized board or commission which can coordinate the overall program.

Oceanographic activities are now dispersed among 5 departments and 14 agencies.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, therefore, in Senate Resolution 136 recommends that in order to coordinate the programs of the various agencies some method of interagency cooperation be developed, possibly through an Oceanographic Research Board or Commission.

This has been done with effective results in Great Britain and, I understand, several other nations.

Great Britain in 1949 established a National Oceanographic Council, an Executive Committee of the Council, and a National Institute of Oceanography.

The Council and the Executive Committee develops policies and programs.

I think it is worth noting that in Great Britain the Executive Committee is comprised equally of high government officials who have direct responsibilities in the improvement of ocean defense and in development of ocean resources, and of scientific leaders in universities and oceanographic institutions.

It is my conviction that our scientists should have a greater voice in the development of those sciences which the Federal Government has now found necessary to support and expand in the national interest, and in the programing of this development.

The work of our nongovernment Committee on Oceanography was a wholly voluntary effort, performed as a public service by civilians engaged at universities and institutions. It is my hope that the services of representatives of this group will be utilized in the future by our Government in preparing a coordinated program of ocean research.

In conclusion I should like to submit a letter from a university scientist now employed at the University of Washington's department of oceanography which, I think, bears out particularly, the need for expanded fisheries research.

I ask that the letter of Mr. William Aron, research instructor, department of oceanography, University of Washington, dated June 29, 1959, be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit III.)

EXHIBIT III

JUNE 29, 1959.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Usually my letters to elected officials are letters either of complaint or protest. This letter, however, is to lend support to your activities on behalf of the advancement of oceanography and the marine sciences in general. Your farsighted attitude in this regard is worthy of commendation.

Being a fisheries biologist employed through a grant from the National Science Foundation to the University of Washington, department of oceanography, my voice might be considered the voice of the vested interests. With this in mind I should like to offer the following comments:

1. The prime need in marine sciences is obviously more money. It is certainly true that more and better equipment is needed, but it is even more necessary to train people to operate the equipment. Training must be on all levels, from the technician to the doctor of philosophy, for even today many unfilled jobs await properly trained personnel.

2. As a member of a National Academy of Sciences subcommittee to consider the disposal of radioactive waste materials off the Pacific coast, I have become aware that our lack of detailed knowledge of even the inshore waters is glaringly evident. The importance of such detailed knowledge should be obvious not only in considering the disposal of waste material, but also for the rational operation of our fisheries programs and, of course, defense needs.

3. To bring matters very close to home, at the recent AAAS meetings in San Diego, Lloyd Royal, Director of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, pointed out that because of the unusual oceanographic conditions which existed on our Pacific coast during the past year an excess of 1,500,000 salmon were allowed to reach the spawning areas. These fish, according to Royal, were worth about $5 million. Several oceanographers believe that these conditions are predictable far enough in advance, providing the proper surveys are made, to avoid the loss of such fish. I rather doubt if 10 percent of this sum is spent by the United States to study the oceanography of the northern Pacific each year.

4. It seems difficult to justify a multibillion dollar outer-space and missile program and not consider further extensive research in the ocean if for no other purpose than defense requirements. As an absolute minimum a comprehensive understanding of the ocean would pave the way for the development of submarine detecting devices, underwater guided missiles, improved submarines, etc.

The State of Washington and its university are in an ideal position, both geographically and because of an already established oceanography program, both on the teaching and research level, to fill the objectives mentioned above. It pleases me that you have recognized this fact, not only with words but with action.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM ARON,
Research Instructor, Department of Oceanography, University of Washington.

INCREASED FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 143) to increase the amount of funds for the investigation of matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to

the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 55, Eighty-sixth Congress, agreed to February 2, 1959 (to investigate matters pertaining to Immigration and Naturalization), is hereby amended by striking out "$96,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$116,000".

INCREASED FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND ANTIMONOPOLY LAWS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 144) to increase the amount of funds for the investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 57, Eighty-sixth Congress, agreed to February 2, 1959 (authorizing an investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration), is hereby amended by striking out "$395,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$425,000".

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lester L. Cecil, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit;

Kenneth C. Raub, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Indiana;

Joseph Mainelli, of Rhode Island, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Rhode Island; and

Dale M. Green, of Washington, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 2360. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes", approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2361. A bill for the relief of Andros Szasz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2362. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2363. A bill to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes; and

S. 2364. A bill to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act of the District of Columbia, as amended, to permit paregoric to be dispensed by oral as well as written prescription; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 2365. A bill to reduce the stocks of wheat held by the Commodity Credit Corporation through a voluntary program for wheat producers for the 1960 crop year; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2367. A bill to provide that certain surplus property of the United States may be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2368. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2369. A bill for the relief of Sachiko Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2370. A bill to amend the laws relating to the census so as to remove any penalty for the failure or refusal of a person to answer questions pertaining to manufactures, mineral industries, and other businesses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2371. A bill for the relief of Christine Cleyrat Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2372. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Drufovka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 2373. A bill to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any act or joint resolution of the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CARROLL (by request):

S. 2374. A bill to establish standards of conduct for agency hearing proceedings of record; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2375. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide an exemption from the provisions of such part for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2376. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2377. A bill for the relief of Johann Czernopolsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. KENNEDY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to official recognition by the United States of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KENNEDY, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 143) to increase the amount of funds for the investigation of matters pertaining to immigation and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 144) to increase the amount of funds for the investigation of antitrust and antimonopoly laws and their administration, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. KEFAUVER, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PLIGHT OF ANDROS SZASZ, REFUGEE FROM HUNGARY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Andros Szasz. In connection with the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an eloquent article by Watford Reed which appeared in the Oregon Journal, of Portland, Oreg., on April 17, 1959, entitled "Hungarians Here Rally to Aid of Countryman."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2361) for the relief of Andros Szasz, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The article presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

HUNGARIANS HERE RALLY TO AID OF COUNTRYMAN

(By Watford Reed)

Portland's Hungarian colony is rallying in support of a modern "man without a country," 25-year-old Andros Szasz, who faces return to Austria.

Szasz entered the United States as a Hungarian refugee late in 1956 and wound up in Portland, where he worked first at the Budapest restaurant. Later he got a job as a bus boy at Timberline Lodge, where he was working when he was ordered excluded because his birthplace is in Rumania.

The blond refugee, still trying to master English, explained that he was born in

Timisoira, a small town which belonged to Hungary until the end of World War I, when the border was redrawn and it became part of Rumania.

In World War II Hitler called away all the town's Germans, who composed about half the population, leaving only Hungarians.

In 1951, at the age of 18, Szasz was drafted into the Rumanian army, but because he was Hungarian and considered a second-class citizen, he was assigned to slave labor in a coal mine.

After 2 years he managed to escape into Yugoslavia, where he was kept in a camp surrounded by electrified wires for 4½ months. Then he was given 10,000 dinars ($12) and sent to Austria.

When the Hungarian uprising was suppressed, he walked into a Hungarian refugee camp in Austria, said he was a Hungarian, and was accepted without question.

Like other Hungarian refugees, he was admitted to the United States on parole and a few days ago was called by immigration officials who are determining which Hungarians may be eligible for permanent residence.

Asked his birthplace for the first time, he named Timisoira and was ordered excluded on the grounds that he is a Rumanian, not a Hungarian.

The order means that he will be sent to Austria and may apply for reentry to the United States under the Rumanian quota—but it is filled.

Hungarians in Portland sprang into action, among them Jan Bauer, lumberman of Hungarian extraction, and Paul Ousley, owner of the Budapest restaurant. Attorney Sid Lezak agreed to handle Szasz' case on a voluntary basis.

The immigration service promised to keep Szasz here while his friends took steps on his behalf. They asked Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER to investigate the possibility of introducing a private bill to enable him to stay.

Federal Judge Gus J. Solomon issued a 10-day stay to enable NEUBERGER to investigate the merits of the request for a private bill, on condition that Szasz' counsel agreed not to take delaying court action.

James Turner, district director of immigration and naturalization, told the judge that Szasz has been a law-abiding resident since his arrival in the Portland area, and the judge ordered him released on $1,000 bail. The money was posted by Bauer, himself a former refugee, and Ousley.

Lezak said:

"One of the matters we are most interested in is whether Szasz would eventually wind up behind the Iron Curtain if he is sent back to Austria.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CITY OF ARLINGTON, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE], a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project. It is my understanding that Representative AL ULLMAN, from Oregon's Second District, where Arlington is located, is introducing a companion bill in the other body.

This proposed legislation is necessary because of the construction of the John Day lock and dam, which was authorized by Congress in 1950. With the construction of the dam, much of the present city of Arlington will be flooded by the pool water behind the dam. The Army engineers are authorized to build a fill, so that part of the existing city can be retained.

The engineers this fall will start purchasing land from private owners, in connection with the construction of the dam in the city of Arlington. The purpose of the bill is to allow the city to purchase from the Army engineers, at fair market value, the land within the present city limits of Arlington, once it has been filled. This proposed legislation is necessary, since, under existing statutes, there is no guarantee that the land would be returned to the city upon the completion of the project. It is my hope that this bill will be promptly considered, so that the residents of Arlington can be assured of the future of their city, since construction in the area will start within the near future.

This bill has been cooperatively drawn by the staffs of our three offices and M. D. Van Valkenburgh, city attorney of Arlington, Oreg., who recently was here in Washington, and ably assisted in the drafting of the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the city officials of Arlington approving the bill I am introducing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2362) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The resolution presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

RESOLUTION 4

Resolution approving proposed legislation enactment

Whereas the city of Arlington, State of Oregon, has heretofore declared a need for Federal legislation so as to provide certain governmental agencies with authority to convey to the city of Arlington or its designated agencies certain properties which are subject to inundation or disturbance as a result of the John Day Dam project; and

Whereas this body, in cooperation with other governmental agencies, has prepared a draft for a bill to be introduced into the Congress of the United States of America for the above-stated purpose; and

Whereas said proposed legislation is attached hereto and incorporated herein as a part of this resolution by this reference thereto as exhibit A and has been approved by this body: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city of Arlington, as follows:

SECTION 1. It is hereby found, declared, and announced that the heretofore-mentioned draft of a bill, attached hereto as exhibit A, is approved by this body.

SEC. 2. It is further resolved and this body declares that it recommends to the Oregon congressional delegation and the U.S. Congress that this bill be passed with all reasonable haste.

Dated this 8th day of July 1959.

JACK HARFORD, *Mayor.*

Attested:

CARRIE AINSCOUGH,
Acting City Recorder.

Approved as to form by:

M. D. VAN VALKENBURGH,
City Attorney.

REDUCTION OF STOCKS OF WHEAT THROUGH VOLUNTARY PROGRAM FOR PRODUCERS, FOR 1960 CROP YEAR

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on several occasions I have discussed with the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] the great problem which faces the farmers and the country in connection with the farm program because of the glut of wheat which has accumulated, and which threatens to increase during the coming year.

The Senator from Wyoming had some ideas on this subject, which he was gracious enough to discuss with me. At the time of his recent illness he was working on a bill which would present these proposals in legislative form. The bill has now been drafted. On behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, so that it will be available to Members of Congress and others who are interested, in order that it may be studied as a contribution to the thinking which will be necessary to clarify our farm problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 2365) to reduce the stocks of wheat held by the Commodity Credit Corporation through a voluntary program for wheat producers for the 1960 crop year, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. O'MAHONEY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out a program for the 1960 crop of wheat as provided in this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The owner or operator of any farm eligible for a wheat acreage allotment for 1960 under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, may elect not to plant the wheat acreage allotment for such farm for such year and enter into an agreement with the Secretary under which such producer will be entitled to purchase wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation at a price and in an amount prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b).

(b) Any producer who elects not to plant his wheat acreage allotment and who enters into a contract with the Secretary under the provisions of this Act shall be entitled to purchase from the Commodity Credit Corporation an amount of wheat, as determined by the Secretary, equal in value to the amount that the wheat acreage allotment for such producer's farm would have produced had such acreage allotment been planted and harvested. The wheat being purchased shall be valued at the market price thereof as determined by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The amount and value of the wheat which would have been produced shall be based on the normal yield, as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the farm and the basic support rate per bushel for number one wheat of the crop which would have been produced and

for the county in which the farm is located. The price to be paid by such producer for the wheat being purchased shall be 60 per centum of the value of such wheat being purchased.

SEC. 3. (a) Any producer electing to come under the provisions of this Act shall agree—

(1) not to plant the wheat acreage allotment for his farm for 1960,

(2) not to harvest any crop, or graze, specifically designated acreage of cropland on his farm equal to such wheat acreage allotment,

(3) not to plant wheat on any other acreage of his farm,

(4) to such other terms and conditions, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on such designated acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the provisions of this Act, and

(5) that in the event the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the agreement at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the agreement, to forfeit all rights under the agreement.

(b) The provisions of section 107(d) of the Soil Bank Act shall apply in the same manner and to the same extent with respect to the termination of contracts under this Act as in the case of the termination of contracts under the Soil Bank Act.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of price support operations carried out under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, wheat purchased by any producer pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be deemed to have been produced by such producer on his farm, and such producer shall be deemed to be a cooperator with respect to the production of such wheat.

SEC. 5. In the future establishment of State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, wheat acreage not planted pursuant to an agreement with the Secretary under the provisions of this Act shall be credited to the State, county, and farm as though such acreage had actually been devoted to the production of wheat.

SEC. 6. In administering the provisions of this Act the Secretary may utilize the services of the local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall submit as soon as practicable after the end of the 1960 crop year, or prior thereto, a report to the Congress with respect to the operation of the program provided for in this Act, and recommendations as to the desirability of continuing the operation of such program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am advised that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is rapidly improving, and will have a complete recovery. I am sure that that news will be joyously greeted by all Members of the Senate, who hold him in such high esteem.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF UNITY OF ITALY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution providing for U.S. participation in the celebration marking the centennial of the unification of Italy. The celebration will be held in Turin, Italy, in March 1961.

A similar concurrent resolution has been submitted in the other body by Representative ANFUSO, of New York.

In the history of every nation there are fateful times of decision which forever shape the destiny of that nation. The unification of Italy was such an event.

For many years it was merely the dream of visionaries. Then, under the leadership of Garibaldi, Cavour, Victor Emmanuel, and a host of other patriots, the will of the people found expression. Foreign rulers were displaced, and many small, weak, uneconomic political units were welded together into a great nation.

It is especially appropriate for us to participate in the celebration of this event, for in our own history we have had a parallel experience. Like the Italian kingdoms, our Thirteen Colonies had to battle for independence, and, after the battle was won, to reconcile their differences and join together in a single nation. Like the people of Italy, we faced and overcame what were considered at that time to be insuperable obstacles.

Our participation in the celebration has been officially presented to the U.S. Government by the Committee for the Celebration of the First Century of the Unification of Italy by the Italian Embassy. The concurrent resolution expresses our pleasure in receiving the invitation and testifies to our admiration for the contributions this great Nation has made to our common ideals of freedom and and independence. It is fitting and proper that we recognize in this fashion the progress and achievements of the people of Italy during the past century.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to official recognition of the United States of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy, submitted by Mr. KENNEDY, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (The House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should extend official greetings from the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy, which occurs in March of 1961, and should provide for official participation by the United States in the celebration to be held in 1961 in the city of Turin, cradle of Italian unity, in recognition of the progress and achievements of the people of Italy during the past century.

APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYEES BY CUSTOMS COURT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1947) relating to the authority of the Customs Court to appoint employees, and for other purposes, introduced by me on May 14, 1959.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960 — AMENDMENTS

Mr. MONRONEY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. THURMOND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7454, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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. FREAR:

Address on the subject "Getting the Job Done," delivered by Senator HARTKE before the annual convention of the Federation of Democratic Clubs, Dover, Del., April 25, 1959, discussing affairs in Washington.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Address delivered by him before Non-Partisan Statehood Association of Puerto Rico, at San Juan, P.R., on July 3, 1959.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Article written by Representative JAMES G. FULTON, entitled "Where Should the United States Concentrate Its Defense Buildup?" published in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, on Sunday, June 28, 1959.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, by the end of this day the Senate may pass the Department of Defense appropriations bill, which shortly will be presented on this floor.

The appropriations provided by the bill total nearly $40 billion—over 50 percent of the budget—and that figure does not include appropriations for atomic weapons, military construction, military foreign aid, or strategic stockpiling.

To the best of my knowledge, all experts in this field agree that the carrying out of the program the administration is recommending will result in tremendous duplication and waste.

No doubt the major responsibility for this annual waste of billions of dollars lies in the executive branch. But I, for one, believe that the time is long overdue for the Congress to exercise its rights, through the appropriation of funds, to force the administration to reorganize its defenses on the basis of the progress incident to this nuclear age, instead of continuing to let them drift in tradition.

In other words, we should appropriate on the basis of functions to be performed, rather than on some predetermined split of a given amount between the services.

We are not only talking about what this program is doing to our economy. We are also talking about what it is doing to our national security.

I hope every Member of the Senate will read an article by Brig. Gen.

Thomas Phillips published yesterday in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The article illustrates clearly why and how these billions of dollars are being wasted unnecessarily.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the well-written article by General Phillips be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 12, 1959]

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND U.S. DEFENSE COSTS—MILITARY WRITER SAYS CHIEFS HAVE FAILED TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR KEY DECISIONS—THE RESULT, EACH SERVICE TRIES TO PREPARE FOR WAR ALONE

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S.A. (Retired))

WASHINGTON, July 11.—Before the present Defense budget was submitted to Congress the Joint Chiefs of Staff were directed to sign a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense that they considered the budget adequate. All the Chiefs were outraged. No one of them considered his particular budget adequate and no one of them felt that he should be ordered to sign such a statement.

The Chiefs signed a statement, but only after they had rewritten it so that their assent was a qualified one. Each also appended to the memorandum a statement of reservations.

The critical change that the Chiefs made in the memorandum presented to them, instead of approving the budget that was directed by the administration was to state that "the proposed expenditure figure of $40,945 million is adequate to provide for the essential programs necessary for the defense of the Nation for the period under consideration."

What they meant was that this amount of money was sufficient if it was spent properly. Each one of them had different reservations about what it should be spent for and no one of them agreed with the division of the budget.

The position of the Chiefs of Staff is also that of Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri. He told the Post-Dispatch "we are wasting tens of millions of dollars a week because of overlapping duplication and waste due to service rivalry. The amount of money made available for the Defense Department is ample for our defense if it were spent for the right weapons in the right proportions."

It is strange to find the Joint Chiefs of Staff all in agreement that proper provision for defense could be made with $41 billion and all in agreement that it is not being used properly.

The Chiefs of Staff, in the minds of the public, are the ones who are responsible for the division of funds between the services. Apparently they are condemning themselves.

This is both true and not true. They have not accepted the responsibility for the budget nor for the weapons required by each other. Basically they agree on the manpower needs of the three services to carry out each service's part of the various war plans. They do not tell each other what the money that finally comes to them should be spent for.

The Chiefs of Staff do not consider whether the Navy needs a new aircraft carrier, or whether the Air Force should buy 70 more B–52s, or whether the Air Force Bomarc unmanned interceptor is redundant in comparison with manned interceptors, or whether Bomarc is a more effective air defense weapon than the Nike-Hercules.

The historical reason for this hands-off policy with the services' private prerogatives dates back 11 years to the service fight over the supercarrier and the B–36. The Chiefs of Staff came out of that fight so badly bruised that ever since each service has determined by itself how it would spend whatever money the Congress gave.

In consequence, each service, as SYMINGTON has said, "is trying to put itself in a position where it can fight any possible new war by itself." Functional weapons systems are duplicated without any consideration of whether too much is provided, when the weapons of all three services, intended for a single purpose, are added up.

The abdication by the Chiefs of Staff of responsibility for these decisions—and it should be said they alone have the technical competence to make them—has put the most important decisions into the hands of the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council, the Director of the Budget, and the Congress. No one of these agencies is technically qualified to make these decisions.

The failure of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to correlate the budget with strategic requirements has put this decision in the hands of the money men. During the preparation of the 1958 budget, the Chiefs of Staff spent about a month discussing the proportions for the services. They were not in full agreement, but they had given the matter earnest consideration.

When they met with the comptroller, Assistant Secretary of Defense Wilfred J. McNeil, he pulled out an envelope and off the back of it read the guidelines dividing up the pot into four piles, one for each service and one for the Department of Defense.

The decision had been taken without their advice.

The money men, the Defense Department comptroller and the Bureau of the Budget, keep on dividing up the pot in the same proportion that it has been divided previously without regard to changing weapons systems and separate service requirements.

The guidelines for the 1961 budget were given out at Quantico recently and the proportions between the services were almost the same as in the past. The main difference was that the division was in 23 piles instead of 4.

This happened because Congress has demanded that each service budget be prepared along similar lines. Seven divisions were made, such as personnel, procurement, research and development, operations and maintenance, etc., and each service's budget is prepared in these categories so that comparisons can be made about costs between services.

For the 1961 budget the guidelines were in seven piles for each service, one for the Advanced Research Projects Agency and one for the Department of Defense.

The budget is prepared on a service basis and is examined vertically for each service separately. No one takes, for example, a different look at the budget—a horizontal look that first would determine how much is needed for each military function such as the strategic striking force, continental air defense, limited war, protection of sea communications, etc.

For the strategic striking force, for example, a determination might first be made as to how many weapons are needed to destroy the target system in the war plan. This would add together the capacities of bombers and missiles of the Air Force, the Navy carriers and Polaris, and the Army's longer missiles. Most experts are confident that if this were done it would be found that the United States has more of such weapons than are required.

Such an examination would inevitably require comparative studies of the cost and effectiveness of different systems. For example, a hardened intercontinental ballistic missile may cost $10 million and a Polaris missile, including the proportion put into the submarine, may cost $20 million. Does the Polaris have sufficient advantages (its great disadvantage is that only a third ordinarily and two-thirds in emergency can be on station at a time, thus increasing the cost per missile substantially) that it should be the primary long-range striking element? Or, due to cost, low yield of warhead, and inability to remain long in readiness, should Polaris be considered only a supplementary weapon?

Under the present system no one examines the defense budget in this manner. No one makes comparisons between different weapons systems of different services intended to accomplish the same thing to find out which is preferable and the relative cost for expected yield.

The weapons system evaluation group in the Department of Defense, contrary to popular belief, makes no such examinations and comparisons. Its first task was to make such a comparison between the supercarrier and the B–36. It did not give an answer and it has not been required to perform a similar service since. It does evaluate the effectiveness of weapons systems individually, but not in relation to other related functional systems.

Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy was asked at his press conference at Quantico whether the 1961 budget would be prepared on a functional, rather than a service basis. He said it could not be done that quickly, since the 1961 budget is already being prepared. He did not indicate any enthusiasm for a change in the system.

The director of the budget, Maurice H. Stans, is known to be in favor of the change. The Bureau of the Budget has been making studies of past budgets, trying to determine functional categories. The Bureau of the Budget has considered as functions the strategic striking force; defense of the strategic striking force and the home base; ground, sea and air forces for limited war; and, a general category of support for these groups.

Both the Air Force and the Navy look with suspicion on a functional budget, since this might reduce their imperial freedom of action. The Army favors it.

The new role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, since the reorganization of the Defense Department, as well as before, does not provide them with the capability of correlating new weapons and new technologies. They have no unbiased agency to make comparative studies of weapons systems to determine effectiveness and relative cost for yield. Inherently they are service representatives and quite incapable, at this stage of mental unification, of being other than service advocates.

As a consequence, major military decisions are evaded by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and are tossed into the laps of the civilian Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council, the President and the Congress.

None of these people and agencies has the competence to make such decisions. The Secretary of Defense is a civilian and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are his advisers and they have defaulted. When they give no advice where can he turn? The same is true of the National Security Council and the President, who ordinarily has no military background.

So decisions are delayed and compromised. It took 8 years before the Navaho winged missile was given up after an expenditure of $770 million. A similar decision with reference to Bomarc is past due after an expenditure of $1,900,000.

Inevitably Congress tries to do something about the problems which are obvious to everyone. But Congress has neither the individual knowledge with a few exceptions—such as SYMINGTON, almost alone in the Senate, and half a dozen outstanding experts in the House, including Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, and GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas—and no

large and expert staffs to make the decisions the military chiefs have failed to make.

A public fight lasting a year and a half was needed to get a decision on operational control of Jupiter and Thor missiles. It may take 2 years of service fighting to get a decision on operational control of Polaris. The Air Force is eyeing the Army Pershing solid-propellant missile.

Congress has had to make a decision for the Chiefs of Staff to eliminate funds for the Air Force Mace subsonic, unmanned bomber. It was helped in this because the Navy had made the decision to discard the Regulus II, a better missile of the same type than Mace.

Actually, it is impossible under the present organization, where the Chiefs of Staff of the services are mainly concerned with service problems, to spend enough time as Joint Chiefs of Staff to make the studies and decisions that are essential. Membership in the Joint Chiefs of Staff would have to be a full-time assignment.

A single Chief of Staff has been proposed. Another proposal is to have the service chiefs graduate at age 60 or thereabouts from chief of a service to membership in the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a tour of 2 or 4 years.

This last idea has the advantage of keeping the Joint Chiefs of Staff filled with men fully current with present military developments. In this age of revolutionary military change this is considered to be far better than to call back distinguished retired officers who have been out of touch with military evolution.

There must be a change, for the present system is breaking down and is wasting billions annually. Consideration of the military budget functionally and decisions by the Chiefs of Staff on each others weapons can be required by administrative action.

But once the Chiefs of Staff move into these fields, they have a full-time task and can no longer be the chiefs of the services. The law will have to be changed to provide service chiefs of staff in addition to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, with the next few days the Senate may begin debate on a piece of legislation which is of significance to our Nation's economic well-being. I am referring to the long-awaited Coal Research and Development Act, which already has been passed by the House of Representatives.

The House bill, H.R. 6596, is very similar to S. 49, the Senate bill introduced by our distinguished minority leader and cosponsored by nine other Senators, including my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and myself.

This legislation would mean much to the country, Mr. President, in terms of economic improvement, relief of unemployment, and strengthening of defense potential through industrial stabilization.

I assume that by this time there are few Members of the Senate who are not aware that the American coal industry, and the people who depend upon it for a livelihood, have been facing difficult times, and have been facing them for years. During the past months, throughout the debate on the depressed areas bill, the Senate was informed again and again of the unemployment and underemployment in the coal industry, and of the resulting privation in our Nation's coalfields. My colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I spoke repeatedly of the situation in our own State. We pointed out that coal employment in our State had declined from 124,952 miners in 1948 to 44,237 miners in 1958. We emphasized that jobless coal miners constitute a major portion of the number of West Virginians out of work. We stressed that the deterioration of the American coal industry has been caused chiefly by continual and ever-increasing losses of markets. With the modernization of American homes and the abandonment of coal heating stoves and furnaces, a large market was lost to coal. With the dieselization of American railroads, another great coal market was lost. With the rising flood of cheap foreign residual oils into America, additional commercial markets were lost to coal. And although a recent Presidential order places a degree of mandatory restriction on cheap oil imports, the remainder of the imports still constitute stiff competition for coal.

Moreover, we pointed out that the hard times in the coal industry have brought hardship to dozens of affiliated areas of the economy. For instance, as coal production in West Virginia fell from 174 million tons in 1947 to 118 million tons last year, the coal-hauling railroads suffered a corresponding loss of revenue and loss of employment. And, as the thousands of miners and railroad workers lost their jobs, there was a corresponding loss in purchasing power, which placed a tight pinch on the small businessmen of West Virginia—so tight a pinch that hundreds of them were forced out of business.

And there is yet another—and much more far-reaching—ill effect on the weakening of the coal industry; namely, the impairing of our Nation's defense potential. If coal operation slumps deeper into enfeeblement, if mines are closed and allowed to collapse or fill with water, if the coalfield work force is forced to shrink and the young men turn to new occupations, if mining equipment is allowed to deteriorate and is not replaced when worn out, and if the coal-hauling railroads further reduce their capacity to transport large quantities of this basic fuel—then, the Nation's very fighting strength would be seriously weakened, for the coal and rail industries would not be able to meet the immense demands for energy supplies which would face our Nation in event of war.

Thus, Mr. President, it is evident that the American coal industry is in need of help of the type that would be provided by a broad scale program of research. Such a program would bring into focus all the encouraging indications that coal indeed promises to be a tremendous source of basic materials for the American chemical industry, and indeed promises to become a raw material for literally thousands of new products which might be added to our American way of living.

To stimulate and help bring about this renaissance for coal, the coal industry itself has invested considerable amounts of money in research. But it is evident that the coal industry, operating at a tiny margin of profit—and often at a loss—is incapable of launching entirely by itself a really significant program of research to discover new uses and markets for coal.

Only a comprehensive, coordinated research program, such as would be carried out by the Coal Research and Development Act, can be counted on to fully exploit the potential of America's most plentiful fuel resource, and to assure long-lasting prosperity to the regions of our country which are dependent upon coal for their economic stability.

Therefore, I urge that the Senate give prompt approval to H.R. 6596, as soon as it is reported to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the unfinished business House Bill 7454?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield with that understanding.

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

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

KOZLOV PROPAGANDA UNMASKED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today Soviet First Deputy Premier Frol R. Kozlov is returning to the Soviet Union

from a trip to the United States. We all hope that he takes with him a clear picture of our unyielding goal of peace with justice in the world, our gathering defensive strength to deter aggression, and perhaps, something of the standard of living which our system of free, competitive enterprise has given us.

He was in Washington about a week or 10 days ago. A number of us were invited to sit down with him in the Foreign Relations Committee room. He appeared to me to fulfill the typical picture of the inscrutable Russian Communist leader, unquestionably able and educated, capable of smiling sweetly, or of brushing off a question if it did not suit his purpose to give a direct, relevant answer. He protested with vigor and with great gesticulation that the Kremlin, representing the Russian people, wants peace and works for peace. I thought at the time, however, that he had a clear opportunity to recognize the unanimity by which Republicans and Democrats stand unequivocally behind President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Herter in the position they take on behalf of our country at Geneva. I still think so, now that Mr. Kozlov has completed a short tour of our country.

Yesterday, on the eve of his departure, Mr. Kozlov held a press conference in New York City. He prophesied that the people of the United States would be Communist, that we would have a Communist government, a couple of generations hence, in the day of our grandchildren. God grant that he is completely wrong in that ungodly prophecy.

I doubt that I have ever read two more splendid constructive editorial comments than that which appears today in the New York Times under the title "Mr. Kozlov's Steak," and that which appeared on Sunday, July 5, just a week ago, under the title "The Voice of the Turtle." They make the most effective comments on Mr. Kozlov's trip here, and the propaganda which he left behind him. They belong on the list of required reading for all Americans.

In the latter editorial the New York Times takes six of Mr. Kozlov's misstatements which he made in Washington before the National Press Club, and demonstrates the falsity of each. In part, the New York Times says in this editorial:

> When the question was put to him directly whether "if the Russians cannot get agreement to make Berlin a free city will they use force to obtain that objective?" he answered: "If a war is unleashed over this question and force is restored to, then force will be met by force." This is the basic point at which the apostle of freedom and peace arrives.

Kozlov thus did not answer the question. He evaded it. And, in evading it, left a vague and threatening implication.

Just one more point which the editorial makes:

> He said: "We do not intend to foist this order by force on anybody. That is what, oh, so soberly, he said.

"We do not intend to foist this order by force on anybody." What is the date that any such intention started to motivate Moscow?

There can be no question, really, as the Times says, "It has been foisted by force upon the Baltic States, Hungary, a good part of Eastern Germany, and an unknown number of the Russian people." And there would have been more foisting had it not been for the defensive arrangements of the free nations in Western Europe.

Mr. President, let the record clearly show that, while Kozlov attempted to exculpate Russian communism from any part of the blame for Russian aggression in Europe, a special committee of the United Nations, composed of representatives, not from the World War II allies, United States nor of Great Britain nor of France, but composed of representatives of a half-dozen smaller nations after painstakingly sifting the evidence, unanimously convicted Soviet Russia of aggression against the freedom-loving, freedom-hopeful peoples of Hungary. And the record of such action cannot be erased by sweet talk.

In the editorial which appears today the Times says that at Whiting, Ind., last week Kozlov said at one of the lunches which he attended, "Please reduce the size of your beefsteaks. They are enough for two people."

The Times proceeds with logic to demonstrate that here in this comment was a confession by Kozlov that he did not realize the abundance by which we in this freedom-blessed land, live. Meanwhile, the Soviet press continues to tell its poor, deluded people that unemployment and starvation are rampant in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of both editorials appear at this point in my comments.

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

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1959]

THE VOICE OF THE TURTLE

We have left spring a little behind but nevertheless, as Mr. Kozlov proceeds on his swift journey, we are all perhaps reminded of the verse from the "Song of Solomon": "The time of the singing of birds is come and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land." The Biblical turtle is, of course, the turtledove. Some apply this name to the mourning dove, whose plaintive notes may be heard just after sundown and before dawn.

The mournfulness of Mr. Kozlov's remarks lies beneath the superficial joviality. At Washington, on Thursday, he seemed to be speaking for peace and good will, but much of what he said was either misleading or threatening. Let us take six points that he made:

1. He said: "The will of the Soviet people is a sacred law for the Government of the U.S.S.R." The Russian Government is an autocracy. It doesn't know what the will of the Soviet people is.

2. He said: "We are building a new society and we believe it will be the most just social order on earth." There is no standard of justice in Russia except what half a dozen or so people may say it is.

3. He said: "We do not intend to foist this order by force on anybody." It has been foisted by force upon the Baltic States, Hungary, a good part of Eastern Germany and an unknown number of the Russian people.

4. He spoke of reductions in the Russian army and armaments. He presented no proof that a single man had been demobilized.

5. He spoke of offers made by Moscow to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. He did not mention that Russia has refused to make a single binding guarantee that this would be done. Whenever such guarantees are discussed, as they have been in the long-drawn-out atomic weapons conference in Geneva, the Russians have made unrealistic and unacceptable demands.

6. He discussed the surrender of West Berlin to the Moscow-dominated East German Republic as a step in the direction of peace, rejecting with indignation the charge that the Russian policy for West Germany revealed aggressive intention.

He knew better and his hearers knew better. When the question was put to him directly whether if the Russians cannot get agreement to make Berlin a free city will they use force to obtain that objective? he answered: "If a war is unleashed over this question and force is resorted to, then force will be met by force." This is the basic point at which the apostle of freedom and peace arrives.

Such is the voice of the turtledove, as we hear it in this early summer on this continent. Our people welcome with almost pathetic eagerness every kindly thing that Mr. Kozlov says. We are pleased that a representative Russian official comes here, pats our children on the head, and enjoys, with a special interest all his own, the spectacle of happy animals in the National Zoological Park in Washington—perhaps as an indication of what is to come when the almost perfect state has been fitted to almost all mankind. We are glad to have him see what was once Russia's river in California, and visit Jack London's convival Valley of the Moon.

But we cannot be at our ease until we are certain that this time of the singing of birds, this passing of winter, is not merely a temporary phenomenon to catch us off our guard.

[From the New York Times, July 13, 1959]

MR. KOZLOV'S STEAK

Last Wednesday, at a luncheon in Whiting, Ind., Frol R. Kozlov voiced one of the few major public complaints he made during his tour of the United States. "Please reduce the size of your beefsteaks," he told the luncheon group, adding, "They are enough for two people."

It is worth remembering those words when we seek to evaluate the Soviet First Deputy Premier's amazing performance at his press conference here yesterday. His visit to this country, he solemnly assured the assembled reporters, had not altered his picture of the United States, nor had it shaken his confidence that Premier Khrushchev was correct in predicting our grandchildren will live under communism. Yet, by his own testimony, he had not realized how abundantly we live.

Judged most charitably, it was a disingenuous performance Mr. Kozlov put on yesterday. He knows perfectly well that the question at issue is not the level of American technology, as he tried to make it appear it was. He came here from a country whose press has been regaling its readers for months now with stories of vast American unemployment, starvation and the like. What he actually saw was a United States at the peak of its historic prosperity.

On innumerable occasions he saw for himself the vast flood of cars on the highways he traveled, the abundance of goods in our stores, and the superiority of the dress of our citizens over that of Soviet citizens. When he asked workers in factories he visited about their wages, he got answers ranging from about $1.50 to $5 an hour, earnings far above the real wages of the corresponding Soviet workers.

It is not without interest that at no time during his visit did Mr. Kozlov bother to visit an American worker's home to investigate

workers' housing and living conditions here. Nor did he accept the invitation extended by union official James B. Carey to visit a union headquarters and have an exchange of opinions with a group of ordinary workers, or with union officials. Instead the Soviet leader socialized almost exclusively with top Government officials in Washington, and with leaders of business and finance elsewhere on his travels. It was a curious performance for a "leader of the proletariat."

So far as can be judged from this distance, Mr. Kozlov is today the most important Soviet citizen born in this century. It is conceivable that he may someday succeed Premier Khrushchev. He could never have reached his present eminence without having a good deal of intelligence and great capacity, to say nothing of skill at political maneuvering. It would seem an insult to a man of such competence to believe he really meant what he said yesterday about having learned nothing new about our country.

But would it not have been better for all concerned—and a truer contribution to the cause of peace about which he has spoken so much—if he had been more candid in his reactions? Unfortunately there was nothing he said yesterday which might lead us to suppose that after his return the Soviet press will be any more truthful about our country than it has been this past half year since Mr. Mikoyan returned to Moscow. But perhaps if enough Soviet citizens—ordinary workers as well as top leaders—visit here there may be yet some truth about this country in Pravda and some honest news about us in Izvestia.

CONTROL OF CONGRESS OVER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there has been a continuation of the mounting interest, as well as concern, not only of our colleagues in the Senate but among the people, over the independence of Federal agencies from any popular or public scrutiny, and particularly the independence or the large Federal bureaus from any checks by the Congress of the United States. As a number of our colleagues argued in the stress of debate, this was the central issue, rather than a demonstration of any particular personality quirks of any Senator.

I was struck this weekend by the tone of an article, its depth and perceptiveness, which appeared in the July 9 issue of The Reporter magazine. It is an article by Joseph Kraft. The title of the article is "The One That Broke the Camel's Back."

In this article, Author Kraft assesses, in hindsight, the implications of the Strauss debate, by centering them around the one focal question of the right of the people to know of the continuing constitutional prerogative of the Senate to check.

Because I think Senators would enjoy, as I did, the opportunity to read the article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE ONE THAT BROKE THE CAMEL'S BACK

(By Joseph Kraft)

WASHINGTON.—Chance counted heavily in the Senate's rejection of Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. But underlying the case was a general issue, only dimly perceived: that of Congress' inability to obtain the most ordinary kind of information about the workings of the Federal Government. This issue has increasingly come to poison relations between the executive and legislative branches; in the Strauss case, it gave rise to a new phenomenon in the Senate—a kind of neopopulism.

Of the chancy factors, personality was all-important. "Arrogant" was the description of Mr. Strauss favored by his opponents. HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, a leading backer, cited a sympathetic article which asserted merely that Mr. Strauss had "plenty of confidence in Lewis L. Strauss." Arrogant or self-confident, he evinced in the hearings a manner ill-calculated to charm Senators.

Respect laid on with a trowel is the demeanor usually enjoined upon seekers of senatorial blessing. In winning confirmation as Ambassador to Israel over opposition from Senator FULBRIGHT, Ogden Reid, for example, served up slow stuff that only an exeprt slugger could move past the infield. Asked once whether he had a statement to make, Mr. Reid said: "No sir; I am here trying to cooperate to the fullest possible extent. I am sure you have some questions, and I do not want to presume to take any of your valuable time."

Mr. Strauss, by contrast, logged in fast ones which the feeblest batter, if he connected, could hit for the distance. Repeatedly he corrected the Senators on facts; when they fumbled, he prompted. In a biographical statement, read after a shorter version had been inserted by the committee chairman, Mr. Strauss found 38 occasions for use of the first person singular. Without so much as a nod at David Lilienthal, Dean Acheson, Harry Truman, or even Edward Teller, he advanced the claim that "I began the movement to initiate development of * * * the thermonuclear bomb."

Connected with personality were the tactics used on behalf of Mr. Strauss. Senator SCOTT on the Senate floor likened the Strauss case to the Dreyfus affair. The New York Times and Herald Tribune, both Strauss supporters, immediately asserted that there was not the slightest trace of antisemitism in the Strauss opposition. Why, then, hint that there was? Simply to impress Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, so the figuring went on Capitol Hill, into believing that a stand against Mr. Strauss would harm his chances of winning the Jewish vote as a Presidential candidate. Rumors also circulated that a Democratic Senator from New England had been won over by pledges to curtail competition from Japanese textiles; that Senators from the coal States of West Virginia and Kentucky had been taken in tow by hints that imports of residual fuel oil would be kept down; and that some hanky-panky on sugar prices had appealed to Coca-Cola, which, it was said, passed the word to Georgia's Senators.

In the end, two Senators protested publicly against such pressures, and it is doubtful, on balance, whether Mr. Strauss gained much from these maneuverings. But apart from all personal factors, what best armed the opposition was the general problem of congressional access to information about the Government.

WHAT GOES ON?

Technological and international realities have been working for nearly half a century to make the Government huge and complex. With the best will in the world, Senators could not know, and officials could not tell them, all that goes on inside the bureaucracy. But only very slowly has there broken in upon Members of Congress the sense that they have, at best, an exceedingly faint idea of what goes on. They are in the position of the man who itches all over and doesn't know where to scratch.

As target for the information itch, Lewis Strauss was the ideal candidate. He had made his money as a banker on Wall Street, doing deals beyond the fathoming of ordinary men and not a few Senators. He had made his name in Government in a field—atomic energy—doubly remote from public understanding; security considerations restricted knowledge of his work at the AEC; and technical complexities and the rapid pace of development pushed comprehension of the atom past the intellectual grasp of all but a handful on the Hill.

The specter of similar secret powers at the Commerce Department was raised at the very first committee hearing on the Strauss nomination. Chairman WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, read into the record a list of 14 different agencies, boards, commissions, and so forth that would be under Strauss' thumb, summoning images of shadowy bureaucratic empires.

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON of New Mexico, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, posed the information issue squarely in testimony on Mr. Strauss' "various deliberate efforts to avoid keeping the Joint Committee fully and currently informed." It was a good thing that someone spoke plainly, for without another word of explanation, virtually every topic in the committee hearings seemed, mysteriously, to gyrate around the information question without ever defining it.

It was brought out that Mr. Strauss, though he divulged his personal financial holdings, was not keen to make known those of his family. (Neither is anyone else, and the practice is rarely, if ever, followed.) It was claimed that Mr. Strauss used control of security clearances to beat down personal foes. An aimless trek (240 pages in the record) through the trackless waste of the Dixon-Yates contract arrived, mirabile dictu, at its starting point. Senator KEFAUVER, testifying to Mr. Strauss' role in Dixon-Yates, sounded almost pathetic: "There are a lot of questions left unanswered. * * * Points that are left hanging up in the air. * * * I don't know how long it would take me to pick my way through all this."

IN THE LABYRINTH

Intimations that such quests might last for centuries developed dramatically out of the committee hearings. As in the McCarthy-Army circus, disputes on the smallest points dragged on without resolution. As a sampling, here is an abridged account of a dispute about whether the State Department had or had not approved a decision made by Mr. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce by recess appointment to deny any exporter's application to ship line pipe to the Soviet Union:

March 11: Mr. Strauss denies the application. He says the denial was recommended by an interdepartmental committee on which the State Department is represented.

March 12: A New York Times story says that the State Department saw "no useful purpose" in denying the application.

March 17: The Providence Evening Bulletin criticizes Mr. Strauss editorially for implying that the denial had "State Department sanction."

March 18: Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, raises the question in committee. Mr. Strauss testifies: "There was absolutely no difference between the State Department and the Department of Commerce on this."

April 15: Chairman MAGNUSON writes the State Department for a copy of the minutes of the interdepartmental meeting.

May 6: Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., replies: "The papers * * * which you have requested are a part of the Department of Commerce files, and, in any event, fall within the category * * * which I am not privileged to release to you."

May 11: Senator MAGNUSON renews the request, citing a statement by the President in favor of full disclosure.

May 19: The Assistant Secretary releases the requested document. It says: "the Department * * * objected to the recommendation * * * to deny an application to export line pipe to the U.S.S.R."—a seeming victory for the opposition to Mr. Strauss. But it also points out that the State Department did not exercise its right to appeal the recommendation—a leg, even if slightly spindly, to support Mr. Strauss' claim that the State Department sanctioned his decision.

In other instances the committee got even less for its pains. One issue in the hearings turned on the case of the geneticist H. J. Muller. Professor Muller had been asked by the AEC to deliver a paper at the 1955 Geneva Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. On May 18, 1955, he was informed that his paper would be acceptable. On June 17, there appeared in the magazine Science an article by Dr. Muller on "Genetic Damage Produced by Radiation." On July 18, Professor Muller was informed by the AEC that he would not be included in the U.S. delegation to Geneva and that accordingly he could not read his paper to the conference. In many scientific quarters there was a feeling that Dr. Muller had been kept off the delegation because he had espoused a position on the dangers of radiation at odds with the official position of the AEC.

On May 14, in the committee hearings, Senator MAGNUSON raised the Muller issue with Mr. Strauss. On May 21, in a letter to Senator MAGNUSON, Mr. Strauss said: "With reference to your inquiry concerning Prof. H. J. Muller, I have no record on this subject and would have to rely upon the records of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have no doubt that the Commission will be glad to respond to your inquiry, however, and I am relaying [the inquiry] to the Chairman of the Commission. * * * On May 26, the AEC sent the committee a transcript of a press conference on the Muller affair held by Mr. Strauss himself on October 3, 1955. In it Mr. Strauss said of the decision not to allow Professor Muller to read his paper at Geneva: "The decision was a sound one made for this reason: that Dr. Muller's paper, which I understand is an excellent paper, depended upon a reference, or perhaps more than one reference to the bombing of Hiroshima. The Geneva conference was a conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. * * * A discussion on the bombing of Hiroshima would have been out of bounds for the Conference."

After several chases like that, Senators understandably waxed wroth. The three hostile to Mr. Strauss at the outset were joined by five more, against a majority of nine, in the committee vote. By the time the nomination reached the floor, what had started as a question of candor had swollen to an epic battle of plain people versus omniscient bigness.

Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, put the matter squarely. The trouble, he declared, was one "of administrative heads acting as though they were still the top management of corporations or the high officers of the Military Establishment. They set the policy and administer it largely on their own initiative. Their decisions, backed up by estimates of the Bureau of the Budget, are presented to the Congress with the authority of law, and Congress is charged with being reckless and irresponsible when it makes judgments that vary from the decrees of the supreme command."

Then the scratching began again. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, thundered against the "high finance" and "pervasive influence of Wall Street." Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, lamented that Congress "knows nothing about the [foreign aid] contracts." Mr. Strauss, he said, was "above the law, above the Constitution, above the President, above the executive branch, above the Attorney General, above the legislative branch." In fact, Mr. Strauss reminded the Senator of "an old political boss in New Jersey who said: 'I am the law.'" Senator O'MAHONEY broke in: "Once there was a man, Louis—Louis XIV—who said 'I am the state.' Now we have a Lewis who says, 'I am the law'."

Nothing better illustrated the character of the opposition to Mr. Strauss than its geographical composition. The more sophisticated northern liberals—e.g., DOUGLAS and HUMPHREY—were elsewhere while the Strauss debate droned on. Two Republican northern liberals, Senators JAVITS and SCOTT, actively backed Mr. Strauss. The fires of opposition were stoked by men from the smaller, rural States of the South and West: ANDERSON, of New Mexico; KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; O'MAHONEY and MCGEE of Wyoming; MONRONEY, of Oklahoma; and, on the Republican side, LANGER, of North Dakota. Seventy years ago they would have called themselves populists and critics would have dubbed them "sons of the wild jackass." In one sense they are grandsons. For Mr. Strauss may or may not be lacking in candor. But the size and complexity of the Government have been sanctioned by acts of Congress passed under the urgent press of circumstance. Like revolutions and peoples, circumstance cannot be put on trial.

Still, in a way familiar in democracies yet hard to define, the opposition to Mr. Strauss touched on a matter of genuine importance. Big Government is inexorably escaping the very comprehension—to say nothing of control—of Congress. Insofar as its increasing complexity baffles scrutiny, it seems increasingly reasonable for Congress to pay more than cursory attention to Executive appointments—one of the few things it really can do. The very circumstances that make for big Government work against the traditional presumption in favor of the President's right to nominate as he pleases.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Minneapolis Star, July 7, 1959, concerning the great food for peace program recently proposed by the senior Senator from Minnesota, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY:

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

HIGH FARM PRICES OR HIGH PRODUCTION?

A central question involved in the hearing that opened today in Washington on Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S food for peace plan is whether American farmers should produce in abundance to help fill the needs of the world or whether their output should be limited to narrow domestic markets through imposition of strict Government controls.

Perhaps the issue never will be defined in exactly that way in the Washington hearings, but it is the significant question in the minds of many observers and participants.

What Senator HUMPHREY proposes to do is to build on the administration's present surplus removal program and convert it into a plan to use farm products as a tool of foreign economic policy.

What is wanted by some opponents of the present program—and by some critics of HUMPHREY'S amendments—are strict governmental controls to reduce sharply the productive capacity of the Nation's farms, create artificial shortages and thus raise farm prices.

The latter alternative would be unthinkable, in our opinion, because it would put American farm prices out of the reach of foreign consumers, sharply limit farmers' freedom, bar U.S. farmers from all except the domestic market and even require protection at home against imports of farm products.

HUMPHREY'S program, as he said when he introduced his amendments, would make the present Public Law 480 surplus removal program "a more effective instrument for using U.S. abundance of food to help build essential world conditions of peace and freedom and thereby strengthen and promote the foreign policies of the United States."

He has emphasized this shift in the purpose of the present program—from surplus removal to economic policy tool—by getting the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—instead of the Agriculture Committee—to conduct the present hearings.

Under his proposals, the program would run for 5 years rather than just continuing on the year-to-year basis of the past. This approach was strongly recommended by Dr. John H. Davis, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the Eisenhower administration, after his study of overseas farm surplus removal last year.

Both the United States and the receiving countries can plan better if they know that the program is going to continue for a period of time without substantial change. And there is little likelihood that we will be able to deal ourselves out of our present surplus stocks in less than a 5-year period—unless war intervenes.

The Humphrey amendments also put a ceiling of $2 billion a year on the amount of products which can be purchased from the Commodity Credit Corporation for this purpose; set a ceiling of 2.5 percent on interest on development loans made from funds gained from sales of surplus farm products; and greatly expand the uses which can be made of local currency proceeds from sales of farm surpluses in order to help the recipient countries with their economic development.

No one is suggesting that we provide additional incentives to farmers to produce more for the food-for-peace program. But we already have this huge stock of surplus products, and we ought to use it as intelligently as possible. Helping feed the people, start the economic development, and raise the standards of living in the underdeveloped areas are commendable objectives. And under the food-for-peace plan they could be pursued while keeping open the doors to international trade.

For diplomatic, economic and humanitarian reasons, the food-for-peace program deserves favorable consideration by Congress. We hope the administration—which has recommended a more limited program with more limited objectives—also gives it the green light.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 660. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; and

S. 866. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1910.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 726) to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of

cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7500) to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. JUDD, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and Mr. CHIPERFIELD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I give notice to the attachés of the Senate that this will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ervin	Magnuson
Allott	Frear	Mansfield
Anderson	Fulbright	Martin
Bartlett	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bennett	Gruening	Morton
Bible	Hart	Mundt
Bridges	Hartke	Muskie
Bush	Hayden	Neuberger
Butler	Hennings	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Proxmire
Cannon	Holland	Randolph
Capehart	Hruska	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Carroll	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, N.J	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Chavez	Jordan	Smith
Church	Keating	Sparkman
Clark	Kefauver	Stennis
Cooper	Kennedy	Symington
Cotton	Kerr	Talmadge
Curtis	Kuchel	Thurmond
Dirksen	Langer	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Long	Yarborough
Dworshak	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Ellender	McGee	
Engle	McNamara	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the pending bill is H.R. 7454, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that any point of order against the committee amendments be reserved.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "Fund", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That effective July 1, 1959, the appropriation accounts 'Military Personnel, Army', 1956 and 1957, shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation account entitled, 'Military Personnel, Army, Prior Years' established pursuant to the provisions of section 1(a)(1) of the Act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 647, 648)."

On page 3, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$596,900,000" and insert "$620,600,000"; in the same line, after the word "addition", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$24,000,000", and in line 17, after the word "fund", to insert a colon and the following provisos: *"Provided,* That the Regular Marine Corps personnel paid from this appropriation shall be maintained at an end strength of not less than two hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960: *Provided further,* That $32,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at an end strength of not less than two hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960."

On page 4, line 11, after the word "case", to strike out "$3,912,000,000" and insert "$3,892,000,000", and in line 13, after the word "fund", to insert "and, in addition, $20,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the Airlift Service, Air Force Industrial Fund: *Provided,* That such amount as may be used for the liquidation of obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1959."

On page 4, line 24, after the figures "$231,700,000", to insert a colon and the following provisos: *"Provided,* That the Army Reserve personnel paid from this appropriation shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than three hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960: *Provided further,* That $29,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Army Reserve at an average strength of not less than three hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960."

On page 6, line 14, after the word "Code", to insert a colon and the following provisos: *"Provided further,* That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than four hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960 including not less than fifty-five thousand input into the six months' training program during fiscal 1960 and funded from this appropriation: *Provided further,* That $43,000,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Army National Guard at an average strength of four hundred thousand during the fiscal year 1960."

On page 9 line 19, after the word "Government", to strike out "$3,065,390,000" and insert "$3,085,390,000", and, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following provisos: *"Provided further,* That $24,300,0000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Army National Guard at an average strength of four hundred thousand during the fiscal year 1960: *Provided further,* That $24,500,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Army Reserve at an average strength of not less than three hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960: *And provided further,* That the expenditures under this head in the fiscal year 1958 by the Army on behalf of the Navy for medical care are authorized and validated."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$2,599,320,000" and insert "$2,621,720,000", and in the line 7, after the word "stations", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That $5,900,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at an end strength of not less than two hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960."

On page 13, line 6, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$171,350,000" and insert "$175,850,000", and after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That $4,500,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at an end strength of not less than two hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960."

On page 15, line 7, after the word "Government", to strike out "$4,167,506,000" and insert "$4,222,506,000."

On page 16, line 6, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$157,000,000" and insert "$151,700,000", and on page 17, line 3, after the word "respectively", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That $5,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Army National Guard at an average strength of four hundred thousand during the fiscal year 1960."

On page 20, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

On page 21, line 7, after "(Public Law 85-365)", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$800,000, of which $400,000 shall not be available unless H.R. 5674 or similar authorization is enacted into law."

On page 22, line 9, after the word "authorized", to strike out "$1,232,300,000" and insert "$1,450,000,000", and in line 10, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That $117,800,000 of the funds available to the Department of the Army for procurement of Nike-Hercules missiles and supporting equipment shall be reprogramed for Army modernization."

On page 23, line 1, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$1,969,394,000" and insert "$1,950,294,000."

On page 23, line 18, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$1,322,000,000" and insert "$1,636,200,000."

On page 24, line 7, after the word "plants", to strike out "$627,369,000" and insert "$564,069,000."

On page 25, line 6, after the word "things", to strike out "$4,165,700,000" and insert "$4,316,600,000", and in line 7, after the word "expended", to insert "of which $2,900,000 shall be available solely for procurement for the Air National Guard."

On page 26, line 7, after the word "things", to strike out "$2,448,300,000" and insert "$2,552,900,000."

On page 27, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "$1,104,100,000" and insert "$1,115,200,000", and at the beginning of line 12, to insert "of which $16,100,000 shall be available solely for procurement for the Air National Guard."

On page 28, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "$1,046,515,000" and insert "$1,035,715,000."

On page 29, line 6, after the word "law", to strike out "$1,015,920,000" and insert "$970,920,000."

On page 30, line 1, after the word "made", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction,

maintenance, or rental of missile testing facilities until the fullest practical use is made of testing facilities and equipment at existing installations or those now under construction."

On page 32, at the beginning of line 21, to insert "allowances as determined by the Secretary of Defense, for the representation of the United States by officers of United States military missions to foreign countries;".

On page 41, line 10, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided further,* That such limitation shall not apply in the case of four Marine Corps officers below the grade of captain (at the time such training is begun hereunder) if such officers agree in writing to serve in the Marine Corps for a period of not less than six years after completion of such training and agree to seek admission to the bar of the highest court of a State or of the District of Columbia upon completion of such training."

On page 46, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$2,900,000" and insert "$2,400,000" and after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That this amount shall be available for apportionment to the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense."

On page 46, after line 19, to strike out:

"SEC. 631. Of the funds made available by this Act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $80,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service; and the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable."

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 631. Of the funds made available by this Act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $100,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service from carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as scheduled or supplemental air carriers; and the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of such civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable."

On page 47, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 633. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, may, whenever he deems it advantageous to the national defense to accelerate any ballistic missile program or nonballistic strategic or tactical missile programs, transfer to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement and production of ballistic missile systems or nonballistic strategic or tactical missile programs, up to 10 per centum of the amounts programed for obligation during the current fiscal year for research, development, test, and evaluation, procurement, and production or operation and maintenance of missile systems or continental air defense programs: *Provided,* That any appropriations transferred shall not exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations from which transferred: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Appropriations Committees of the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority."

On page 48, at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "633" to "634."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to make a little clarification of the language in the bill.

In printing the bill three words were omitted in the section on "Military Personnel, Air Force."

I ask unanimous consent that on page 4, line 15, after the word "be" the words "required may be" be inserted in the bill.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am glad quite a few Senators are present in the Chamber. This is an important bill.

Mr. President, H.R. 7454, the Department of Defense appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1960, as reported to the Senate, contains $39,594,339,000 in appropriations and $450 million in transfer authority.

This is $346,139,000 in appropriations over the budget estimate of $39,248,200,000. It is also $110 million over the budget estimate in transfer authority.

Compared with the House bill, it is $746 million over the appropriations recommended by the House of $38,848,339,000 and $29 million over the House recommendation of $421 million in transfer authority.

Compared with the appropriations made for fiscal year 1959 it is $293,868,100 under the $39,888,207,100 made that year.

The above figures do not include amounts requested for military construction items, which are included in another bill and will be presented to this body at a later date.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AS A GOAL

I believe this to be a good bill—a bill which, under present day circumstances, will make our defense forces stronger, not only in the present fiscal year, but in the years stretching ahead. The changes made by the committee in the bill are, in our opinion, substantial improvements. They reflected the intent to provide the most defense for the dollar appropriated, and to wring out of every technological advance made by present-day science every ounce of improvement possible in order to provide a defense which is as modern as the genius of our military and technical people can provide and as strong as the courage and the sinews of a great nation can produce. It symbolizes America on the march—not to war, God willing, but toward a goal of strength and security, present and future, which only the foolhardy would dare challenge. This is not the defense bill which would be presented if there were no threats to the peace of the free world, but it is the measure which, we hope, will help maintain the peace, and deter aggression against all the nations of the free world.

CHANGES IN DEFENSE CONCEPT

The last 6 months have been a particularly contentious period in the public discussion of our national defense programs and policies. No doubt the extremely rapid progress in military technology has had much to do with the many controversies surrounding the defense budget. Events are moving so fast that it is extremely difficult to maintain one's thinking abreast of developments and in reasonable prospective. Three years ago the B–52 occupied the center of the stage in the controversy over the defense program. Today the B–52 issue is a settled one and public attention is focused on the intercontinental ballistic missile. Three years ago the expansion of our air defense system was a matter of great concern to the whole country. The talk then was of supersonic interceptors, ground-to-air missiles, the DEW line, the SAGE system, and so forth. Now it appears that these systems for defense against manned bombers are of declining importance and our concern now is with the defense against ballistic missiles. So it goes throughout the entire defense program.

The rapid surge of technological progress is introducing into our thoughts and vocabularly many new and strange concepts—the ballistic missile early warning radars; the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile; the reconnaissance satellites; ballistic missile warning satellites; ballistic missile submarines; boost-glide aircraft; the mysterious effects of high altitude nuclear detonations; and many other strange and wondrous products of science and technology.

Most of the advanced tools of defense are as yet not in production. We can only speculate as to their effectiveness and particularly as to their effectiveness in relation to their costs in terms of the physical resources required to make them operational. It is no wonder that there exist such wide differences of opinion as to the worth of these various devices for the defense of our Nation even among our most competent military people.

While the problems of all-out nuclear war understandably attract the greatest attention, we find that even in this nuclear age there is still a need for forces suitable for use in conflict short of all-out nuclear war.

Many knowledgeable people argue with great conviction that because both sides now have these horribly destructive nuclear weapons, limited wars are now more probable than all-out wars. Yet, the frightful danger of all-out nuclear war continues to overshadow all other considerations as the most dire threat to our very survival as a nation.

So we have a very real and extremely difficult problem of achieving a proper balance among all the diverse elements of our military requirements in a changing and uncertain world. What is needed now above all else is a calm and judicious approach to this problem devoid of preconceptions, emotional biases and service or partisan interests. This is the approach which has guided the committee's consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, 30 Members of this body—27 members of the Committee on Appropriations and 3 members of the Committee on Armed Services, who are ex officio members of the Appropriation Committee—participated in presenting the bill to the Senate.

In presenting the committee bill to the Senate, I should first like to indicate the forces which the budget provided as it was submitted to the Congress, then list briefly the major changes made by

the Senate, and finally provided a detailed description of each Senate amendment.

A summary of the military strengths and major military forces of the three services as proposed in the budget document is as follows:

First. For the Army the plans are to have 14 divisions, 4 Army missile commands and 80¼ air defense antiaircraft battalions, at the end of fiscal year 1960. In addition, it is indicated that there would be an active aircraft inventory totaling 5,363. Army personnel as of the end of the fiscal year would consist of 870,000 on active duty with an additional 360,000 in the National Guard and 330,022 in Army Reserve programs. Of this Reserve total, 270,000 are in drill pay status or are 6-month enlisted trainees.

Second. For the Navy the budget plans to have a total of 864 active ships—389 warships and 475 other ships—at the end of fiscal year 1960. It is proposed that there would be 16 carrier air groups, 22 carrier antisubmarine squadrons, 3 Marine divisions, 3 Marine aircraft wings, and an active aircraft inventory of 9,117. Navy active duty personnel strength would be 630,000 plus 175,000 marines. In addition, the planned strength of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve is 145,168 and 47,775 respectively.

Third. For the Air Force the budget plans for the end of the fiscal year are to have a total of 102 wings. Of this number 43 would be strategic, 25 would be air defense and 34 would be tactical—including airlift—wings. The planned number of active aircraft in inventory is 19,644. Active duty military strength is 845,000, Air National Guard strength 74,500 and Air Force Reserve strength 71,902.

MAJOR CHANGES IN SENATE BILL

The committee has approved substantially all of the above-mentioned defense items. In certain areas, however, substantial changes have been made. These, briefly, are as follows:

Military strength: In three items dealing with military strength important changes have been made. The House has added funds and the Senate committee has agreed to provide an Army Reserve of 300,000 rather than the 270,000 provided in the budget. The House also added funds, and the Senate committee has agreed, to maintain an Army National Guard of 400,000 rather than the budgeted 360,000. In addition, the Senate committee has added funds to increase the Marine Corps from 175,000 to 200,000.

Army procurement: Second, in Army procurement, the committee recommends an increase of $205.3 million for Army modernization over the House recommendation, plus reprograming actions which will add $117.8 million to Army modernization. These, together with House increases, make available an additional $386.1 million for modernization, plus substantial sums for Nike-Zeus acceleration.

Nuclear carrier: Third, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $380 million for full funding of a nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier in place of the conventionally powered carrier proposed in the budget and deleted by the House.

Air Force missiles: Fourth, the committee recommends partial restoration of Air Force Bomarc missile funds, and approved House additions of $162 million for ballistic missile programs. In addition, the committee has recommended language in the bill which will provide the Department of Defense with certain flexibility within the amounts available to utilize missile funds in the best interests of our preparedness program.

In other words, instead of designating a particular missile by name, such as A, B, C, D, or X, we provided the money, and left the selection of the missile up to the Department of Defense, whenever there is a breakthrough.

INCREASES IN MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTH

Now I shall detail the various aspects of the Senate changes in the bill.

For "Military personnel, Army," no substantial changes have been made, the committee approving House action which reduced the appropriation by $81 million, but made a like amount available by transfer from revolving funds.

The bill as reported by the committee strengthens the Marine Corps by providing funds and mandatory language for an active duty strength of not less than 200,000 for the end of fiscal year 1960. An increase of $43.1 million has been provided for this purpose, spread over three appropriations—Military personnel, Marine Corps; operation and maintenance, Marine Corps; and operation and maintenance, Navy. Included in this amount is an additional $9 million to be derived by transfer from the Marine Corps stock fund. This will still leave the stock fund with an adequate cash balance to carry on its operations in an orderly fashion.

The bill also provides that none of these additional funds shall be used for any other purpose than the maintenance of the Marine Corps end strength at not less than 200,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I prefer to finish my statement. I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my statement.

The Marine Corps is one of the principal elements of our limited war forces. The reduction in strength to 175,000 has made it necessary for the Marine Corps to reduce the number of battalion landing teams, the cutting edge of the corps, from 27 to 21. This reduction of six battalions was greater than the number of battalion landing teams actually used in the Lebanon operation, where four teams were employed. The Marine Corps reports that it also had to reduce its combat aviation strength by about six aircraft squadrons, although still maintaining the three air wings. With this additional strength the Marine Corps should be able to restore the units deleted in fiscal year 1959.

I should like to elaborate a little further on the Marine Corps item, and explain the action of the committee in placing the strength of the Marine Corps at 200,000 men.

The committee has provided funds to maintain the Marine Corps at a year end strength of 200,000. In addition the committee has added language to the bill which will require the Department of Defense to maintain the corps at this strength.

While there is ample precedent for the Congress to fix the strength of the Marine Corps at a given figure I would like to review for the Senate some of the background, and reasoning of the committee, which has prompted this mandate on Marine Corps strength. It is my hope that the Senate will clearly understand that the action of the committee with respect to the Marine Corps is neither hasty nor ill conceived, nor is it in any sense an intrusion by the Congress upon any prerogative of the executive branch.

The question of what constitutes an adequate strength for a combat-ready Marine Corps has probably been the subject of the most flagrant and continuing example of disregard for the plainly expressed will and intent of the Congress that the Nation has witnessed in recent history.

The Senate will recall that the Congress has repeatedly and clearly expressed its intent that this Nation requires a Marine Corps of not less than 200,000, and appropriated the necessary funds to give effect to its carefully considered judgment.

Never have we made our intent more clear than we did in both this and the other body in providing funds once again during the past fiscal year for a minimum of 200,000 marines. In spite of this fact we have been confronted with the deepest cut the Pentagon has ever made in the Marine Corps.

Our action in recommending to the Senate mandatory language on the strength of the Marine Corps is based upon this clear proof on the record that no other means will serve to effect the intent of the Congress.

To insure its instant readiness and availability the Congress has carefully designed its structure and assigned its missions in greater detail than we have done for any other service. As every Member of this body knows so well, we have fashioned a superbly ready expeditionary force of amphibious troops that have never failed the Nation in any test, to which they have been put.

As we view the world situation—the continuing tension of the cold war—we can perceive no sound basis for any belief that in the near future this Nation can expect any relaxation of the relentless pressure of the Communist empire upon this Nation and its allies in the free world.

It is precisely this unsettled and dangerous state of world affairs that has made necessary in recent years the repeated use of Marine Corps forces with the fleet in the very missions for which they are held in constant readiness. In the opinion of the committee, which it is my great honor to head, the very presence of these forces, and the naval units

of which they form so vital an element, has more than once prevented the holocaust we seek by every honorable means to avoid.

We are convinced that what constitutes an adequate strength for the Marine Corps must be measured by the Nation's needs for forces of the kind that only that corps by reason of its specialized training, organization, equipment and close partnership with our fleets can provide. We foresee no diminution of the proven need of recent years. Until there is firm evidence to the contrary we must continue to provide the 200,000 marines as a necessary minimum to man the 3 combat divisions and 3 air wings required by law.

I referred a moment ago to the fact that there is ample precedent for fixing the strength of the Marine Corps at a definite figure. I revert to the subject again only because there has been in the minds of some a question as to whether any precedent exists for the Congress to provide for the Armed Forces in such detail as to prescribe the actual strength of one of the services.

I invite your attention to the fact that the Congress only last year prescribed the strength of the Army Reserve and National Guard, an action the committee recommends again this year.

Further, I think it may be informative to all Senators to recall that throughout our history, from the earliest days when the membership of this body included some of the framers of our Constitution, the Congress has from time to time prescribed in detail for the Armed Forces far more minute than the broad question of national military policy involved in setting the strength of an entire armed service.

The Congress has directed the composition of the crews of certain named naval vessels by number and by rank; the organization of units as small as the infantry company and artillery battery; the speed, the armament, the thickness of armor, even the tensile strength of the steel in warships to be constructed; the assignment of marines in specified numbers to duty aboard ships of the fleet; the rank of the commanding officers of certain naval vessels, to name but a few instances selected at random from the many which exist.

I need hardly add that it is the Congress which has established the roles and missions of each armed service; the actual major combat units into which the Marine Corps shall be organized; the membership and duties of, and limitations upon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There are indeed many detailed precedents which go far beyond the broad question of an adequate strength for the Marine Corps.

I can assure the Senate that the figure of 200,000 was not selected haphazardly. It is based upon the committee's most careful consideration of the difference in terms of actual combat strength between a Marine Corps of 175,000 and one of 200,000.

Two hundred thousand marines will support the three full combat divisions and three air wings the Congress has prescribed for the Marine Corps by law.

One hundred and seventy-five thousand Marines, the actual present strength, has meant the deactivation of 6 of the 27 battalion landing teams of the corps with their artillery, tanks, engineer and support troops. Further, 6 tactical squadrons and more than 100 other aircraft are lost.

I know the Senate will be surprised and disturbed, even as the committee, to learn that in this process of weakening the major combat units of the corps not even the Marine division on Okinawa escaped its share of the cut. Certainly you must agree that it is the height of folly to weaken the single major U.S. ground force in the Far East, not only a fact but a symbol of American determination, faith, and resolve to our hard pressed allies there. What must our friends in that vitally important, seriously threatened part of the world think as they watch this reduction of ready combat forces even as the shelling of Quemoy continues?

It is clear to me, as I am certain it must be to every Member of the Senate, that the fundamental issue involved here far transcends in importance the question of what constitutes an adequate strength for the Marine Corps or any other service. What is in fact involved here is the constitutional role of the Congress in formulating the Nation's military policy.

The responsibility of the Congress in matters concerning the national defense is clear.

The Constitution places the ultimate responsibility for our defense squarely upon the Congress. It does so by lodging plenary power in the Congress to raise and support armies and provide and maintain a Navy. No less an authority than Charles Evans Hughes has stated that this power is unlimited except for the qualification that no appropriation for the Army may be for a longer term than 2 years.

Speaking before the American Bar Association in September 1917, even as this Nation struggled to mobilize for the first great war, he defined this constitutional grant of authority to include the duty "to prescribe the military organization and provide the Military Establishment, fix numbers, regulate equipment, afford maintenance, and for these purposes appropriate such amounts of money as it thinks necessary."

Another distinguished authority, Dr. Howard White, has examined this constitutional grant of power to the Congress and found that—

> Raising armies includes such matters as the determination of the number of men to be enlisted; their enlistment qualifications; their organization into the different arms of the service, the number and arrangements of the various units; the number and rank of officers; the term of service for officers and men. * * * Over all these matters the power of Congress is complete and exclusive. The President is vested with no constitutional power in regard to raising and organization of the Armed Forces.

The Attorney General of the United States in an opinion upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress which directed the President to maintain detachments of marines in specified strengths on board certain armed vessels of the Navy stated the duty and the power of Congress which flow from the constitutional grant in words which admit no misunderstanding:

> This power to raise and support armies and provide and maintain a Navy, is plenary and without limitation or restriction, and the Congress is the sole judge of how the Army and Navy shall be raised and of what it shall be composed (27 Op. Atty. Gen. 259).

I do not mean to suggest that any part of this tremendous burden which rests upon our shoulders infringes in any way upon the equally heavy responsibilities of the Executive. The President is the Commander in Chief and must employ the forces and direct the campaigns wherever and however he may think they should be carried on. For this reason the recommendations of the executive branch are entitled to the greatest respect and most careful consideration. I can assure the Senate that they are so received by the committee.

But it is clear that each of these great powers is the subject of separate grants of power in the Constitution, one to the Executive, one to the legislative branch. Each complements the other and together they furnish the Nation's adequate equipment for war.

In those occasional instances wherein our most carefully considered judgment differs from that of the Executive, as we do in this matter of what constitutes an adequate Marine Corps, the Congress cannot in honor and good conscience absolve itself of its burden by supinely bowing to the Executive.

Recognition of this truth, grounded upon the clear meaning of the basic law, has guided the committee in prescribing a fixed strength for the Marine Corps.

Similar action has been taken by the Senate committee to maintain the drill pay strength of the Army Reserve at 300,000 and the Army National Guard at 400,000. The apparent reduction of $5.3 million made in the amount provided by the House will not affect these strengths. The $5.3 million was originally included to provide for an accelerated transfer of the Nike sites to the Army National Guard. This plan has now been modified and the $5.3 million is no longer required for that purpose.

Over a period of years there have been progressive reductions in the strength of the active Army. One of the factors compensating for this reduction in active duty strength has been the increasing effectiveness and readiness of the Army Guard and Reserve.

The Guard and the Reserve are the lowest cost military forces that we have. As an economical and effective alternative to large standing forces they should, at all times, be kept at optimum strength levels compatible with the importance of their missions.

Because no nation, however prosperous, can afford to maintain on active duty all of the personnel who might be needed in time of national emergency, it is imperative that there be a pool of trained manpower available at a moment's notice. The Guard and the Reserve, if properly supported and main-

tained at adequate strength levels, will be able to fulfill this requirement.

In order to insure that the Army National Guard and Army Reserve are maintained at their present levels of 400,000 and 300,000, respectively, the Senate committee has added mandatory language to the bill and has provided that the increased funds be used solely for the purpose indicated.

OPERATION FUND

A variety of reductions were made by the House in the operation and maintenance funds for the three Departments. Some of these were not appealed. Of those which were appealed, the Senate committee made substantial restoration in all accounts except the 1 percent House reduction in civilian personnel. The restorations referred to were in the fields of base operating costs, proficiency flying, and operation and maintenance of the active fleet. Amounts required to support the increased strengths for the Marine Corps, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve are also found in these appropriations.

In two other operational items, the committee approved the budget estimate of $800,000 for the winter Olympic games, and approved $15 million for the contingency fund of the Secretary of Defense.

ARMY PROCUREMENT INCREASES

One of the committee's principal efforts in developing its recommendations on this bill was to achieve a better balance between our general war and limited war capabilities and between our offensive and defensive forces. The committee was impressed with the fact that the approaching situation of nuclear parity with which we now find ourselves confronted apparently has not diminished the possibility of limited wars. These are the kind of conflicts which primarily involve Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces. The committee's recommendations strengthen these elements of our Defense Establishment.

Although the committee did not recommend an increase in the strength of the Army above the 870,000 provided in the President's budget, we do recommend a very substantial increase in funds for the modernization of Army equipment. In so doing the committee was guided by the paramount need for a well-trained, mobile and modern Army with increased firepower.

The committee added another $250.3 million to the $200 million already added by the House for Army modernization and/or the expansion of the Nike-Zeus program, or a total of $405.3 million over the amount included for this purpose in the President's budget. Actually a greater amount has been provided. The bill provides "that $117,800,000 of the funds available to the Department of the Army for procurement of Nike-Hercules missiles and supporting equipment shall be reprogramed for Army modernization." This figure includes the $76.8 million which became available for Army modernization as a result of the Defense Department's recent revision of the air defense plan, plus $41 million in other Nike-Hercules funds. Thus, in addition to the $405.3 million of new funds added to the bill by the House and Senate committee actions there is also provided a total of $117.8 million of funds reprogramed from the Nike-Hercules, making a grand total of $523.1 million available for Army modernization and/or expansion of the Nike-Zeus program over and above the amount requested in the President's budget. Of this amount, it is understood that the Defense Department will use $137 million for the Nike-Zeus.

Finally, there is included in the bill a $20 million increase for National Guard and Reserve procurement. The committee report provides that, to the extent these funds are not required for the National Guard and Reserve, they may be utilized by the Army for the modernization of the equipment of its active forces.

These additional funds are also intended to provide for an estimated deficiency of between $117 million and $267 million which may develop in the Army procurement account during fiscal year 1960 as the result of reductions in MAP orders originally expected to be placed with the Army and anticipated short falls in the amount of deobligations which will actually be realized in fiscal year 1960.

In other words, the Defense Department told me that it had made a mistake of some $200 million, and this is the way it is supposed to be made up.

NUCLEAR ATTACK AIRCRAFT CARRIER

For the Navy the committee has provided a total of $380 million for a nuclear-powered attack carrier. This would be the eighth large attack carrier to be constructed for the Navy and the second nuclear-powered attack carrier. The President's budget requested $260 million for a conventionally powered attack carrier. The House rejected this request and instead substituted $255.3 million spread over five different Navy appropriations for an increase in antisubmarine warfare capability. I wish to make it clear that the Senate Appropriations Committee fully agrees with the House on the importance of an adequate antisubmarine capability. But we must not overlook the fact that the attack carrier is the backbone of the Navy's limited war forces. We have seen within the last year on two widely separated cold war fronts the unique contribution that the carrier task force can make to our limited war capabilities. In both the Lebanon and Taiwan situations American military power was projected in large part through the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and the 7th Fleet in the Far Pacific.

They were already in the general area when the trouble began and were able to respond promptly to the needs of the hour. These great American fleets are always on the job, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and 52 weeks of the year, safeguarding the peace.

These carrier forces have other assets. Seaborne military power avoids the necessity of stationing large numbers of U.S. military personnel in foreign countries, thereby avoiding the many problems involved in status of forces agreements and the possibilities for friction with other countries. Also, the carrier task forces avoid the delicate problem of introducing U.S. nuclear weapons into other sovereign countries. The carrier task forces place at the scene of any potential trouble a form of U.S. military power which has both a conventional and nuclear capability without involving the sovereignty of any other nation, and they are touchy at times.

It has been argued that the Navy already has enough aircraft carriers. It is true that the Navy has a sizable number of aircraft carriers, but most of these vessels were built during World War II and are no longer suitable or safe enough for the employment of the kind of high performance combat aircraft now being delivered to the fleet. I speak here of the World War II *Essex*-class carriers which still constitute about half of the attack carriers presently being operated by the Navy. The three *Midway*-class carriers constructed at the close of World War II and which were subsequently modernized are still suitable for the attack carrier mission. These three vessels, together with whatever number of *Forrestal*-class carriers are eventually constructed, will constitute the carrier task force of the future. And, as I said earlier, the advent of nuclear weapons has by no means diminished the possibilities of limited wars and the need for aircraft carriers.

There are some people who would also argue that the Navy does not need high-performance aircraft and therefore does not need large modern attack carriers. This is not only a fallacious argument, but it is dangerous to our military position in the world. We should have learned the lesson taught to us during the Korean war when the Navy with its late World War II and very early model jet aircraft found itself unable to cope with the Migs furnished by the Soviet Union to the Chinese Communists. Our naval fliers should not be asked to fly in combat in second-line aircraft nor should they be asked to operate first-line aircraft from second-line carriers. If this Nation is to continue to operate carrier task forces, the Navy must have some additional modern carriers.

Considering the long construction time involved and the long service life of such a vessel the committee is convinced that all new attack carriers should incorporate the most advanced technology in order to avoid early and wasteful obsolescence. The nuclear-powered carrier of the *Enterprise* class has many advantages over the conventional *Forrestal*-class carrier. It has greatly increased endurance especially at high speeds, thus making it less vulnerable to enemy submarines. It can carry more aircraft and it is able to provide increased storage for aviation fuel and other essential items. It is far less vulnerable to nuclear fallout, and because of its minimum superstructure, it can accommodate more readily very powerful search radars. All of these advantages in the opinion of the committee are worth the extra $120 million in cost.

The bill also includes funds for the advance procurement of long-leadtime components for an additional nuclear-powered killer submarine. Many Navy

experts have stressed the fact that one of the best antisubmarine weapons yet devised is another fast and maneuverable submarine. Providing funds for advance procurement will insure an earlier availability of this valuable addition to the Nation's anti-submarine-warfare capability.

The bill provides the funds requested for the balance of the shipbuilding program recommended in the 1960 budget and has restored the funds deleted by the 1-percent cut made by the House in this and all other Navy, Army, and Air Force procurement appropriations.

I might add that although the committee fully concurs in the objective of the House action it would probably result in a reduction in the procurement of "hardware" for equipping the forces. The Secretary of Defense agreed that there is room for improvement in the Department's procurement methods and procedures, but pointed out that the 1960 budget requests were based on tight budgeting. The original budget estimates were prepared under rules which allowed no provision for future price and wage increases. Because of price increases and cost overruns which have already taken place since the 1960 budget was prepared, a distinct improvement in procurement procedures will be needed if the programs in the budget are to be supported. Since some further price increases may occur in the months ahead, even the apparently modest 1-percent reduction in procurement appropriations would require an actual reduction in the programs for 1960.

Each of the military services has assured the committee that it will promptly correct faulty procurement practices when deficiencies are pointed out and will intensify its efforts to seek out more efficient and economical procurement procedures. The committee intends to follow up this matter and see to it that the necessary action is taken.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION, AIR FORCE

The committee has added $150,900,000 to the amount provided by the House for "Aircraft procurement, Air Force." It has approved the restoration of 35 jet utility training aircraft required to provide jet proficiency training to pilots and crew members to insure a higher level of jet qualification. It has restored 14 jet navigation training aircraft needed for advanced navigator training, electronic countermeasure training, and for airway traffic control surveillance. It has also restored $50 million of the $100 million requested for modification of aircraft to insure safety of flight for aircraft and crew and for correction of service-revealed deficiencies. The committee has also made a restoration of the 1-percent overall procurement reduction made by the House and has added funds for 11 F–27 aircraft. The committee did not approve restoration of funds which were requested for 10 jet cargo aircraft, believing that the civil air fleet is adequate to cover this requirement.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The total budget estimate for "Missile procurement, Air Force" was $2,601,200,000. The House provided $2,448,300,000, or a net reduction of $152,900,000. Included in this action by the House was a 1-percent general procurement reduction; the deletion of funds from the Mace missile; amounting to $127.5 million; a reduction in the Bomarc totaling $162.7 million; an increase of $85 million for 8 additional Atlas squadrons; and an increase of $77 million for Minuteman acceleration. However, during the Senate hearings the Secretary of Defense provided, at Senate urging, a revised air defense program. Senators will find this detailed on page 4 of the committee report. In this revised plan, among other changes, the Department of Defense proposed a reduction of $32.8 million from the budget in Bomarc. Full restoration was requested of other budgeted items deleted by the House. The Department also requested that House additions for Atlas and Minuteman be deleted, but that if the committee saw fit to include the funds, they would provide additional flexibility in the programs.

In providing $2,552,900,000 for this appropriation, the committee took a number of related actions. It restored the 1-percent general reduction of $24,700,000. It restored $79.9 million for the Bomarc missile. And it approved the additional amounts which the House had included for Atlas and Minuteman. However, in so doing, the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to use these funds where they are most needed in the missile area.

The committee did not restore the funds deleted by the House for the Mace missile. However, in order to provide further flexibility to the Secretary of Defense the committee recommends a new general provision, section 633. A full explanation of this new section is found on page 25 of Senate Report 476.

FLEXIBILITY IN MISSILE FUNDS PROVIDED

This section would permit the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget to accelerate any ballistic missile program—or nonballistic, strategic, or tactical missile program—by transferring up to 10 percent of the amounts programed for obligation during fiscal year 1960 for research, development, test, and evaluation; procurement and production, or operation and maintenance of missile systems or continental air defense programs. The section also provides that the amounts transferred shall not exceed 10 percent of the appropriations from which transferred and that the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Appropriations Committees of the Congress of all transfers made pursuant to this authority.

MACE PROGRAM

By the wording of the section, available funds may be utilized for the Mace missile program. The committee has been informed that a number of our NATO allies are interested in this weapon and that General Norstad, Supreme Commander Allied Forces, Europe, is banking heavily on the availability of this weapon for use in Europe. The Mace, as the members of this body know, is an improved version of the Matador, already deployed overseas. It is essentially an all-weather tactical air weapon and is capable of accurately hitting targets at a very wide variety of ranges and of attacking at a high or low altitude. If in the judgment of the Defense Department, procurement of this weapon is of sufficiently high priority, then under section 633 the Secretary of Defense has the authority to make the necessary adjustments in other missile or air defense programs to provide the funds for this purpose. By the same wording of section 633, and as stated in the committee report, funds may be transferred from but not to, the Nike-Ajax, Nike-Hercules, or Bomarc programs.

The state of the art in the ballistic missile area is still in such an early stage of development as to warrant providing the Secretary of Defense considerable latitude in shifting funds to various ballistic missile programs. It is generally agreed that the ballistic missile will be a weapon of prime importance in the years immediately ahead. The Nation cannot afford to be second best qualitatively in this field. The Defense Department must be in a position to capitalize immediately on any breakthroughs in this area and to move promptly from less promising to more promising missile systems.

In the appropriation "Other procurement, Air Force" the committee has restored the general reduction but not that connected with the radar improvement program, part of which, under the revised air defense program, was not requested.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For the three services the Department requested $3,772,335,000 for "research, development, test and evaluation." The committee has made relatively minor changes in this. It has deleted $10,800,000 in the Department of the Army's Nike-Hercules program, as requested by the Department of Defense; it has deducted the research portion of the antisubmarine warfare addition made by the House which the Department did not request; and it has approved the House addition of $10 million for the acceleration of Minuteman research and development, which the Department asked be retained.

This concludes the money action in the bill.

LANGUAGE PROVISIONS

The committee made a number of changes in the language pertinent to the appropriations. Some of these I have already dealt with. Those remaining, I shall summarize briefly.

In "Military Personnel, Army," the committee has included a proviso to close out deficiencies incurred in fiscal 1956 and 1957, caused by the inability of the Department to estimate, a year previous, within two-tenths of 1 percent of the funds required. In "Military Personnel, Air Force," the committee has reduced the appropriation by $20 million but has added authority to transfer that amount from revolving funds.

I have already discussed provisions in the bill providing mandatory strengths for the Marine Corps, and Army Reserve and National Guard, as well as the limitation on the use of the added funds. In the case of the Army National Guard additional language was added to provide for an input of 55,000 6-month

trainees, as being necessary in order to maintain the strength at 400,000.

Language is also added on page 10 of the bill validating expenditures made by the Department of the Army in 1958 on behalf of the Department of the Navy for medical care.

On page 21 language is included making the funds provided for the winter Olympic games available only on enactment of authorizing legislation, which as I understand, has already passed both Houses, but has not been signed.

On pages 25 and 27 of the bill are amendments earmarking budgeted funds for the use of the Air National Guard.

On page 30 of the bill is an amendment which would prevent the construction of duplicating missile testing facilities. An identical provision was included in last year's law.

Those in command at the Pentagon love to build new things. There are so many things available now that unless there is a very good, sound reason for additional construction, the present facilities should be used.

Section 603 is amended to include representation allowances to officers of military missions in foreign countries.

Section 617 is amended to permit four Marine Corps officers under certain conditions to take legal training.

Section 630 is amended to limit the funds available for legislative liaison activities to $2,400,000, a reduction of $500,000, with the proviso that the Secretary of Defense may apportion the total funds available as required.

Finally, section 631 is amended by making available an additional $20 million, or a total of $100 million, for commercial air transportation carriers from funds available to the Military Air Transport Service. This does not appropriate new money, but earmarks a portion of MATS funds to be expended on commercial service.

Last year we earmarked $80 million for such service by commercial air carriers. This year we are making available $100 million. I wish to say that a request for $150 million was made, but the committee believed that $100 million would be sufficient.

Last year $80 million was made available, but only $70 million of it was used for the purpose intended.

The $100 million will not be an additional amount. We simply are providing that up to $100 million of available funds could be used for this particular purpose.

Mr. President, as a dedicated American who holds his God and the Nation's welfare above all other things in life, and, second, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee for Defense Appropriations, it is my duty before closing these remarks to inform the Senate that the highest priority must be placed on this Nation's defense, and also on its offense, if necessary. Therefore, I feel duty bound at this time to call attention to the great team which is part of the U.S. Army, Army Ordnance Missile Command—AOMC—located at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., and their miraculous achievements. Russia has her sputnik and Laika. Thank God that America has Redstone.

The elements of this command are the Army Ballistic Missile Agency—ABMA—the Army Rocket and Guided Missile Agency—ARGMA—Redstone Arsenal, and the White Sands Missile Range—WSMR—in my native State of New Mexico.

Because of the Army's foresight which in 1945 brought from Germany to this country some 150 scientists and engineers, the key men who had developed the devastating V–2 ballistic missile of World War II, we have Redstone. The Army further had the wisdom and managerial genius to incorporate their talents into the Army missile development program already underway, with the outstanding results of which the whole free world is proud.

I do not intend by my remarks to minimize the importance of the efforts or achievements of the other services. All of us are in this effort together. If the Polaris is good, we owe thanks to the men who put it in the hands of freedom. We have deterent capability in our SAC; and the Nation and the West owe a million thanks to Gen. Curtis LeMay, Gen. Thomas S. Power, and their team.

By the same token, Redstone and White Sands are this Nation's crowning achievement.

We hear expressions such as, "the Army's space effort is a part of the national space program." This is true. But there is another much clearer way of expressing it: "As the Army properly discharges its combat mission, a unique space capability is an inevitable by-product."

This organization was conceived and held together by a hand of iron possessed by a great American, Maj. Gen. John Bruce Medaris, who should be honored and appreciated by his Nation. The Army Ordnance Missile Command—AOMCO—has proved beyond any doubt that it has certain peculiar capabilities of management and technical support which are in national demand and are being utilized to the reciprocal benefit of the national defense and space research. It is a resource of the U.S. Army, and is directing the Army's missile programs which are so necessary to our defense.

All of us recall some of the great achievements of this Army team:

(a) In February 1949 the first penetration of outer space was accomplished at White Sands Missile Range—WSMR—which achieved an altitude of 250 miles.

(b) In November 1951, this team made the first successful guided-missile intercept of an airplane.

(c) During 1953, the first operational Air Defense guided missile battalion was deployed for defense of the Washington-Baltimore area. I may add that the Army has been successful in installing many of these defense units throughout the United States, with an improved guided missile capable of destroying the highest performance target known.

(d) In May 1957, the first successful intermediate range ballistic missile was launched by the Army.

(e) It was this team that made America's first successful nose cone recovery, after the missile had been hurled 1,500 miles through space.

(f) Everyone is familiar with the Army's spectacular performance in launching the free world's first earth satellite and the free world's first moon probe and solar satellite.

(g) Placing Able and Baker in orbit and returning them unharmed was via an Army Jupiter missile.

These events are engraved in our memories by the reprieve they afforded us when the international prestige of the United States of America was in eclipse because the Soviet Union had first performed these feats, to the awe of a watching world.

As a Nation, let us not applaud the achievements of the Army. Let us look to our national interest, and make sure this superb Army missile team is utilized and exploited to the maximum good of the United States.

In closing this part of my remarks, I ask that a great American not be overlooked. In Europe—which is under the gun, so to speak—our military capability, entrusted to General Norstadt, is safe; and our interests, our security, and the security of the West are assured.

Mr. President, I cannot conclude my remarks about this bill without paying tribute to dedicated men, both military and civilian.

I personally believe sincerely that the American people have never had a better Secretary of the Defense Department than Secretary McElroy. I believe that Secretary Brucker of the Army, Secretary Douglas of the Air Force, and Secretary Franke are outstanding in their line of endeavor.

I take it for granted that they are Republicans; but I know that, first and foremost, these men are fine Americans and are dedicated to their country.

Throughout the years, practically a lifetime of service in the interest of the American people has been contributed by Assistant Secretary of Defense W. J. McNeil and by Assistant Secretary Lyle S. Garlock, of the Air Force.

We hear a great deal about past military leaders; but where would we get any improvement over General Twining, General Taylor, General White, Admiral Burke, and General Pate of the U.S. Marines?

We hear a great deal about Russian scientists; but I will place my trust in our fine military scientists—General Schriever, General Medaris, General Funk, and Admiral Rayburn. In the past 3 years these men have practically accomplished miracles in the fields of modern weaponry.

In passing out accolades, the committee feels that many deserving agencies and persons within the Department of Defense could be mentioned. But time does not permit this.

This committee is entrusted by the Senate with managing this huge appropriation bill. We have taken this responsibility to heart.

The amount of $39,594,339,000 is a staggering sum. For the most important factor in this entire complex problem—namely, the American taxpayer—it is a crushing sum for defense.

In passing out praise, who is more deserving of tribute than the American

taxpayer? History owes the long suffering American taxpayer a tremendous debt. Try to imagine world conditions today without the American taxpayer. He asks very little in return. He asks only that his dollar buy him, his family, and his country, military security. He asks for this unselfishly. The significant byproduct of his efforts is the preservation of Western civilization.

To realize the taxpayers' wishes has been the goal of your committee. To spend wisely and economically, and get effective results, has been our responsibility. We have dedicated ourselves to this task.

Mr. President, certainly I owe an expression of thanks to the members of the subcommittee and to the members of the full committee. I know of no group more dedicated or more cooperative in connection with the effort to bring to the Senate a bill which could be justified. Personally, I wish to thank the members of the subcommittee and the members of the staff for their patience and their fine work. It took a long time. There were 1,660 pages of hearings. All Members, on both sides of the aisle, acted as first-class Americans, and cooperated fully with the committee. I wish to thank each one of them.

After the hearings were concluded, we spent considerable time in marking up this bill. Opinions were freely aired; and what differences there were, were settled in a most friendly and understanding manner. The bill, as it is before the Senate, represents the composite of the best thinking which the 30 members of the committee could provide. I am convinced that it is a good bill, worthy of the traditions of the Senate and the great Nation for which it will provide a maximum degree of security. I urge its speedy enactment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say to the chairman of the subcommittee that if the subcommittee is to be commended, it is because of his actions as its chairman. He has been most patient, thorough, careful, and conscientious in his work. Certainly I think every member of the subcommittee and of the full committee, regardless of the side of the aisle on which he sits, joins me in paying this tribute to the Senator from New Mexico for his guidance of the subcommittee's work. As a result, the bill which has been presented to the Senate is a good one. Not all of us may agree about all of its provisions, but it is a good bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I agree that it is a good bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the Senator from New Mexico concluded his speech?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield to the Senator from Louisiana, without losing the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield now to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico knows, at the markup of this bill by the subcommittee, I endeavored with the help of some of my colleagues to provide the necessary funds for a 900,000-man Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico also knows, that last year the Congress provided funds for a 900,000-man Army, but the President saw fit to use the funds so provided for other purposes.

The Senator from New Mexico is also aware that both the subcommittee, and later, the full committee voted down, by a close margin, my amendments which would have provided funds for an Army of 900,000.

I wonder if the Senator from New Mexico is willing to venture an opinion on the chances of having the Senate adopt an amendment which will provide for a 900,000-man Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As my good friend from Louisiana knows, Mr. President, that matter was taken up first by the subcommittee, and efforts were made to use the same language, for the same numbers, as was used last year, and also to include a provision that the funds would not be used for any other purpose. But the proponents of providing for a 900,000-man Army were in the minority.

Subsequently, efforts were made in the full committee again to provide for an increase to 900,000; and in the full committee that effort was lost.

I, for one, am supporting the efforts to provide for a 900,000-man Army, just as I favored providing for 300,000 Reserves and 400,000 in the National Guard and 200,000 Marines. But we were outvoted. I have no way of knowing how the Senate would vote now if an amendment to increase the numbers were submitted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that the Senator from New Mexico realizes that even if we were successful in having the Senate adopt an amendment providing funds for a 900,000-man Army, there would be hardly any hope of forcing the President to utilize the funds in that way.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. In addition, there undoubtedly would be difficulty with the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; the Senator from New Mexico has anticipated what I was about to say. I, too, believe we might encounter a great deal of difficulty with the House of Representatives in putting in such a level.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have a good sized hunch that we would have such difficulty.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course I am a realist. I should like to submit such amendments; but it is my sincere belief that it will amount to an exercise in futility. Later in the day I shall decide whether I shall submit such amendments. My amendments would add a total of $132 million to the bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

This addition would be included under three separate appropriations, as follows: Military personnel, Army, $59 million; operation and maintenance, Army, $43 million; procurement of equipment and missiles, $30 million.

I submit that the $132 million that it would cost to restore our Army strength to 900,000 men is indeed a small price to pay for the increased national security it would bring.

Mr. Preisdent, I hold in my hand an article by Ben Price, of the Associated Press, from the July 5, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled, "Why General Taylor Is Unhappy Over Our Defense." According to this article, what the general had to say about our military posture could be boiled down in part to this:

"The U.S. defense dollar is not being spent wisely. Repeated cutbacks in manpower have sapped Army strength to the danger point."

It should be remembered, Mr. President, that in the past General Taylor has repeatedly testified before Congress that the minimum strength of the Army should be 925,000.

When queried about Army strength by Mr. PRICE, here is what the general had to say:

> I definitely feel that this 870,000 figure is inadequate. There is a dangerous shortage of personnel in the Far East. In Europe, we are dependent upon civilians to perform tasks normally performed by our soldiers in time of war. The Strategic Army Command (STRAC) has been reduced from four divisions to three.
>
> The reduction in STRAC forces seriously limits the U.S. ability to fight limited wars or to reinforce troops involved in a fight.

Now, Mr. President, I believe the Senate Appropriations Committee has given partial recognition to the views of General Taylor, but they have failed to go all the way.

In its budget estimate the Department of Defense requested end strengths for the Marine Corps and the Regular Army of 175,000 and 870,000, respectively. The Senate Appropriations Committee has seen fit to increase the strength of the Marine Corps from 175,000 to 200,000, but it has failed to increase the strength of the Army.

In refusing to increase the strength of the Army, the committee, on page 7 of its report, has this to say, and I quote:

> The committee carefully considered increasing the size of the Regular Army from the budgeted 870,000 to 900,000. It will be recalled that in fiscal year 1959 the Congress provided funds for a strength of 900,000 rather than the requested 870,000, as provided in the budget for that year. Subsequent to the Taiwan and Lebanon crises the forces were reduced, so that as of May 31, 1959, they total 865,732. The committee has provided funds for 870,000 personnel, the same as approved by the House. In so doing, the committee was guided by paramount need for a well-trained, mobile, and modern Army with increased firepower, and has made provision elsewhere in the bill for these objectives.

Mr. President, I feel that it should be pointed out that in the report language which I have just read the committee has made it perfectly clear that the strength of the Army was not reduced by the Department of Defense until after the crises in Taiwan and Lebanon had passed. Thus, the committee language seems to make it clear that should there be subsequent crises there might still be need for additional troops to handle such situations. Does any Senator on the

floor this moment believe that there will not be such crises in the future. I believe not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at this time I should like to make a further statement in regard to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the very able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for his masterful presentation of the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1960. It is the largest appropriation bill which will come before this session of Congress. The Senator from New Mexico, in his usual able manner, has held thorough committee hearings, has given weeks and even months of consideration to the bill, and has done an outstanding job. I believe he has recommended to the Senate a bill which warrants the support and approval of this body.

I want the Senator from New Mexico to know that I believe that every Member of the Senate and every liberty-loving American looks with a great deal of approval upon his efforts.

The Senator from New Mexico has had a long and useful life of dedicated public service; and I think the Senate is honored to have him head this important subcommittee, which handles the funds for more than half of the entire budget. I want the Senator from New Mexico to know that we are pleased with his record of action and his record of service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Texas, that this bill, together with the bill for military construction funds, will involve a total of $41 billion—more than the cost of running the rest of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

In view of the comprehensive accounting made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I do not propose to discuss this bill in detail. My remarks today will be concerned largely with the relationship between this appropriation bill and certain facts that have come to the fore as a result of the hearings of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

In January, at the very outset of the subcommittee's hearings, the Secretary of Defense informed us that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had stated in writing that he considered "that the fiscal year 1960 proposed expenditure is adequate to provide for the essential programs necessary for the defense of the Nation for the period under consideration."

It was admitted, however, that each service chief had expressed some reservations regarding some of the program items of his own service. The Preparedness Subcommittee went into this matter in considerable detail with the individual members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think that the record of our hearings demonstrated that their reservations to the 1960 budget were quite significant.

General Taylor, Chief of Staff of the Army, expressed serious concern with respect to four major Army programs. They were: First, Army modernization; second, the antimissile missile—Nike-Zeus—program; third, the personnel strength of the Active Army and the Reserve forces—which the very able senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has waged such an untiring fight to keep adequate; and, fourth, the Army surface-to-air missile program.

Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, expressed his reservations concerning five major areas. These were: First, maintenance and modernization of ships and aircraft; second, procurement of new ships, new aircraft, guided missiles, and associated electronic equipment; third, acceleration of the antisubmarine warfare program; fourth, rate of procurement of the Polaris program; and fifth, increased research and development effort.

General Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, had reservations in four areas. These were: First, reduction of Marine Corps personnel; second, lag in new ship construction; third, decline in naval air strength; and, fourth, maintenance and construction of facilities.

General Pate further stated that he considered the military personnel reduction to be paramount.

General White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, was less specific as to his reservations. He did mention, however, four specific examples: First, B–47's are not being replaced as rapidly as requested; second, the aircraft nuclear-powered program should be accelerated; third BOMARC procurement was less than initially requested by the Air Force; and fourth, operation and maintenance funding is minimal.

We all recognize that it is never possible to satisfy all the requirements that can be presented by each of the Armed Forces. And the problem becomes particularly acute when there is a lack of central guidance and direction in establishing priorities among programs.

A good case in point is the fact that the Army and Navy each considered that inadequate funds had been provided for their individual surface-to-air missile programs. In large measure, this simply reflected the fact that the Department of Defense had failed to come up with a unified and consistent plan for continental air defense. It took the direct intervention of the Congress to force the Department of Defense to make long overdue decisions in this area. As a result, it has been possible to reduce the funds required for air defense against manned aircraft. If the Congress had not forced a decision, we would probably still have the Army and Air Force pursuing separate plans which were combined only by a paperclip.

The bill recommended by the Appropriations Committee goes part way toward meeting the reservations expressed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. For example, the committee has recommended an increase of $425,300,000 over the original budget estimate for the Army appropriation for procurement and equipment and missiles. The committee has also directed the reprograming of $117,800,000 of funds previously contemplated for the Nike-Hercules program. This will permit a major stepup in the Nike-Zeus antimissile-missile program, as well as provide for additional firepower and modernization of the Army.

The committee has recommended funds for nuclear-powered aircraft carrier and for an additional antisubmarine submarine. The committee has also provided for maintaining the Army National Guard at a minimum strength of 400,000, the Army Reserve at a minimum strength of 300,000, and the regular Marine Corps at an end strength of not less than 200,000. This will prevent the reductions planned in the 1960 budget, which had proposed to cut the Army Reserve by 30,000 men, the Army National Guard by 40,000, and the Marine Corps by 25,000.

These actions will help materially in overcoming deficiencies in the 1960 budget in two important areas—namely, our capabilities for limited warfare and for defense against ballistic missiles.

At the time that the military construction authorization bill was debated on this floor, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, and the other members of his subcommittee, expressed their doubts as to whether the so-called master plan—or more properly, the revised plan for continental air defense—had gone far enough. Nevertheless, they reluctantly concluded that this plan should be adopted since it was a halting step in the right direction and would save the taxpayer some $1.4 billion over the next few years.

The subcommittee report made it clear that the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were expected to review the proposed program again before construction was begun on the new sites authorized in the bill. The committee also wisely stated its conclusion that, "The best defense is a strong effective offense." In all the debate on the construction authorization, I can recall no disagreement with this point of view.

Strangely enough, the written reservations expressed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the 1960 budget did not deal with the inadequacy of the projected ballistic missile programs. The only exception to this was Admiral Burke's reservation concerning the inadequate rate of procurement for the Polaris fleet ballistic missile system. Despite this omission, the hearings of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee are replete with references to the fact that the 1960 budget placed too much emphasis on defense against manned aircraft and too little emphasis on our offensive retaliatory capabilities. This point of view was expressed not only by the military witnesses appearing before the subcommittee, but was also concurred in by Mr. Stans, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The hearings developed the fact that the Administration's program conceded to the Russians at least a 3-to-1 preponderance in ICBM's for the next few years.

Mr. President, this sort of finding confronts the Congress with a dilemma. On the one hand, we receive clear-cut evidence of the inadequacy of defense plans and programs presented for congressional approval. On the other hand, the Congress is not a military body and should not be placed in the position of

making decisions as to specific weapons systems. Such decisions must be made by those bearing the responsibility—the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President. It is indeed unfortunate that the Congress is placed in the position of making such decisions because of the inability of the constituted authorities to do so promptly and decisively.

For this reason I wish to congratulate the committee for one of the major recommendations that they have made in connection with the 1960 budget for the Department of Defense. I refer to section 633 which provides the Secretary of Defense with additional authority to transfer up to 10 percent of the amounts planned for missile systems or continental air defense programs in order to accelerate any ballistic missile program or nonballistic strategic or tactical missile program, whenever such acceleration will be advantageous to the national defense.

Mr. President, the testimony given to the Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee points up the fact that some of the inadequacy of the defense budget for 1960 stems from the way in which it was prepared. Despite all the glowing statements and promises we have been given concerning unification in the Department of Defense, despite the action the last Congress took providing for greater unification, the 1960 budget was not developed on a Department-wide basis. Instead, each service was given an individual expenditure target. The only decisions as to priorities were made within each department in relation to its individual expenditure target. We could find no evidence to show that the importance of any particular Army program was weighed against the importance of some other Navy or Air Force program. As a matter of fact, testimony revealed the shocking fact that the Joint Chiefs as a group were given only two days to consider the end result of the budget process and never considered such important things as the size of the Army, the need for a new aircraft carrier or—most fundamental of all—what deterrent forces are needed.

I do not think that the American people will ever get a full dollar's worth of defense for every tax dollar devoted to this purpose until the Department of Defense stops budgeting on this basis—on the basis of preestablished dollar ceilings—and instead starts considering the job to be done and the best way of getting the job done. I do believe that the additional transfer authority provided by section 633 of the appropriation bill will provide a valuable tool for shifting funds, so that we can accelerate ballistic missile programs to the maximum extent feasible.

Before concluding, I would like to mention briefly one other aspect of the 1960 budget that has been highlighted by the excellent committee report, which I hope each Member of the Senate will have a full and adequate opportunity to consider thoroughly.

There has been a good deal of talk in this Chamber about fiscal responsibility and backdoor financing. I, for one, call the shots as I see them. I do not believe that there is any room for a double standard—whether it be in human affairs or fiscal affairs. Yet, that is precisely what the administration appears to be practicing.

We all know that there has been a good deal of partisan debate about who is responsible for increasing the budget and who has been responsible for cutting the budget. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with speeches and tables on this matter.

Certainly, so far as the budget estimates for 1960 are concerned, any score card on the increases and decreases Congress makes on the budget estimates must start with the budget estimates. Even if it were not required by law, simple public morality would dictate that where changes occur following submission of the budget to the Congress, the executive branch should submit a budget amendment or supplemental estimate on the desired changes. I believe most Members of this body assume that this is, in fact, being done. However, this principle has certainly not been applied to the Defense budget.

As pointed out on page 6 of the committee report—and I ask each Senator to bear the report in mind—the Army testified that a deficiency of $267 million was now anticipated in fiscal year 1960 because certain reimbursements were not expected to materialize. This estimate was disputed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Comptroller—who informed the chairman of the subcommittee that the estimated shortage was approximately $117 million. I do not intend to debate the relative merits of these two estimates.

As to differences between the Army and the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, they ought to get together over in the Pentagon. The important thing is the fact that there is admittedly a deficiency of at least $117 million. Despite this, the executive branch refrained from submitting a budget amendment to the Congress, but urged the Senate to approve the $200 million added to the Army procurement request by the House, so that a portion of the admitted shortage could be met in this fashion.

A natural question, in view of the above circumstances, is whether the failure to submit a budget amendment was simply because of lack of time to do so. This is clearly not the case. This was a deliberate and, I believe, a considered decision.

On the very day that the Secretary of Defense appeared before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, resumed his testimony before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. In questioning Mr. Stans, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] referred to the House committee report on the question of shortage of funds for the Army procurement program. He asked Mr. Stans whether such a shortage actually existed. Let me quote some of the colloquy that followed.

I think each Member of the Senate ought to be able to read this colloquy in the RECORD. I think it ought to be made a permanent part of the records of this country and of the Senate:

Mr. STANS. As we understand it, the matter of Army's needs for its fiscal year 1960 programs is being handled in connection with the appeal to the Senate from the House action on the entire defense budget. I have talked to the Secretary of Defense about that, and my understanding is that if any further action is required after Senate action, it will be brought to our attention. The matter is in abeyance at the present time until the fiscal year 1960 appropriations have been made.

Senator STENNIS. You mean you deferred it until a supplemental bill could come in at this session?

Mr. STANS. No; we deferred it until action is taken on the fiscal year 1960 appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Senator STENNIS. That is what this alleged shortage pertains to. Why would you defer it until the committee acted?

Mr. STANS. The House added $200 million to the Army's programs, and there were a number of other adjustments. As I have said, I discussed this with the Secretary of Defense, and we agreed to hold off consideration of this matter until their determination as to whether or not they were going to accept within their program the add-on made by the House, or whether they were going to ask for Army's appropriations to be handled in some other way.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Stans, that would not touch this problem, would it, because the House, as I understand it, provided that the extra money could not be used for any purpose except those they specified. * * * The House committee said with reference to the $200 million they added, that "The committee does not intend that any of the funds provided above in the budget estimates for Nike Zeus firepower modernization or the Reserve forces be used to make up the shortage * * *."

Senator STENNIS. If you defer this until all those matters are settled, with this shortage of $217 million, I don't see any way for the Appropriations Committee to handle it. It would require a supplemental, don't you think?

Mr. STANS. I understand that the matters will be presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee by the Department of Defense in such a way as to make a supplemental unnecessary, but we do not have all of the details of their testimony.

Senator STENNIS. Do you give them just carte blanche authority to handle it that way? I want to feel that all of the departments have cleared it through you gentlemen. Not that we mistrust them, but it gives us assurance that someone has brought it out and put the pieces together.

Mr. STANS. We did not take issue with the Department of Defense determinations as to the position they should take on the House add-ons and on the House cuts. We did make suggestions as to what we thought might be the best way to handle them, but the determination was to be made by the Secretary of Defense, and I am not sure that we have all of the details yet as to how the Secretary is going to make the presentation.

The only limitation that was imposed upon him was that in the aggregate the Secretary would not ask for a greater budget for the Department of Defense than appeared in the budget document last January.

I would like to read the last paragraph again because I believe this is the clue to the strategy behind the decision not to submit a supplemental estimate to cover this $117 million, or $267 million, deficiency:

The only limitation that was imposed upon him was that in the aggregate the Secretary would not ask for a greater budget for the

Department of Defense than appeared in the budget document last January.

Now, if this were the only such deficiency the matter might not be so significant. However, there were at least two other acknowledged deficiencies involving large sums of money. There was a deficiency of approximately $43 million in the Air Force military personnel account for fiscal year 1959. In addition, the Secretary of Defense told the Appropriations Committee that there was a deficiency of approximately $60 million in the Air Force military personnel account for fiscal year 1960. But no supplemental estimates or budget amendments were submitted to the Congress. Instead, the Department of Defense tried to cover up this matter by merely asking for blanket authority to transfer whatever amounts were required to meet these deficiencies. The bill before you now provides such transfer authority for fiscal year 1959 but rejects it for fiscal year 1960.

I certainly do not mean to criticize the committee for providing this transfer authority for fiscal year 1959 since, as a practical matter, the funds in question have been spent and the Congress has no recourse but to make up this deficiency. However, this informal, backdoor method of covering up deficiencies must not be permitted to set a precedent for the future. In this connection I agree wholeheartedly with the statement on page 9 of the very fine committee report, which states:

> The committee is emphatic in its belief that this deficiency should not again occur without the committee being promptly informed in accordance with the statutes on deficiencies.
>
> With reference to the deficiency in the Air Force military personnel account for fiscal year 1959, there appears to be a definite violation of the provisions of the Antideficiency Act (sec. 3679, Revised Statutes) in the failure of the Bureau of the Budget to submit the detailed reports required by the statute, accompanied by the required supplemental estimates. Furthermore, the failure of the Bureau of the Budget to submit formally revised estimates to cover the admitted deficiencies in the Air Force military personnel account for fiscal year 1960 is in conflict with the applicable provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended. One of the applicable provisions of this act states:
>
> "No estimate or request for an appropriation and no request for an increase in an item of any such estimate or request, and no recommendation as to how the revenue needs of the Government should be met, shall be submitted to Congress or any committee thereof by any officer or employee of any department or establishment, unless at the request of either House of Congress" (June 10, 1921, ch. 18, title II, sec. 206, 42 Stat. 21).

The three deficiencies, I have just mentioned, for which formal budget estimates have not been submitted, amount to either $220 million or $370 million—depending on whether the Army or the Assistant Secretary of Defense is correct with respect to the shortage in the Army procurement account.

In this connection I would like to call the Senate's attention to one other transaction in which, in my opinion, a revised budget estimate should have been submitted to the Congress. In presenting the revised air defense plan to the Congress several weeks ago, the Department of Defense requested approval of an additional $137 million for the Nike-Zeus program. We were told that this increase was approved by the President. The Budget Director testified that he also participated in consideration of this increase. Despite this, no budget amendment was submitted to the Congress.

Now the President vetoed the housing bill just the other day on the ground that it was inflationary. That bill would have increased spending during the current year by a maximum of some $70 million, according to the staff estimate. Yet, the administration thinks nothing of requesting the Congress to cover admitted deficiencies and supplemental requirements amounting to approximately one-half billion dollars without any formal budget submission whatsoever.

We have heard of double-entry bookkeeping but apparently the administration has revealed a new method altogether—triple-entry bookkeeping.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before I supplement by a few additional words what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has said, I wish to state that he has done a very thorough, conscientious job in hearing the testimony and in presenting the budget on the defense appropriations.

In the pending bill the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends for military functions of the Department of Defense, fiscal year 1960, a total of $39.6 billion in new funds and $450 million in cash transfers from revolving funds.

Stated briefly in terms of total dollars, this is how the Senate committee bill compares with the President's budget request, with the House bill, and with the Department of Defense request of the Senate:

New obligational authority:	
President's budget	$39,284,200,000
House bill	38,848,339,000
Defense Department request	39,385,438,000
Senate committee bill	39,594,339,000
Over budget	+346,139,000
Over House bill	+746,000,000
Over Department of Defense request	+208,901,000
Transfers from revolving funds:	
President's budget	340,000,000
House bill	421,000,000
Defense Department request	421,000,000
Senate committee bill	450,000,000
Over budget	+110,000,000
Over House bill	+29,000,000
Over Department of Defense request	+29,000,000

The Department of Defense request of the Senate exceeded the President's earlier budget requests by $137,238,000, and consisted of appeals from House reductions and of changes in fiscal year 1960 requests arising out of the Department's revised air defense plan.

Gross increases approved by the Senate committee in new funds over the budget request total $916,600,000. Gross decreases total $570,461,000—giving a net increase in the Senate committee bill over the budget of $346,139,000 in new obligational authority.

The Senate committee contains gross increases over the House bill totaling $1,061,400,000. Subtracting the gross decreases of $315,400,000 on the House bill made by the Senate committee, the net increase of $746 million is derived.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks two statements, the first entitled "Senate Appropriations Committee Versus Budget," and the second, "Senate Appropriations Committee Versus House Bill," giving a breakdown to show how the totals are obtained.

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

Senate Appropriations Committee versus budget

Senate committee increases in new funds versus budget	+$916,600,000
Senate committee decrease in new funds versus budget	—570,461,000
Net committee increases	+346,139,000
Senate committee total transfers from revolving funds	450,000,000
Budget total transfers from revolving funds	340,000,000
Senate committee increase in transfers	+110,000,000

BREAKDOWN OF NEW FUND INCREASES BY COMMITTEE, $916,600,000

Military personnel strength:	
Marine Corps (committee 200,000; budget 175,000):	
Military personnel, Marine Corps	$32,700,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	5,900,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	4,500,000
Total, Marine Corps increase	43,100,000
Army Reserves (committee 300,000; budget 270,000):	
Reserve personnel, Army	29,700,000
Operation and maintenance, Army	24,500,000
Procurement equipment and missiles, Army	8,000,000
Total Army Reserves	62,200,000
Army National Guard (committee 400,000; budget 360,000):	
National Guard personnel, Army	43,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Army	24,300,000
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	5,700,000
Procurement equipment and missiles, Army	12,000,000
Total Army National Guard	85,000,000
Nike-Zeus antiballistic missile: Procurement equipment and missiles, Army	137,000,000

Senate Appropriations Committee versus budget—Continued

Army modernization: procurement equipment and missiles, Army	268,300,000
Nuclear ships:	
Nuclear attack aircraft carrier (cost of nuclear carrier, $380,000,000) (cost of conventional carrier in budget, $260,000,000)	120,000,000
Nuclear antisubmarine submarine, long-lead-time components for	18,000,000
Aircraft: 11 F-27 mission support planes: Aircraft procurement, Air Force	11,000,000
Ballistic missiles	172,000,000
Missile procurement, Air Force:	
Atlas	85,000,000
Minuteman	77,000,000
Research, development, test and engineering, AF Minuteman	10,000,000

(Senate committee approved the $85 million added by the House for Atlas ICBM and $87 million added by the House for Minuteman ICBM, but the Senate committee did not limit the use of these funds to these two missiles, providing instead that the funds be used to accelerate any ballistic missile program the Secretary of Defense finds can be speeded up in the national interest.)

BREAKDOWN OF NEW FUND DECREASES BY SENATE COMMITTEE, $570,461,000

Military personnel	$112,000,000
Military personnel, Army (offset by transfer of $81,000,000 in cash from revolving fund)	81,000,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps (offset by transfer of $9,000,000 in cash from revolving fund)	9,000,000
Military personnel, Air Force ($20,000,000 of this offset by cash transfer from revolving fund; $2,000,000 cut in permanent change of station travel)	22,000,000
Operation and maintenance	−67,511,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army (1 percent cut in civilian personnel and several minor items)	−17,195,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army (1 percent cut in civilian personnel and cost of carrying mail to Alaska and Hawaii)	−15,372,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (1 percent cut in civilian personnel)	−650,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (1 percent cut in civilian personnel and several minor items)	−34,294,000
Contingencies	−15,000,000
Procurement, Marine Corps (1 percent cut in civilian personnel)	−1,350,000
Jet cargo aircraft (10) aircraft procurement, AF	−53,500,000
Safety of flight modifications, aircraft procurement, AF	−50,000,000

Senate Appropriations Committee versus budget—Continued

Operation and maintenance—Continued	
Mace tactical missile, missile procurement, AF	−$127,500,000
Bomarc air defense missile, missile procurement, AF	−82,800,000
Radar improvement, other procurement, AF	−50,000,000
Nike-Hercules air defense missile research, development, test, and engineering, Army	−10,800,000

Senate Appropriations Committee versus House bill

Senate committee increases in new funds versus House bill	+$1,061,400,000
Senate committee decreases in new funds versus House bill	−315,400,000
Net committee increases	+746,000,000
Senate committee total transfers from revolving funds	450,000,000
House bill total transfers from revolving funds	421,000,000
Senate committee increase in transfers	+29,000,000

BREAKDOWN OF NEW FUND INCREASES BY COMMITTEE, $1,061,400,000

Marine Corps strength	$43,100,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	32,700,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	5,900,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	4,500,000
Operation and maintenance	96,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Army (restoration to be applied to base operations and proficiency flying)	20,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy (restoration to be applied to base operations, proficiency flying, and operation and maintenance of the active fleet)	21,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force (restoration to be applied to operational support and proficiency flying	55,000,000
Olympic winter games	400,000
Restoration of 1 percent general cut in procurement	129,800,000
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	12,400,000
Aircraft and related procurement, Navy	19,900,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	13,400,000
Procurement of ordnance and ammunition, Navy	6,300,000
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	42,000,000
Missile procurement, Air Force	24,700,000
Other procurement, Air Force	11,100,000

Senate Appropriations Committee versus House bill—Continued

Army modernization: Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$205,300,000
Nuclear ships	398,000,000
Nuclear attack aircraft carrier shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	380,000,000
Nuclear antisubmarine submarine shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	18,000,000
Jet aircraft	47,900,000
35 jet utility aircraft	24,500,000
14 jet navigational trainers aircraft procurement, Air Force	23,400,000
F-27 mission support planes (11): Aircraft procurement, Air Force	11,000,000
Safety of flight modifications: Aircraft procurement, Air Force	50,000,000
Bomarc air defense missile: Missile procurement, Air Force	79,900,000

BREAKDOWN OF NEW FUNDS DECREASES BY COMMITTEE, $315,400,000

Military personnel	—$29,000,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps (offset by transfer of $9,000,000 cash from revolving fund)	−9,000,000
Military personnel, Air Force (offset by transfer of $20,000,000 cash from revolving fund)	−20,000,000
Antisubmarine warfare	−255,300,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	−4,500,000
Aircraft and related procurement, Navy	−39,000,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	−97,200,000
Procurement of ordnance and ammunition, Navy	−69,600,000
Research, development, test, and engineering, Navy	−45,000,000
Army-National Guard: Operation and maintenance, Army-National Guard (reduction in Nike support funds)	−5,300,000
Contingencies, Department of Defense	−15,000,000
Nike-Hercules: Research, development, test, and engineering, Army (as result of revised air defense program)	−10,800,000

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In round figures, the Senate committee approved $40 billion for national defense.

This is a large sum of money in anybody's language.

Wisely applied, these huge sums can greatly strengthen our military forces in the many ways needed to meet the anticipated threat we will face over the next few years.

The committee did its utmost in all good conscience to provide money for those military purposes which, we believe, will offer our country the greatest security for our defense dollars.

The security of our country was first and foremost in our thoughts as we considered the defense budget for the new fiscal year.

A number of broad policy questions faced us as we considered the budget requests—policy questions to which there are no pat answers. Are we emphasizing our offensive strength enough? Are we emphasizing our defensive systems too much? Are we overbuilding for general nuclear war? Are we underbuilding for so-called limited war? How soon will the weapons these funds will buy become obsolete? Are we funding several weapons systems which are all designed for the same general mission? Can we eliminate any of these or cut back on them? In these days of rapidly moving science and technology are we putting the Department of Defense in a fiscal straitjacket, or have we provided enough flexibility to the Secretary to exploit weapons discoveries and improvements?

These are the kinds of questions the committee wrestled with—questions involving human judgment and evaluation, questions on which honest men may disagree.

Not every member of the committee agreed with the prevailing action on every item in the bill. But, taken as a whole, there was substantial agreement on the policy directions indicated by the committee action.

BEST DEFENSE IS GOOD OFFENSE

Speaking for myself, I believe the best defense is a good offense. I voted with the rest of the committee to increase the budget requests for programs to strengthen our offensive power—such as the Atlas and Minuteman ICBM's.

At the same time, the committee showed its concern against overemphasis on purely defensive weapons systems like the Bomarc and the Nike-Hercules which, even at best, can never afford the Nation 100-percent protection against enemy bombers and missiles.

In my judgment, an enemy is likely to be deterred from attacking us more by our power to retaliate against his homeland than by any purely defensive umbrella we raise over these United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I interrupt to say that I think the Senator is making a very constructive statement. The conclusion which he offers for himself with respect to the comparative value of defense and offense for the deterrent effect upon a potential aggressor coincides, I believe, with the conclusion which many members of the Armed Services Committee, as well as members of the Appropriations Committee, have reached as a result of the hearings this year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, and I feel that he expresses the feeling of the great majority of our committee.

Nobody has yet devised an attack-proof defense. No matter how we try, no matter how much we spend, it looks as if we cannot prevent some destruction by bombers and missiles, should an enemy attack us.

Because there is no such thing as an attack-proof defense system, I supported the further reductions made by the committee in the Bomarc and Nike-Hercules air defense program below the Department's revised plans, colloquially termed "the master plan."

In its revised air defense program, the Department of Defense reduced the January budget request for Bomarc procurement by $32.8 million. The committee reduced the January budget request by $82.8 million. We also concurred in the $10.8 million reduction proposed by the Department in Nike-Hercules research and development.

COMMITTEE FAVORS ARMY MODERNIZATION

Army modernization is one way of building up our offensive punch for limited war, just as accelerating ballistic missiles helps build up our retaliatory punch for general war.

The need to provide forces to meet both threats—the threat of general war and the threat of brushfire wars—was of vital concern to the committee, just as was the need to beef up our offensive striking power.

These considerations become apparent when the committee bill is examined in detail, as I will shortly do.

MILITARY MANPOWER

For example, regarding active military personnel, the committee approved funds for an 870,000-man Army, a 630,000-man Navy, a 200,000-man Marine Corps, and an 845,000-man Air Force. The only change from the President's budget in Active Military Forces was addition of a total of $43.1 million to raise the Marine Corps from the budget figure of 175,000 to 200,000.

The committee approved the budget force levels for the Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, but provided extra funds to maintain the Army National Guard at an average strength of 400,000, instead of 360,000 planned by the budget. The committee also added funds to provide an average strength of 300,000 in the Army Reserve, instead of the 270,000 contemplated by the President's budget.

In the three accounts where the force levels were raised above the budget—that is, the Marine Corps, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve—the committee included language establishing mandatory floors under these personnel strength figures.

COMMITTEE RESTORED FUNDS FOR COMBAT READINESS

In the operation and maintenance accounts, the committee restored funds in areas directly concerned with our combat readiness. At the same time, the committee agreed with the House in making a 1-percent reduction in civilian personnel funds in the operation and maintenance accounts. That is civilian personnel and not military personnel.

For operation and maintenance, Army, the committee restored four-fifths—that is, $20 million—of the House cut, and we specify that the restoration is to apply to base operation costs and proficiency flying.

For operation and maintenance, Navy, the committee restored about three-fourths—or $21 million—of the House cut and directed that this amount go toward base operation costs, proficiency flying, and operating and maintaining the active fleet.

For operation and maintenance, Air Force, we restored about three-fourths—or $55 million—of the House cut and directed that this restoration go toward operational support and proficiency flying.

MILITARY HARDWARE ACTIONS

In procurement of military hardware, the committee's views on military funding policy are very clear. We did not agree with the House across-the-board cut of 1 percent in all procurement accounts, which totaled $131,150,000. We restored all except the 1 percent cut of $1,350,000 in procurement, Marine Corps, which cut was accepted by the Department of Defense.

Instead of across-the-board reductions, the committee made increases and decreases for specific items.

For Army procurement of equipment and missiles, the Senate committee insisted on further funds for modernizing our Army. I think it is fair to say there was considerable sentiment for providing our pentomic Army with the most up-to-date weapons, although the committee made no attempt to list priorities of procurement in the Army's extensive shopping list.

In addition to considering new funds for Army procurement, the subcommittee was confronted with reprograming actions involving prior year funds for procurement and shortages in funds originally anticipated in the budget to help the Army finance its procurement program for 1960.

Because all these figures are confusing, I should like to explain the situation as I understand it.

For procurement of equipment and missiles, Army, the January budget request totaled $1,024,700,000.

The House allowed a total of $1,232,300,000, consisting of a 1 percent general reduction of $12.4 million, a $20 million increase to support the enlarged Army Reserve and Army National Guard, and $200 million for acceleration of Nike-Zeus and/or Army modernization. The House bill provided a net increase of $207.6 million over the January budget.

The Senate committee bill provides $1,450 million, which is a net increase of $425.3 million over the January budget and $217.7 million over the House bill.

Parenthetically, let me say that when the Department of Defense presented its reclamas to the Senate Appropriations Committee, we were told the Department would accept the $200 million of the House increase, applying $137 million to accelerate Nike-Zeus and $63 million to Army modernization.

The Senate committee increase over the January budget breaks down as follows: $20 million for support of the enlarged Army Reserves and Army National Guard; $137 million for Nike-Zeus acceleration; $268.3 million for Army modernization.

The net increase of $217.7 million voted by the Senate committee over the House bill consists of: $12.4 million, restoration of 1 percent general cut; $205.3 million, Army modernization.

The Senate committee also changed both the January budget and the House bill by its action reprograming a total of $117.8 million from Nike-Hercules procurement to Army modernization. This was $41 million more than the $76.8 million the Department indicated it would reprogram as a result of its downward revision of the air defense program.

I would say, parenthetically, that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] explained the reason for our doing this. It is a question of building up our offense rather than building up our defense to the same extent.

So far, I believe the action is understandable. Complicating the Army procurement and modernization picture, however, is the question of a shortfall in financial resources in this Army account.

The Department of the Army testified that an estimated total of $267 million in financial resources originally expected to help buy the 1960 procurement program would not materialize. If this is true, then obviously the Army will have to reduce its 1960 shopping list by that amount.

On the other hand, the Comptroller of the Department of Defense informed the committee that the latest estimates compiled by his office indicated a shortfall of only $117 million.

As computed by the Army, the following estimated assets will not materialize:

	Million
Military assistance program reimbursable from prior years	$142.0
Estimated deobligations in fiscal year 1959	75.0
Estimated deobligations in fiscal year 1960	50.0
Total shortage in new obligational authority	267.0

Stated another way, the January budget showed a $460 million carryover for Army procurement, which, with the $1,024,700,000 in new funds requested in the budget, would finance the fiscal year 1960 procurement of equipment and missiles. During our subcommittee hearings, the Army estimated the $460 million carryover had been reduced by $267 million.

Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil, in a letter dated July 1, however, informed the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the senior Senator from New Mexico, that the Army shortfall was estimated by the Department of Defense as follows:

	Million
Military assistance program reimbursables	$42
Estimated deobligations in fiscal year 1959	75
Total	117

Regarding the loss of estimated deobligations in fiscal year 1960 predicted by the Army, Mr. McNeil wrote:

> It is too early to consider that no part of the $50 million estimate of recovery or prior year obligations in fiscal year 1960 would materialize.
>
> If the estimated recoveries for fiscal year 1960 should be realized in full, the Army would have about $23 million more than required to finance the Army's procurement program in the President's budget, whereas realization of only half of the estimate would make the program and financing about equal.

Mr. President, my only reason for going into such detail on Army procurement is that these estimates of shortages in the Army's assets occasion differences as to the net effect of the Senate committee's action on Army modernization.

As Secretary McNeil said in his letter:

> In a program of this magnitude and scope the situation is not static—there is constant change of emphasis and reprograming occurring, which results in pluses or minuses to previously considered financing plans.

Mr. President, because these estimates of shortages in the Army's finances are not firm figures, I suggest the Senate concur in the $1,450 million recommended by the Senate committee. If during the fiscal year, substantial shortages do occur in these financial assets, I would hope we would be sympathetic to a supplemental request to make up the deficiency.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am not quite certain that I understand what the able Senator from Massachusetts is referring to with respect to the matter of $267 million mentioned in the letter from Secretary McNeil. As I understand, the letter from the Secretary in effect admitted that the statement that there was an error of $267 million was correct, but he said that, in his opinion, only $117 million of the $267 million error needed to be restored. In other words, he did not challenge the figures. The Comptroller simply concluded that some of the money was not needed. The Army does not agree with the Defense Comptroller's view.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would most respectfully disagree. I shall quote one sentence from the letter. Would the Senator from Missouri care to see this? I believe he has a copy of the same letter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have a copy of what I believe is the same letter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read the last four lines on the first page:

> It appears, therefore, that the two items in question may have a value of approximately $117 million. (The fiscal year 1959 shortfall of $75 million in recoveries of prior year obligations plus the $42 million for MAP cancellations.)

Mr. McNeil said further, according to my memory, that for fiscal year 1960 it is too early to calculate the figures. So, as I understand, the figure might be $117 million plus $150 million, or any part of it; in other words, $117 million instead of $267 million would be Mr. McNeil's total.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, would the Senator from Massachusetts mind if I read further from Mr. McNeil's letter?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I read from the second paragraph:

> The President's budget for fiscal year 1960 estimated that $75 million of deobligations would occur during fiscal year 1959 and $50 million in fiscal year 1960, which would in effect make that amount of obligational authority available to apply toward financing the Army's procurement program for fiscal year 1960. Since submission of the President's budget there has also been a cancellation of $142 million of military assistance program orders to the Army. Therefore, the position of the Army, as they have stated, is that they are short of funds to finance the 1960 program by an estimated $125 million shortfall in deobligations and $142 million lost by cancellation of MAP orders to this appropriation. These amounts would total the $267 million used in an Army presentation.

Later in the letter, Mr. McNeil states:

> In this revalidation process the Army estimated that the cancellation resulted in lost assets of the full amount of $142 million. An application, however, of the accepted percentage of items not requiring replacement in kind related to this loss of orders would reduce the $142 million deficiency to $92 million. Also it should be noted that since that time new MAP orders resulting in approximately $50 million of shelf sales not requiring replacement in kind have been placed with the Army. Therefore, the $92 million shortfall can be further reduced to $42 million.

On the basis of that statement, we have simply an opinion by the Comptroller as to whether that money is or is not needed. The Comptroller in no way challenges the fact that the Army was shortchanged due to an erroneous estimate of $267 million.

I think it is important at this time that we recognize that the actual modernization increase which this bill is making in consideration of the $267 million admitted error is only $1,300,000 plus the reprograming of $117.8 million, most of which is being carried over from prior year appropriations.

That is why I intend, later, to offer an amendment to provide $333.9 million for the modernization of the Army. This added money would do what the $425.3 million increase in the bill does not do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter of Assistant Secretary of Defense Mr. McNeil be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1959.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to request from a member of your committee, information is furnished regarding the shortfall in certain assets which are not expected to materialize that will affect the Army's procurement program for fiscal year 1960.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1960 estimated that $75 million of deobligations would occur during fiscal year 1959 and $50 million in fiscal year 1960, which would in effect make that amount of obligational authority available to apply toward financing the Army's procurement program for fiscal year 1960. Since submission of the Presi-

dent's budget there has also been a cancellation of $142 million of military assistance program orders to the Army. Therefore, the position of the Army, as they have stated, is that they are short of funds to finance the 1960 program by an estimated $125 million shortfall in deobligations and $142 million lost by cancellation of MAP orders to this appropriation. These amounts would total the $267 million used in an Army presentation.

In review of the Army's stated position regarding the loss of assets to finance the procurement program for 1960, the following points have been developed. Since the submission of the President's budget, indications are that the $75 million of deobligations in fiscal year 1959 will not materialize. It is too early, however, to write off the estimated recoveries of prior year obligations in fiscal year 1960. This is especially true in view of the changes and reprograming actions that may occur in fiscal year 1960. In regard to the anticipated sales to MAP, a revalidation of the orders issued to the Army did result in cancellation of orders to this appropriation. In this revalidation process the Army estimated that the cancellation resulted in lost assets of the full amount of $142 million. An application, however, of the accepted percentage of items not requiring replacement in kind related to this loss of orders would reduce the $142 million deficiency to $92 million. Also it should be noted that since that time new MAP orders resulting in approximately $50 million of shelf sales not requiring replacement in kind have been placed with the Army. Therefore, the $92 million shortfall can be further reduced to $42 million. It appears, therefore, that the two items in question may have a value of approximately $117 million. (The fiscal year 1959 shortfall of $75 million in recoveries of prior year obligations plus the $42 million for MAP cancellations.)

The House action resulted in an add-on of $200 million after the Secretary of Defense indicated that this amount would be acceptable inasmuch as some anticipated assets of the Army were not going to materialize. Almost simultaneous with the House action, the new air defense plan was presented by the Secretary of Defense, resulting in a cutback in the Nike-Hercules program and acceleration of the Nike-Zeus program. The Nike-Zeus acceleration results in an additional requirement over that contained in the President's Budget of $137 million. By applying this requirement to the House add-on, the residual amount of $63 million is considered to be available to apply to the Army's financing problem. In addition, $76.8 million resulting from the cutback in the Nike-Hercules program is available through reprograming action to apply to this area. This makes a total of $139.8 million available to apply against the currently estimated shortage of $117 million as outlined above.

As stated above, it is too early to consider that no part of the $50 million estimate of recovery of prior year obligations in fiscal year 1960 would materialize. If the estimated recoveries for fiscal year 1960 should be realized in full, the Army would have about $23 million more than required to finance the Army's procurement program in the President's budget, whereas realization of only half of the estimate would make the program and financing about equal. In this connection, it should be noted that a month ago we did not know that the Nike-Hercules program would be adjusted, thereby making available $76.8 million worth of assets. In other words, in a program of this magnitude and scope the situation is not static—there is constant change of emphasis and reprograming occurring, which results in pluses or minuses to previously considered financing plans.

The Department of Defense has arranged to accept the $200 million House add-on in order to alleviate this financing problem in fiscal year 1960. Even with the acceleration of Nike-Zeus and by reprograming of funds made available from the Nike-Hercules buyout and other adjustments, the Department of Defense request to the Senate for this appropriation appears adequate to meet an Army procurement program of the general order of magnitude contemplated in the President's budget for fiscal year 1960.

Sincerely,

W. J. McNEIL,
Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator agrees with me that the total of reprogramed and NOA funds for Army modernization, on the basis of a $267 million deficiency, is $119,100,000; or, if Mr. McNeil's figure of $117 million deficiency is used, a total of $269,100,000.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. But after investigating the matter more thoroughly, I do not think there is any justification for using the figure of error, $117 million. I think there is every justification for using the figure $267 million.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator offers his amendment, I shall try to get a further description of the matter, if there is any misunderstanding about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his typically gracious courtesy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when I yielded to the Senator from Missouri, I had reached the subject of aircraft carrier and antisubmarine warfare.

AIRCRAFT CARRIER AND ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

In considering Navy procurement accounts, the subcommittee very carefully and fully weighed the question of providing one attack aircraft carrier to replace one of the overage carriers in our current attack fleet.

The budget called for $260 million for the cost of one conventionally powered carrier. The House struck out the $260 million for the carrier and added a total of $255.3 million for antisubmarine warfare.

The House add-on was spread through five Navy accounts and included funds for 20 helicopters and 18 antisubmarine aircraft, for 1 guided missile destroyer and 1 atomic submarine, and for missiles, torpedoes, mines, and depth charges.

The Senate subcommittee not only approved the building of a new attack carrier with its longer flight decks and modern equipment, but also provided funds for nuclear propulsion, at a total cost of $380 million. This is $120 million more than the $260 million required for a conventional carrier.

In addition, the subcommittee provided $18 million for long leadtime components for a nuclear antisubmarine submarine.

With a period of world tension ahead of us and the resultant need of preparedness for limited war, our carrier task forces form an important, if not indispensable, part of our defense team. Just a brief glance at the world map and the potential trouble areas will impress upon anyone the need for this country to control the seas and to have mobile forces deployed ready for action.

At the time of the Quemoy crisis last fall, Admiral Beakley had five carrier task forces in his command in the area and one on the way. Should trouble break out simultaneously in several areas, it is easy to understand that a 14-attack-carrier fleet is needed.

If we need 14 carriers, then let us by all means have as modern a fleet as we can. We are providing modern jet aircraft for the Navy; let us provide modern ships for these aircraft.

It is my understanding that the Navy has in mind a long-range plan to schedule a new aircraft carrier every other year, and an antisubmarine submarine in the odd years. This year is the year for the scheduling an aircraft carrier. Last year was the year for an antisubmarine submarine. Therefore, that is one of the fundamental reasons why the Navy urges us to modernize our carrier fleet this year by the construction of one additional carrier.

Navy witnesses told us the landing accident rate on the old carriers is double that of the new carriers with their longer flight decks and better arresting gear. The new carrier will permit better use of our high performance aircraft and will undoubtedly save lives and planes, too.

The question arises, why did we strike out all of the House increase of $255.3 million for antisubmarine warfare.

For one thing, it was testified that the January budget included $1.2 billion for antisubmarine warfare.

Furthermore, the subcommittee added the money for the long-leadtime items for one atomic submarine for use in antisubmarine warfare.

Admiral Beakley was asked about the need for the guided missile destroyer and the atomic submarine added by the House. His reply, on page 1,037 of the hearings, was:

> In my view these two ships cannot compare in giving us the strength that this aircraft carrier can give us * * *. They add to our antisubmarine defense, but I don't personally believe that they add anywhere near as much to our antisubmarine warfare capability as a modern carrier will add to it.

Earlier, on page 1,035 of the hearings, Admiral Beakley pointed out the aircraft carrier is a "significant part" of our antisubmarine warfare. He explained that—

> The best place to kill submarines is before they get to sea. Our attack carrier aircraft can do this.

Admiral Beakley further stated:

> If you don't have airpower on the sea today you are going to lose control of the seas. You cannot sail your ships on the sea without having control of the air over it. This attack carrier is the center of our ability to do this.

Of course, Mr. President, the subcommittee was not unmindful of the fact that the carrier furnishes the aircraft support for Marine amphibious landings.

Very briefly, Mr. President, that summarizes the case for the carrier, as we

saw it in the subcommittee, as against the antisubmarine increases provided in the House version of the bill.

AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

While the Senate committee agreed with the House in denying $53.5 million for 10 jet cargo aircraft, we did restore $24.5 million for 35 jet utility trainers and $23.4 million for 14 jet navigation trainers. In addition, the Senate committee approved $11 million for 11 F–27's which are mission support aircraft.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT

The Senate committee bill, like the House version, reduces funds for the Mace tactical missile of the Air Force by $127.5 million. But the committee in section 633 of its version of the bill, gave the Secretary of Defense authority in his discretion to transfer funds from other accounts and apply these transferred funds to the Mace program to carry out our commitments to NATO countries.

The Mace "B" advanced model is a subsonic missile, which is really a pilotless bomber. For the time period when this model Mace will be available, it is believed there are other weapons that can fill the mission satisfactorily.

As I have already mentioned, Mr. President, the Air Force missile procurement request for Bomarc was reduced in the Senate committee bill by $82.8 million from the January budget, and by $50 million from the $129.9 million restoration request of the Department of Defense. In other words, Mr. President, the Senate committee bill restores $79.9 million of the 162.7 million Bomarc reduction made by the House.

Mr. President, in regard to ballistic missiles, there was recognition in the subcommittee of two very important facts: One, ballistic missiles represent offensive power; and the stronger our offense, the better our prospects to deter an enemy from attack. Two, the ballistic missiles programs change very rapidly during a fiscal year.

The subcommittee wished to provide the Secretary of Defense with the funds and authority to expedite the ballistic missile programs showing the greatest promise. At the time of a budget presentation, it might be the Atlas; but during the course of the ensuing fiscal year, it might be Minuteman or some other ballistic missile. The chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ] explained this, I think, very ably.

Therefore, the subcommittee approved the $85 million increase of the House version of the bill for downpayment on eight additional Atlas squadrons and the $77 million increase for accelerating Minuteman, but we did not specifically earmark the funds for those missiles. Instead, we authorized the Secretary of Defense to use those funds for any ballistic missile he believes should be accelerated. In addition, we provided that the Secretary of Defense could transfer up to 10 percent of any procurement account, any research and development account, any operation and maintenance account for missiles systems, and could apply the transfers to speed up the program for the most promising ballistic missile weapons.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Senate committee bill contains the reduction of $10.8 million in the funds for research and development on Nike-Hercules volunteered by the Department of Defense under its revised air-defense program.

Also contained in the committee bill is the $10 million extra added by the House for research on the Minuteman ICBM.

MATS (MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE)

The Senate Appropriations Committee provided that $100 million of the funds available for MATS shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service from carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as scheduled for supplemental air carriers. In fiscal year 1959, the amount of MATS funds made available only for commercial carriers was $80 million, of which the Department used about $70 million.

Present plans of the Air Force MATS operation call for $70 million worth of business for commercial air carriers in the fiscal year 1960. Nevertheless, the Department had asked Congress to strike out the requirement in law for a certain portion of MATS funds to go for commercial air transport. The committee was ever mindful of the need to build and maintain a strong, healthy civilian cargo and transport fleet, and of the simultaneous need for a strong military transport fleet ready to go, in case of emergency. Therefore, the committee decided that the best policy to insure both was to require by law that commercial air carriers be used for transporting some military passengers and cargo.

Mr. President, without going fully into all the figures involved, I have tried to summarize the highlights of the Senate committee's version of the bill. I have pointed out my understanding of the policy decisions underlying the dollars involved. This statement is made in an effort to supplement the statement made by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]; it duplicates—although in different language—some of the statements he has previously made.

All in all, Mr. President, the provisions of the Senate committee's version of the bill will add substantially to our military strength. It emphasizes offense, and avoids too much emphasis on defense, in order to give the greatest deterrent for our dollars invested. It recognized the onrush of science, technology, and military weaponry, and gives the administration flexibility to make the most of these advances. It recognizes the need for preparedness for limited war as well as for all-out nuclear war.

Mr. President, I join the chairman of the subcommittee in urging the Senate to pass the bill as recommended by the committee.

Mr. JACKSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will recall that my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] and I appeared before the subcommittee in reference to the consumption of milk by troops in Alaska; and we laid before the subcommittee the proposition that, very uniquely, reconstituted grade C milk is being served there. We urged that the troops in Alaska be served fresh grade A milk, as is done in every other State. That presentation before the subcommittee followed several meetings on our part with Department of Defense officials, who appeared unwilling to make this desired and desirable change.

I am very happy to find on page 26 of the committee's report a reference to that situation, in the following words:

ALASKA TROOP MILK

Testimony before the committee indicated that the Department of Defense was presently serving reconstituted grade C milk to Army troops stationed in Alaska, while fresh grade A milk was being served to troops in the other States. The committee directs the Department of Defense to serve fresh grade A milk to men in the services in every State, unless a great disparity in cost between grade A milk and other milk is evidenced.

I am particularly happy to note that that is not merely a recommendation, but is a directive.

On behalf of both my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, I wish to express our gratitude to the chairman and the other members of the committee for having incorporated that statement in their report.

I have somewhat of a fear that the Department of Defense may in any case claim there is a great disparity in cost between serving fresh grade A milk and reconstituted grade C milk in Alaska. I think the testimony we presented to the subcommittee constituted an adequate demonstration that that is not the case. I wonder whether the chairman of the subcommittee cares to comment on that situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Alaska, that the subcommittee heard testimony to the effect that in Alaska, troops received reconstituted grade C milk, rather than fresh, grade A milk, with the exception of the officers' clubs; we understood that the officers' clubs were served grade A milk, but that grade A milk was not given to the personnel in the lower echelons.

I know that the committee did not appreciate that. It was the intent of the language contained in the report to be definite that the committee feels that, wherever it can be done, even if it costs a little more money, the soldier or personnel should be given grade A milk. We did not want any grade B, C, or D milk given to the personnel if it were possible to get grade A milk. Of course, the committee also understood that the dairy

industry in that area was rather limited; but, insofar as the production of milk makes it possible, there is no reason why the personnel in Alaska should not receive grade A milk, just as they receive it in New Mexico, Arizona, or Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to hear the chairman of the subcommittee so state. We recognize that there are defense posts where it is necessary to serve recompounded milk; but there are large installations, such as at Anchorage and Fairbanks, where grade A milk can be served at very little additional cost to the Department.

I appreciate what the chairman of the subcommittee has had to say about this subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I hope the Defense Department will realize that what is intended is that wherever practicable the personnel will be given grade A milk.

Mr. BARTLETT. The chairman of the subcommittee will agree with me, will he not, that it is practicable to provide grade A milk at installations at Fairbanks and Anchorage, for example?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I have been at Fairbanks, Anchorage, Elmendorf, and Kodiak. I have seen milk served in Kodiak and that is farther away than Fairbanks or Anchorage.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleague in expressing appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the committee for making it possible for Alaska to take its place wholly with the other 48 States in having grade A milk served to personnel in the Armed Forces stationed in Alaska. It was shocking to me to find out it was not done, particularly in view of the information from the Public Health Service that there was practically no control of the bacterial count in grade C reconstituted milk. Certainly in areas such as are near Anchorage, Fairbanks, with Elmendorf Field and Ladd Field adjacent, and other large installations, not far from which are good dairies there should be no problem at all of supplying grade A, whole milk.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When I was in that area I saw good dairy herds a short distance, as the crow flies, from Anchorage.

Mr. GRUENING. There is no reason why grade A milk should not be served to personnel in such bases as Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Field, Eielson, Fort Greeley, and the new installation now under construction at Clear, and at Kodiak.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me tell my good friend from Alaska that I was very much surprised to find that there were a couple of Texans on Kodiak who had Texas beef. There were 1,500 Texas whiteface cattle up there. If it can be done with cattle, it can be done so far as furnishing good milk is concerned.

Mr. GRUENING. We appreciate the Senator's views and are glad to have his support and that of the committee.

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may ask questions without my losing the floor.

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

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I know he has a prepared speech to make, but this may be my only opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. JACKSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to direct my remarks to both the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the ranking minority member [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The bill we are discussing today may be the most important bill the Senate will vote upon this year, because upon its adequacy, the judgment of the Department of Defense, the judgment of the committee, and indeed the judgment of the Senate, depends the security of this country. After hearing the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee explain the bill, and it seemed in a very reasonable and logical way, I know that we owe many thanks to him and to the members of the committee.

I should like to ask the Senator a few questions. First, awaiting the day when we believe that we shall have a missile weapons system which, if it is not on a parity now, will be on a parity with that of the Soviet Union, I assume the Strategic Air Force is the chief deterrent against aggression. Am I correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel for the moment, and until we get the missiles in inventory and deployed, our chief deterrent is the Strategic Air Force.

Mr. COOPER. Is it the committee's firm belief from the testimony it heard that in the period until a wholly adequate missile system is developed the Strategic Air Force is of the size and quality to afford a deterrent against an attack and to prevent war?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel that not only are the quality of personnel and the hardware as good as can be obtained, but that the personnel are dedicated to their task. I am a great believer in SAC. I know the wonderful record made under the administration of General LeMay, and I know how well it is doing under General Power. In my opinion, it is our first line of defense. It can be ready within 13 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. I am not on the committee, but like all Members, I have my responsibility. I have read the comments ascribed to Gen. Maxwell Taylor that modernization of the Army is imperative.

Was it the committee's judgment that the funds which it has made available for modernization of the Army are sufficient? Will the funds recommended make the Army equal to its task?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The intention was that the Army would have modernized weapons as well as modernized personnel.

Mr. COOPER. As I recall, over $500 million is provided for that purpose, by the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right. Procurement for equipment and missiles amounted to $1,450 million. The budget estimate was $1,024,700,000. Thus, the total increase by the Senate committee over the budget was $425 million. Of course, most of that, for instance, was for acceleration of the Nike-Zeus program, and the rest of that program could be used to increase modernization of the Army.

Mr. COOPER. I am not on the Armed Services Committee or on the Appropriations Committee, but I have a deep interest in the subject. I assure the Senator from Washington my questions will not take over 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to be fair, but, frankly, I have been waiting for the floor since noon.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask another question, if the Senator will yield?

Mr. JACKSON. One more question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. After the Senator gets through, I shall be glad to answer any questions the Senator from Kentucky wishes to ask.

Mr. COOPER. I have tried to keep abreast of the question as to whether a nuclear aircraft carrier should be constructed. I listened to the remarks of the Senator on this subject and I know that the committee recommendation for a nuclear aircraft carrier contravened the decision made in the House against its construction. Is it the judgment of the committee that an aircraft carrier, under conditions which would exist today, is necessary for our defense or would it be, as some claim, "a sitting duck"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, I do not think it would be a sitting duck.

Mr. COOPER. Would it be helpful for our defense?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would be helpful, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the committee. The Navy recommended a conventional type carrier. The House did not allow it. The Budget requested funds for a conventional type carrier, and the committee decided that so long as we were going to have a carrier, and the carrier was necessary, we should have the best. The committee felt we should be up to date.

Mr. COOPER. I am not referring to the type of carrier involved. I am simply asking whether it is the reasoned judgment of the committee that an aircraft carrier of any type is adequate to the needs of modern defense and warfare.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. It will not be a sitting duck, because it is a moving target. It is not like an airbase, which sits in one place. Airbases have been called sitting ducks. Mobile bases have many advantages. The carrier keeps on moving. It can travel hundreds of miles in the course of a night. As a matter of fact, the carrier is not as much of a sitting duck as an ordinary airbase.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and in particular the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], for improving the 1960 defense program in four important areas.

First. The Senate committee refused to be swayed by the reluctance of the administration to accelerate the intercontinental ballistic missile program. The committee concurred in the House

action to add $162 million to administration requests in order to speed up current and future generations of ballistic missiles.

Second. The Senate committee recognized the need of additional military personnel to the extent of providing funds to maintain marine strength at 200,000. The committee also concurred in House action to maintain the strength of the Army Reserve at 300,000 and the National Guard at 400,000.

Third. The Senate committee has recognized the serious lack of modern equipment in the Army. While the committee did not add much money for modernization, it made a small addition and also shifted certain funds into the program from less vital areas. I hope the administration will carry on from this modest effort to up-date the Army.

Fourth. The Senate committee provided that the new attack carrier will be nuclear-powered, thus assuring that we would not buy obsolescence in this area. I only regret that the additional money for the carrier was taken from the critically important antisubmarine warfare program.

Despite Senate committee improvements, Mr. President, the bill before us falls far short of the kind of defense program needed by the Nation.

I realize, of course, what the Appropriations Committee was up against. From past experience, we know that if we provide funds above and beyond the administration's budget request, such funds are most likely to be frozen. In fact, on repeated occasions, the Congress has been so advised by the President. It is clear, therefore, that the committee had to operate under this limitation—the threat of Executive impoundment. In this situation, under our system of government, the Congress is left without a remedy—only the Executive can order the expenditure of funds.

Despite this limitation, it is the duty of all of us in carrying out our constitutional obligations to make clear what we consider to be our minimum defense requirements.

Mr. President, as I have said so many times in the past, we must move faster to the most invulnerable military deterrent now in sight—the ballistic missile buried in the earth, mounted on mobile railroad cars, and carried on nuclear submarines. In particular, I have in mind the solid-propellent Minuteman missile, and the Polaris submarine system.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for the long, constant, and unflagging fight he has made in this body to bring home to the attention of the Senate, of the Department of Defense, and of the country, the need for and advantages of the Polaris submarine.

The Senator knows the junior Senator from New Hampshire has felt just as strongly about this matter. In the Polaris submarine, when it is developed and available in sufficient numbers, we will have a weapon which cannot be knocked out by an aggressor enemy at the first blow, one which has terrific capabilities of retaliation and attack, and one which does not require great fleets of escort vessels or extensive foreign bases to support it.

I have long watched with admiration the work of the distinguished Senator from Washington in this regard, and I have fought by his side in this respect.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington if, under all circumstances, considering the remaining difficulties which may have to be ironed out with regard to the development of this weapon, the Senator feels that the appropriation bill now before the Senate goes far enough in respect to the Polaris submarine.

Mr. JACKSON. First, Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire for the very fine position he has taken for quite some time regarding the Polaris weapons system. In my judgment, we should have more submarines provided for in the bill, for the Polaris program.

I am informed that the bill as it now stands makes provision for long lead-time items for three additional nuclear powered Polaris submarines. The Senator will recall that last year the administration asked, I believe, for two, and we added four, making a total of six for that year. Three Polaris submarines were authorized the previous year. I think we are making substantial progress on the development of this system and that we should go faster, above and beyond what is now provided in the bill.

Mr. COTTON. On that point, may I ask the Senator, is it not a fact that what the bill actually will add to the Polaris submarine program is appropriations for purchasing the long leadtime items only for three additional Polaris submarines?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. It would not lay the keels.

Mr. COTTON. It would only open the way, considering what we suspect to be the situation with regard to our potential enemy, to what is still rather slow progress. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. I think as a minimum we should be laying the keel for three submarines in this bill. As a matter of fact, we should be setting our sights much higher.

Mr. COTTON. I know the Senator joins me in expressing the hope that we will have an opportunity to support a more rapid advance at the very earliest possible date.

Mr. JACKSON. I assure the Senator that I will do all I can in this area, as I have over a period of many years. I think this system is so important, not only from the standpoint of our own security but also from the standpoint of the security of our allies, that much more should be done.

Now that Great Britain is undertaking a nuclear-powered submarine program, that small country—the island—will have an ability to extend its boundaries far beyond the confines of Great Britain to the seven oceans. Seafaring countries, which may be small in population and subject to attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles and missiles of lesser range, will be able to provide a deterrent of their own on the high seas and under the seas as a result of the development of this weapons system.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to say a word, as my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has done, in commendation of the advocacy of Polaris submarines by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

As the distinguished Senator probably has been made aware, in the hearings I made an effort to increase the submarine content of the bill. We did not add a Polaris submarine, above the three already in the bill, which I had hoped to do, but we did add an antisubmarine submarine, which I think is also very important in the entire submarine war.

I believe that one of the two great advantages which our potential opponent in any great war has lies in the large number of submarines it has and the large standing army it has. The one way that we should be able to combat that advantage would be by developing our antisubmarine warfare on the one hand, and the development of our Polaris program on the other. I think the Senator from Washington is a great patriot. While I do not agree with him on everything, I certainly agree with many of his views on national defense. I commend him for the statement he is making.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire for his kind remarks. Being a fellow member of the Armed Services Committee, I have known from the beginning of his keen interest in and support of the entire nuclear submarine program, not only as it pertains to our offensive capability, but also in the area of antisubmarine warfare.

In one area at least we knew that we have a commanding lead over the Soviets, and that is in the area of nuclear propulsion. Having such a commanding lead, now is the time to expand that lead, and to make sure that we have in being nuclear-powered submarines capable of dealing with the antisubmarine warfare threat. We should provide at the earliest possible date the most invulnerable deterrent from the sea that is in sight. That is what the Polaris system means.

I think it would be a great mistake for us to move in low gear in connection with this program. A year from this fall, in November 1960, we should have our first Polaris system in operation. Next year, when the appropriation bill is before us, in the light of the record to date, at least, I believe the Congress should serve notice on the Department of Defense that we expect a very substantial increase in funds for antisubmarine warfare. That includes additional attack nuclear submarines, and additional Polaris submarines.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I find myself delighted, for once, to be in complete accord with

my good friends and colleagues, the two Senators from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator mentioned that fact, because that is a very unusual circumstance, and I think it should have the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I think there should be a mutual celebration.

I should like to indicate my strong feeling that we are not doing enough in connection with antisubmarine warfare. I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] could give us a little information on this subject, if the Senator from Washington will yield for that purpose.

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will look at page 18 of the committee report, in the second full paragraph on that page, under the heading "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy," I note that the committee has deleted the funds added by the House for antisubmarine warfare, amounting to $97,200,000 in this appropriation, but has added $18 million for procurement of long-lead components for one antisubmarine submarine. I note that that sum was added by the House.

I also note, as the Senator from New Mexico will see if he will look at page 200 of the hearings, that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is present in the Chamber at this time, was discussing with Admiral Russell antisubmarine warfare and the development of Polaris. I read from page 200:

> Senator SALTONSTALL. You would rather have more new ships than even those expensive newest type of weapons like a nuclear-powered carrier and a Polaris submarine?
>
> Admiral RUSSELL. Yes, sir. May I qualify that. If I could get three more antisubmarine destroyers and maybe one or two killer submarines, and I think an amphibious ship—because as the commandant pointed out we are a little short in amphibious ships now—I would take those and then the Polaris submarine, knowing what the present program is.

I have no doubt that the committee gave careful consideration to this subject; but cannot a strong case be made for the proposition that it would be wiser to put this money into antisubmarine warfare and the further development of Polaris, rather than building an extremely expensive nuclear carrier, which the Navy never asked for in the first place?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We had to take the evidence as it was presented to the committee. If the Senator will turn to pages 1539 and 1540 of the hearings, he will note what Admiral Burke had to say about the carrier.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I know that Admiral Burke, who certainly is an expert in this field, is devoted to the belief that the Navy needs a fast, 31-knot ship. He is an exponent of the surface ship. I take it the committee agrees with him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If it had not agreed with him, the item would not be before us.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was good enough to mention my name. The reason I agreed with what the chairman has just said is this: There is $1,200 million in the budget now for antisubmarine warfare, this year. The Navy has told us that one year it will accelerate its antisubmarine warfare program, as it did last year, and that in the next year, the odd-numbered year, it will try to modernize its carriers, which are so necessary.

This year it did not put in the antisubmarine warfare item, which the House included, but the Department did put in an item for a carrier. So we went along with Navy, except that we increased the item so as to include a nuclear carrier.

Mr. CLARK. The Senate committee increased that item, and deleted the additional amount which the House had allowed for antisubmarine warfare.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I may comment on the carrier, the President's budget recommended $260 million for a conventionally powered attack carrier, the eighth in the Navy's post-World War II program for modernizing the carrier force. The House deleted this item and substituted in its place $255,300,000, spread over 5 different Navy appropriations, for an increase in antisubmarine warfare capability.

Although the Department of Defense agreed with the House Appropriations Committee on the critical importance of an antisubmarine capability, Defense witnesses testified to this committee that another modern attack carrier is of higher priority.

They did not minimize antisubmarine warfare, but they said that in this instance priority should go to the carrier. The committee as a whole said, "If we are to have a carrier, why not make it up to date? Why not build a nuclear-powered carrier?" It requires about as much time to construct one as the other. The great difference is that the nuclear-powered carrier costs more.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, and I am grateful to the Senator from Washington for his courtesy in yielding. I should like to commend him very much for the strong position he has taken as to the wisdom not only of developing our own undersea warfare, which really meets the Russian threat, whereas in my judgment a new carrier does not; but also for his strong leadership in connection with developing our own Polaris system as a mobile base, which could be of the greatest possible importance in the years ahead.

I am on the side of the Senator from Washington. I hope he will press his position as time goes on, so that we can really modernize our armed services, and particularly the Navy, to meet tomorrow's threat, and not yesterday's.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania ever since he first came to the Senate has been most consistent and most active in the support of this weapons system.

I think it might be well to add, in connection with the antisubmarine warfare program, what is needed probably more than anything else today is more money for research and development.

Mention has been made of carriers. There are two reasons for the carriers. One, of course, is the problem of limited war. It is true they have a strategic capability, but it is primarily for limited warfare. The second reason for building them is for antisubmarine warfare purposes.

Due to a lack of information on how to detect enemy submarines and how to identify them, we today have to tie up a whole naval task force to go after one submarine. This is the problem.

We are not even striving for equality with the Soviets in the intercontinental ballistic missile, although superiority in this weapon was and is the key to maintaining an overall military balance with the Soviet Union. By our own decision, we are accepting second place in the most important weapon of our age, and the fateful implications of this decision are hardly being discussed publicly.

Surely, we must develop stronger conventional forces with modern equipment to meet limited aggression with limited means.

Year by year we have steadily reduced the number of our Army divisions: 20 in 1953, 18 in 1956, 15 in 1958, and now 14 in 1959 and 1960. Unfortunately, the Senate Appropriations Committee did not agree even to hold the Army at 15 divisions. And the bill before us would still leave the Army woefully short of up-to-date equipment.

General Taylor testified this year that about $15 billion was needed over a period of 5 years to modernize the Army—starting with about $2.8 billion in 1960. He said further that of this sum $1.4 billion was required in 1960 just for replacement of worn out equipment. Despite this testimony, the administration asked for only $1.024 billion for total Army procurement in 1960.

Once again, we find ourselves in a situation where we do not have the clear conventional capability either to keep a local crisis from spreading into a general war, or to handle more than one crisis at a time.

Surely, we must give higher priority to antisubmarine defenses. The time is rapidly nearing when the Soviets could mount a devastating nuclear warhead attack from the sea.

We should step up our attack nuclear submarine program. Experts agree that the best instrument for finding and killing a submarine is another submarine.

In addition, we should enlarge our program of applied research in undersea warfare to find an effective detection system. At present we tie up an entire naval task force, involving many ships and thousands of men, just looking for one Soviet submarine.

Likewise, we should expand our effort in basic research below the oceans, including the Arctic.

Surely, also, we must have a more vigorous research and development effort in other critical areas. We live in an age when military security depends on scientific achievement. Just as every

progressive corporation that wants to get ahead must invest heavily in research and development, so must a prudent and wise government.

This country is engaged in a series of races of discovery with the Soviet Union. Some of these races involve highly critical projects, so that failure to be first in their completion causes a serious deterioration in our military and political position.

The moral of Soviet success with sputnik and missiles should be fresh in our minds; we lacked foresight to indentify critical new projects early enough and then we failed to prosecute them energetically enough.

In particular, I am not convinced that the bill before us provides ample emergency money for vital programs.

In the next months, important breakthroughs may come in such fields as solid propellants, satellites, computer techniques, material and component developments, as well as in the broad field of basic research. Unless more reserve funds are provided there is danger that new requirements will not be met, or that they will be satisfied only at the expense of important existing projects.

Mr. President, last year the Congress appropriated $39.888 billion for defense. This year the administration requested a defense budget of only $39.248 billion, $640 million less than last year. The bill before us proposes a $39,594 billion program, still well below that we appropriated last year.

Has the threat to our security diminished in the last 12 months? Have the requirements of survival lessened? Not as I read the news.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the able junior Senator from Washington. No man in the Senate has tried harder than he has to make a stronger America in order that it might stay a free America.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is probably the best informed man in this body on the question of nuclear weapons. I noticed the other day that the Secretary of Defense stated that we had fallen down in our development and production of intercontinental ballistics, but he says, in effect, that it is not a serious matter because the Russians have fallen down also.

Does the Senator know of any information which would justify that extraordinary statement?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I compliment our distinguished colleague from Washington on the excellent statement he is making to the Senate and the country on this important matter, and he has certainly put in proper order the priorities of our national defense requirements.

I observed that he says that "we must move faster to the most invulnerable military deterrent now in sight—the ballistic missile buried in the earth, mounted on mobile railroad cars, and carried on nuclear submarines." I could not agree with any statement more, and I hope that we will move just as fast as we can, not only to get the Minuteman, but to get more of the Polaris than we have, creating an absolutely invulnerable deterrent force. That is what we must do.

Then, second, I am glad to observe that as to priority, the Senator says, "Surely, we must develop stronger conventional forces with modern equipment to meet limited aggression with limited means."

It is perfectly obvious to me, Mr. President, that when we strike a balance with the Soviets in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles, we have a balance of terror, so to speak, so that neither side can use an intercontinental ballistic missile, because we know that we will not only destroy each other, but possibly destroy life on the planet itself; that the next area of conflict is going to be in the field of limited wars, and we are not in a position now to manage a limited war in any part of this earth.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely right. It is obvious that we should move as fast as possible to achieve a deterrent force which the enemy cannot destroy even in a surprise attack.

Mr. ENGLE. That is certainly correct.

Mr. JACKSON. And when we have achieved that position, we will still be confronted with an even greater threat, as the Senator points out, the threat of limited warfare.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator has very properly, in my opinion, stated the priorities. That is, the first priority is to create an indestructible deterrent force. The second priority is to strengthen our conventional forces for limited warfare.

When it comes to the third priority, the Department of Defense itself is a little fuzzy. They are not altogether certain just where the third priority should be. But I observe that the distinguished Senator from Washington has stated that we must have higher priority on antisubmarine defenses. It is certainly true that except for intercontinental ballistic missiles, we do not know whether the Soviets could hit the broad side of the North American Continent with the intercontinental ballistic missile from Asia. But we know that the Soviets can get off the coast in a submarine, 200 or 250 miles, and with missiles which, according to our intelligence, have already shown pretty good accuracy, bomb the daylights out of 70 percent of the major areas of the United States.

So if we are to have continental defense as our third priority, it ought to be in the form of antisubmarine defenses. We have not taken care of them.

Mr. JACKSON. We know less about what is under the sea than we do about outer space. The Soviets have been working hard in the area of underwater research and undersea warfare since 1937. We have a long way to go to catch up with them in that area. We do have the edge in nuclear propulsion; but in order to take advantage of the important environment under the sea, it is fundamental that we make a greater effort in basic research.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator from Washington said he listened with great interest to Gen. Maxwell Taylor on a television program last night. General Taylor made the statement on that television program that we had not had any real evaluation of our procurement system or our methods of defense since 1953.

He said that we did not procure by function or mission; that is, we did not procure and establish our military requirements on the basis of, say, first, our atomic retaliatory power, which is scattered around among the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The same is true of the continental defense.

I ask the Senator from Washington, who has had much experience in this matter and who has followed the problems of defense with much interest, whether he knows of any action which is being taken now or which can be taken to correct the startling effects which General Taylor referred to in his statement on television on Sunday night.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not know of any effort on the part of the people within the Department of Defense to correct what it indeed a rather deplorable situation. I think those of us who followed very closely, as did the junior Senator from California, the presentation of the so-called air defense master plan, realize that there is no coordination between the procurement of the support weapons system and those who have command functions. The effort has been fractionated among all the services. As a result, there is duplication and waste.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, witness the free world reverses in the Middle East, the Berlin crisis, the continuing Far Eastern threat, and the forward surge in Soviet economic and military power.

If Soviet power continues to grow relative to ours, the results are clear and foreseeable. Moscow is bound to become more adventuresome and more difficult to deal with. Underdeveloped countries will increasingly be subject to Communist penetration. Our allies will be more and more reluctant to stand up to Moscow, and more and more tempted to make concessions and deals. We can expect crisis to be piled on crisis, each leaving the free world weaker than before.

Group after group, committee after committee, have warned that we must make a greater defense effort. But these warnings are ignored.

In fact, Government officials tell us "fiscal soundness" keeps us from doing more. I am as much in favor of fiscal

soundness as the next man. But what is fiscal soundness? It is not an end.

Survival is the end. Adequate national programs are an essential means to that end. Adequate programs obviously should be provided in ways that are fiscally sound, rather than fiscally unsound. In other words, we must pay our way. That is all that fiscal soundness means. Nothing more. It does not set an arbitrary ceiling.

Could there have been anything more unimaginative than the defense budget ceiling of $14 billion in 1950, just before the Korean attack? In 3 years we had to treble our defense program, and we have maintained it at substantially that level ever since. Now, even a $40 to $41 billion defense program is not enough.

Yet our executive leadership has reverted to the arbitrary budget ceiling—an ideal device to obscure the real requirements of survival.

It is the business of the Senate to find every practical way to hold defense appropriations down to the lowest level compatible with national security. But it is absurd to say that we cannot afford to do what is necessary for survival. We cannot afford not to do it.

We must determine our needs in the light of the objective danger. Then we must find fiscally sound ways to meet those needs—by expanding our economy, and, if necessary, by providing more funds through additional taxes.

In summary, there is no economic ceiling on our capacity to do our duty. We are blessed with plentiful resources—both human and material. The overall power of the free nations is still greater than that of the Communist nations. The means to beat the Communists and build a better world lie about us. But we are barely using them.

The tragedy is that we are defeating ourselves. We are tying our own hands behind our backs, by failing to take advantage of our assets.

Above all, we must raise our overall rate of economic growth, expanding our economy at a rate of 5 or 6 percent a year.

This is the one way we can carry out all the needed programs: To enlarge our military defense; to train more talent in the natural and social sciences; to sustain our alliances; to aid underdeveloped countries; and to supply the public services needed by our own rapidly growing population.

An expansion of our economy by 2 or 3 percent a year is not enough. The difference between a 3 percent and a 5 percent annual growth rate would be in the order of $630 billion by 1969. This is the indispensable extra margin we need. Economists on both sides of the political aisle now agree that a 5 percent rate of growth is an attainable goal.

The nub of the matter is this: We should exchange the principle of the arbitrary budget ceiling for the principle of sustained growth. We must dedicate our best talent to find ways to stimulate growth and to utilize the full potential of our free system.

Mr. President, if this Nation had all the time in the world to work things out, complacency might see us through. But, today, time is the one commodity in short supply. Our only time is the present.

Fortunately, the Senate still has an opportunity to improve the bill before us, by judicious amendment from the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, again I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Washington for his able and thoughtful presentation with respect to the growing problems of our national defense. I am especially interested in his statement that the Senate still has an opportunity to improve the bill, by means of judicious amendments from the floor.

I also wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for the thoroughness and the conscientious manner in which he conducted the defense appropriation hearings. Of course, I am not surprised at that, as I have been privileged to work with him in committees prior to this occasion.

Mr. President, I now propose how the bill can be amended in the interest of our security.

Mr. President, all of us now know that the U.S. Army is outmanned, outtanked, and outgunned, as against the Soviet armies.

Our equipment is inferior. The Congress should provide now additional funds for modernization of the equipment of our ground combat troops.

The President sent up a budget request for Army procurement of $1,024,700,000. This was $644,638,000 less than was appropriated for this purpose for the fiscal year 1959.

As has been so ably pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in his address, who knows of any change in the world situation which would justify cutting our defense expenditures—and, more specifically, cutting the Army procurement budget by almost 40 percent this year, as compared with the amount provided last year.

We now know there can be no possible doubt as to the superiority of the Soviet Army's equipment over our own army equipment.

As I have said many times, if in this the richest country in the history of the world, we have the right, in peacetime, to draft boys off the farms and out of the cities, who do not want to enter the Armed Forces, surely we have the obligation to give them the best equipment to, in turn, give them the best chance to come home.

After the budget was submitted, and before the Senate committee had acted, it was discovered that the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget had made an error of $267 million in the amount of money available for the Army under the present budget. This mistake is referred to in the Senate committee report as "a program deficiency of $267 million." In other words, when the Army procurement program was determined and was translated into budget figures, they used the funds that would be carried over from prior appropriations, and estimated that certain moneys would come into the Army as the result of deobligations and restoration of funds used for mutual assistance programs, and then came to the Congress for new money for the remainder.

It so happens that $267 million on which they had been counting did not materialize. So the President's budget request of $1,024,700,000 was short that amount, if the scheduled program was to be carried out.

The Army procurement portion of the bill before the Senate is for $1,450 million. This is $425,300,000 above the budget.

However, two items—amounting to $20 million for the National Guard and the Reserves, and $137 million for the continued development of the Nike-Zeus—cannot properly be considered modernization of our combat troops.

This total of $157 million, therefore, should be subtracted from the $425,300,000, in order to get at the modernization figure.

This leaves $268,300,000 from which the error of $267 million properly should be subtracted. Hence, we find that the House and Senate committee, in rectifying this administration error, have actually added by $1,300,000 of new money for more modernization.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Pennsylvania, who has so consistently expressed a keen interest in the problems of our national security.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his fine words. I wonder whether I correctly understood him. After reading the committee report, I was under the impression that a very substantial increase, amounting to several hundred million dollars, had been voted by the committee in the vitally important area of giving our ground combat troops the modern weapons they need, not only for their own survival, but also in order to accomplish their mission. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Missouri to say that the total increase provided by the pending bill for Army modernization is less than $2 million?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct; it is $1,300,000 of added new money. Some other money has been transferred from other programs, but that is all of the net addition for modernization above the program in the President's budget request.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania will permit me to continue with my remarks at this time, I shall be pleased to yield to him again.

Mr. President, this is not the full story on Army modernization. There has also been a reprograming of funds and a transfer of such funds into the modernization category from antiaircraft procurement.

Seventy-six million eight hundred thousand dollars has been reprogramed from prior year funds, and $41 million from the original 1960 program, for a total of $117,800,000 of transfer.

While this $117.8 million is not new money, and does not call for any addition to the appropriation, it can properly be added to the modernization figure, in order that the Senate may fully understand the amount of actions taken.

This means that we can add $117.8 million of reprogramed funds to the $1.3 million of additional funds, and get the total of $119.1 million, which can rightly be considered an addition to the modernization available to the Army.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my good friend.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator believe that the $117,800,000 is anywhere near adequate in order to put our ground forces into proper combat status?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that that figure is totally inadequate.

Mr. CLARK. Is my friend, the Senator from Missouri, aware of the views of Gen. Maxwell Taylor on this subject?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am. As the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will remember, General Taylor said $15 billion was needed to modernize the U.S. Army. He asked that that amount be provided in five annual components of $3 billion each.

Actually, by means of this bill he will not receive anything like $3 billion a year; and even with the additions which I propose be made at this time, he would not receive anything like that amount. Even with those additions, the amount would be just over half of the $2.8 billion General Taylor stated was absolutely essential this year in order to begin to give our combat force the equipment which will approximate the modern equipment possessed by the Communists.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that General Taylor is not alone in that view. Do I not correctly recall that General Gavin and General Ridgway have also warned along those lines for the last several years?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. And do I not also correctly recall that the same matter was raised in the Rockefeller report and in the Gaither report?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that is correct.

Mr. CLARK. My friend, the Senator from Missouri, has been known in the Senate for many years because of his very distinguished record as Secretary of the Air Force. On occasion, it is said that service jealousies bear some of the blame for the fact that our military posture is extravagant and inefficient.

I am most interested that the distinguished Senator from Missouri should have risen to the defense of the Army, in view of his background. Knowing him as a patriotic American who looks at all our military services with a broad and a fair view, I am not surprised. The country will be interested, more than usual, in the speech the Senator from Missouri is making now, because it is a strong defense of the Army as a necessary part of our defense posture in the modern world. I commend him most heartily for the fine speech he is making.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. It is true I went into the Air Force in a civilian capacity in 1946, but it is also true I was a private in the U.S. Army 40 years ago. So I have a feeling for both services, as well as for the Navy and the Marines. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I particularly wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania. Having served with my colleague from Missouri for several years on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am acutely aware of the fact that from the very beginning he has been interested in modernizing the Army and in maintaining it at a proper level, and with proper airlift support. In my judgment, the Senator is rendering a great service to the country in singling out one area in the bill now before the Senate which certainly is in need of urgent attention.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, all I can say at this point is that there is nobody in the U.S. Senate from whom I would rather hear those kind words, which are undeserved but deeply appreciated. I thank my friend from the State of Washington.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Missouri on a very fine statement, one in which he is eminently correct. I observe that he is addressing himself to the subject of modernization of the Army, whereas his own connection with the Defense Department has been in connection mainly, and he is identified in the public mind mainly, with the Air Force and as the first Secretary for Air. I observe that in the Senator's statement the net addition for modernization of the Army becomes a rather thin slice after everything is deducted.

I listened with careful interest to the statements made by Gen. Maxwell Taylor on a television program last night. Those statements have been referred to repeatedly in connection with this debate. As I recall, Gen. Maxwell Taylor said he thought that the gross sum of $41 billion, or on that order, was an adequate amount in total to manage the defense requirements of the Nation, and that he had stated that, but he had not agreed with the priorities inside the budget. He used a different term. He called it the relationships inside the budget.

What I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Misouri is this: Is it possible to readjust the priorities inside the budget, this figure of $41 billion, and come out with those items that have top priority, namely, first, the creation of an indestructible retaliatory power, and, second, having a priority very close to the first category, modernizing the U.S. Army and making it capable of fighting limited wars. In other words, what I am saying is that some of us want to see both of those objectives accomplished. In particular, I should like to see the objective accomplished to which the distinguished Senator from Missouri is addressing himself. Is there not some way in which we can readjust the figures inside the $41 billion budget that will make it possible to do it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier today I placed in the RECORD an article by Gen. Thomas Phillips, which, in my opinion, answers the very distinguished Senator from California in this regard. That excellent article points up clearly how lack of unification in the Department of Defense is costing the American people billions of dollars a year.

I appreciate the kind remarks the Senator from California has been good enough to make about me. When he was a Member of the other body, we were also working together for a stronger America. As he well knows, how the appropriations are used for our Armed Forces is largely a matter for executive decision. I personally believe that, if the amount of money provided were used efficiently and effectively so the taxpayer would receive a maximum return for his defense dollar, we could handle the defense problem within the funds provided in the present budget. It is most unfortunate that it is not being administered that way. However, I hope that the Senate will express firmly its intent this afternoon, based on the facts which I have presented to them.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the Senator yield before he proceeds?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will allow me to continue just for a moment I shall then be glad to yield.

The great bombers, ballistic missiles, missile-launching submarines, and other glamour weapons tend to overshadow the very real fact that the Soviet Union has pursued an almost continuous modernization of its ground forces since World War II. This Russia has done while also leading us in ICBM's and in space vehicles.

The products of the Soviets' modernization program have been extended also to the forces of both the satellite states as well as to certain fellow traveling nations.

On the other hand, the rifles with which our troops are currently equipped were adopted 23 years ago; their machineguns and squad automatic rifles are of basically World War I design.

It is true that the Army has developed, tested, and adopted a new rifle and a machinegun, and that these new, more efficient weapons make possible a reduction in the number of type weapons in the hands of troops from eight to four. However, the rate of production which the Army has been able to program for these weapons is a mere trickle. At the present rate, it will be well into the middle of the next decade before our troops will be reequipped with them, due to fund limitations. This, like the illustration of the miniaturized radio, is only indicative of practically all areas of Army modernization.

General Taylor has stated—and I concur in his judgment—that we must exploit the progress of science and technology to improve the firepower, the mobility, and the communications of our Army units, in order that our Army manpower can be fully effective when called upon to perform in battle.

I am glad to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding again for an observation.

With reference to the top limits of the military budget, which have been set at about $41 billion, we have a very serious practical problem. We can add money, and the money can be impounded, and the Executive can refuse to spend it. As a consequence, we do not get our way at all. We have seen that happen time and again. Somehow, we are merely spinning our wheels if we just sit here and add money. It seems to me what we have to do is to aim inside the budget figure, because we know the Executive is going to impound money that is provided in excess of the budget figure, and then put limitations in the bill with reference to expenditure of money which cannot be shifted around. Then the Executive will either have to spend it for the purpose Congress has provided, or come back to Congress. It seems to me we have to consider the practical way to get the Executive to do what we intend shall be done.

In other words, Congress should decide as a policy matter that the Army should be modernized, and then, in order to prevent the President from impounding the funds provided, keep within the dollar limits, but provide the money in the bill with limitations in such a way that, if not spent, it will be returned. That is the only procedure we can follow if we are to get the things done we want done. Otherwise, the Executive thwarts the intention of Congress by impounding funds and refusing to go forward by spending the money Congress has simply added to the budget.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his able contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President, after a detailed study and careful consultation with the experts in the Army, including the now retired Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, I have obtained a list of priority items which would give essential modernization a significant boost.

This list includes such things as multiple rocket launchers, rifles, modern tanks, electronic and communications equipment for combat areas, tactical, and support vehicles as well as other modern equipment. The total dollar value of this minimum priority list is $453 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this priority list be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

PRIORITY LIST FOR $453 MILLION

This increment provides the highest priority segment, over and above the defense budget, to meet the fiscal year 1960 requirements to modernize the equipment (other than missiles) for the Pentomic Field Army. Representative items of equipment to be procured are as follows:

PRIORITY I	
30 multiple launcher 45–115 mm rockets (2 infantry and 2 Abn divisions)	0.3
60,000 rifles, M14 (3 infantry and 2 armored divisions, initial issue)	8.0
180 tank, medium XM60—to equip 2 infantry divisions or ½ armored division	24.7
600 carriers, armored personnel T113—to equip 3 infantry divisions and 2 armored cavalry regiments	18.5
500 S.P. howitzers, 155 mm (T–196)—to equip all active divisions and support units	31.0
275 S.P. howitzers, 105 mm (T–195)—to equip 5 infantry divisions and 2 armored divisions	28.4
80,000 rockets 115 mm, optimum area T–238	12.0
Total	122.9
PRIORITY II	
80 helicopter reconnaissance H13/H23 (4 infantry divisions)	4.6
5 Helicopter transport, YHC–1B	2.0
15 airplane light cargo, AC–1 (1 tactical transportation company—should be 1 in each corps)	13.0
18 airplane, medium observation AO–1 (1 missile command medium and 1 air transportation missile command)	13.3
24 airplane utility UL–A (5 armored cavalry regiments and 2 infantry brigades)	3.5
27 short range missile launcher locator	1.8
26 radio control switching system for division and battalion group	9.0
560 radar set portable, for detecting enemy movement in forward areas (all active army divisions)	5.3
Total	52.5
PRIORITY III	
3,300 trucks, ¾-ton, 4 x 4, for tactical units; 125 trucks, 5-ton bridge, for tactical units; 225 trucks, 5-ton, 6 x 6, for tactical units; 500 trucks, 2½-ton trailer for tactical units	9.7
2,300 weapons sights, new infrared	1.3
600 radio sets Army aircraft, tactical	4.5
570 converter automatic switches (radio to 4-wire transmission)	2.4
800 switchboard, manual (division and corps)	2.6
600 radio sets, Army aircraft tactical air to ground	4.5
Ammunition, 90 mm., 120 mm., 4.2 mortar	25.0
Total	50.0
PRIORITY IV	
5 antiaircraft defense control systems for field Army and Army rear area	38.0
Communications and electronic (tactical radars and radios (division and corps)), mine detectors, tellurometer, antenna groups, VHF radio, airborne navigation and communications	12.8
Total	50.8
PRIORITY V	
Combat vehicles: 130 gun SP, 175 mm. T235	18.0
Ammunition: 175 mm. HE w/prop charge	20.0
Aircraft: Modification of H–37 helicopter	4.0
Communications and electronics: radars and radios for tactical units	11.0
Total	53.0
PRIORITY VI	
Tactical and support vehicles: 1,975 trucks, 5-ton, 6 x 6	23.5
Electronics and communications: 110 countermeasure sets, fuze jamming mobile used at division level	13.0
Ammunition: 90, 120, 175 mm. ammunition	13.5
Total	50.3
PRIORITY VII	
Aircraft: 30 airplanes, L–23	4.9
Other major items of equipment: 150 boats, bridge, erection; 1,587 boats, assault, plastic; 575 pontoons, half, aluminum; 60 distributers, bitumen 800 gallons; 200 crane-shovels, track mounted, 20 tons, 2 cubic yards; 85 crane-shovels, crawler, 40 tons; 200 loaders, scoop type, wheeled, 2½ cubic yards; 50 tractors, wheeled, abn, 10,000 draw bar pull; 93 water purif equip sets (3,000 gals per hour); 275 generator sets, 15 kilowatts, 60 cycle; 140 bridges, AVL, 60 feet; 67 launchers, AVL bridge	48.4
Total	53.3
PRIORITY VIII	
Ammunition: 90, 120, 175 mm ammunition, 4.2 illuminating shells and antitank mines	7.2
Industrial mobilization: Preproduction planning and preparation for new equipment	13.3
Total	20.5

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, since, in one way or another, the Congress already finds $119.1 million available for application to this minimum priority list, the deficiency amounts to the difference between $453 million and $119.1 million—or $333.9 million.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment to strike the figure of $1,450 million for procurement of equipment and missiles for the Army, and replace that figure with $1,783,900,000.

If the Congress will accept this amendment, it will show clearly its intent that our relatively very small combat Army should be modernized, and will back up that intent with funds sufficient to get that modernization under way.

Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman of the committee will take the amendment to conference, I should be glad to leave it that way.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 9, it is proposed to strike "$1,450,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof $1,783,900,000."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the request of the Senator from Missouri, but I do not feel that the chairman of the subcommittee should take that responsibility, because there is too much money involved. If the Senate wants to agree to the amendment, I would be willing to fight for it in conference.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, as I understand it, is to add $333.9 million to the bill for further Army modernization. The Senator well knows my views on the subject of modernizing the Army. He

knows that I voted to increase the size of the Army in the subcommittee and in the full committee. He also knows that I lent enthusiastic support to the motion to increase the funds for Army modernization by $205 million over the House figure. He knows that I also supported the reprograming of Nike-Hercules funds so that an additional $117 million would go to Army modernization.

I wish I could support the Senator's present amendment; but I believe that the Senate has already made substantial efforts in this line. We have added $205.3 million in new appropriations. We have agreed with the House additions of $200 million for Nike-Zeus and/or Army modernization. And we have approved $117 million in reprograming of Nike-Hercules funds. These added sources for modernization come to $522.3 million, certainly a substantial amount.

It is true that some of this must be utilized for programs already planned. Somewhere between $117 million and $267 million is the anticipated program deficiency, depending on whether the Department of Defense or the Department of the Army is correct in its estimates.

The committee acted as it did, in part at least, because we could not get the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army together on any particular estimate.

I believe that in providing $1,450,000,000 for Army procurement we have given the Army a good start on its modernization program. I doubt if the funds would be used if we provided additional money. I should like to join my friend in his amendment, but I would prefer to let the present amounts stand at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, to be sure we all understand what we are talking about, I should like to give a summary of exactly what the Senate is doing, as against what the implications might be with regard to what the Senate is doing.

The President's budget requested $1,024,700,000. The Senate committee raised this figure to $1,450 million, an increase of $425,300,000.

This new obligational authority increase includes nonmodernization items, however, of $20 million for the National Guard and the Reserves, and $137 million for Nike-Zeus, which has nothing to do with modernization of the combat capability of the Army. This is a total of $157 million. Subtracting the $157 million from the $425,300,000, which the Senate ostensibly is giving for modernization of the Army, we have a figure of $268,300,000.

Actually, however, an error turned up in the Department of Defense with respect to what is being done for the Army, an error of $267 million which is admitted and which is referred to in the Senate committee report. So, in regard to what the Senate is really adding for modernization of the Army, the total of added new money is $268.3 million minus $267 million or only $1.3 million.

In addition, however, there was $117.8 million reprogramed—not new money—to modernization. This was made up of $76.8 million from prior year funds and $41 million from money in the 1960 budget. All of this was money transferred from air defense programs and was not any new added appropriation for modernization of the Army.

If we deduct the $267 million error, and if we add the $117,800,000 of reprogramed funds, we get a total availability for additional modernization of $119,100,000.

Mr. President, in order to have our Army, which is very much outnumbered already, equipped with equipment which at least approximates in some cases the modern equipment of the Soviets, I propose to add $333.9 million to the $119,100,000, in order that the bill will really contain something significant for modernization of the Army.

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

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator has completed his speech, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. 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. KUCHEL. 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 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Missouri is asking for an increase of $333.9 million over the budget. The Senator has read certain figures with respect to the new procurement for the Army, and what the committee has done, as opposed to the budget. I am in accord with the figures he has read, with one exception.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The exception is the amount of the Army deficiency estimate. The Army testified, without question in my mind, that there was a $267 million estimate of a deficiency, because of mutual security procurement and estimated deobligations in fiscal year 1959 and fiscal year 1960. Later a lower estimate was submitted by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNeil.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But not by the Army.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not by the Army. Mr. McNeil brought it down to $117 million.

The Senator from Missouri and I had a little colloquy an hour or so ago, and we put into the RECORD, by mutual consent, a letter from the Assistant Secretary, Mr. McNeil. That letter, I agree with the Senator, may be a bit confusing in its language.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator and I agree it is not very clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. After that colloquy, I called up the office of Mr. McNeil and asked him if he could send me a letter immediately. That letter has come. It has some ink longhand amendments or corrections by Mr. McNeil. The Senator from New Mexico has not seen it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator give us the implications of the letter?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The implications of the letter are that, instead of a $267 million deficiency, there is a $167 million deficiency for fiscal year 1959 and prior years, with another $50 million, for the year 1960, which cannot be cataloged as either one thing or the other, making a net deficiency of $117 million estimated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the difference between what the Senator has suggested in his figures and the figures now given to us by Mr. McNeil would be $100 million, with the possibility of $50 million more, with respect to which I would not argue with the Senator. But Mr. McNeil says definitely that the Army deficiency estimate is $167 million instead of $267 million, with $50 million more, which he did not think would enter into it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. I shall be very glad to reduce the figure in my amendment, based upon that letter and my confidence in the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I will modify my amendment by reducing the amount from $333 million to $233 million. If the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee will be so kind as to take that amount to conference, I shall be glad to ask that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, about the only time the Pentagon pays any attention to us is when it is after money. It never tells us about mistakes.

The last letter is more confusing than ever. The best information available to the committee would paint this picture, so far as this appropriation bill is concerned: The tabulation of increases available for Army modernization in the production and procurement account shows that, for the Army, the Senate committee version of the bill contains $1,450 million. The budget estimate was $1,024,700,000. The committee figure was $425,300,000 over the budget; less support of the Reserve or National Guard, $20 million; less Nike-Zeus missile acceleration, $137 million, which would make a net increase in the appropriation for modernization of $268,300,000, plus reprograming of the Nike-Hercules, $117,800,000, or a total addition for modernization of $386,100,000.

The Army estimate of the deficiency is $267 million, which would leave a net available for modernization of the Army of $119,100,000.

The Department of Defense has another figure. Its estimate of deficiency is $117 million, leaving a net available for modernization of $269,100,000.

The reports are very confusing. I hope the Senate will stand by the committee. I believe that the money we have allowed the Army for modernization is sufficient, and that if we were to give them 10 cents more, or $100, or $1 million, or $10 million, or the figure the Senator from Missouri has suggested, the Army could not use the money.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator makes a most extraordinary statement when he says that the Army cannot use the money. General Taylor himself supports fully this priority list of $453 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. And states that he would like to have better tanks and better ground-troop-carrying equipment, and better rifles. How can the Senator say that the Army could not use the money if they got it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because they will not.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Why will they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Bureau of the Budget would probably not release the funds.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is a real possibility of that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe in modern tanks and other modern equipment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Why does not the Senator want this money appropriated if that is what he believes?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think that we appropriated enough for what I believe in, and I think the committee appropriated enough for what it believes in. This is my bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator deny what the Defense Department now admits, that there was a large error in the figures which were allocated originally to the Army?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course. I do not know who is correct. I do not know whether the Army is correct or whether the Defense Department is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts just stated that the Defense Department admitted an error.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Thirty men from this body for weeks and weeks and weeks, 27 members of the Appropriation Committee and 3 of the ex officio members from the Armed Services Committee worked like slaves trying to cooperate in order to make us secure so that American men and American women could go to bed at night feeling that the Congress was doing what was right in order to provide security for the Nation.

I dislike to disagree with some of my friends even in this body, but I do feel that the committee did some fine work and has presented a good bill. All that I am asking is that the Senate support the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator and I hope the Senate will support the committee.

As I understand, the President asked for $1,024 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of new obligational authority for procurement in the Army. Of the $425.3 million increase in new obligational authority provided by the Senate committee, the amount for Army modernization over the budget is $119,100,000, based on one set of figures and including $117.8 million of reprogramed funds. On another set of figures supported by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the increase for Army modernization including reprogramed funds of $117.8 million, is $269,100,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So somewhere between $119 million and $269 million, depending on which set of figures, is the amount that the committee has gone above the budget of the President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right. Now, to put it another way, the President requested $1,024,700,000.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. And this committee recommended $1,450 million, $425 million more than the budget request.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I ask the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in this matter. What was the sum appropriated last year for this same purpose?

The purpose of my question is to find out what we appropriated last year for the Army in this category.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. And what we are doing this year. I want to see whether or not we are interested in a modern Army.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is right. Last year, procurement of equipment and missiles, Army, 1959 appropriations, $1,669,338,000.

Mr. CARROLL. That was last year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was 1959.

Mr. CARROLL. Now, what is proposed for this year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This year the committee is recommending $1,450 million.

Mr. CARROLL. You have then $200 million less for the Army this year. Would my distinguished friend from New Mexico tell us how we can justify the present figures in the bill—and I am not at this time taking a position on the amendment—how can we justify the present figures when we have military experts asking for a modern Army and we have cut last year's amount by $200 million?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason we can justify it is that we are $400 million over the budget as it is now to what the Budget Bureau, the administration, recommended to the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. I am talking about this category.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In this category.

Mr. CARROLL. What about the Bureau of the Budget? Did they recommend a reduction of $400 million?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right, actually their reduction is even greater.

Mr. CARROLL. Was there any justification for that recommendation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, they try to justify it, but the committee took a different view and increased the budget figures by better than $400 million.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CARROLL. If the senior Senator from New Mexico accepts the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and as I understand it, his amendment now has been modified following the explanation by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, he is now asking a modification and extension of $233 million——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Something like that; yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Now, if we add that $233 million, will we not be just about where we were last year in this category?

Mr. CHAVEZ. As far as the figures go, yes, but not as far as the budget recommendations or the program of 1959 are concerned. Last year we had money in the totals that I just stated to the Senator from Colorado, included considerable funds for the Jupiter missile, which is not in this program of 1960.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and I admit the committee has done a fine piece of work——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, I wouldn't say we did, but know we tried to do a good piece of work.

Mr. CARROLL. And the committee spent many weeks on a very difficult bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Missouri was there helping. The Senator from Florida was there and the Senator from Massachusetts was there—in all, 30 Senators. They actually worked, trying to present a reasonable, justifiable bill that would be a credit to the Congress of the United States and to the American people.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. With all of the fine work that has been done by this committee, this is the real purpose of my questioning. Last year we appropriated $1.669 billion for Army procurement of equipment. This year, for some reason, unbeknownst, at least, to the junior Senator from Colorado, the Bureau of the Budget reduced it $640 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. And we come now to a period where Gen. Maxwell Taylor—I heard his broadcast yesterday, speaking to the American people—is asking for a stronger and more modern Army at the very time when the Bureau of the Budget cut the Army appropriations by $640 million, and, at the same time, this committee, which has done such fine work, has not agreed with the Bureau of the Budget. However, we are still over $200 million short of last year's appropriation. At the same time, all other services are moving ahead. That is why I think there is considerable merit to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me give the Senator from Colorado some figures. In the 1959 appropriation, $1,669,338,000. The Budget estimate for 1960, this year, $1,024,700,000.

Mr. CARROLL. Six hundred million dollars less?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, that would be practically $645 million.

Mr. CARROLL. Six hundred and forty-five million dollars was cut this year by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right. Notwithstanding the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, the bill which the committee has presented for Senate action today contains more than $400 million over the Budget figure.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico; but, notwithstanding the fine work of the committee, we have $200 million less than we had last year, although there is a greater demand on the part of the military leaders of the Army, asking for a more modern striking force.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but in the modernization, as we understand it, it affects purchase of hardware, the buying of modern artillery, modern ammunition, modern equipment.

They tell us that because we provided last year for 900,000 personnel, and they have cut the number down now to 870,000. That is presumably another reason why they do not want the additional $600 million.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, one of the reasons given by the Bureau of the Budget for a reduction in amount requested for Army equipment is that there will be a reduction in Army personnel?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, if we vote for the amendment adding $233 million, is there any reason to believe that the Department will increase the Armed Forces to 900,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish we could say that that would be done. We have tried in the subcommittee and have tried in the full committee. The Senator from Louisiana, over and over again, made the effort to increase the size of the Army, but we were unsuccessful. The Senator from Louisiana suggested this morning that he might not bring the matter up on the floor. But we could not do anything in the subcommittee or in the full committee, so far as raising the number of personnel to 900,000 was concerned. That is one of the excuses or justifications for cutting down the appropriation.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator from New Mexico mean by that statement that even though we voted the $233 million, the Department would not spend it to increase the number of troops?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They have not done so in the past. For 2 years, Congress has provided funds for 200,000 marines, 300,000 reservists, and 400,000 National Guardsmen. But the Department did not use the money for an increase in the Marine Corps nor the Regular Army.

This year, so far as the marines, the National Guardsmen, and the reservists are concerned, language was included to make the funds usable for that purpose only. Previously the Department took the money and used it otherwise, even though Congress had provided it was to be used for additional marines, National Guardsmen, and reservists. That has happened in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand the Senator from New Mexico, he said that even if we voted for the amendment to provide $300 million, the Army would not use it. Does the Senator from New Mexico mean that the Department has no plans to modernize the Army? Let us forget about personnel; I am talking about hardware. Does the Department have no plans for modernization? Has it no place to use the money? Would they not use it to modernize the Army?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They could use it, and they know how to use it, but they will not use it. From past actions one can assume that the Budget Bureau will not let them have it.

Mr. CARROLL. That is a very illuminating statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator mean that even though Congress appropriated money for the purpose of modernizing the Army, the Bureau of the Budget would not permit its use?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Bureau of the Budget might very well stop the Department from using it. It has done so in the past. All Congress can do is to make the money available. We cannot make the Department use the money. Congress can simply make the money available to the military for any purpose; but, after all, the executive branch spends it.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the Senator from New Mexico suggesting that the Bureau of the Budget has made a recommendation of $1.024 billion, the committee has provided $1.450 billion, but there is no way of knowing whether the Department will spend the money?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have asked the Department to report to us, but that is the best we can do. We have asked or suggested that it be appropriated for a certain purpose only, so that it cannot be used, as in the past, for any other purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. That leads me to the next question. Was all the money which was appropriated by Congress last year in this category spent?

Mr. CHAVEZ. As far as the Marines are concerned, it may have been spent for other purposes, but not for the things for which it was appropriated. That is why we have provided in the bill this year that the funds cannot be used for any other purpose except the purpose for which they are appropriated.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand correctly that the money was appropriated last year for this category but was not spent for that purpose, but was spent for other purposes?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct for the Army; and also money for the Marine Corps.

Mr. CARROLL. How much of last year's budget was related to the development of the Zeus missile? How much has been provided for that missile this year, or has it been discontinued?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish I could answer the Senator, but such information is classified. I could not answer the Senator in public.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator know?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes; we know.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator know whether, if money is appropriated for this purpose, it will be used for that purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but I could not tell the Senator in public the exact figures. But the information is available. I can make it available to the Senator from Colorado or to any other Senator who wishes to see it.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senate should vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to provide $233 million, and the Department does not use it, we will not have lost anything, will we?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Department does not use it, we will not have lost anything: and at the same time our action may be taken as an expression of how we feel about modernizing the Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason for the language in the bill and the reason for the increased appropriation. We want to tell the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and the administration that we want a modern Army.

Mr. CARROLL. In view of the amazing revelations made today about the Bureau of the Budget and the fact that Congress can appropriate but the Department will not spend, would it not be advisable to take the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to conference, at least as a manifestation of our own feeling?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I would not mind taking the amendment to conference, but I do not want to do it on my own responsibility. I think $333 million is not something for any Senator to accept on his own responsibility. If the Senate wants to send the amendment to conference, well and good; I will fight for it with all the strength I have. But I do not think it is fair to ask one Senator to take to conference an amendment providing $333 million.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Who has the floor?

Mr. CARROLL. I believe the Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the Senator from Colorado, I point out that even if the additional money proposed by the Senator from Missouri is allowed, it is not at all certain that that money will be spent for the purpose for which he wants it spent, because, time and time again, Congress has appropriated money, and it has not been used for

the purpose for which it was intended; it has been used for other purposes.

That brings me to the fact that a few years ago Congress appropriated $40 million of additional funds, under an amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], to maintain the strength of the Marine Corps at a certain level. What did the administration do? It tried to use the money for everything else in the Department of Defense except for the maintenance of the Marine Corps as Congress had indicated it should be maintained. I ask the Senator from New Mexico: Is there language in this appropriation bill which makes it mandatory this year, in comparison with last year, that the Marine Corps be maintained at a strength of not less than 200,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I will point it out to the Senator in just a moment. It is under the heading "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

Mr. MANSFIELD. On what page?

Mr. CHAVEZ On page 3 of the bill, line 15.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to ask the Senator a question in respect to the proviso. Is this language as strong as the language contained in last year's defense appropriation bill, which made it mandatory on the Pentagon—and they are agreed—to maintain the Army, the Reserves, and the National Guard at the levels specified by Congress?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was the intention of the committee, in drafting the language, to make it as strong as it had been heretofore.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the language in this bill as strong as we made it in the supplemental appropriation bill this year, which sought to allow funds to maintain the strength of the Marine Corps at a figure of not less than 200,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; and the language on page 3 is—

Provided, That the Regular Marine Corps personnel paid from this appropriation shall be maintained at an end strength of not less than two hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960: *Provided further*, That $32,700,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available only to meet the increased expenses to maintain the Regular Marine Corps at an end strength of not less than two hundred thousand for the fiscal year 1960.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, insofar as the Senate is concerned, we shall have included the strongest possible language and shall have made it as mandatory as we could, so as to see to it that the Marine Corps shall be maintained at a strength of not less than 200,000 men.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but we shall also have provided the funds with which to do it.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Montana has raised a very important question. I wish to propound an inquiry to the Senator from New Mexico. The debate in regard to the Marine Corps has been very illuminating. Let us assume that the Senate adopts the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, which asks for an additional $233 million, and let us assume that that money is provided in that category. Will it be tied down for a specific purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The language I have just now read from the bill ties it down for that specific purpose, and nothing else. We made the language stronger than the language we used last year, because last year we did not tie it down sufficiently to prevent them from using the money for other purposes.

Mr. CARROLL. I am frank to state that I do not want to vote for an additional $233 million to be placed in a category which I believe will be used to modernize the Army, and then have the money used for another purpose. I do not want the money we provide in this connection to be provided in such a way that the officials in the Defense Department can play around with the money. I want the additional $233 million to be used for the purpose of modernizing the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield at this point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Colorado has raised a very pertinent question. It will do the Senator from Missouri no good to have more funds provided, unless they are tied down for a specific purpose, as we did last year in the case of the National Guard and the Reserves; and as we tried to do last year for the Regular Army and the Marine Corps, but failed; and as we intend to do this year, insofar as the Marine Corps is concerned.

Mr. CARROLL. That is very important.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; it is. The language I am talking about affects the National Guard and the Army Reserves and the Marine Corps. But the language in regard to modernization would not take care of the idea the Senator from Colorado has in mind. The money could possibly be used for other purposes, for language to prevent the money from being used for other purposes is not included in the bill as it now stands.

Mr. CARROLL. The bill already contains sufficient appropriations for those categories.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I do not know what the purpose of the proposed additional $233 million is in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. However, I assume it has to do with modernizing the Army and perhaps with hardware. Will the Senator from Missouri state the purpose of the proposed additional $233 million?

Mr. CHAVEZ. First, let me say that I am not antagonistic to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I favor modernization; and I would not oppose including in the bill language which would carry out the purpose we have provided for in the bill—and no other purpose—in the case of the Marines, the National Guard, and the Reserves.

Mr. CARROLL. I understand that the bill already provides sufficient funds in that regard. So what is the purpose of the additional $233 million proposed by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I say to my good friend, the Senator from Colorado, that after finding out that our troops around Berlin had 23-year-old rifles, that their tanks were half the range of the tanks of the Soviets, that their tanks were badly outgunned, that their machine guns were of World War I vintage—not even of World War II vintage—I thought it might be wise to provide for modernizing the U.S. Army, which is so greatly outnumbered. Therefore, I submitted this amendment.

The Department of Defense has admitted that there was a major error in their figures, although the error is believed as being not so large as was originally believed.

Mr. President, based on what the distinguished Senator from Colorado has done this afternoon—and I express to him my thanks for clarifying these points to the extent he has—and based on the letter submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, and based on the statements made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and other Members, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be revised, so that the figure be $233 million, instead of $333 million, and that the amendment precisely state that these funds can be used only for modernization of the Army.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield first to me, to permit me to request that the letter referred to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be very happy to have that done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the letter addressed by Assistant Secretary of Defense McNeil to me, under date of July 13.

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

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1959.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: You asked that we clarify a statement made in our recent letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations with respect to whether certain assets of the Army were expected to materialize. You indicated that a question had arisen as to whether the Office of the Secretary of Defense had agreed at any time with the Army as to the validity of the dollar amount as stated by the Army, $267 million.

The answer to that is that the Office of the Secretary of Defense at no time agreed as to the validity of the shortfall in the assets of the Army in the amount of $267

million. First, the Office of the Secretary of Defense did not consider that approximately $50 million could be validated because this amount represented orders canceled by the military assistance program which in order to be valid would have required purchases by the Army. In other words, to be in a position to collect the reimbursements they would concurrently have had to spend $50 million; therefore, the cancellation of orders in this amount would have no effect on the buying program of the Army for its own account. This item reduced the forecasted shortfall to $217 million.

Next, the Office of the Secretary of Defense feels that it is too early to write off the $50 million of deobligations forecast for the year 1960. For example, only 60 days ago it was not apparent that there would be substantial changes in the Army's procurement program in the last quarter of the fiscal year 1959; yet in the last 60 days there have been changes proposed by the executive branch in the Army procurement appropriation involving a reduction of $76.8 million in the air defense program—not counting the $41 million additional recommended by the Senate committee. For such a reason, a present decision on the $50 million deobligations in fiscal year 1960 would be premature.

Another point is that late in fiscal year 1959 the military assistance program reinstated orders not requiring replacement in kind amounting to approximately $50 million. Therefore, $50 million of additional assets are available to the Army. It was for the above reasons that the Office of the Secretary of Defense has never concurred in the statement that there was a shortfall in the amount of $267 million.

Sincerely,

W. J. McNEIL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Missouri is agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON'S modified amendment, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

On page 22, in line 9, strike out "$1,450,000,000," and substitute therefore "$1,683,900,000."

And on page 22, in line 10, after the word "expended" add:

"*Provided*, That a minimum of $453,000,000 of which be used for modernization of the combat equipment of the Army, and".

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as I stated before, I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee which handles the appropriation bill for the military. Until the letter was read by the Senator from Massachusetts on the floor of the Senate, I had not heard about the matter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Neither had I heard of this new interpretation of the error.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no one for whom I care more than I do for my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, but I do resent the fact that the Department of Defense would not notify the chairman of the subcommittee which is handling the bill, which even provides the pay of all those in the Defense Department, and would not let the chairman of the subcommittee know what is happening.

I thought I had prepared a good report for the Senate, and I believe I did; and I had fine cooperation from the members of the subcommittee as a whole. But out of a clear sky the Department of Defense officials have changed their minds about the original information which they gave to us; and now they want us to change our minds and to approprate for them additional amounts of money.

I am sympathetic with the views of the Senator from Missouri.

As for the mistake which was made in the Department of Defense, I do not know whether the correct amount is $178 million or $278 million. I do not think the Department of Defense officials themselves know the correct figure. I am taking the information the committee received in committee session, and am trying to present to the Senate a justifiable proposal.

I shall have to oppose the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Certainly there is no reflection upon the integrity or the ability of the committee. The fact is that the committee received through the Budget—by way of the Department of Defense, I assume, from what I have heard—a figure which involved a great mistake, one running into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. And now another letter has been received.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think the Department of Defense officials themselves know what the actual mistake is.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that such indecision and confusion on the part of the Department of Defense officials—following the testimony given by some very able men in the military, whose responsibility is the modernization of the Army—resulted in the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], whose purpose is to tie down the amount to $233 million. But we do not know whether the Bureau of the Budget will permit the Department of Defense to spend the money. However, now we do know—in view of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—that the Department of Defense will not be able to use the money for another purpose.

In this case, let us give the Department of Defense an opportunity to spend the money for the purpose we intend. Perhaps they will find they made other mistakes or other errors. But at least let us not make the mistake of not providing sufficient funds to permit the modernization of the Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We want to provide sufficient money to modernize the Army; and I think we have provided enough money to make a good start in that direction. I am sympathetic with the amendment of the Senator from Missouri; but I should like to have the Bureau of the Budget and the Defense Department present us with a firm figure in connection with the shortage of funds.

Mr. CARROLL. They did submit a firm figure, and the committee voted to increase it by $400 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They submitted a figure, but they tried to explain that in that connection an error was made—whether $170 million or $177 million or $270 million, no one knows. But the figure they gave the Senate committee was the figure that committee used; and based on that figure, the committee voted to appropriate $425 million more than the Budget recommendation.

Mr. CARROLL. The main thing I want to say is that there is no reflection upon the chairman of the subcommittee. It was not the fault of the committee. But we cannot afford to gamble, in my opinion. At least, we can provide the wherewithal so that if the services want to go ahead and modernize the Army, they can do so, now that we have pinpointed it. I am glad the amendment has been offered. I hope the chairman will agree to take it to conference.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would like to do it, but the Senator from New Mexico does not feel justified in taking a $333 million addition——

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will yield for a correction, the amount is now $233.9 million, not $333.9 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, that is not a small amount. I do not feel justified in accepting the amendment on my own judgment. If the Senate decides to adopt the amendment, I will fight for that sum in conference, but I do not feel justified in taking the responsibility for saying that I am willing to take that amendment, which involves $233 million, to conference.

Mr. President, in analyzing and in bringing factors to bear on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, I point out that in last year's appropriation we included a lot of money for Nike-Hercules and Jupiter running into millions of dollars, which is not included in the present proposal. Also, the $1,450 million provided in the bill is to be used for modernization of the Army. My contention is that it is sufficient for this year.

I am sympathetic with everything the Senator from Missouri has said. I want a modern Army. I want our Army to be up-to-date. I do not want our boys to have to fight with Springfield rifles of 1902 vintage that Teddy Roosevelt might have used in Cuba. I want modern Army, modern guns, and modern firepower. I do not want any more 25's; I want big ones. But I think we ought to proceed in a reasonable way. The $40 billion is a lot of money the American people are having to pay for defense, and I believe it will provide under the present circumstances, an adequate defense.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that even as to the revised budget estimate for 1960, the Senate committee-approved bill adds $346 million thereto, making the bill that much larger than the estimate?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In Army procurement $425 million over the estimate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that of the amounts added by the Senate com-

mittee version of the bill approximately $450 million is for Army procurement, and most of that for Army modernization?

Mr. CHAVEZ. $400 million is for modernization.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that in the markup of the bill by the full committee, the greatest of priority and the greatest of attention were given to having the bill reflect adequate funds for Army modernization?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the intention of the subcommittee and the full committee—to give the Department all the money necessary in order to try to modernize the Army from all standpoints.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator allow me to make one brief statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recognize completely the good intentions of the Senator from Missouri, who himself sat in the committee, and participated during the markup of the bill and knows what took place at that time. But it seems to me that, in view of the statement made here by the Senator from Missouri to the effect that the funds are adequate, but it is the allocation or distribution of the funds which needs attention, we have ample funds provided in the bill, large as it is over the budget amount and large as it is over the House approved amount, and that the question of allocation should be the question approached by the Senator from Missouri, rather than the question of added appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct, and I believe language having that objective can be included, just as was done with relation to the National Guard and the Reserve and the Marines, which would protect the intention that the funds would be used for modernization purposes only, and nothing else.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my friend from Florida for referring to my statement, but it is a fact that the committee voted for what I consider to be obsolete weapons, such as our limited-range and very expensive ground-to-air missiles.

Mr. President, if my amendment is defeated it will mean we plan to spend $150 million more on just one new atomic-powered carrier for operation in 1964 than we are to modernize the Army—which is outmanned, and outtanked, and generally deficient in equipment. We do not seem to be able to provide funds for modernization of the Army beyond the amount provided by the committee.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that the request of General Taylor, in connection with the present budget, was for an overall procurement of $2,800 million? This figure, as I understand, was turned down by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. The figure in the bill now before the Senate is $1,450 million. With the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, it would be $1,683 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment provides an additional $233 million.

Mr. JACKSON. The amendment provides an additional $233 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON. So the Members of the Senate will understand, is it not true that a very large part of the procurement funds for the Army relate to Nike-Zeus and to Nike-Hercules?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct, as the Senator knows.

Mr. JACKSON. So when we talk here about modernizing the Army, we are talking about modernizing the offensive capability of our ground forces, are we not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. We are now talking about making it possible for our Army to fight in a limited war or to defend itself on a nuclear battlefield. It is obvious we must have an Army that is mobile and an Army that can defend itself effectively. If the Senate does not find out today, it will find out later that we are not providing enough funds, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget, to provide for the kind of modern Army that the last two Chiefs of Staff have insisted is essential to the job assigned to the Army.

General Ridgway, General Taylor, and General Gavin, who headed Research and Development, are outstanding men in their field. They have no ax to grind. All three of them left the Army, telling the American people we are not doing a sufficient job of modernization.

In light of that testimony by outstanding professional men—men who are indeed qualified to speak, men who have made the statement repeatedly, and who have left the service primarily because of their difficulties in trying to get the job done—I say it is time the United States Senate heeded their advice and provided a small downpayment on that effort.

I hope the Senate will support the amendment of my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able friend from Washington.

I should like to point out to the Senate that in World War II the Army of the United States, not the glamorous service, suffered 80 percent of the casualties of the war. In the Korea war again the Army of the United States suffered 80 percent of the casualties.

I hope, as the true condition of our Army becomes more fully understood by the Senate, primarily through the testimony of officers who have resigned in protest—such as General Ridgway, General Gavin, and General Taylor—the Congress of the United States will approve legislation which will make it possible for an American soldier in West Germany, in West Berlin, to have a radio comparable to one the average child in this country has—a 1-pound radio—instead of being forced today to carry, along with his old-fashioned rifle, a 20-pound radio, simply because we do not give him modern electronic equipment.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my able friend, the senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank my esteemed colleague from Missouri.

It is appropriate to recall that period in 1939–40 when there was a feeling within the Congress of the United States that it was unnecessary to provide for improvement of harbors and channels on the island of Guam. Obsolescence had set in. There was a vital need to modernize our facilities. But we failed to act. Guam fell, and fell quickly, when the Japanese sprung their surprise.

I remember as one of those in the House who supported the fortification of Guam, that there were those who, like my former colleague, Representative Melvin J. Maas, warned of the impending disaster:

> I want to point out that while the proposal in this bill is limited to improving the harbor for planes, such improvement would have tremendous national defense value without any fortification whatever. * * * Not to have this information might very well lead to a tragic destruction of the Canal or a surprise raid on Hawaii, or even the continental coast cities themselves.

The Washington, D.C., Star of February 17, 1940 in an editorial, "Guam Loses Again," concluded with these prophetic words:

> If our vital national interests are to be properly safeguarded, Congress must be guided by the recommendations of American defense experts, not by the less-than-candid protests of foreign propagandists.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Guam was ripped asunder because we failed to realize the necessity for modernization and flexibility. Once again, my colleagues, we are challenged to provide flexibility of firepower. I hope the Senate will vote affirmatively on this issue. Senator SYMINGTON'S amendment merits our support, and this statement in no manner reflects on the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from West Virginia for his most significant remarks with respect to this particular problem.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not hear all of the Senator's speech. I should like to ask a few questions, however.

Was there conclusive testimony offered at the hearings, either the hearings of the Appropriations Committee or the hearings held by any subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, in which Gen. Maxwell Taylor said, or from which it could be inferred, that the funds which have been recommended by the committee will not be sufficient to modernize the Army?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator has asked a very pertinent question. The answer is in the affirmative. The Appropriations Subcommittee assigned several of us to find out what General Taylor considered to be the

highest priority items for the modernization of the Army of the United States. As a result, we made up, with the general's approval, a priority list totaling $453 million of the type and character of equipment which has no glamor, but which would be very essential for our ground soldiers in case we got into any real trouble in Europe.

The Senate found an error of $267 million, which the Army reported and which the Senate committee recorded on the summary sheets and in its report.

Thanks to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, we have had the benefit of a Department of Defense letter which has been introduced in the RECORD this afternoon. As a consequence, I have agreed to give them the benefit of the doubt and reduce the error to $167 million.

My amendment now specifies $233 milliion, which would take care of the error and some minimum marginal increases, which General Taylor feels are very important in order to modernize the Army.

In addition, at the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, my amendment now states that the money can only be used for Army modernization. To accomplish that latter purpose, the amendment has the proviso that "a minimum of $453,000,000 of which be used for modernization of the combat equipment of the Army,". Unfortunately, the debate has been confused by inclusion of moneys which have to do with missiles and have nothing to do with modernizing our ground troops.

My answer to my friend from Kentucky, who himself served with great distinction in the Army of the United States, is that this is the minimum amount of money which General Taylor considers to be absolutely essential in order to modernize these troops, who are today facing the Communists in Germany.

I repeat what I said earlier: If this Congress has the right to draft boys off the farms and out of the cities in peacetime, when they do not want to go into uniform, then we as the richest country in the world have the duty to give them the best equipment we can build, and give them thereby the best chance to accomplish their mission and come home safely.

Considering the percentage of casualties which the Army suffered in the last three wars, it is incredible to me that because of fiscal reasons we should conform to this determination to place the importance of money above the importance of the survival of our soldiers.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator a specific question. I heard the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. CHAVEZ, say in his explanation of the bill that the committee had recommended over a half billion dollars to modernize the Army equipment and weapons. Do I understand the Senator from Missouri is saying that the half billion dollars is not sufficient, according to the testimony of Gen. Maxwell Taylor?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is not only not a sufficient amount of money, but, from the standpoint of what the Senate has done, if the error remains at $267 million, the total amount which the Senate has provided for increased modernization of the Army ground troops is only $1.3 million. That is a long way from a half billion dollars. If the error is reduced by $100 million—and I want to say, as a result of the constructive approach to this problem taken by my able friend from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have agreed to reducing it—the total amount of additional money the Senate is actually appropriating for Army modernization, against the $453 million minimum which General Taylor stated was essential, is $101.3 million.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I know these questions are difficult to answer categorically, for they involve matters of judgment. But I know that I will rely on the judgment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, if I can know exactly what recommendation he made to the committee.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri, that this Nation cannot risk again a poorly equipped Army.

I remember, as the Senator from Missouri does, that we were not prepared at the beginning of World War II. We did not have equipment—we did not have the weapons. Even after that experience, we seemingly could not learn from experience, and when the Korean war began we were not properly prepared and did not have the equipment and weapons. In consequence, in December 1950, we were almost forced from the Korean peninsula.

I should like to be assured, by my friend, the Senator from Missouri, who knows I have great confidence in his thorough study of defense problems, that Gen. Maxwell Taylor's position is that the recommendation of the committee, for over a half billion dollars, is not sufficient to equip an army with modern equipment. If this is General Taylor's position, it is mine. For remembering the awful experiences of World War II and the Korean war, when our Army was poorly equipped, I will vote for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, to provide additional funds for the essential equipment of the U.S. Army.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again I thank my friend from Kentucky. He is an able Senator, and was once an able soldier. I assure him that, although General Taylor could not give me official approval of the high priority list for which this amendment seeks money, he did state to me, in writing, that this recommendation had his personal approval.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a brief statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to make a brief statement in support of the Senator from New Mexico. I shall be glad to defer it until after the Senator from Mississippi has concluded his statement.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield briefly to the Senator from Massachusetts without losing the floor.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, I support the Senator from New Mexico in what he has said. Let me say in answer to the questions of the Senator from Kentucky that the Army witnesses testified that there was obsolescence in Army material of approximately $1,400 million each year. General Taylor testified that for the next 5 years, in order completely to modernize the Army, it would require $15 billion, in his opinion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. $15 billion, or $3 billion a year for 5 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; $15 billion for the next 5 years.

What we are trying to do is to take care of procurement in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to cover our overall defense. What we have done with respect to the Army is this:

The new obligational authority in the budget was $1,024,700,000. The Senate committee voted a new obligational authority of $1,450 million. If we take out of that $20 million for the National Guard Reserve and $137 million for Nike-Zeus, which could not be called strictly Army procurement, there is an increase over the budget of $268,300,000.

The difference of opinion arises in this way: the Mutual Security Agency buys its military equipment from the Army. The question is whether the Army has money to replace that equipment, or whether it comes out of obsolete equipment.

It was testified by the Army officials that there was an Army deficiency estimate of $267 million. If we take the reprograming funds allowed by the Senate committee, plus the new funds of $268 million, and subtract the Army's estimate of $267 million deficiency, we get a net figure of new and reprogramed funds of approximately $120 million over the budget figure.

Mr. McNeil, Assistant Secretary of Defense, testified that the deficiency, instead of being $267 million, should be $117 million. So the correct figure is somewhere between $1,143 million and $1,293 million of new and reprogramed funds available for new procurement in the bill this year. The Senator from Missouri wishes to add $233 million.

In the new procurement is included money for Nike-Zeus. We have cut down Nike-Hercules. We have cut down the Bomarc money. We have cut down classified amounts in prior years for the Nike-Hercules and Bomarc missiles. The problem is how to arrange procurement so that we shall go forward with strategic missiles, strategic bombers, and antisubmarine warfare requirements, and the new aircraft carrier. Whether that is a good thing or not can be disputed.

The point to which I wish to direct the Senator's attention is that, on the basis of the minimum figures of $1,143 million, or the maximum figure of $1,293 million in new and reprogramed

funds in the committee bill for new Army procurement in fiscal year 1960—which is exclusive of the Nike-Zeus research and exclusive of what goes into the National Guard—I support the Senator from New Mexico in the amounts which were added in the committee.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. It is very difficult for a Member of the Senate who is not a member of the Armed Services Committee, or the Appropriations Committee which study constantly our defense needs to comprehend, in a day's debate, these large sums and their implications. And it is difficult to go against the judgment of the committee.

Every Member of the Senate has his responsibility in voting on Defense Appropriations, for it is concerned with the very defense and security of this contry and its people. A few days ago, when the mutual security bill was before us, I voted to strike $300 million from military assistance to other countries, for among other reasons, I would prefer that the $300 million be used for our armed services than for those of another country. But that is beside the point—except to say if additional funds are needed to modernize the Army, and I believe they are—I want to vote to make the funds available.

I have read statements ascribed to General Taylor. He is reported to have said that the Army's equipment is obsolescent, and that the Army does not have modern weapons. Is that true?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He did say so. He said that obsolescence was about $1,400 million a year. He said that in the next 5 years $15 billion should be put into the Army to modernize it.

Mr. COOPER. If it is true, as General Taylor says, that the Army's equipment is obsolescent, it is not a modern Army, and it could not fulfill its mission in today's warfare—if war should come. Will the Senator say that the money which has been recommended by the committee is sufficient to meet the needs, or a proper schedule for modernizing the Army?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It goes in that direction, to the extent of somewhere between $1,143 million and $1,293 million in new and reprogramed funds for Army procurement of new equipment and missiles, exclusive of $20 million for increased Guard and Reserve, and $137 million for Nike-Zeus. I do not say that that is as much as the Army wants. I do not say that what we have recommended is as much as the Navy or the Air Force wants. We have increased appropriations over the budget by $346 million, and over the House figures by some $746 million.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has been in the Army. He knows that unless an army has modern equipment today, it does not matter how much second-rate equipment it has. Our Army must be the best. It must have the best weapons if we are to be secure. We know this. Is our Army properly equipped to perform its mission?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot say truthfully on this floor that, in the words of the Army itself, it has as much modernized equipment as it wants.

Considering the Army, Navy, and Air Force, in the present organization of the Department of Defense, we have done as good a job as we could; and the figure recommended by the Senate committee is $346 million over the budget. Of course, the budget was prepared by the administration. We have gone $346 million over that figure. We have changed the figures around, so that there is a substantial amount—almost $1 billion—over the budget figures. It is $916 million over the budget request; and the gross decreases are $570 million. So the bill as reported by the Senate committee is $346 million over the budget.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the Senator's frank views. As I have said, it is a pretty difficult thing for a Senator who is not on the committee dealing with defense to reach a sound judgment. But, I remember the experience of the past, of World War II, the experience of the Korean war, when we almost suffered a tragic defeat, and we cannot take such a risk again.

I am concerned when General Taylor says that the Army is poorly equipped. I hope—as all of us do—that we shall have no more wars; but we are in danger in Berlin, and throughout the world, and I would not like to see the United States again in the same position as before World War II and the Korean war. I support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

I preface my remarks by saying that he and I have started with the same idea and from the same premise. We have attended many hearings together. I very strongly believe that the modernization of the Army is one of the highest priorities that should be considered in connection with our forward looking military program. I would not detract one bit from it.

However, I point out to Senators that the bill carries more than $346 million over the budget. Even though some of the figures are in dispute, and there is a difference of opinion as to just how much is added for modernization of the Army, almost this full amount goes to the solution of the very problem to which the Senator from Missouri directs his amendment.

My conclusion is based upon the idea that I think we should intensify our preparation for the so-called limited conflict or limited war. I believe that is where we shall have to play a big role for many years to come, and that the more effective we are in that respect, and the more quickly we can get to the trouble spots, the more influence we shall have from the standpoint of preventing outbreaks or in dealing with them.

I have given this program a very high priority in my thinking. I am confronted with the fact that there is already in the Army budget, for procurement of equipment and missiles for the Army, $1,024 million.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield briefly.

Mr. CLARK. I invite the Senator's attention to page 16 of the committee report. Is it not true that the budget requests for procurement of equipment and missiles for the Army, which is the subject matter we are now discussing, are some $600 million less than they were last year?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is undoubtedly correct. He has the report before him. I do not have in mind the exact comparison with last year.

Mr. CLARK. While it is true that the appropriation now recommended is above the budget figure, it is still $700 million less than was appropriated last year.

Mr. STENNIS. The point I wish to make is that there is already money in the budget figure even to buy some modern equipment, modern tanks, and other weapons that are needed. I think there ought to be more than the budget allows, and I actively supported the increased amount in the committee, which was larger than either the budget estimate or the House amount, but not as large as the amount the Senator from Missouri seeks.

Mr. President, we had to make choices. For example, we had to decide as to whether we were for a 900,000-man Army. I voted for an 870,000-man Army, with the idea that we would thereby have more money for modernization, believing that the lesser number of men properly equipped with modern weapons, modern tanks, and everything else, would be better than a 900,000-man Army on which we might spend that much money.

We had to make choices among these priorities, and these figures. Most unfortunately, there is some uncertainty about how much of a deficit there is for the Army that must be taken care of.

But to go over the figures again, figures which have already been repeated, there is $425 million of new money in the bill, over the budget request, for the modernization of these weapons. When we subtract $137 million from that, which will cover the Nike-Zeus program, a special weapon in a way, but not yet in actual use, we have $288 million left. To this, however, we should add the $117.8 million reprogramed from Nike-Hercules, for a total of $406 million.

From that amount must be subtracted the sum that is in dispute. I do not know what it is; no one seems to know, and it is very unfortunate, but if it is $100 million, we have over $300 million, in addition to what is in the budget originally for the modernization of the Army and, as I have said, we have only $346 million in the entire bill above the budget.

So with all deference to what has been said—and I want to make it clear I am not against the idea of modernization of the Army—that is a sizable bite to take in one year after the other programs have already been set up.

For my part, I am helping to start right now a campaign for the further modernization of the Army next year at a more rapid rate.

What has been said is also true, Mr. President, with reference to the modernization of the fleet. The two most impressive statements I have heard all year

dealt with the need for modernization. One was made by Admiral Burke with reference to the modernization of the fleet, and the other one was made by General Taylor with reference to the modernization of the Army. But at this late date in planning for expenditures for the present budget year, what is proposed is certainly a sizable increase for the modernization of the Army in addition to the funds in the budget, and will make an appreciable start toward what I hope will be a much more forward looking, much more rapidly moving program for next year and the years to come until we do have this completely equipped, hard bone-and-muscle, quick striking ground power that can be put into motion in a matter of hours and quickly transported to any spot in the world. That is why I have been so interested in putting the emphasis on these things rather than this point defense program, and ground-to-air missiles, the effectiveness of which is unfortunately uncertain. The need is in the direction of what we are providing for, and this is a sizable step forward.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator knows full well, because he has been the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, that the money in the Army appropriation is substantially the same as what has gone into the Nike-Hercules and into the Air Force and the Bomarc, and we have found now that these weapons are obsolescent. We are turning to the Nike-Zeus. We are trying to provide for the modernization of the Army.

Mr. STENNIS. I am in accord with that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator mentioned Army modernization to make our forces capable of striking quickly. He mentioned the Navy. He did not happen to mention it, but I am sure he agrees essentially with the research and development on the ICBM and the IRBM missiles, which are such an essential part of modernization.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator is to be commended for his incessant fight and his incessant efforts from month to month and from year to year on the modernization of the very Army we are talking about in the bill, what we are considering at this time. I think the amount carried in the bill represents a very liberal provision for the reasonable increases we are making.

The Senator from Pennsylvania raised a very fine point about the decrease from last year's budget. It is due in large part to the elimination of a very expensive missile the Army had, the Jupiter, and is due, further, to a cutting down on another very expensive ground-to-air defensive missile, the Nike-Hercules, and devoting this money more to offensive, modern striking power. That is where it belongs, in my opinion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, first I wish to join with my distinguished friend from Mississippi in commending the Senator from Missouri for keeping before the American people the fundamental fact that our freedom must be maintained at a price, and we cannot afford not to make sacrifices necessary for survival in the kind of world in which we find ourselves.

Some years ago I was disturbed about our bomber situation. In view of the testimony of General Le May that we were not going forward with the B–52 bombers, which at the time were the fastest we had, I offered an amendment in committee to add $900 million to the bomber program. In the offering of the amendment, I had the excellent support of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. The money was included in the budget. It was not spent the first year, but it was subsequently spent. If it had not been spent, we would not have what we think we have today, that is, bomber superiority over the Soviets.

I also endorse the statement of the Senator from Mississippi that the bill represents our best-informed guess of appropriate priorities, subject to limitations of the money we have to spend. No one could argue that if we had unlimited funds, we would not provide more money for almost every category. The situation is simply that serious.

On the other hand, with all due respect to our colleagues in the House, we must recognize that they thought they had done a pretty good job for defense. The press received the House bill in a fairly good manner. Yet we bring to the Senate a bill which is more than $700 million above the House appropriation. The amount added by the Senate, according to the report, is $746 million. We bring to the Senate a bill which is almost $350 million above the budget estimate.

I voted against a 900,000 Army and for the 870,000. But I did vote for 400,000 in the National Guard and 300,000 in the Army Reserves. I supported the proposal to keep the strength of the Marine Corps at 200,000, because the Marines are always ready and are used in the so-called brush wars.

I believe the bill reflects something of a compromise within the limitation of the funds available, between the concept, on the one hand, that we must emphasize retaliatory power as the best means of preventing a war from starting, and the concept that to fight a nuclear war is too horrible for contemplation. No one will plunge the world into that kind of war. But there may be in the future, as there have been in the past, limited wars in which we may become involved—brush wars, as some persons call them. To that end, we cannot afford to commit our ground troops unless they are fully equipped.

The committee has reported to the Senate a compromise between those two conflicting theories. As I have said, the Senate figure is far above the total amount provided by the House. It is substantially above the budget figure.

Yet we feel that what we have asked is not above the ability of this Nation to finance within the framework of a sound economic program. It is true that out of a $77 billion budget, we have reported a defense bill totaling $39,594,339,000. That bill will be followed by the military construction bill in an amount approximately in the neighborhood of $2 billion.

But, Mr. President, the committee gave possibly more thought to the question of modernizing the Army than to any other one subject we had before us. As the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has said, we reached something in the nature of a compromise. We realized the importance of the matter. We added a very substantial amount above that provided by the House. It is $217 million above the House figure and more than $400 million above the budget estimate for this very purpose.

Therefore, considering the limitations upon the funds which are available and the difficulty of selling long-term bonds if the budget is not balanced, I feel that the Senate would be well advised to follow the recommendation of the full committee and accept the bill as it has been reported with respect to this item.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. I think we must raise our sights a little as we consider the bill.

It is true that the bill calls for more than the amount provided in the budget. But the bill calls for $293 million less than was appropriated last year. In its funds for procurement of missiles and equipment for the Army, the bill calls for $645 million less than was appropriated last year.

We should be looking to see to what extent we really are making any progress in the modernization of the Army. As the Senator from Missouri has so brilliantly pointed out, no one can say that the United States has a properly equipped, modern Army today. At Lebanon, the gasoline was taken ashore in 5-gallon cans of early World War II vintage. The troops were equipped with World War I rifles and machine guns. The radio and communications equipment which was used was obsolete 15 years ago. The personnel carriers and aircraft, which the Army needs in increasing numbers, were all out of date. So today the Army is not adequately equipped, and no one can or will contend that it is.

We are now asked to spend less money for the equipment of a modern Army than we did last year—less money by several hundred million dollars. Why? Because the money changers are back in the temple. Because the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury are running the show. Because in the interests of a fictitious balanced budget at the preconceived figure of $77 billion we are asked to permit American boys to continue to go to the fronts of the cold war—fronts where any day they may be involved in shooting, in defending their lives, and in defending our security—with inadequate, second-rate, obsolete equipment, while facing the most modern equipped army in the world. We ought to raise our sights a little and not

simply think about the budget figure as submitted by the President.

It will take much more money than the modest amount provided in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to get us on the road. This is but a small, slow start. I am certain the Senator from Missouri appreciates that as well as anybody else, because he cited figures given by General Taylor. We know what the Rockefeller report said and what the Gaither report said. I think the statement is completely sound that $1,500,000,000 in additional appropriations would be needed this year and for several additional years in the future to provide us with the kind of modern equipped Army we ought to have.

Let no one pretend that the Army is big enough. I regret that the committee did not see fit to insist on a ceiling of at least 900,000. But that is 200,000 too low. We need a minimum of five additional divisions ready for modern combat in brush-fire wars; and ready to go anywhere in the world with an adequate airlift. We do not have them now, and we are not going to get them.

If we want America to be properly defended, we must pay the cost. If we are not going to provide funds because we find ourselves bound—indeed, hogtied—by figures sent down in this year's budget by the President, on the advice and consent not of the Congress, but of the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury, we shall never keep America secure.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. In urging its adoption, I say to the able Senator from New Mexico that I think he and his subcommittee have done magnificent work. I realize how frustrating it must be to try to appropriate money which one knows will not be spent. I realize how frustrating it must be to try to make these figures make sense, when the Department of Defense cannot make sense out of them itself.

I also realize the heavy responsibility the Senator from New Mexico bears in attempting to take amendments to conference; and I understand fully when he says he does not feel that he can take this amendment to conference.

But certainly in this way the Senate makes it abundantly clear to the administration that the Senate does not intend to sit idly by and see our troops denied sufficient modern equipment with which to protect themselves against well equipped Communist hordes which could attack them at any moment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the question of agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Missouri; and on that question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ervin	Magnuson
Allott	Frear	Mansfield
Anderson	Fulbright	Martin
Bartlett	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bennett	Gruening	Morton
Bible	Hart	Mundt
Bridges	Hartke	Muskie
Bush	Hayden	Neuberger
Butler	Hennings	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Proxmire
Cannon	Holland	Randolph
Capehart	Hruska	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Carroll	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Chavez	Jordan	Smith
Church	Keating	Sparkman
Clark	Kefauver	Stennis
Cooper	Kennedy	Symington
Cotton	Kerr	Talmadge
Curtis	Kuchel	Thurmond
Dirksen	Langer	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Long	Yarborough
Dworshak	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Ellender	McGee	
Engle	McNamara	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer re-announce the question on which the vote is being taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, as modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated again, for the information of the Senate?

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 9, it is proposed to strike "$1,450,000,000" and to substitute therefor "$1,683,900,000."

And on page 22, line 10, after the word "expended" it is proposed to add the following:

Provided, That a minimum of $453,000,000 of which shall be used for modernization of the combat equipment of the Army, and.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—43

Anderson	Gruening	McNamara
Bartlett	Hart	Magnuson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Mansfield
Cannon	Hennings	Monroney
Carroll	Jackson	Morse
Church	Javits	Muskie
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Dodd	Kefauver	Symington
Douglas	Kennedy	Thurmond
Ellender	Kerr	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Langer	Yarborough
Ervin	Long	Young, Ohio
Frear	McCarthy	
Fulbright	McGee	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Dirksen	Morton
Allott	Dworshak	Mundt
Beall	Eastland	Neuberger
Bennett	Goldwater	Pastore
Bible	Green	Prouty
Bridges	Hayden	Proxmire
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler	Hill	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hruska	Scott
Carlson	Jordan	Smith
Case, N.J.	Keating	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Stennis
Chavez	Lausche	Talmadge
Cotton	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Martin	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—7

Gore	Murray	Wiley
Humphrey	O'Mahoney	
Moss	Schoeppel	

So Mr. SYMINGTON'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THURMOND. 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 5, line 2, in the committee amendment, between "1960" and the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: "including not less than fourty-four thousand input into the six months training program during fiscal 1960 and funded from this appropriation".

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina is identical with the one with regard to the National Guard. This amendment deals with the Reserves. I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the distinguished Senator for accepting the amendment. It is an important amendment to the Army Reserves, and I am very much pleased to have it accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I offer another 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 47, line 4, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to delete "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$70,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND obtained the floor.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. THURMOND. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARROLL. What does the amendment relate to? I did not have an opportunity to get an explanation of the previous amendment, and I should like to know what this one relates to.

Mr. THURMOND. I shall be glad to explain the amendment. Section 631, on page 47 of the bill, reads as follows:

SEC. 631. Of the funds made available by this Act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $100,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service from carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as scheduled or supplemental air carriers; and the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of such civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable.

The purpose of my amendment is to reduce the $100 million to $70 million. I have a full statement, which I shall be pleased to present. I think it will be of interest to the Senate.

Excessive concern for commercial aviation has caused us to progressively nibble away at the Military Air Transportation Service to such an extent as to practically immobilize it. In fiscal 1955, MATS spent $4.5 million on business with the airlines of the United States. This amount has increased with each subsequent year to an all-time high for fiscal 1959 of approximately $71 million for overseas airlift.

This year the House set a mandatory amount of $80 million for procurement of commercial air transportation services. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee earmarked $150 million of MATS funds for commercial air transportation procurement, but this was reduced to $100 million by the full committee. The amount is still flagrantly excessive.

MATS has a specific wartime mission to perform, which I shall discuss shortly. Its crews need training to prepare for that mission. The earmarking of $100 million of MATS funds for commercial airlift, even with the flexible language now in section 631, will merely induce untold pressures on the Secretary of Defense to spend this sum. The airline industry is now receiving a fair and adequate share of MATS business, and if we continue to increase that share, we stand in danger of subverting the national security and our survival.

No one claims that MATS is now prepared, nor should be augmented to obtain a sufficient capability, to do the job of air transport alone. The commercial carriers are needed and they are now being utilized. During this past fiscal year, the Department of Defense actually spent about $200 million for the purchase of military airlift for all purposes. Of this total MATS spent $71 million to buy augmented commercial airlift for cargo and military passengers overseas alone.

If, however, MATS is forced to spend more than that amount of money on commercial airlift, it would be uneconomical. The taxpayer would be paying twice—once for MATS training and again for commercial airlift for loads that MATS could carry while training at a 5-hour per day pace. Even worse, the substantial increase in the commercial augmentation program could force MATS to reduce its integral size—in other words, to reduce personnel, dispense with part of its air fleet, close down some of its bases, disperse its efforts and become a mere cipher in our military planning. While we should be undertaking to modernize our strategic air transport fleet, we are, in effect, considering a step which could demobilize a considerable part of our air transport capability. This would throw the burden of transport and support of the Armed Forces very heavily on commercial operators in the event of an emergency. Just what this would do to the bulk of our heavy weapons deliveries, not to mention domestic air travel, is difficult to foresee, because we cannot anticipate the extent of such an emergency.

Far from competing with the airlines, MATS is now using the airlines in a businesslike and economical way when they are needed. But at the same time, the space which MATS itself has available on its training missions is used to carry material and personnel overseas and thereby save a very substantial amount of money for the Department of Defense and the three military services and the American public. What would it cost if MATS planes flew empty on their training missions? The most reliable estimate is three quarters of a billion dollars in funds which would have to be produced from taxes and added to the budgets of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Under the industrial fund investment plan, the services must pay MATS for airlift whether it is military or commercial. Therefore, the incongrous part of any sizable increase in the augmentation fund would be that MATS, in order to maintain its state of readiness, will have to fly its 5 hours over the same identical routes as the commercial carrier, carrying a dummy load or even worse, empty.

The more responsible and prudent course is to earmark a reasonable and more modest sum for procurement of commercial airlift. Our whole concept of defense presupposes an adequate air transport system for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In the early days of an emergency, and, indeed, for the continuation of the emergency in the critical area, it is military planes and crews that will have to deliver the goods. These military planes and crews are available only in MATS. Our full commercial airlift potential will undoubtedly be essential in such an operation, but the initial effort and all effort in the danger zone must be by the military.

MATS has been called on in emergencies repeatedly since World War II—in the Berlin airlift, Korea, and last year the twin crises of Lebanon and Formosa. Even though their planes are growing old and outdated in service—and they have no jets in the stratgic air transport fleet—MATS has never been found wanting.

One factor above all is essential to the continued response of the strategic air transport fleet. They must meet the minimum training requirements, which are just as necessary for MATS as they are for the strategic and technical air commands, the Army, Navy, Marines, or Coast Guard. The MATS training mission minimum is 5 hours per day per aircraft on the average. This minimum of training must be maintained at all costs. On the other hand, it would be no less than fiscal foolishness to require these planes to fly their training missions empty, while procuring commercial airlift for military cargo and passengers over the same routes which military planes fly their training missions.

Both military and commercial airlift potential are essential to our defense effort. Let us seek a solution compatible with the maximum preservation of each. If our air supply lifeline is weakened or perhaps severed, our global bases and our global position as a world power are undermined. We must always bear the consequences of enemy action against that supply lifeline; but let us not, by our own neglect or devotion to business as usual, wreck the very substance of the military power on which our national existence depends.

This amendment would reduce the amount which shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service from $100 million to $70 million. This is just under the $71 million so utilized during fiscal 1959, the highest to date.

This does not mean that more, even $100 million or $150 million, could not be used for procurement of commercial air transportation by MATS. The $70 million, or the $100 million as it now stands, is a minimum figure. Surely $70 million, only $1 million less than the highest sum ever spent for this purpose, is a high enough minimum to impose on the Secretary of Defense. I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to adopt this lower and more realistic minimum.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I have been intrigued by the language in the section to which the

amendment offered by the distinguished Senator relates.

This section as amended by the Senate committee reads as follows:

SEC. 631. Of the funds made available by this Act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $100,000,000 shall be available only for the procurement of commercial air transportation service from carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as scheduled or supplemental air carriers; and the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of such civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable.

May I ask some questions about this? Here is a hundred-million-dollar pie set out for particular outfits to cut up, and I would like to find out who they are. They are limited in two ways, as I understand. They have to be certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as scheduled or supplemental air carriers. That is the No. 1 qualification.

No. 2 qualification is that they must qualify as small business. That puts two measuring sticks on them.

I should like to have somebody tell me who those air carriers are. I have been informed that there is only a handful of them, and that this language in the bill eliminates some 50 contract carriers who are not certificated but who can compete bidwise for this kind of business.

I ask the chairman of the committee or somebody else to give us a list, if that can be done, and I should like to know whether or not it is true that some 20 or 30 of these fellows will cut up a $100 million pumpkin among themselves. I ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina who these carriers are who are to get this money.

I am in favor of cutting it down to $70 million. Perhaps $70 million would be better than $100 million, but it seems to me we ought to know who these air carriers are who are going to qualify for this money.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the Senator from California, I will say that I do not know who the airlines are, but I am not concerned so much who they are. My only interest is that it just does not make sense for us to say to MATS that they have to give business to commercial airlines to the extent of $100 million a year whether they need to do it or not.

What I propose is to reduce the amount from $100 million to $70 million. The committee recommended $100 million, and my amendment merely reduces that amount to $70 million.

I do not know whether there ought to be any provision forcing them to give business if they do not need to. If we are to have an Army that can be moved quickly to Lebanon or any other part of the world, we must have transport with which to do it, with transport that can go into a section where action is under way, where an emergency exists for military air transportation, and we must keep a strong MATS. We must keep a Military Air Transportation Service that can take these troops where they are needed and when they are needed. We cannot wait until the emergency occurs. I think they ought to be ready, and if we are to do that, it does not make sense to keep the plane crews trained, to have the planes available, and to have them flying empty overseas and around over the country, when they could be transporting troops and rendering a service and save the money we are paying to commercial airlines.

Mr. President, I know that commercial airlines need some help and I am not against them, but I think that first we have to look after the interests of this country and its survival, and I think that one measure of survival of this country depends upon immediate transport, having it ready and available.

Our Army has at present what is known as STRAC, the Strategic Army Corps. It has four divisions. I believe the number is to be reduced to three, which I do not like to see. If the troops are to be taken to the places where they will be needed, we must have the military air transport to carry them, and I think it is foolishness not to have it, but if we do have it, then why not let the personnel be in training? Why not let them be rendering service, and why not let them be saving the American taxpayers money, and not forcing them to give commercial airlines business when it is not necessary? That is the thought behind the amendment.

I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator from South Carolina has put his finger on the proposition that this language has the effect of forcing the giving of business whether it is wanted or not. This is how the language reads:

Of the funds made available by this Act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $100,000,000 shall be available only—

I stress the word "only"—

for the procurement of commercial air transportation.

If I interpret that language correctly, it means that this $100 million cannot be spent for any other purpose.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the Senator accept an amendment to his amendment which would strike the word "only"? If the little word "only" is taken out, the money will be available, but not available "only."

Mr. THURMOND. I shall be pleased to accept the amendment, although my main purpose was simply to restore the amount to what it was last year. Last year the amount was $71 million. I provided in my amendment for $70 million. I have no particular objection. I would rather have action on my amendment first, if the Senator does not mind. Then he could offer his amendment, and we could take action on it.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator has made an appealing argument about forcing the Government to spend money for commercial transportation. His amendment would prevent that. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for an announcement?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, and several other Senators on both sides of the aisle, have asked me to try not to have any yea-and-nay votes scheduled later this evening.

I announce that, if it suits the pleasure of the Senate, it is planned to have the Senate go over until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, and that there be no yea-and-nay votes later this evening. If the Senate convenes at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, we can attempt to finish action on the bill at an early hour.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to say, before Senators leave the Chamber, that there may be a voice vote on this amendment, not a yea-and-nay vote. If Senators are interested, I suggest that they remain in the Chamber.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. All of us have been greatly impressed with the argument which has been presented by the Senator from South Carolina, all of us being in favor of maintaining adequate military aircraft, so that they will be ready for use whenever they are needed. But there is a point which I believe was included in the statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE].

We know that the Military Establishment does not have sufficient aircraft with which to meet the demands in case of an emergency. It never has had. It has been necessary to rely on civilian aircraft. During the Berlin airlift, during the Korean airlift, and during so many other emergencies, it was necessary to call upon civilian aircraft for assistance. As the Senator from California pointed out, often it was not the big commercial airlines, but it was the small companies, which were doing the contract work. I want to be certain that those small companies are not excluded by the language of the amendment. They were not left out last year, and my understanding is that they are not left out this year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee set a ceiling of $80 million, not for the so-called big enterprises, but for small businesses, the little concerns. During the war in Korea, more of that type of airline delivered the soldiers, the material, the machinery, the equipment, than did the big lines, or even MATS itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I may not be correct in this statement, but it is my understanding that last year the military service used the services of the small airlines to the full extent which the committee provided, perhaps even more so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. Out of the $80 million, only $70 million was used.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was very nearly what the committee earmarked.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very nearly. This year there is proposed a program running to $100 million. As a matter of fact, one Senator made the suggestion that the committee make the amount $150 million; but the committee in its discretion decided that $100 million could be used to avail.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It seems to me that the committee has done well to make this amount available. There is one question in my mind; and again I am thinking of the little plane companies. The Senator from South Carolina used some language, as to the meaning of which I am not absolutely certain. He referred to certificated and supplemental carriers. We know there has been a long drawnout hearing and fight on the question of small, independent, nonsubsidized airlines which have been flying irregular schedules, by contract, and doing much of the airlift work. I want to be certain that the language does not exclude any of those companies which have been included heretofore.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I direct the Senator's attention to page 24 of the report, where the committee defines the term.

The term "certificated supplemental air carriers" includes all carriers which the CAB has certificated as such; all to which the CAB has awarded a hearing in order to qualify for such certification; and those whose certificated status is pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. It is not the intention of the committee to include any carrier not subject to economic regulation by the CAB.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the very language which disturbs me, and it is because of the fight which has been going on for 8 years. There was a partial settlement last year, but all the matters have not been settled yet. The question of economic regulation by the CAB might be interpreted, I think, to mean the exclusion of some 50 small carriers which heretofore have been qualified, have been eligible, and have been used, and which have done magnificent work. I want to be certain that those little fellows will not be excluded.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The committee went into this matter very carefully. The subcommittee on MATS transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce considered it, as did the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. Both national organizations representing the small supplemental carriers appeared and testified and accept the language in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In this bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. In this bill. They recommended the $150 million which the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations voted. Both the national organizations which represent small, nonsked carriers testified and supported the language in the bill.

When the bill was drawn up, it was found that six carriers' cases were still pending before the CAB. But the language in the report makes those companies eligible.

The great mass of the nonskeds, which the distinguished Senator from Alabama has fought hard to keep in business, because they are small business enterprises, are taken care of.

The language does rule out the tissue paper operator. It is high time that was done. I refer to a man who has a lease on a plane or two, who has a brother-in-law or an uncle who he thinks can fly, and who bids for a contract with the Air Force.

This practice has become one of the great rackets in the aviation industry. The people who engage in it are those who organize an airline for the sole purpose of submitting a bid. In the few cases in which they buy equipment, they run it until it has worn out.

We have the small, certificated, nonsked carrier eligible to participate in the military business. What is the use of a carrier going through the process of certification if it does not mean anything; if he is to be in competition with someone who can go out and borrow, beg, or lease a plane and hire his brother-in-law to fly it?

We have taken care of practically every legitimate airline operation which has any kind of growth potential or serious intent to stay in the aviation business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly to me on this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe that, as a matter of fact, I know something about the fight we have had.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure the Senator from Alabama does. He has waged a valiant fight, and I have been with him many times on it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Our Small Business Committee repeatedly—the first time was in 1951, when we made the special study—has worked on this matter. At that time we called attention to the fact that a wonderful asset in the field of air transportation was not being utilized, and that some way to utilize it properly should be found.

After long years of haggling, the plan for certification was proposed. But that plan cut out a number of small companies which I believe deserve a much better compliment than that of being called tissue paper boys. There may be a few that fall in the category the Senator from Oklahoma has described; but I know of a great many who have been left out so far, insofar as the Civil Aeronautics Board is concerned, and who, because of their past records, deserve better consideration than that. I want to be certain that they are not thrown to the wolves, as the Civil Aeronautics Board would have done long ago if it had not been for the fight that has been carried on here in the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from South Carolina.

In response to the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, let me say that certainly I well remember that when I first came to the Congress, the Senator from Alabama was holding a hearing on this very subject. Probably there is no Member of Congress, with the exception of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who knows more about the airline industry than does the Senator from Alabama.

However, in my particular State, especially in Dade County, there probably are as many of the independent small carriers as there are to be found in any other area of the entire country. As a matter of fact, I think most of them are there.

I cannot help but agree with the statement which was made by the Senator from Oklahoma—namely, that these boys get together four or five planes—they invest in some old DC–4's or DC–6's—and then they employ perhaps half a dozen persons—a small operation, by any standard. They are required to meet minimum standards with respect to safety and operations, and so forth, if they are to obtain Government contracts. So they are required to be certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Civil Aeronautics Board, as the result of proddings by the Small Business Committee, has been rather lenient in letting them have certifications; and today most of them are certificated.

But if we now require the CAB to certificate all of them, that will mean that the small ones who hope to be able to get a share of the new business which will be available as we cut down on the MATS operations——

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Florida means the new ones——

Mr. SMATHERS. No; I mean those who already have been certificated, but have been hanging on by their bootstraps for the last 5 or 6 years. But if we do not require that they be certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, then almost everyone will buy a plane and will obviously bid lower—with the result that all the safety regulations will be done away with; and then we shall find that the small businesses which have been created as such will be hurt very badly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was the intention of the committee to help small business.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And that is the reason for the ceiling of $100 million.

Mr. SMATHERS. On that point the committee has done a good job; and I hope the Senate will follow the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was not the intention of the committee to hurt small business in any way. On the contrary, the committee wishes to help small business.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct; and any small business that wishes to engage in this business has only to appear before the CAB and get certificated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; for the sake of the safety of the passengers and of the business.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course these companies have been carrying on the fight for a good many years; and some of them have been certificated, but many of them have not been certificated.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is taken care of in the report, if the Senator will read it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Why should they not be taken care of?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me.

I wish to address my remarks to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. I understand there are about 50 contract carriers who are cut out by this language, which limits to a certain category those who can participate in the $100 million. Certainly there is, somewhere, a list of those carriers.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Senator from California will consider the situation in Los Angeles and elsewhere, he will find one or two who have had a company for 3 or 4 years, using one or two planes; and they have had names, and all of them were contract carriers, because they did business on contract. But when they went to the CAB, to get themselves certificated for certain types of business, they were not able to do so, because they did not meet the requirements, which are not hard to meet.

If we do not have what I believe is a very reasonable requirement, then we shall say that those who already are in the business will be completely cut out. I think it would be a great mistake, and actually would injure existing small business and would hurt small business more than could ever be imagined, if we did not provide the limit the committee proposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have the floor; and I have yielded to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, let me make my statement; and then the Senator from South Carolina can yield to other Senators.

This language is very limited. It sets about to carve out a particular group in American business who will receive, mandatorily, $100 million of business, because the language provides that the money can be spent "only" for this purpose. The word "only" is the key word of this section. The House provision of the bill does not use the word "only" and does not tighten this provision in such a way as to throw out the contract carriers the Senator from Oklahoma has talked about.

Certainly we know that there are a few flimflam operators. But the place to handle them is in the Defense Department. Those people know when a man has had an airplane and when he has not.

The Flying Tigers, in my State, are a good example of how this matter works. They began as contract carriers. A contract carrier does not fly to any particular place. The other types of carriers have to make regular trips to certain areas, at certain times, and for a certain number of times during a particular period—let us say each week or each month. But the contract carriers go anywhere, at any time.

They want to bid on this business, but this amendment would limit those who could cut into the $100 million pie, by providing a limit in two ways: They would have to be certified by the CAB and they would have to be qualified as small business.

I assert that a list of those who will be eligible—and certainly such a list should be available somewhere—will show just who these people are. Are there 20 or 30 of them who will divide up the $100 million of business?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have a partial list; it is here in the hearings. Will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Not at the moment.

Let us see who are the ones who would cut up between themselves the $100 million pie—mandatorily.

The Flying Tigers started as a contract outfit. Finally they got certificated. They are not involved in this matter, because now they are too big.

But the proposed language would eliminate competition by putting the carrying of freight under the CAB, and the CAB would set the rates. In other words, not only would there be a special group who would profit by the $100 million, to the exclusion of all others in the country, but, in addition, instead of having to bid on the business, as has been the practice in the past, the CAB would establish the rates. That would be a fine arrangement for someone; and all I want to find out is who would be able to get along so well under such provisions. I should like to see a list of the names of the companies that would qualify. As I have said, two limitations are imposed: First, that they be certificated; second, that they qualify as small business.

I would like to know how tightly this has been "cinched" down.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have before me a list of the members of the Independent Airlines Association which supports this language in the bill. They are composed of the very people the distinguished Senator from California wishes to see get this business. I am reading this list from the hearings.

Mr. ENGLE. May I have the page number?

Mr. MONRONEY. It appears on page 1292 of the hearings:

Airline Transport Carriers, d.b.a. California Hawaiian Air Lines, Burbank, Calif.

All American Airways, Inc., Miami, Fla.

American Flyers Airline Corp., Fort Worth, Tex.

Arctic-Pacific, Inc., Oakland, Calif.

Aviation Corp. of Seattle, d.b.a. Westair Transport, Seattle, Wash.

Capitol Airways, Inc., Nashville, Tenn.

Central Air Transport, Inc., North Hollywood, Calif.

Coastal Cargo Co., Inc., West Trenton, N.J.

Currey Air Transport, Ltd., Burbank, Calif.

General Airways, Inc., Portland, Oreg.

Great Lakes Airlines, Inc., Burbank, Calif.

Miami Airline, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.

Modern Air Transport, Inc., Newark, N.J.

Purdue Aeronautics Corp., Lafayette, Ind.

Quaker City Airways, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

Regina Airlines, Miami Springs, Fla.

S.S.W., Inc., d.b.a. Universal Airlines, Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Transocean Air Lines, Oakland, Calif.

Twentieth Century Aircraft, Inc., d.b.a. Twentieth Century Airlines, Sun Valley, Calif. (This carrier is not certicated.)

Unit Export Co., Burbank, Calif.

U.S. Aircoach, Burbank, Calif.

World Airways, Inc., Oakland, Calif.

That is only a partial list of the airlines covered.

Mr. SMATHERS. The language has been approved by them, has it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. These are members of the Independent Airlines Association, whose president testified that they liked this language.

Mr. SMATHERS. And they have been certificated by the CAB for this work. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. Then there is another small carriers association, the supplemental air carrier conference, which supports this language.

It was stated that the Defense Department can decide this question. In the last bid the Department sent out invitations to bid on MATS business to 28 additional bidders, and only 3 of them own a single 4-engine airplane.

Mr. ENGLE. I have no objection to the airlines which the Senator mentioned participating in the business, but there are only 22 of them——

Mr. MONRONEY. I read only that list, but there are others.

Mr. ENGLE. To parcel out that much money among 22 firms is pretty good for them. All I want to see is the fellow who does not happen to be certificated, but who has an airplane, and who is in a legitimate business, and who is willing to compete, given an opportunity to do so. I do not know why the door should be slammed shut against that individual.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I want to say to the able Senator from California that at the time World War II came to an end, everybody seemed to have an airplane. They were all over the place. Some airlines of this nature went bankrupt. The rate of bankruptcy was fantastic. What happened was that there was no certification. Anybody who had an airplane could bid on a contract.

I also wish to point out the CAB will not set the rates which these people get. It is done by bid. If a small businessman had four airplanes and finally built up a pretty good business, I call

to the attention of the Senator from California what happens. Someone learns there is going to be a contract let on bid, so he rents an airplane. He may get it from Cuba, Panama, or somewhere else, and it may not even have been well kept up. He submits the lowest bid. I hope the Senator will listen——

Mr. ENGLE. I am listening very carefully.

Mr. SMATHERS. He offers the lowest bid. By law, we have provided that the Defense Department has to take that bid. So the Defense Department is put in the position of having to accept a tissue paper operation, as the Senator from Oklahoma has stated. Because the legislation is wide open, we ruin it for the reasonably well-established little businessman.

The CAB does not close the door to others who want to get organized and get certificated. Any group of young fellows who get an airplane can eventually come in, and, in a reasonably short space of time, get a certificate from the CAB. I think it would be a terrible situation if we left it wide open and let anybody offer as low a bid as possible.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there a disposition to press this amendment to a vote tonight? I trust not, because there seems to be a difference of opinion, and I would be reluctant to press a point of no quorum. Can it be agreed that if there is to be a vote, it will go over?

Mr. THURMOND. I have no desire to press for a vote tonight, if there is objection.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator and I have discussed a case which occurred in his own district, where the attempt to qualify a business firm in his own State to get MATS business resulted in a major investigation and an indictment of the operator and his banker. They had no financial responsibility.

It must be remembered that G.I.'s and their families are being flown in MATS planes. I think more strict requirements should be expected on the part of the Defense Department than merely looking at a low bid, when it is contracting for an airplane to fly across the ocean carrying Army personnel. I do not mind it so much as to domestic service, but certainly certification should be required. Certainly there only established businesses with some growth potential should be considered, rather than have 28 new bidders with only 3 having a 4-engine airplane.

In addition to the list of eligible carriers I have read, there should be added the scheduled airlines, both oversea and domestic, the cargo carriers, and the feeder lines.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator does not assert that the oversea airlines would qualify as small business, does he?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is why we have provided that special emphasis shall be given to small business. There is a relationship between Pan American and a feeder airline in the State of the Senator. That is why the language states that all emphasis possible shall be placed on small business, to distinguish between the giants and the little fellow.

If the Senator will look at page 47 of the bill, it states:

> And the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of such civil air carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable.

We hope that this year this will not involve the limitation of 500 men as indicating a small business, because some smaller airlines which had growth potential are becoming successful lines. The more successful, and the quicker the business grows, the quicker they are out from under the umbrella of a limitation of 500 employees.

The provision has been written into the bill that particular emphasis shall be placed on using the smaller airlines which qualify, to the fullest extent found practicable. About 27 percent of the traffic which MATS shipped by civil carrier was carried by small business airlines last year.

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I have no objection to that. I am in favor of helping small business.

My objection to the language in the bill is that it would cut off small business, because a man has to be certificated under the language of the bill. The man would fall in two special classifications. No. 1, he has to be certificated. No. 2, he has to qualify as being engaged in small business.

What I should like to see stricken out is the language which says that it is necessary to be certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, so that the contract carriers can come in and bid if they want to do so.

Every certificated carrier represented on the list which the Senator read started out as a contract carrier. That is the way these men start out. They contract carriage from here to there; then some of them are certificated as supplemental carriers; and then some of them are certificated as main line carriers.

This language would go in exactly the opposite direction from that of helping small business.

We do have some "phony" and some "paper" outfits. I am not in favor of those. However, the cure is not to be found by picking out 22 outfits and telling them they have a $100 million melon to be divided up among them. I think that would destroy competition.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would hope, in the distribution of the business to small businesses—and far more than 22 are eligible—that certainly more of the traffic would go by common carriage via the regular oversea carriers.

This amendment is not for the purpose of helping private carriers; it is to help the United States have an airlift which is a little bit more modern than a wornout DC–3. If we do not have a growth potential then we might as well not try to set aside anything in the bill.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. The design, the practice, and the idea is to have a little opportunity for private carriers to equip themselves with modern cargo aircraft. Many of these aircraft are built in the Senator's home State. They are ready to be designed, if we can find the purchasers in the civilian field. If we do not have any cargo business existing, then the airlines cannot buy the planes. It is as simple as that.

The best way I know of to destroy all of the work which has been going on with regard to trying to get cargo aircraft designed and built, and trying to get the airlines to buy them without subsidy, or without the Government owning them and leasing them back, is not to have a little military cargo available.

We have opened the door as wide as we know how. We have had testimony from both the nonscheduled association representatives, agreeing to the language in the bill, and agreeing to the definition.

I do not know about whom the Senator is talking. I know that one of the major cargo carriers is reported to have set up a tissue paper organization. That is a scheduled carrier, but it set up a tissue paper organization, because it has outgrown the category of small business. Now they are apparently proposing to lease planes to a paper airline in a deal which smacks a little bit of being "phony." They are leasing planes and signing on pilots, and flying under the category of small business. It is one of these quickie "junked up" organizations of convenience to get around the law and to try to negate what we have done.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. This program is going to be under continuing supervision.

There is an amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina, in which he undertakes to cut the amount from $100 million to $70 million. About $70 million was spent on this program last year.

The way to get this program into trouble is to undertake to put a straitjacket on who is going to be able to bid for this Government business. I would regret to see this kind of program conducted.

I am in favor of hiring our domestic carriers, but I would regret to see a straitjacket put on this program, to funnel it into the hands of particular groups, clearly designated and easily definable, when such large sums of money are involved. If we do that, we are going to blow the program right out of the water.

I assure Senators, that is what is going to happen. The way to make the program work is to open it up and to let

all these people bid. When we catch some "phony" operator, we can throw him out. That is easy enough to do.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Who is going to catch these "phonies" if the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Authority do not do it?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me answer the question.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from California is a pilot, and he understands how the program operates.

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. Let me answer the question. The Senator has asked me a question.

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The situation is that the Defense Department always asks for the lowest responsible bidder. Millions and millions of dollars are involved in these contracts. We have under consideration a bill which involves some $40 billion. All these contracts are given out, in a large sense, to the lowest responsible bidder. When there is a fellow who comes in to bid to carry cargo for the Defense Department or for MATS, if he does not own an airplane he is not a responsible bidder.

Mr. SMATHERS. What I say is that some fellow will come in who has not been in business for 5 years, but who has an old plane he picked up somewhere down the road. He may have leased it for a while. He may have said, "If I get the contract, I will buy the plane." That fellow comes in with a pretty good record as a flyer of 5 or 10 years before. He contracts to fly a lot of servicemen and their families around the country. It would seem to me we would not be doing a great service to those servicemen and their families, to say to them, "You are going to fly with and your equipment is going to be transported by somebody who cannot get a certificate from the CAB."

As I said earlier, the CAB does not close its doors to those new organizations which want to be formed and which come before the CAB and legitimately demonstrate they do have planes, they are not fly-by-night organizations, and they can meet the specifications.

We have required that the small business principle be followed, and we want the Defense Department to take the lowest bid. If we make the language too restrictive, we will put the Defense Department in a situation of spending months, after each bid is submitted, to determine whether a person is responsible. The man may say, "I am going to be responsible, because if I get the contract I will then go over and get another firm to help me handle the business."

That is how some of these fellows make themselves responsible.

I think it would be an intolerable sitfornia: all those engaged in aviation, in to some extent.

I will say to the able Senator from California, all those engaged in aviation, in radio, and in all other fields which use the airways, the railroads, and so on, have to get certificates. Even those who drive the motorbuses do. We do not let a motorbus business start out without authority. Even in the Senator's State, truckers do not simply start out by getting all the business they can get. They are small businessmen. They are very small businessmen. But we say that the Interstate Commerce Commission has to approve them. They have to come in to get a certificate. There are thousands of those fellows. We do the same with regard to the merchant marine and with regard to the operation of radio stations.

This language does not represent the closing of the door to the point of blocking out everybody forever. We are just saying that the Defense Department has the right to do business with, and should do business with, those who have met the minimum requirements approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Would the Senator support an amendment striking out the word "only" from the language, so that the Defense Department would not be in a position of mandatorily placing Government business with one definable group of people? Otherwise, the money cannot be spent in any other manner.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may answer the question?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. For about 4 years, I will say to my distinguished colleague from California, the Appropriations Committee wrote language into its report recommending that MATS make greater use of commercial carriers. Each time MATS paid no attention whatsoever to the language.

Finally, last year, the language was written into the appropriation bill. Unless we write language into the appropriation bill providing that the funds are not to be available other than for the purchase of transportation from commercial airlines in a certain amount, we might as well do away with the section, because its only force and effect is in restraining MATS from spending this money on itself. MATS works on the basis of payments from the three services. Only if we earmark the amount to be used for commercial carriage will we have any results from the amendment. I would rather see us strike the whole thing out, if we are to strike out the word "only," because if we strike out that word MATS will pay no attention to the language. MATS paid no attention to the previous reports and to the legislation previously passed. MATS did not pay attention to the $80 million provision written into the bill last year, but spent only $71 million.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California to submit a question to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the Senator look at page 24 of the committee report and tell me, if he can, what is meant by this language:

> It is not the intention of the committee to include any carrier not subject to economic regulation by the CAB.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. What is meant by that language?

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will look further, he will find the following on the same page:

> The term "certificated supplemental air carriers" includes all carriers which the CAB has certificated as such; all to which the CAB has awarded a hearing in order to qualify for such certification; and those whose certificated status is pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. It is not the intention of the committee to include any carrier not subject to economic regulation by the CAB.

I think the Senator will understand the situation better if he realizes that no carrier can fly without certification from the CAB. That is the law. What we are doing is granting an exemption to those who have not quite been certificated. None of them would be in the air if it were not for granting an exemption for flying military traffic. Such carriers could not pick up a civilian passenger. They would be in violation of the law. The law provides that all carriers engaging in air commerce must be certificated. We say that this includes all the certificated and supplemental carriers. We go further and say:

> All to which the CAB has awarded a hearing in order to qualify for such certification; and those whose certificated status is pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

That, too, was put in at the request of three or four carriers which had not quite been certificated; but that was about all that could be found that could possibly be qualified to fly our soldiers and their dependents.

Mr. ENGLE. Is it meant to be indicated by that language that the words "subject to economic regulation by the CAB" mean control of the rates?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; that language does not mean control of the rates. If the Senator will read further in the report he will see that this service can be furnished on the basis of the lowest bid, which the CAB has nothing to do with, or it can be bought on the basis of common carriage. The Government has the advantage of selecting the service best adapted to the military's needs.

Mr. ENGLE. Why are the words "subject to economic regulation by the CAB" used in the report? I do not understand the relevancy of that language.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe they are necessary, except that a certificate should be required, particularly to fly passengers.

Mr. ENGLE. That is not economic regulation. That is safety regulation.

Mr. MONRONEY. No. Economic regulation is the general designation of the regulation which the CAB exercises.

Mr. ENGLE. To put it simply, this language means——

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will read title IV of the Federal Aviation

Act, he will note that it is entitled "Economic Regulation." That includes all the certificating power of the CAB.

Mr. ENGLE. The bill boils down to one proposition. The military will be required to spend the money with this particular list of identifiable carriers, to the extent of $100 million or $70 million, if the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is agreed to, whether the service is needed or not. Otherwise, the money will not be spent.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think it should be made clear for the RECORD, as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, that this money is not to be spent with these particular carriers. It is being spent with all the carriers—Western Airlines, Northwestern, TWA, and all the rest of them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Including United, Pan American, and many others.

Mr. SMATHERS. Every certificated carrier may participate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I judge that there are 40 or 45 certificated carriers eligible; and Lord knows how many there would be under the language of the report, which opens the field still further. Of course, it does not open it up to 25 out of 28 firms to which the Department of Defense has sent invitations to bid, but which have no suitable airplanes. I do not believe that we want to trust the transportation of soldiers and their dependents to carriers which have no decent airplanes, no maintenance, no facilities, and no terminal services.

If the Senator does not like the amendment, he should join the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, or offer an amendment to eliminate the entire paragraph.

I do not think there is any use in having it in the bill unless it will serve a purpose, namely, to create a civilian airlift to augment our military airlift, and provide this country with a way of supplying adequate, modern planes to supplement what the military has.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the fact that the Senator is yielding to me.

The argument which I made before the full committee was, in many respects, similar to the one which has been made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. It seems to me that the bill, as it came from the subcommittee, would have earmarked too great a portion of the total budget available for military air transport service, as a required amount to be contracted out to commercial carriers.

I am completely in sympathy with the idea of utilizing the commercial carriers, in greater degree than they have been used heretofore. I wish that Senators, who will be asked to vote on this question tomorrow, might have reference to several places in the committee record.

On page 1290 of the printed hearings, we find a part of the testimony of Mr. Clayton L. Burwell, who represents the 21 carriers which are members of the Independent Air Lines Association, whose membership list is shown on page 1292 of the record.

That part of Mr. Burwell's testimony which I wish to quote is as follows:

> We urge, as we did before the House committee, that section 634 of the 1959 Defense Appropriation Act (sec. 631 of H.R. 7454) be reenacted but with $100 million substituted for the $80 million earmarked for commercial service, and that this figure be made a minimum, not a maximum. Emphasis on the use of small-business air carriers should be reiterated, since these carriers are airlift "minutemen" who unfortunately get overlooked if MATS is not required to consider them in making awards during peacetime.

The next quotation is on page 1308 of the same record, in the testimony of Mr. S. E. Spicher, who is president of the other Supplemental Airlines Organization. Unfortunately the list of members of his organization is not included, and I hope that before tomorrow, when the Senate votes on this amendment, Senators who are particularly interested will obtain a list of the members of that organization also, so that the debate will show the complete list of supplemental carriers which belong to each of these two organizations.

The third item to which I wish to invite attention is the testimony of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce representative, as shown on pages 1339 and following, particularly the paragraph at the middle of page 1344, as follows:

> The House Appropriations Committee has again spelled out this principle in the pending bill and has recommended that $80 million again be set aside for the purchase of commercial air transport service. The national chamber believes that the amount should be higher this year than last—perhaps $100 million. This figure would still be far less than half of the $289 million worth of airlift the Department of Defense estimates it will need in 1960, and it would underline again the Congressional mandate that there be increased reliance on the CRAF carriers.

I think it will appear rather clearly that this question has been gone into in some detail. I should say, in complete candor, that I was out of sympathy with the $150 million figure, which was included in the subcommittee report. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the full Committee on Appropriations. In the full committee there was a long discussion about this item, which resulted in the committee's accepting the figure of $100 million, the figure which is mentioned, as Senators have noted, in the various excerpts from testimony which I have already quoted. The $100 million represents the compromise figure which was finally arrived at, with almost complete unanimity, by the committee.

I hope that figure will be allowed to remain in the bill, because it represents a small increase in utilization of the commercial air carriers by the MATS service. I am just as strongly in favor of the continuation of the MATS service as is the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. It seems to me, however, that with this program increasing, as it is, the $100 million figure will permit MATS to continue with undiminished vigor. It was that belief which animated the committee when it took final action on this item.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. One thing further, and the Senator from Florida will be through.

I cannot reassure the Senator from California as to exactly what carriers are covered, and what carriers are eliminated under the descriptive words used in the bill as reported by the committee. My amendment, which was offered and adopted in committee, merely changed the amount from $150 million to $100 million. It did not affect the wording of the bill.

However, my understanding—without my being able to give complete assurance on it—is that all carriers certificated by the CAB are included, with express emphasis being laid on the small business carriers, and that the inclusion of the list of carriers in the second group of supplemental carriers represented by Mr. Spicher would give us most of the information which is desired by the Senator from California. Certainly there was no intention on the part of the Senator from Florida or any other member of the full Committee on Appropriations to eliminate operators who are qualified by experience, by equipment, and by personnel, to handle this work.

It was the understanding of the Senator from Florida at the time of the adoption of this item that the term "supplemental carriers" would adequately cover all legitimate carriers which have the necessary experience, the adequate equipment, the proper personnel, and which are now being recognized by the Department of Defense in the handling of this traffic. If that is not the case, additional or different language may be inserted in the bill.

I thank my distinguished friend from South Carolina. I am sorry I am not in a position to support his amendment, but after having recited the history of the long debate which took place in the committee, and the fact that the committee finally accepted my amendment, I am sure he will realize that I feel committed to the continuance of the amount of $100 million.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on my amendment be postponed until tomorrow.

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

ROLE OF LOUIS I. POKRASS AS SPONSOR OF MID-HARLEM PROJECT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two letters, the first a letter dated July 9, 1959, signed by Mr. David M. Walker, Urban Renewal Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the second my reply of July 11, 1959.

In Mr. Walker's letter he confirms that the Slum Clearance Committee of New York had tentatively approved Louis I. Pokrass, an associate of the New York underworld, as a sponsor of the

mid-Harlem project of that city, but that his final approval would not be effective until the New York regional office had concurred.

In my reply I again strongly condemned consideration of this underworld character as a sponsor to spend Government money, and again called upon the Agency to reject his application should it be presented again.

I ask that both letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This will acknowledge your letter of July 2, 1959, asking for a report concerning the Mid-Harlem project in New York City and the role of Louis I. Pokrass as a sponsor of that project.

Our files disclose that by resolution of July 26, 1956, the Board of Estimate, governing body for the city of New York, approved the undertaking of surveys and plans for the Mid-Harlem project and authorized the execution and filing of an application for a title I advance, in an amount not to exceed $350,000, pursuant to section 102(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended. The project area extends from 125th Street to 135th Street and is bounded on the west by Eighth Avenue and on the east by St. Nicholas Avenue. The area is predominantly residential and the proposal was to clear the area for redevelopment.

An application for an advance in the amount of $225,000 was filed by the Committee on Slum Clearance with our New York regional office on January 14, 1957. According to an article appearing in the New York Times for July 4, 1959, Mr. Pokrass was designated by the Committee on Slum Clearance as sponsor for the project in March of 1957. At that time, the committee apparently had a proposal from another group seeking to serve as the sponsor for redevelopment of the project area. The latter group was headed by Charles Buchanan and included Samuel Leidesdorf and William Langley. The article in the New York Times reports that a memorandum in the files of the committee discloses that the Buchanan group refused to undertake joint sponsorship with the Pokrass group because of the latter's background, and that in March of 1957 the committee designated Mr. Pokrass as the sponsor. The application for an advance was returned to the Committee on Slum Clearance without approval because funds were not available at that time to permit the reservation of $6 million in capital grant funds that was requested for the project.

In December of 1958, a new application was filed seeking an advance to cover preliminary planning and surveys for the mid-Harlem project. That application is on file with our New York regional office, but it has not yet been reviewed because of the fact that funds are still not available to meet the requested capital grant reservation. The regional administrator advises me that neither Louis Pokrass nor any corporation in which he may have an interest has been suggested to this Agency by the Committee on Slum Clearance as a proposed sponsor for the project. Under our normal practices in New York City, the agreement of the sponsor with the Committee on Slum Clearance is not filed for approval as to legal form and the financial responsibility of the proposed sponsor until an application is made for a Federal grant. The normal time interval between the undertaking of preliminary planning work and the application for a Federal grant to defray project costs is approximately 2 years. Accordingly, so far as this Agency is concerned, the mid-Harlem project represents no more than a proposal by the Committee on Slum Clearance for the designation of a project area, in connection with which an application for a Federal advance to finance the costs of preliminary planning is pending in a standby status.

The chairman of the Committee on Slum Clearance is quoted in the New York Times on July 4, 1959, as stating that the committee never came to any final conclusion about the sponsorship of the mid-Harlem project. He stated that Mr. John J. Bennett, former member of the Committee on Slum Clearance and attorney for the Pokrass syndicate, seemed to have prima facie evidence of the financial capacity of his clients and that he, Moses, had suggested that the Pokrass group get together with the Buchanan group. Buchanan and his associates evinced no interest in the suggestion and withdrew from further negotiation for the sponsorship of the mid-Harlem project. Mr. Moses states that he never saw Pokrass so far as he can recall, and that he dislikes doing business with sponsors of dubious backgrounds but he observed that people with better qualifications failed to present proposals to serve as sponsors for title I projects in New York City. In any case, the mayor of the city of New York is reported by the New York Times on the same date as stating that the project would never receive his approval (or the approval of the Board of Estimate) unless it had a new and acceptable sponsor.

It is apparent that Pokrass has negotiated with the Committee on Slum Clearance for the sponsorship of the mid-Harlem project. The chairman of the Committee on Slum Clearance denies that any commitment has been made to have Pokrass act as the sponsor of the mid-Harlem project, and no such agreement could become effective without the prior approval of the Board of Estimate and our own New York regional office.

I trust that this is the information that you require, but if I can assist you further in connection with this matter please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. WALKER,
Urban Renewal Commissioner.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1959.

Mr. DAVID M. WALKER,
Urban Renewal Commissioner,
Housing and Home Finance Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALKER: Your letter of July 9, 1959, in which you included a report on the mid-Harlem project in New York City and the role of Mr. Louis I. Pokrass as a sponsor of that project, is acknowledged.

In reading this letter I note that Mr. Pokrass had previously been approved for this project by the Committee on Slum Clearance. Apparently this approval of Mr. Pokrass was given after they had tried to pressure another group into joining Mr. Pokrass as a cosponsor but which group had refused to undertake joint sponsorship because of Mr. Pokrass' questionable background. I am amazed that the committee, recognizing Mr. Pokrass' questionable background, should suggest that he be considered either as a sponsor or as a cosponsor. In the last paragraph of your letter you state that no financial agreement can become effective until it has the approval of your New York Regional Office.

I again strongly recommend that your New York Regional Office be instructed not to approve Mr. Pokrass or any of his associates either for this project or for any other project involving the expenditures of Government money. At the same time I am requesting that my name be placed on file to be notified when this project has been given final approval and to be advised as to who has been selected as the sponsor.

On July 8, 1959, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on Mr. Pokrass' background and association with the underworld, and for your records a copy of this statement is enclosed herewith.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

ADM. HARRY E. YARNELL: NAVAL OFFICER AND STATESMAN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday of last week, July 7, Adm. Harry E. Yarnell, one of the great fighting men of the U.S. Navy, died in the Naval Hospital at Newport, R.I.

Admiral Yarnell was one of the most distinguished sons of my State of Iowa. All who knew him mourn his passing, and his death was a loss to the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I cannot let this unhappy occasion pass without paying my respects to the memory of this great American. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my tribute to Adm. Harry E. Yarnell, and to include two newspaper articles lauding his career, as printed in the New York Times and the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the tribute and the two newspaper articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Born at Independence, Iowa, October 18, 1875, Harry E. Yarnell was attracted to the sea and secured an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy from which he graduated in 1897, standing number four in his class. His first assignment was on the U.S.S. *Oregon*. On that vessel he made the famous cruise around the Horn in 1898 to join the U.S. Fleet off Santiago in the Spanish-American War, which cruise served to dramatize the necessity for an Isthmian canal and to interest young Yarnell in canal problems.

From that time to his first retirement in 1939, he was a participant in important operations. Among these were: The Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Campaign: occupation of Vera Cruz, 1914; and World War I.

More far-visioned than many of his contemporaries, he early recognized the role in naval warfare to be played by aircraft and, while still a captain in 1924, became Commander, Aircraft Squadrons, of the Scouting Fleet in the Atlantic. Later, in 1927, he was assigned as the first commanding officer of the first great aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Saratoga*, flagship of the Aircraft Squadrons of the Battle Fleet in the Pacific.

In the course of the *Saratoga's* Pacific-bound transit of the Panama Canal in January 1928, he observed a series of critical situations affecting the navigation of large naval vessels in that waterway. These experiences made indelible impressions on him. Also, while in command of the *Saratoga*, he helped to lay the groundwork for successful aircraft operations in World War II and was selected for promotion to rear admiral.

While in command of the Aircraft Squadrons, Battle Fleet, 1931–33, during fleet maneuvers in the Hawaiian Islands, he used the forces under his command to execute an attack on the naval base on Oahu on a Sunday morning, in effect rehearsing the battle of Pearl Harbor that was to come 9 years later.

His most notable assignment afloat was as Commander in Chief, U.S. Asiatic Fleet, 1936–39, a period which covered the Panay incident and the extension of Japanese operations into China preceding World War II.

His handling of a series of crucial situations and vigorous defense of American rights in the Far East form a brilliant chapter of U.S. diplomatic-naval history. Recorded in the libraries of the world, it merits the study of future historians of U.S. foreign policy and naval strategy.

Though officially retired from active naval service on November 1, 1939, he was recalled to active duty in World War II for special service in the Navy Department, 1941–43, and again in 1944, as assistant to Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal.

During this period, wartime needs led to original studies of the problems of operation of the Panama Canal, out of which grew what is known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan for its operational improvement. When the basic thesis of this design was brought to his attention in the Navy Department, he recognized its fundamental nature and its irrefutable documentation with supporting data derived from marine experience in canal operations, which had been vividly emphasized by the 1928 transit of the *Saratoga*. Commenting on it as "a momentous paper," he became a strong supporter in and out of Government circles of the terminal lake situation.

Viewed as a whole, the career of Admiral Yarnell stands out brilliantly and as an inspiration to the Youth of Iowa and the Nation.

In order that a more complete record of Admiral Yarnell's career, as recorded in obituaries of some of the Nation's leading papers, may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, I am including two of them in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, July 9, 1959]

ADMIRAL YARNELL DIES AT AGE OF 83—COMMANDER OF ASIATIC FLEET IN 1936–39—DEMANDED INDEMNITY FOR THE PANAY

NEWPORT, R.I., July 7.—Adm. Harry Ervin Yarnell, U.S. Navy, retired, a former commander of the Asiatic Fleet, died Tuesday night at the Naval Hospital. He was 83 years old.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Emily C. Thomas Yarnell; a son, Philip, and four grandchildren. A daughter, Ruth died in 1947.

GUARDED AMERICANS' RIGHTS

Admiral Yarnell spent a major portion of his long naval service in the Far East. He took command of the Asiatic Fleet in 1936 and held it until his retirement in 1939.

His last months of service were portentous and difficult ones. Japan was conducting an undeclared war against China. As he endeavored to protect the rights of Americans in China without implicating the United States in the hostilities, Admiral Yarnell's purposes at times ran counter to those of the Japanese commanders.

His ship, the heavy cruiser *Augusta*, was bombed twice and three seamen were killed. But the admiral seldom permitted his own guns to be fired.

While thus avoiding open combat, the admiral resisted Japanese incursions on American rights in other ways.

Late in 1939, the Japanese fleet captured the harbor at Swatow in South China. As it did so, it curtly ordered a British and an American destroyer to get out.

Washington had given Admiral Yarnell sweeping authority to act as he saw fit. The commander of the American destroyer wired for instructions.

"We're staying at Swatow," the admiral replied.

The principle at stake, he said, was the United States Navy's right to protect its nationals wherever they were.

Describing this as the paramount duty of his warships, he declared that "they will go wherever it is necessary at any time to carry out that mission." He then ordered more ships into the harbor.

REFUSED TO WITHDRAW

When the U.S. gunboat *Panay* was sunk in the Yangtze River in December, 1937, Admiral Yarnell demanded, and got, indemnity of more than $2,200,000.

The Japanese said they were sorry—that it had been a horrible mistake. The *Panay*, they said, bore striking resemblance to a ship carrying Chinese troops. But when a Japanese naval official suggested that the United States withdraw its gunboats from the Yangtze, Admiral Yarnell refused.

The admiral's determination to resist encroachments on American rights at times caused queasiness in high places in Washington. But he was invariably supported.

Admiral Yarnell reached the naval age limit in the summer of 1939 and was forced into retirement. Among those bidding him farewell were Japanese officers who had come to respect his adamancy as well as his capacity to withhold fire.

The admiral was born at Independence, Iowa, in October 1875. He had an early yearning to follow the sea and a leaning toward mathematics and engineering. These inclinations fitted him for admission to the United States Naval Academy. He went there not even knowing how to swim and graduated, a very young salt, in 1897.

He saw duty aboard the old *Yorktown* during the Philippine Insurrection and Boxer Rebellion.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 8, 1959]

ADM. H. C. YARNELL, FAR EAST EXPERT, DIES

Adm. Harry E. Yarnell, U.S. Navy (retired), 83, who followed a two-fisted policy of sticking up for U.S. rights in the Far East immediately before World War II, died yesterday in Newport, R.I.

The cause of death was not announced. He had been hospitalized for 2 weeks.

Admiral Yarnell was commander of the Asiatic Fleet when the Japanese sank the U.S. gunboat *Panay* on the Yangtze River in China in 1937. He was instrumental in bringing about the Japanese payment of $2.2 million indemnity for the incident.

Given a free hand in meeting many diplomatic problems in the Far East, he frequently said "no" to the Japanese. As a result, the U.S. firm policy in this area came to be known as the "Yarnell policy."

FOUR DECADES OF SERVICE

His four decades of service at sea and on shore included service under fire in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, the China relief expedition during the 1900 Boxer Rebellion and World War I. He took part in the occupation of Vera Cruz in 1914.

Admiral Yarnell, who retired in 1939, was recalled from retirement during World War II to serve in a special capacity for the Navy in Washington. He retired as a rear admiral, but was elevated to a full admiral in 1942.

It was during his service in China and the Far East that he made his better-known contributions.

He adhered rigidly to the policy he stated in his rejection of a Japanese warning that American nationals and warships be evacuated from the harbor at Swatow, South China, in 1939.

"The Paramount duty of U.S. naval vessels is the protection of American citizens and they will go wherever it is necessary at any time to carry out that mission."

CALLS MORE SHIPS

He not only refused to withdraw, but ordered more warships to the area.

Just before Admiral Yarnell's retirement, President Franklin D. Roosevelt presented him with the Distinguished Service Medal for his skillful handling of "the many delicate situations that arose during the continued emergency in China." He also held the Navy Cross.

Born October 18, 1875, at Independence, Iowa, he was graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1897.

After his retirement, he served as head of the Navy summer school at Culver Military Academy from 1944 to 1949. Since then he had lived at Newport.

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Emily C. Yarnell of Newport; a son, Philip Yarnell of Baltimore and four grandsons. A daughter, Mrs. Ruth Sylvester, wife of Vice Admiral John Sylvester, died 12 years ago.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN JOHN DAY DAM PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to include my name as a sponsor of the bill introduced this morning by my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands included in the John Day Dam project adjacent to the city.

The proposed legislation covered by the bill, if enacted into law, will enable the city of Arlington to carry on in orderly fashion an excellent redevelopment program necessitated by the construction of John Day Dam. Through repurchase and carefully planned development of an area adjacent to the Columbia River to be filled in by the Corps of Engineers, the city of Arlington will be able to develop a waterfront area that will be a source of pride to present and future residents of the city, and a great attraction for those who will visit the area of this multipurpose development of the Columbia River.

The bill protects the taxpayers of the United States through assurance of payment of fair market value, as prescribed in the language of the bill. I urge that the committee to which this bill is referred give prompt and sympathetic attention to its provisions, because I am satisfied that it is not only in the interest of the city of Arlington, but of the people of the United States.

RADIATION HAZARDS ACT OF 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I should like to call the attention of the Congress to one of the most important bills that, in my opinion, has ever been introduced for the protection of our Nation's health. That bill is S. 1628, the Radiation Hazards Act of 1959, which was introduced on April 8 by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Senator LISTER HILL. Senator HILL is chairman of the Subcommittee on Health to which S. 1628 has been referred. Two days of hearings have been held, and it is expected that there will be more.

In recognition of the danger to the public health and safety from ionizing radiation, the Radiation Hazards Act of 1959 would vest in the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service the administration of this act with authority to undertake and provide support and aid for research relating to the control of radiation hazards, to make technical

assistance available to States and localities, to develop through research and studies, and in consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies, uniform standards of radiation protection, and to provide for the training of professional and technical personnel in matters relating to radiation hazard control.

I heartily support Senator HILL's bill that would turn over to one agency of the Government, namely the Public Health Service, the responsibility for protecting the public's health against radiation hazards. Unlike the Atomic Energy Commission, which currently handles the work in this field, the Public Health Service does not have conflicting interests and responsibilities. I furthermore am heartily in accord with the recommendation in this Act, which is based on a report by the National Advisory Committee on Radiation, that the Surgeon General shall submit to the Congress not later than February 28, 1960, a comprehensive program for the control of radiation hazards. I further agree to the wisdom of establishing a National Advisory Council on Radiation Hazard Control composed of experts in the field.

Mr. President, once again I bring attention to the increasing concern, confusion, and panic among helpless citizens who are pulled this way and that by contradictory reports as to the extent of radiation in the milk they and their children drink, in the wheat they eat, as to the amount of strontium-90 daily entering their bones and those of their unborn children, conflicting statistics as to just what is a "safe" radiation level, how much of a dose we are receiving right now, what would become of humanity should nuclear-weapons testing continue to say nothing of the holocaust that would result from an all-out nuclear war.

Every day the public is becoming more and more aware of the radiation hazards that result from nuclear-bomb testing. So much publicity, confusing as it is, has been given to this serious aspect of the danger that we are prone to overlook the other, even more common, sources of radiation damage.

In his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Health, Dr. Russell H. Morgan, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Radiation, and professor of radiology at Johns Hopkins Medical School, cited four other principal sources of ionizing radiation. These are: X-ray machines, nuclear reactors and their radioisotopic by-products, high-energy particle accelerators, and concentrated forms of naturally occurring radioactive materials. It is significant that most radiation received today, other than that from natural sources, comes from X-ray machines employed by health professions. It is shocking that of all sources of ionizing radiation, both manmade and natural, only nuclear reactors, their fuels, by-products, and wastes have been placed under substantial regulation from the standpoint of health and safety.

Mr. President, it is Dr. Morgan's opinion, and I agree with him, that the Atomic Energy Commission should continue to be responsible for the control of radiation hazards within its own installations—just as our private industries should be—but the Commission should not be responsible for the health and safety of the public in the entire field of radiation protection. The Commission's responsibility is primarily that of promotion of atomic energy production. The question of radiation protection is one of public health.

Also, the Public Health Service has the know-how, the basic personnel, and the organizational framework to administer such a program. As Dr. Berwyn Mattison, Executive Secretary of the American Public Health Association, stated in the hearings, personnel with specific skills in the field of protection from radiation exposure already exist in the U.S. Public Health Service. He further stated:

> May I sum up by saying that the American Public Health Association supports enactment of S. 1628, the Radiation Hazards Act of 1959, because we feel that protection of the public from the health hazards of ionizing radiation should fully utilize existing health agencies and the skills and personnel already experienced in this field, whether it be at the local, State, or National level.

Mr. President, how long must we wait before the vast field of protection from radiation hazard is concentrated in one well-administered, well-financed, well-staffed control program? How long must we wait before the American public is insured of security in the knowledge that the right experts in the right agency are devoting their full energies and skill toward protecting humanity from the fear and actuality of death and deformity from exposure to radiation? I am firmly convinced that radiation control should receive the same support as do cancer, heart disease, and mental health, and—like these diseases—I think research, control, and cure should lie within the scope of one agency, and that agency is rightfully the Public Health Administration.

As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I intend to give S. 1628 my wholehearted support when it comes before the full committee, and I shall support it again when it comes to the floor of the Senate for a vote.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—FAVORABLE RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, shortly the Senate will be debating S. 1681, a bill granting municipal home rule to the District of Columbia. It is my hope that the Senate will pass that measure. It has been said, in an attempt to minimize the importance of this needed step, that one reason little interest can be expected to be shown in the fate of the bill is that there are no votes to be garnered from it. The cynical and, I might add, ill-informed who advance this spurious argument would have us believe that the American public is essentially self-centered and without interest in measures other than those which appertain directly to their own concerns.

I have never accepted this argument, because it does not jibe with the facts of my own experience. My Oregon electorate has time after time through correspondence and through personal conversation exhibited a concern, sincere and deep, over many issues far removed from the immediate and local. This is as it should be. This wider range, this enlarged scope of informed comment is a healthy carrying out, on the part of the citizens, of his duties and responsibilities in the democratic process.

These observations, Mr. President, were initiated by my receipt of a formal resolution from the city of Portland, Oreg., calling upon Congress to grant home rule to the first municipality of our Nation, for Washington should be the finest expression of a city that we can create.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the certificate which accompanied it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

OFFICE OF AUDITOR OF THE
CITY OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg.

COPY CERTIFICATE

STATE OF OREGON,
County of Multnomah,
City of Portland, ss:

I, Ray Smith, auditor of the city of Portland, do hereby certify that I have compared the following copy of resolution No. 28063 adopted by the council July 8, 1959, being "A resolution endorsing home rule for Washington, D.C., and the District of Columbia," with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true and correct transcript of such original resolution No. 28063 and of the whole thereof as the same appears on file and of record in my office, and in my care and custody.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of the city of Portland affixed this 8th day of July 1959.

RAY SMITH,
Auditor of the City of Portland.
By ROBERT L. MCCOY,
Deputy.

RESOLUTION 28063

Whereas the city of Washington, D.C., the center of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, has been governed by the Congress through a Commission established in 1878, and its people, numbering in excess of 800,000 within the city limits, have been denied the right of self-government, not only since the establishment of the Commission, but since the city itself was incorporated in 1802; and

Whereas the cost of the government of the city has been and is being, borne largely by the residents thereof, with certain supplemental payments from the Congress; and

Whereas in the public interest, the citizens of Washington should have the right of suffrage and the right of self-government in order to carry out the principles of home rule and self-determination on the local level; and

Whereas it is of mutual interest to all cities in the United States to foster and support the efforts of the residents of the city of Washington, and of the District of Columbia for such home rule: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Portland, in regular session assembled, To endorse the efforts of the residents of the District of Columbia, and particularly those residing within the city of Washington, to

achieve self-government, by the Congress granting home rule to the District; and be it further

Resolved, That the auditor of the city of Portland file certified copies of this resolution with the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States, and the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk of the Senate; the Senate standing Committee on the District of Columbia, Leo A. Casey, Chief Clerk; and the House standing Committee on the District of Columbia, William M. McCloud, Jr., Clerk; the Honorable Wayne Morse and the Honorable Richard L. Neuberger, U.S. Senators from the State of Oregon; and to the Honorable Walter Norblad, the Honorable Al Ullman, the Honorable Edith Green, and the Honorable Charles O. Porter, Representatives from the State of Oregon.

HARNEY COUNTY, OREG., ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to supplement what I said last Thursday in my commendation of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for the work he did on the public works appropriation bill. I call attention to the fact that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] deserves great tribute from the people of Oregon for his leadership as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, not only in connection with the Public Works bill which the Senate considered last Thursday, but in particular for his action concerning the Harney Electric Cooperative, in eastern Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the report of the committee of last Thursday dealing with the Harney County Electric Cooperative appropriation be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Harney Electric Cooperative service: The program recommended by the committee includes $1,055,000 for the initiation of construction of facilities to provide service to the Harney Electric Cooperative. In disallowing funds for this facility the House committee stated in its report: "Justification for this line is contingent upon approval of a pending REA loan application for additional facilities for the co-op, and an increase in the very low load in the area."

The Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration announced on June 29, 1959, the approval of the application of the Harney Electric Cooperative for a loan of $5,100,000 to expand the distribution system of the cooperative.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it should be noted from what the committee said in the foregoing quotation from the report that the consideration of funds for the Harney Electric Cooperative had been held up because of a needed REA approval of a loan for this cooperative.

The two Senators from Nevada and the Oregon delegation worked long and hard in complete cooperation with one another in connection with the Harney Electric Cooperative loan need.

At first, as the record will show, the administration took the position that, as a matter of policy, loans were not to be made to cooperatives, such as the Harney Electric Cooperative, located in Oregon, for electric service which would be carried by transmission lines—in this instance, Bonneville lines—into another State, such as Nevada. That position never did make any sense to the Senators from Oregon and Nevada. What in the world do State boundary lines have to do with the need of citizens for electric service? The answer is, obviously, nothing.

We took the position that there was no reason in the world why Bonneville power should not be made available over a transmission system for the benefit and the service of the Harney Electric Cooperative, which might be located in Nevada. Always some reason was found for seeming to slow up the processing of the Harney Electric Coperative's need for Bonneville power.

I finally took my case to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. As he would testify if he were on the floor at this moment, he interested himself in the case. I want the people of the Harney Electric Cooperative to know that, in my judgment, we would not have been successful in moving along the appropriations now contained in the report of the Committee on Appropriations in respect to public works had it not been for the astuteness, the understanding, the dedication, and the public interest of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Therefore, I wish to thank Senator HAYDEN publicly today for the great help he has been to the Oregon delegation in respect to the Harney Electric Cooperative power needs and problems.

I also thank the two Senators from Nevada for the great help they were to me as I pressed for action on this matter.

But, Mr. President, I also want to thank the REA administrators. It is to their credit that once they saw the unanswerable soundness of the position, based upon the facts which I presented to them time and time again, we finally received their approval for the REA loan to the Harney Electric Cooperative.

Mr. President, I hope this will be but one precedent among the many which I believe should be established in the West generally and in the Pacific Northwest, particularly for the extension of power facilities from federally owned multiple-purpose dams now built and others which I hope will be built in the future. It is a precedent which will bring light and power and a great reduction of toil and sweat to many persons in that part of the country who still need electric power.

There are many satisfactions which come in one way or another from public service; but I know of no greater satisfaction that I have ever experienced in my 15 years in the Senate than the satisfaction which has come from pressing to a final successful conclusion my pleas for an extension of electric power service to many people in the Pacific Northwest who had not been able to enjoy it prior thereto.

Mr. President, I take a great deal of satisfaction in the progress that has been made in connection with the action that has been taken on the Harney Electric Cooperative project; and I want the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to know that I am very, very grateful to him for the great assistance he has been to people of my State by making it possible for us to obtain this recommendation, this year, of an appropriation for the Harney Cooperative.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] that I have concluded my remarks, if he would like to have me move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. KUCHEL. Certainly. First, I wish to apologize for starting to make the motion earlier. I did not know that my friend wished to speak at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from California need not apologize to me. I do not know of anyone who is more cooperative than he in extending every possible courtesy to me. He had no way of knowing that I had this pleasant duty to perform.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 14, 1959, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 13, 1959:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Thomas James Hartford, O18330, Medical Corps (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Albert Frederick Cassevant, O18456, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frederick William Gibb, O19222, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Frew Train, O18415, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Kerr Ghormley, O17674, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. George Merle Powell, O19340, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Hallett Daniel Edson, O19541, U.S. Army.

Col. James Alden Norell, O39838, U.S. Army.

Col. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).
Col. Thomas Hogan Hayes, O19556, U.S. Army.
Col. Richard Lee Jewett, O18339, U.S. Army.
Col. Charles Scott Hays, O42534, U.S. Army.
Col. Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474, U.S. Army.
Col. Wilbur Manly Skidmore, O18440, U.S. Army.
Col. William Charles Hall, O18391, U.S. Army.
Col. John Francis Franklin, Jr., O19476, U.S. Army.
Col. George Allen Carver, O19122, U.S. Army.
Col. Evert Spencer Thomas, Jr., O30107, U.S. Army.
Col. Charles Edward Johnson, 3d, O19534, U.S. Army.
Col. Orman Goodyear Charles, O29954, U.S. Army.
Col. John Joseph Lane, O19021, U.S. Army.
Col. James Orr Boswell, O19188, U.S. Army.
Col. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, U.S. Army.
Col. John Ramsey Pugh, O18790, U.S. Army.
Col. Raymond Russell Ramsey, O29470, U.S. Army.
Col. Harold Harry Shaller, O29657, U.S. Army.
Col. Franklin Guest Smith, O191541, U.S. Army.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels

Aber, John E., O23097.
Abrams, Bernard B., O81885.
Adams, Emory S., Jr., O23235.
Adams, John D., O33147.
Adams, Lewis R., O39042.
Addington, Jerry S., O23041.
Addison, John K., O44547.
Ahmajan, Ashod M., O22900.
Alban, Paul E., O23500.
Alexander, Douglas G., O32927.
Alexander, Urey W., O22954.
Allan, John C., O32798.
Allen, Marshall B., O44275.
Anderson, John C., O44768.
Anderson, Lawrence R., O40461.
Ansley, John MacK., O39041.
Archer, Harry C., O44792.
Armstrong, Armour S., O44372.
Arn, Robert E., O23470.
Arnold, Henry H., Jr., O23299.
Arnold, Luther D., O22946.
Athan, Harold W., O52624.
Aubrey, George A., O23110.
Aux, George W., O44399.
Avery, James T., Jr., O32867.
Axtell, Eugene N., O44281.
Baker, Alan G., O23051.
Baker, Barton O., O44222.
Baker, Morris L., O80372.
Ball, Thomas F., O39039.
Balthis, Charles E., Jr., O23199.
Banks, Charles H., O22940.
Barberis, Cesides V., O33249.
Barnaby, Kenneth T., Jr., O44385.
Barry, Arthur R., O23160.
Barry, William G., O40452.
Bartelt, Robert H., O81888.
Barton, Dennis L., O23049.
Bates, Raymond H., O23184.
Batte, James H., O23401.
Baum, Frederick W., O23385.
Bavaro, Michael F., O23117.
Bayer, Kenneth H., O23551.
Bayerle, George J., Jr., O23192.
Beaudry, Charles L., O23077.
Beck, Bernard B., O40481.
Beckham, John B., O32747.
Beda, Edward E., O32916.
Beimfohr, Casper Van D., O81858.
Bell, Olin L., O23119.
Belt, Richard L., O23053.
Bengtson, Nils M., O22979.
Benjamin, George C., O23422.
Bennett, Donald V., O23001.
Bennett, William J., O23331.
Benson, Dean M., O22991.
Benson, Richard T., O52484.
Bieri, Alfred C., O33055.
Bierman, Donald L., O23175.
Bigley, Frank, O83578.
Billingsley, Max E., O44631.
Bingham, Edward C., Jr., O40471.
Bingham, Sidney V., Jr., O23269.
Birch, Thomas H., O32696.
Biswanger, Charles T., Jr., O23245.
Black, Edwin F., O23012.
Blacklock, Ward T., O32899.
Blackwell, George C., O40478.
Blades, Jack, O33082.
Blakely, Carl P., O32870.
Blakeney, Thomas O'C., O23458.
Blewett, Aaron E., O32893.
Bloch, Orville E., O32736.
Bogle, James G., O52642.
Bon Durant, Joseph R., O83579.
Bonham, James B., O23107.
Boothe, John E., Jr., O52533.
Bordley, Marcello W., Jr., O44580.
Bowlby, Herbert M., Jr., O23120.
Bowman, John E., O33211.
Braid, Robert B., O32950.
Branagan, Robert D., O33024.
Branch, James S., O40494.
Brewer, Robert M., O22975.
Brice, Charles S., Jr., O23029.
Briggs, Dan P., O23169.
Brill, Arden C., O23514.
Bristol, Thomas F., O44459.
Brotherton, Richard W., O52658.
Brown, Boyd L., O33215.
Brown, Charles P., O23544.
Brown, Earl J., O39031.
Brown, Gerhard E., O22948.
Brown, Harold C., O22888.
Brubaker, Jack H., O83580.
Brumfiel, Oscar M., O23534.
Bruneau, Alfred W., O23404.
Bryan, Thomas L., O23549.
Buckley, Gordon D., O84347.
Budz, Andrew D., Jr., O23253.
Buhmann, William G., O32748.
Bull, Robert H., O23424.
Burfening, John W., O22891.
Burrows, John E., O23621.
Burton, William E., O44526.
Bussolati, Emile J., O32677.
Byers, Carl F., O52643.
Bykerk, Norman H., O33038.
Byrne, David B., O23181.
Cagwin, Leland G., O23200.
Calahan, Robert H., O40515.
Cameron, Robert C., O23178.
Canfield, William D., O44318.
Carlan, Ulysses G., O76836.
Carnahan, George D., O23007.
Carroll, Walter D., Jr., O79768.
Carter, George E., O40430.
Carter, George F., O23431.
Carter, John H., O33174.
Case, Scott M., O23121.
Cassibry, Robert C., O23058.
Cassidy, Patrick F., O32809.
Cassidy, Richard T., O23213.
Cavness, William D., O23489.
Chamberlain, Thomas C., O23145.
Chandler, Homer B., Jr., O22982.
Chandler, Martin B., O23189.
Chatham, Edwin J., O52513.
Chin, Wah G., O33058.
Cibotti, Philip R., Jr., O23309.
Clancy, John L., O52733.
Clapsaddle, Clarence W., Jr., O22972.
Clark, Cuyler L., Jr., O22947.
Clark, John B., O32695.
Clark, Leroy F., Jr., O32863.
Clark, Melvin D., O23550.
Clay, Carmon L., O32673.
Clay, William L., O23059.
Clement, Wallace L., O23167.
Clifford, Walter H., O33033.
Clock, Raymond M., O22920.
Cloudt, Otto B., Jr., O23462.
Coats, Wendell J., O22964.
Cobb, Robert B., O33025.
Collart, Joseph H., O23447.
Collins, Alfred, O40486.
Colvin, Lloyd D., O32853.
Conley, Victor G., O23276.
Connor, Parker E., Jr., O23491.
Conover, Thomas M., O33029.
Cook, Benjamin F., Jr., O32801.
Cook, Julian A., O23290.
Cook, Truman F., O44727.
Coontz, John B., O23319.
Corbly, John B., Jr., O22944.
Cormier, Everett L., O32923.
Cornett, Jack G., O32972.
Cory, Allan M., O80390.
Costello, Darrel G., O23449.
Cougill, John C., O80391.
Coyle, Ray F., Jr., O52523.
Craig, Paul, O52479.
Creel, George R., Jr., O33241.
Crocker, David R., O23207.
Crowe, John H., O32986.
Crown, Francis J., O23031.
Cullen, Paul S., O23111.
Cullinan, Edward J., O44604.
Cunningham, Henry A., Jr., O23003.
Cushwa, William E., O79788.
Dahlstrom, Edward N., O33238.
Dailey, Paul P., O52682.
Daley, David S., O23453.
Dalness, Harold E., O44310.
Daman, Marion L., O40496.
Damelio, George L., O44627.
Davis, Charles L., O44317.
Davis, Duane D., O39026.
Davis, John N., O32808.
Davis, Theodore W., O23259.
Davis, Warren P., O33245.
Dawson, Clifford H., O39023.
De Kemper, Ralph E., O33240.
de Latour, Frank A., Jr., O23073.
Dean, Arthur L., Jr., O32860.
Delamater, Benjamin F., 3d, O23305.
Delaney, Arthur W., O44697.
Delaney, Joseph J., O33048.
Delaney, Robert J., O23067.
Delaney, William M., O23633.
Demers, Robert J., O33159.
Denno, Bryce F., O23161.
Densley, Hilton, O32946.
Devlin, Francis T., O23314.
Dexheimer, Robert, O32749.
Dibble, John, Jr., O23183.
Dice, Robert I., O22952.
Dickerson, Robert L., O23615.
Dickson, Dwight B., O33099.
Dickson, Lon R., O33098.
Dickson, Robert S., 3d, O80396.
Dietrich, Carl F., O39043.
Dietzel, Joe M., O32881.
Dillon, Wilbur S., O32807.
Downey, Walter G., O33106.
Downs, Lemuel C., O40527.
Drewry, Ivey O., Jr., O33224.
Duddy, Robert R., O33214.
Dunn, Francis L., O40437.
Dunning, Chester H., O52421.
Durgan, Raymond C., O23527.
Duvall, Everett W., O32842.
Edens, Walter A., O23563.
Edwards, Earl W., O23502.
Edwards, Elmer F., O80405.
Eldridge, Ralph S., O23442.
Elliott, Philip L., O22945.
Emery, John C., O23153.
England, Sanford P., O23129.
Engelhardt, Joseph E., O33143.
Epley, Albert D., O23250.
Eschenburg, Emil P., O23469.
Evans, Jack C., Jr., O23517.
Evans, John T., O80408.
Evans, Leon G., O52521.
Fahey, Paul V., O33054.
Fairbanks, George C., 3d, O33145.
Fairley, Jefferson M., O52699.
Fate, Robert J., O23010.
Fellenz, Walter J., O23055.
Fitzpatrick, Edward D., O23288.
Flake, Joe, O40526.
Flanders, Edward A., O22912.

Flanigan, Walter J., O44422.
Fletcher, Melvin, O33111.
Floyd, Alfred J., O23328.
Fogle, George C., O44428.
Forbes, Lawrence G., O22903.
Fortney, Camden P., Jr., O32949.
Foster, David E. O52471.
Foster, Gayle H., O79814.
Fragala, Augustine M., O81899.
Francisco, William P., O22955.
Free, Richard H., O22926.
Freeman, George C., O44214.
Freudendorf, Chester M., O23303.
Freund, John F., O23334.
Fritter, Lee W., O23217.
Fuller, Ford P., Jr., O23170.
Fuller, Lawrence J., O22901.
Gaddis, Shelton, O79818.
Gaines, Weaver H., O32686.
Gardner, Joseph M., O40522.
Gasperini, Silvio E., Jr., O23203.
Gerard, Max H., O32982.
Ghent, Daniel T., O52626.
Giambelluca, Nat, O44161.
Gibson, Edwin C., O44578.
Gilbert, Charles M., O23457.
Gilbert, James T., O44348.
Gildart, William J., O23264.
Giuffre, Matthew R. J., O40425.
Glass, William A., Jr., O44293.
Gleszer, Roland M., O23278.
Goers, William C., O23487.
Goldoni, John E., O33182.
Gondek, Adolph J., O44196.
Goodrich, Merle L., O32693.
Goodrich, Raymond H., O22911.
Goodwin, Samuel McC., O23177.
Graf, John A., O22892.
Grant, Emerson W., O23427.
Gravel, Edwin J., O33206.
Green, Gilford D., O23231.
Green, James B., O23423.
Green, John H., O33085.
Green, Lynell W., O52665.
Greene, James S., Jr., O23137.
Greenwood, Walter, Jr., O23548.
Griffin, James C., O33018.
Griggs Archie J., O44389.
Gunning, John G., O52669.
Gunster, Walter E., Jr., O22928.
Gushurst, Clarence E., O22998.
Guth, Henry T., O32768.
Guy, David R., O22961.
Guy, John J., O33219.
Hackett, Wallace J., O23179.
Haessly, Burdette E., O23016.
Hall, Charles A., O44605.
Hall, Robert C., O23525.
Hamelin, Rolland W., O22997.
Hancock, Chester H. O44292.
Hannah, Raymond W., O32760.
Hansen, Everett A., O23528.
Hansen, George R., O52571.
Hantzes, James, O52467.
Hardenbergh, Hal, O32740.
Hardin, Joseph S., O23126.
Hardman, Tracey J., O33007.
Harness, Leslie J., O23415.
Harnett, John S., O23094.
Harper, Robert E., O32783.
Harris, Jack R., O44544.
Harrison, Charles E., Jr., O22953.
Hartung, Herbert W., O44261.
Haseman, Leonard L., O22925.
Hatten, Philip A., O23417.
Hatter, Harlos V., O32901.
Hawes, Harold VanL., O52711.
Hazeltine, Charles B., O22896.
Heald, Robert C., O44454.
Heinrich, Charles T., O39014.
Hendrickson, Edward H., O23048.
Hennessy, James T., O23148.
Herber, David, O32689.
Hershey, Lyle E., O52502.
Hewitt, Henry H., O32827.
Hewitt, Walter J., O44332.
Hickman, Paul D., O44374.
Hicks, Raymond L., O52535.
Higgins, Harold D., O23554.
Higgins, William A., O40468.
Higgins, William J., Jr., O33141.
Hightower, John M., O23531.
Hill, John F. P., O33108.
Hilliard, Lee H., O33246.
Hino, Kenji, O44753.
Hiser, Charles H., O44795.
Hobson, Victor W., Jr., O23038.
Hoffman, Raymond F., O44240.
Hofinger, Leopold F., O44368.
Holm, William N., O23282.
Hooper, Thomas F., O39028.
Hopkins, John W., Jr., O40504.
Hopper, Bristow S., O32815.
Horan, Timothy F., O84371.
Horner, Charles T., Jr., O23530.
Hovell, Bergen B., O23450.
Hubbard, Frank G., O52430.
Hudson, George E., O44410.
Huffaker, Robert L., O32911.
Hughes, John W., Jr., O32676.
Hughett, Ralph H., O44674.
Hunt, Jay, O32789.
Hutchinson, Philip A., O33200.
Ingalls, Robert C., O23542.
Irving, Richard R., O33127.
Irwin, Walter G., O40490.
Jackson, Bennett L., O80426.
Jackson, John W., O80427.
Jacobs, Marvin L., O22915.
James, Howard, O40463.
Jellum, Delbert L., O44478.
Jenkins, Francis L., Jr., O32684.
Jillson, Stuart F., O80429.
Johnson, Bertil A., O23086.
Johnson, Chester H., O44273.
Johnson, Irvin A., O40464.
Johnson, Lester B., O23490.
Johnson, Robert W., O44258.
Johnstone, John C., O44702.
Jones, Eben R., O32836.
Jones, George E., Jr., O80430.
Jung, Wing F., O23144.
Kadick, Misha N., O23444.
Kasper, William M., O23210.
Keegan, Christopher R., O44383.
Kehe, Arlin J., O33094.
Kenney, John J., Jr. O23114.
Kent, Frank J., O33087.
Kersey, Sidney P., O79877.
Kersting, Donald A., O23436.
Kimball, Curtis Y., O32852.
King, Warren R., O23413.
Kintner, William R., O23068.
Kinzer, John M., O23552.
Kirk, Frank A., Jr., O44442.
Kirk, John E., O32681.
Klunk, Mark C. B., O23273.
Kolster, Kenneth K., O32886.
Kopischkie, Carl E., O80433.
Kramer, Francis E., O23122.
Krauss, Paul H., O22932.
Kreitzer, James F., O23096.
Krueger, Russell C., O32865.
Kuehlke, Christian G., Jr., O80435.
Kuziv, Michael, Jr., O23330.
Kyle, Edward H., O22981.
Lahlum, Arthur H., O23541.
Lain, James L., O32967.
Lamb, Oakley McC, O32751.
Lane, Harry B., O23187.
Lane, Jack F., O23456.
Lang, Ralph W., O33034.
Lange, Herman W. W., O23402.
Langland, Kenneth F., O52505.
Larkin, George T., O23293.
Larsen, Bobby B., O52722.
Larsen, Charles J., O44558.
Latta, William L., Jr., O23627.
Lawhon, Zim E., O23555.
Leahy, Osmund A., O23106.
Lederman, Milton D., O23320.
Legare, Ben W., O39034.
Legere, Lawrence J., Jr., O22937.
Lehtonen, Reino O., O52532.
Leidy, Carl S., O32755.
Lemley, Kenneth McR., O22976.
Leonard, Allan L., Jr. O32898.
Levy, Julius W., O52466.
Lewis, William F., O23206.
Light, Everett DeW., O23033.
Ligon, Walter B., O81912.
Lillyman, Frank L., O32861.
Lingenfelter, William N., O32829.
Lippincott, Clifford E., O23429.
Locke, William J. O40512.
Loewus, James D., O23205.
Logsdon, Harlan V., O44347.
Long, Floyd H., O32889.
Long, Talton W., O32735.
Lotozo, James A., O23109.
Lucas, Charles L., O40249.
Luckenbach, Everett A., O80442.
Lundberg, John W., Jr., O33170.
Lundy, William G., O32692.
Lynn, Edison A., Jr., O23085.
Mabee, Richard W., O23241.
Macaulay, George B., O32549.
Maedler, James R., O23132.
Malone, Robert H., O33014.
Mandell, Frank C., O23234.
Manley, Murray E., O52740.
Manning, Leo W., O33114.
Manson, Peter C., O23545.
Manzolillo, Russell J., O23304.
Marriott, Richard G., O33072.
Marsh, Clarence T., Jr., O22996.
Martin, Alfred, O23629.
Martin, James G., O39035.
Mastran, Joseph L., O23279.
Mather, Donald W., O44458.
Matthews, Maurice H., O32997.
Matzger, Neil MacK., O44539.
May, Joseph G., O32825.
Maynard, John B., Jr., O79915.
Mayo, George, Jr., O22970.
McAlhany, John W., O40517.
McBee, Marshell G., O39015.
McCarthy, Edgar A. P., Jr., O32970.
McCaskill, John C., O80450.
McConnell, John A., O79917.
McCord, James H., O32683.
McCown, Hal D., O23532.
McDaniel, Alva T., O44521.
McDonald, Eugene O., O23218.
McElhenny, William S., O39025.
McHenry, Carroll E., O52545.
McIlhiney, William G., O33005.
McKenney, Stewart L., O23084.
McKerral, Howard A., O80452.
McLean, John R., O23140.
McPherson, Larry G., O52498.
McQuain, Gordon E., O40441.
McRae, Robert B., O33236.
McSherry, Elwood D., O44322.
Medley, Donal, O33165.
Meisell, Harry E., O32812.
Melcher, John F., O80455.
Mellett, Earle C., O80456.
Mendez, Louis G., Jr., O23262.
Merchant, Marvin H., O23301.
Merriam, John H., O33095.
Merrill, John T., O33225.
Meszar, Frank, O23211.
Metcalf, George T., O23501.
Mette, Clarence A., Jr., O32776.
Meyer, Norman E., O40511.
Michaelis, Leon A., O44486.
Miley, Henry A., Jr., O22993.
Miller, Boulton B., O33148.
Miller, Jack C., O23406.
Miller, Wilbur O., Jr., O33126.
Millican, Raymond W., O23000.
Mills, Jene E., O23410.
Milner, James W., O23124.
Minahan, John E., O22949.
Mitchell, Harris T., O52670.
Monroe, Thomas H., Jr., O23017.
Montrone, Alfred J., O32737.
Moore, Benjamin G., O33158.
Moore, Bidwell, O23248.
Moore, James M., O22963.
Moore, Philip J., 3d, O23135.
Moran, Edwin G., O52434.
Morris, Raymond C., O79939.
Morrison, Allen L., O32837.
Morrissey, Stephen B., O23270.
Mueller, George H., O23196.
Muir, Willard A., O44774.
Mullarkey, James P., O33030.
Muller, Thomas H., O23201.
Mullin, William H. H., O23015.
Mulvanity, Edward D., O81916.
Munson, Delbert, E., O23156.
Murdock, Richard G., O44221.
Murphy, Cornelius A., O23146.
Murphy, John H., O44201.

Murphy, Joseph A., O44667.
Murray, Joseph E., O44421.
Mynderse, Jacob F., O23523.
Nelson, Robert K., O44426.
Neumann, William C., Jr., O44145.
Newlin, Charles A., O32983.
Noble, Charles C., O22942.
Norris, John I., O44246.
Norris, Robinson R., O23014.
Nosek, Thaddeus M., O22934.
Nye, Charles A., 3d., O85058.
Oates, Eugene C., Jr., O44576.
Obermeyer, Charles R., O44759.
O'Brien, John A., O23037.
O'Brien, Robert A., Jr., O23152.
O'Connor, Edwin, Jr., O23539.
Oettinger, Frederic N., Jr., O32782.
Oglesby, Charles E., O23244.
O'Keefe, John T., O23176.
Oliver, George L., O33118.
Olson, Winston L., O32940.
O'Neil, Paul F., O22902.
Orman, Leonard M., O23046.
Ortenzi, Anthony H., O33383.
Osborne, Vincent E., O33039.
Oseth, Frederic W., O23090.
Osthues, Henry E., O52512.
Owen, Glenn B., O32725.
Pace, Brice, O33035.
Park, Herman C., O33163.
Parker, David S., O22907.
Parker, Robert M., Jr., O32936.
Pate, Brantley, M., Jr., O80475.
Pate, Roy H., O84407.
Patten, Samuel M., O23008.
Paulick, Michael, O23060.
Pearson, Willard, O44466.
Pederson, John E., O40479.
Pell, Kenneth E., O40432.
Pell, Robert H., O23561.
Penn, Frank A., O32843.
Penney, Howard W., O22917.
Perrin, Bert, O23503.
Perry, Manley C., O23024.
Peterson, Samuel R., O22904.
Petty, Norman E., O33041.
Pfeil, Robert C., O22921.
Phillips, Ivan G., O32941.
Phillips, Paul D., O22939.
Pidgeon, John J., O23089.
Pillsbury, Hobart B., O23019.
Pittman, Walter C., O33022.
Platt, Robert G., O23414.
Plummer, Roosevelt T., O44412.
Podufaly, Edward T., O22913.
Porteous, Charles E., O33203.
Porter, Fred B., O40477.
Prebil, Fred C., O79957.
Preble, Merle R., O23524.
Preston, William D., Jr., O32969.
Prysi, Henry F., O32904.
Pullman, Milton A., O33166.
Quaid, Thomas D., O22919.
Quick, George S., O44602.
Radcliff, Elgin G., O23558.
Ramsey, Lloyd B., O23553.
Randle, Robert B., O52570.
Rasmussen, Henry A., O40502.
Rawlings, James G., O33065.
Reed, James W., O35884.
Reinecke, Paul S., Jr., O23284.
Reitz, James T., O33096.
Renola, Raymond, O22971.
Renwanz, Rowland H., O23123.
Richards, Albert P., O23194.
Richardson, Beverly T., O32864.
Richter, Henry J., O23536.
Riddle, John R., O32745.
Ries, Arthur W., O44226.
Rigel, William E., O32894.
Rigg, Robert B., O76842.
Risque, Beverly, O40446.
Ritchings, Arthur W., O52739.
Ritze, Herbert C., O44634.
Rizza, Salvo, O23139.
Roberts, Clarence F., Jr., O44612.
Roberts, John K., Jr., O23195.
Roberts, Perry J., O44208.
Roberts, Sam A., O33008.
Robinson, Oval H., O22938.
Roedy, William H., O22941.
Rogers, Ralph M., O22943.
Rohan, Thomas C., O32954.
Rosen, Melvin H., O23082.
Rosenberg, Kermit H., O52487.
Ross, Ralph N., O23315.
Ross, Thomas B., Jr., O32724.
Rosson, William B., O23556.
Rozamus, Walter J., O32892.
Ruck, Fred M., O33049.
Ruffner, Clifford H., Jr., O39017.
Rumph, Osborne R., O40466.
Rust, Clayton A., O22916.
Ryan, William T., O52629.
Sample, Charles W., O23437.
Sanders, Robert W., O44296.
Sandholm, Frank A., O33178.
Sandiland, John S., O23445.
Sands, Joseph N., O32957.
Sanford, Charles A., O32857.
Sayre, Edwin M., O33220.
Scandrett, William, O23448.
Scarburgh, Samuel W., O44723.
Schafbuch, Donald V., O32990.
Schafer, Robert W., O39045.
Schell, Rieder W., O33021.
Schendel, Harry A., Jr., O23526.
Schlotzhauer, Walter S., Jr., O76843.
Schmaltz, Frederick A., O23229.
Schmidt, Hugh F., O79992.
Schmidt, Ronald W., O80490.
Schockner, Lester F., O23182.
Schoming, John N., O44755.
Schulten, Leo E., Jr., O40457.
Schuppener, Paul B., O52465.
Schwab, Raymond H., O44646.
Schwartzman, Jack, O40475.
Scott, David M., Jr., O44501.
Scott, Fred W., O44765.
Scott, Thomas H., Jr., O23030.
Scott, Thomas M., Jr., O52544.
Scudder, Willis B., O36179.
Senn, Burkhardt M., O52560.
Sergent, Byrd, O52717.
Shagrin, Richard A., O23261.
Shanahan, William R., O22950.
Shaunesey, Charles A., Jr., O23036.
Shivers, George W., Jr., O23515.
Shockey, Cyrus R., O44234.
Shoemaker, Raymond L., Jr., O22978.
Shoss, Morris L., O22973.
Shropshire, Lewis W., O79995.
Shurtleff, Carlyle H., O44288.
Sigley, Woodrow B., O23411.
Silvasy, Stephen, O22985.
Simmons, Howard H., O39029.
Sisco, David W., O52579.
Smee, James C., O76844.
Smith, Arthur L., Jr., O80000.
Smith, Francis M., O23634.
Smith, Fred C., O44457.
Smith, Gordon K., O32959.
Smith, Page E., O23294.
Smith, Paul F., O33169.
Smith, Thomas E. W., O33064.
Smith, Thomas R., Jr., O33119.
Smith, Vallard C., O23543.
Smith, Woodrow M., O22960.
Smitherman, Willis E., O52455.
Snyder, Robert L., O52456.
Sparra, Charis R., O32712.
Spencer, John J., O44248.
Spengler, John T. H., O22977.
Spinney, Lewis C., O44357.
Steinbacher, Raymond L., O32709.
Stella, Harry A., O23185.
Stephens, Blackburn, O33060.
Sterner, Cyril D., O23434.
Stewart, Charles W., O32925.
Stockton, Hunter Le G., O23409.
Stoddard, William G., Jr., O23130.
Stoneback, Lee S., O44316.
Stover, Harold G., O32845.
Strait, Lewis J., Jr., O44735.
Strauss, James P., O22951.
Strock, Alan M., O23099.
Strom, Lavere H., O32995.
Stuart, Clarence E., O52468.
Stutzman, Oliver G., O32771.
Sullivan, Francis R., O22923.
Sumstad, John, O52646.
Sunderlin, William W., O32678.
Swaim, Allan L., O32871.
Swift, Eben F., O23258.
Symbol, Paul H., O23452.
Tate, Willie L., O32885.
Taylor, Alton R., O33092.
Taylor, Benjamin G., Jr., O23438.
Taylor, James K., O23011.
Telquist, Clark V., O40443.
Tharpe, Felix E., O32204.
Thayer, Alan P., O23087.
Thomas, Douglas R., O80500.
Thomas, Eber H., Jr., O44780.
Thomas, Richard G., O23632.
Thompson, Clarence A., Jr., O33113.
Thompson, Donald G., O32844.
Thybony, William W., O39024.
Tillson, Arthur C., O23546.
Tistadt, Harry E., O44706.
Todd, Walter J., O40491.
Townsend, John D., O23141.
Trabue, William, O23625.
Trainer, Wyatte G., O40516.
Treadway, Joseph E., O23617.
Tredennick, John C., O23405.
Treneman, Robert A., O80506.
Tudor, Ralph N., O39032.
Turner, Clyde M., O43233.
Turner, Hugh J., Jr., O23138.
Twombly, John F. 3d, O23519.
Twyon, Donald E., O32805.
Tyler, James E., O23079.
Ulm, Otis M., O23047.
Unverferth, John E., O23499.
Utley, Robert L., O32977.
Vanderhoef, Dean T., O22984.
Vaughan, Woodrow W., O23004.
Venable, Charles P., O33247.
Vilhauer, Jonas A., O32732.
Von Pawel, Ernest, O52541.
Waddell, Charles C., O80023.
Wade, Richard E., O32824.
Walker, Harry H., Jr., O23460.
Walker, Marion W., O23435.
Walters, James W., Jr., O23006.
Walton, Arthur H., O44746.
Wanner, William S., O33116.
Ward, Robert H., O44280.
Ware, Keith L., O33181.
Warmbrod, Karlton, O33077.
Warren, Carl K., Jr., O23630.
Watson, Ronald, O52459.
Watson, William W., O32756.
Watten, Einar, O44342.
Way, Evert C., O32888.
Webster, Daniel, O33071.
Webster, George B., Jr., O23425.
Webster, Sanford H., O23222.
Weigel, Levene J., O33187.
Welch, Howard K., O33155.
Welch, Louis C., O80024.
Welsh, Charles E., O32706.
Weltmer, Noyes, Jr., O80025.
Wendt, James R., Jr., O22995.
Wermuth, Anthony L. P., O23252.
Wetherill, Roderick, O23158.
Wheeler, Jesse F., Jr., O44719.
White, Charles T., O52708.
White, Fred F., O33776.
White, Frederick G., O23326.
White, Richard A., O40524.
White, Stephen H., O81934.
White, William R., O32847.
Whitting, Henry C., O44487.
Wilderman, Jordan J., O23092.
Wiley, Earl T., Jr., O40442.
Wilkinson, William G., Jr., O23512.
Williams, Frank A., O44750.
Williams, Robert R., O22962.
Williams, Trevor E., O32883.
Willis, Joe McA., O32854.
Wilson, Charles V., O23564.
Wilson, John M., O33026.
Wilson, William H., O32820.
Wingfield, William B., O80525.
Winton, Walter F., Jr., O22966.
Wise, William D., Jr., O32682.
Witt, Landon A., O23317.
Wohner, John H., O23142.
Wolfe, Charles A., O44262.
Wood, John C., Jr., O52640.
Wood, Milford W., O32723.
Woodman, Ernest A. H., O32822.
Woodward, Gilbert H., O23102.

Woolfolk, Robert L., 3d, O52687.
Worrell, Raleigh O., O32697.
Wright, David W., Jr., O33217.
Wright, John MacN., Jr., O23057.
Wright, Ralph, O32765.
Wyand, Preston W., O44363.
Yarrington, William R., O80028.
Yeager, Frederick J., O22969.
Yeager, Pearson B., O33176.
Yerby, Harry L., O32719.
Yeuell, Donovan P., Jr., O23083.
Young, James S., O80029.
Young, Richard A., Jr., O44524.
Young, Stephen D., O23430.
Youngman, Charles W., O33183.
Yourtee, Leon R., Jr., O44329.
Zahrobsky, Ralph E., O23149.
Zaresky, Alexander A., O44353.
Zaumeyer, Lawrence M., O32906.
Zeigler, Howard N., Jr., O44773.
Zipf, Karl A., O39044.

To be lieutenant colonels, chaplain

Adams, Rowland C., O76783.
Bartholomew, Lisle, O76784.
Chmielewski, Joseph F., O84139.
Dicker, Herman, O43154.
Graves, Ned R., O43164.
Helm, Donald W., O79680.
Kasel, Joseph T., O43148.
Koepke, Theodore V., O31177.
Luettgen, Edward M., O31046.
McElwee, Aloysius J., O43151.
Morrell, Joseph J., O51996.
Murphy, James B., O84235.
Naylor, Duncan N., O38860.
Raley, Perry T., O31037.
Reardon, David M., O76788.
Sullivan, Maurice L., O43165.
Williams, George W., O52004.
Zwack, John A., O31066.

To be lieutenant colonels, Women's Army Corps

Brewster, Margaret E., L88.
Kelly, Mary E., L341.
Royster, Kathryn J., L105.
Stephenson, Mary W., L78.
Young, Nellie M., L325.

To be majors

Abbott, Arlo E., O84447.
Achee, Fernand M., O50470.
Adair, Don W., O28491.
Addison, William A. B., O60111.
Adinaro, Joseph T., O80532.
Agnor, Thomas J., Jr., O28152.
Alberti, Donald W., O56695.
Alderson, Frederick K., O28458.
Allen, George R., Jr., O50495.
Allen, Robert W., O28211.
Allred, Wayne, O84584.
Andersen, Andrew M., Jr., O81945.
Anderson, Charles W., O81946.
Anderson, Farrell B., O60157.
Anderson, Ferd E., Jr., O27906.
Andersson, Gunnar E., O28239.
Applebee, John E., O80541.
Appleton, Rolland D., O81948.
Armstrong, John L., O28469.
Ash, Alvin, O28539.
Ashton, Shirley S., O28502.
Asmus, Grover W., O28605.
Atherton, Paul R., O84449.
Bacon, Richard H., Jr., O28656.
Badger, Frederick C., O27902.
Bagot, Alfred W., O81951.
Bailey, Gordon W., O76848.
Baker, David T., O27984.
Baker, Francis R., O28543.
Baker, Van R., O28083.
Balaker, Basil C., O80551.
Ball, Edmund K., O28308.
Bamber, William H., O28480.
Barker, Charles W., O28012.
Barlow, Bowman O., O80039.
Barlow, Kendrick B., Jr., O28438.
Barnhill, Gervase L., O76850.
Barrett, John C., Jr., O28481.
Barth, Delbert S., O28052.
Barthol, Paul I., O28674.
Basham, Edwin W., O28344.
Bassler, Robert E., Jr., O28064.
Bates, John F., O56633.
Baughman, Victor D., O61241.
Baumgartner, John S., O28172.
Beahler, Lee E., Jr., O80560.
Beasley, Rex W., Jr., O28165.
Beatty, Roy P., O27981.
Becker, Jack G., O27915.
Beckner, Richard G., O28001.
Becraft, Clarence W., O80563.
Bell, Ernest L., O80564.
Bell, Thomas L., O80566.
Bender, Keith G., O80567.
Benedict, Calvert P., O28286.
Benson, Robert C., O80569.
Benson, Theodore N., O80570.
Bentz, Harold F., Jr., O28392.
Berg, Jacob J., O80571.
Berger, Rayfield R., O80572.
Berris, Michael T., O80577.
Berry, Fred P., O80578.
Berry, Robert H., O27986.
Bess, Victor E., O80579.
Beveridge, Theodore M., O81957.
Beyer, Donald S., O28673.
Biersack, Christian, O80582.
Bigler, William R., O28292.
Bishop, William C., Jr., O28428.
Blankenbaker, George S., O50494.
Blanton, Walter P., O39474.
Blazey, Frank E., O28693.
Blum, Stanley D., O27971.
Blyth, Rodney A., O28294.
Boake, Corwin, Jr., O28484.
Bolz, Henry H., Jr., O28364.
Book, Clair LaV., O28430.
Booth, Shephard A., Jr., O28654.
Boudinot, Truman E., O28669.
Bowie, Kyle W., O28559.
Bowles, Alvin H., O80595.
Bowman, James C., O85487.
Boyd, Benjamin F., O28696.
Boyd, Russell R., O28040.
Bradley, Earl McG., O58279.
Brady, Philip B., O28192.
Braun, Edgar G., Jr., O27897.
Bresnahan, Richard A., O28643.
Brigandi, Joseph, O80608.
Britten, Roland L., O80609.
Brooks, Herrold E., Jr., O28563.
Brouse, Marion D., O76852.
Brown, Benjamin C., O28493.
Brown, David D., O28009.
Brown, Levi A., O27914.
Brunson, Richard W., O28615.
Bryant, David T., O27950.
Bryant, Oren W., O80618.
Bugh, Arthur J., O28470.
Burgess, James M., O80624.
Burke, James R., O80626.
Burkett, Joseph F., Jr., O81968.
Burnell, Ray L., Jr., O28026.
Burney, John C., Jr., O27982.
Burns, Patrick J., O80628.
Bush, Leonard R., O80630.
Butler, Olva B., O50507.
Cabell, Henry B., O58800.
Calhoun, James R., O76856.
Callaghan, John W., O28580.
Cantaral, Raymond H., O80637.
Carlisle, Carshall C., Jr., O28273.
Carney, Clement E., O60113.
Carpenter, Clyde P., O80639.
Carpenter, Jay D., O79767.
Carter, James E., O28710.
Caruso, Frank S., O28730.
Case, Francis R., O80056.
Cassias, Clarence E., O80643.
Castelli, Joseph R., O28454.
Cavanaugh, Edward J., O28499.
Chalupsky, Fred A., O58804.
Channon, Robert I., O28219.
Child, Thomas W., Jr., O80651.
Clark, Clyde O., O56632.
Clark, Stephen, O80657.
Clifford, Carcie C., O28194.
Cloutier, Francis McC., O80660.
Coggins, Clyde A., O80664.
Colaw, David L., O28459.
Coleman, James E., O28021.
Collins, Edward J., O28251.
Collins, Joseph E., O28633.
Colt, John B., O80667.
Colvocoresses, Alden P., O80668.
Compton, Jack E., O80669.
Conant, Frank D., Jr., O27990.
Conger, Lester M., O28416.
Conner, Steven L., Jr., O28432.
Constant, Thomas M., O28426.
Convey, James E., Jr., O28103.
Conyne, Albert H., O50505.
Cook, Bruce K., O80670.
Corcoran, Frank, O81980.
Cornell, Robert W., O80676.
Cortez, Clyde A., O80677.
Cound, William T., O28231.
Coyle, Martin J., O80062.
Crizer, Pat W., O28579.
Cronkhite, Willis D., Jr., O28269.
Crowley, Edward F., O28628.
Crowley, Robert E., O27967.
Cunningham, Elmo E., O28618.
Dague, Robert V., O80684.
Dalpino, Milton D., O84602.
Daniel, Charles D., Jr., O28258.
Daniel, Robert S., Jr., O28455.
Darby, Charles R., O58072.
Daskevich, Anthony F., O76864.
David, Bert A., O28441.
Davis, Edward M., O81987.
Davis, Harry A., Jr., O28512.
Davis, John L., 3d, O39480.
Day, Franklin R., O28003.
Day, James A., O28160.
Dayton, John B., O28049.
De Long, Walter J., Jr., O28184.
de Moya, Harold G., O28299.
DeRieux, Stanley N., O80694.
DeSanto, Anthony J., O80695.
Dean, Gernard D., O80697.
Delaney, Edward J., O80699.
Dempster, Robert N., O80700.
Denhart, John F., O80701.
Dennett, George L., O28565.
Derrick, Horace F., O28626.
Dessert, Rolland A., O28388.
Devens, W. George, O28008.
Dewey, Hobart E., O39479.
Dewitt, Richard P., O80696.
Dickerson, Roy L., O80705.
Dickerson, William R., Jr., O80704.
Dieleman, William K., O76867.
Dillon, Paul C., O80707.
Diver, Richard B., O28137.
Dixon, James T., O28130.
Dodd, William R., O80709.
Dorney, James J., O28185.
Dort, Dean R., O58280.
Douthitt, Robert S., O28317.
Dover, Donovan C., O80715.
Dowell, Vern B., Jr., O81990.
Drake, Oscar, O80718.
Driscoll, James A., O50467.
Drozd, Walter M., O80719.
Ducote, Richard J., Jr., O80073.
Dumas, Walter A., O28278.
Dunbar, Philip H., Jr., O80721.
Duncan, William L., O80722.
Dunlap, Jack A., O80723.
Dunn, Horace B., Jr., O80725.
Dwyer, Robert C., O80729.
Dye, Earl S., Jr., O28262.
Eblen, George C., O61195.
Edelstein, Leonard, O27965.
Edwards, Stephen O., O28127.
Elder, James M., O28473.
Eliasson, Arne H., O80735.
Elkins, Robert D., O80736.
Ellert, Robert B., O59836.
Elliott, Richard B., O50442.
Elsaesser, Louis O., O27936.
Emerson, John E., Jr., O76874.
Erickson, John D., O80744.
Etchemendy, Leon, O80745.
Evans, Edward S., O80746.
Evans, Robert N., O28630.
Eversole, Mac C., O56634.
Fair, Stanley D., O28551.
Faires, Hunter H., Jr., O28377.
Farnham, Kenneth N., O80751.
Farrell, William J., O38488.
Farris, Philip A., O28627.
Feild, Terry T., O83596.

Felch, Robert I., O80752.
Fields, Jesse A., Jr., O28731.
Fink, George B., O27942.
Fish, Frederick J., O80758.
Fitzgerald, Charles A., O28593.
Flather, Herbert H., Jr., O28234.
Fletcher, Don S., O50476.
Flores, Joe B., O28371.
Floyd, Harry A., O28573.
Fogleman, Paul V., O82000.
Folawn, John S., O60169.
Forrester, Charles T., Jr., O80767.
Frago, John A., O84452.
Frankland, Walter L., Jr., O28391.
Franks, Glenn E., O80086.
Frazier, Robert L., O84611.
Frech, Frederic A., O27930.
Freed, Debow, O28477.
Freeman, Herbert H., O84612.
Friend, Harold C., O28087.
Fuller, Elisha J., O28268.
Fuller, Howard R., Jr., O28098.
Fuller, William C., O28055.
Furr, James H., O80777.
Furth, Norman J., O80778.
Futrell, Alvin F., O28720.
Gaddis, Hubert D., O82004.
Gambill, Charles L., O50435.
Gannon, Vincent DeP., Jr., O28202.
Gardner, George M., O76876.
Geary, John C., O28542.
Gerardo, Alexander, O28119.
Gewinner, Marcus N., O80786.
Giacomozzi, Francis, O80089.
Gigante, James J., Jr., O28267.
Gilbreath, William O., O59454.
Gilham, Jack K., O27988.
Gillespie, John W., Jr., O28577.
Gillig, Roy W., O28358.
Gioe, Joseph F., O56619.
Gioia, Joseph F., O80791.
Glass, Malvin F., Jr., O80793.
Glidewell, Calvin E., O28418.
Godfrey, Wayne R., O80795.
Goldrick, Robert N., O80796.
Goodwin, Guy R., Jr., O80798.
Gorler, Howard W., O80091.
Gosling, Francis G., O27941.
Grady, John H., O28223.
Graham, Daniel O., O28212.
Green, Victor D., O50445.
Greene, Byron D., Jr., O28506.
Gregg, George F., O80807.
Greksa, Paul, O76879.
Gribble, Lee Roy W., O80809.
Gridley, James M., O28360.
Grimm, Charles C., O63226.
Grodin, Richard A., O80813.
Grosz, Peter, Jr., O27977.
Gruenther, Richard L., O28711.
Gustafson, Carl W., O83822.
Haake, Thomas G., O84623.
Hadley, Alvan C., Jr., O28191.
Hagedon, George G., O27898.
Haisley, Philip D., O28380.
Hale, Richard E., O28520.
Hales, William McK., Jr., O76881.
Hall, Charles M., O28456.
Hall, George E., Jr., O28323.
Hall, George R., O80826.
Hall, William C., O28023.
Hall, William W., Jr., O28005.
Hallgren, Hal E., O28116.
Halls, Alexander E., O28065.
Hamer, George R., O80829.
Hamilton, Joseph, Jr., O80830.
Hamilton, Milton H., O28245.
Hamilton, Robert M., O28326.
Hanna, Nathaniel P., O80833.
Hansen, Lawrence P., O61959.
Hanson, Benjamin S., Jr., O28076.
Harris, Roland, O80843.
Hassinger, Robert W., O80847.
Haughney, Edward W., O61964.
Hayes, Stephen H., O80852.
Haymaker, Gerald L., O80853.
Haynes, Thomas E., O76883.
Hazzard, Rutledge P., O28088.
Healey, William R., O50456.
Hearn, William M., O80855.
Hecklinger, Henry D., O80856.
Helterbran, David J., O80857.
Herring, William A., O41340.
Hewett, Robert F., Jr., O28528.
Hickey, Daniel W., 3d, O28427.
Hickey, Frederick F., Jr., O28099.
Hill, Benjamin H., O82023.
Hill, John G., Jr., O27997.
Hill, Joseph C., O27838.
Hill, Ralph E., O80866.
Hinrichs, Frank A., O80868.
Hipley, Fred F., O80869.
Hoar, John C., Jr., O28345.
Hobson, James B., O28419.
Hockman, Lucien J., O84453.
Hodges, William J., O82024.
Hoefling, John A., O28404.
Hoey, James K., O28036.
Hopkins, Paul E., O80878.
Horne, Harold W., O28337.
Horne, Kibbey M., O28057.
Hosemann, Joseph F., Jr., O80881.
Hoskins, Lynn W., Jr., O28713.
Hough, Granville W., O28399.
Houseworth, Joseph E., 3d, O28584.
Howard, Hubert C., O80884.
Huddleston, Thomas M., O28340.
Hughes, Harold L., O80888.
Hummel, Atlee V., O80890.
Humphreys, William A., O28348.
Hurd, James W., O80891.
Hursh, Donald G., Jr., O80892.
Hutchison, David N., O27928.
Hyndman, James H., O80894.
Ingle, Robert H., Jr., O84455.
Inskeep, James H. W., O28682.
Ireland, Paul M., Jr., O28288.
Ireland, Robert A., O80896.
Isenson, Raymond S., O83823.
Israelson, John A., O80898.
Ives, Albert R., Jr., O28675.
Jacks, John L., Jr., O80900.
Jackson, Charles A., O80901.
Jaco, Charles M., Jr., O28203.
Jacula, Peter M., O28716.
Jameson, Malcolm MacG., O80905.
Jank, Arthur W., O27926.
Jansen, Joseph A., O27964.
Jennings, Dan D., Jr., O80907.
Johnson, Richard A., O28145.
Johnson, Sewall H. E., O28712.
Jones, Alfred H., O27407.
Jones, Harold I., O80913.
Jones, Harry L., O80914.
Jones, Hubert R., O80916.
Jones, John T., O28214.
Jordan, Clarence E., Jr., O28078.
Joseph, Edwin M., O28522.
Joy, Albert E., O28534.
Joyce, Jean K., O28284.
Judd, Donald S., O80919.
Jungerheld, Warren S., O28662.
Kamaras, John G., O28100.
Kane, Robert V., O28612.
Kasdorf, Walter W., O80923.
Kearins, Patrick F., O80927.
Keefer, Loren R., O38492.
Keehn, Kent, O28336.
Keith, James E., O80930.
Kelley, Paul A., O28688.
Kelley, Peter E., O80931.
Kelsey, Philip R., O80932.
Kelso, Minor L., O28745.
Kelso, Winchester, Jr., O59656.
Kent, Irvin M., O69963.
Kerker, Edward L., O80936.
Kilby, William L., Jr., O84638.
Kim, Young O., O80941.
Kingsbury, Clarence W., O28325.
Kinney, Richard M., O28609.
Kiser, William M., O28329.
Kitts, Alfred R., O39483.
Kline, Roland A., O28747.
Klundt, Roland E., O80944.
Knapp, Robert E., O28079.
Knepp, Lester J., O80945.
Knox, Thomas J., O80947.
Koch, Harlan G., O28725.
Koehl, Leonard H., O80949.
Kramer, William W., O58281.
Kren, Robert E., O28277.
Krieger, Marvin G., O59657.
Krueger, Richard F., O84642.
La Mar, Andrew W., Jr., O28240.
LaRock, Ralph I., O28159.
Ladd, James Von K., O28464.
Lamb, Robert J., Jr., O28667.
Lampert, Ernest R., O80127.
Landis, Benjamin L., Jr., O27963.
Lane, Robert W., O80955.
Lassiter, George L., O80957.
Lathrop, Robert M., O60109.
Lavin, Peter E., O82039.
Lawson, Wayne E., O28450.
LeVant, William S., O80964.
Leavitt, Albert M., O28218.
Lee, Robert V., Jr., O27974.
Lehman, Raimon W., O56586.
Lehman, Raymond G., Jr., O56621.
Leininger, Daniel M., O27992.
Lennon, Eugene F., Jr., O80963.
Lenzner, Robert E., O28082.
Leonard, Robert T., O80965.
Leonard, Robert W., O80966.
Lepski, Theodore J., O28571.
Lewelling, Billy R., O80968.
Lewin, Edward H., O80970.
Lewis, Jack K., O80971.
Lewis, William W., Jr., O28433.
Lincoln, William T., O28161.
Lind, Ralph W., O80972.
Link, Roger J., O80974.
Lochrie, Arthur J., Jr., O28142.
Long, William F., Jr., O80984.
Longsworth, Ned V., O82044.
Loome, James R., O28383.
Lopez, Fernando, O80987.
Lovrien, John G., O70105.
Lumia, Salvatore A., O80991.
Lunceford, Roy L., O80992.
Mabry, J. P., O80995.
MacDonald, Malcolm E., O28701.
MacPherson, William J., O80141.
Madigan, William, O81001.
Malley, Robert J., O27978.
Manes, Donald L., Jr., O58282.
March, Robert L., O28101.
Martin, James M., O81015.
Martin, Samuel R., O28044.
Marvel, Edgar E., O84871.
Mathias, John R., O28042.
Matteson, Jack F., O28221.
Mattingly, Howard, O80144.
Mattox, Walter S., O28592.
Maxwell, Benjamin B., Jr., O82048.
McCain, John W., O84458.
McCandless, Clarence E., O81023.
McCarty, Charles F., O28715.
McChristian, Clarence E., Jr., O28504.
McClain, Wallis E., O81024.
McCluskey, Joseph E., O85348.
McCollam, William, Jr., O27896.
McDonough, Charles J., O81030.
McDonough, John D. H., O28183.
McFadden, John J., O84647.
McGarity, James M., O28406.
McTague, Norman S., O81041.
McWhorter, John C., O28148.
Meerbott, Joseph O., Jr., O28352.
Meeting, Herbert, Jr., O60110.
Melton, Paul E., O82060.
Mendenhall, Clarence M., 3d, O28728.
Menefee, Robert G., Jr., O81043.
Mewborn, Needham P., O28645.
Michau, Herbert J., O76897.
Midgett, Garland H., O81047.
Miles, James S., O81048.
Miller, Francis D., O81051.
Miller, George L., O28013.
Miller, John E., O81053.
Miller, Judson F., O38518.
Miller, Lawrence, O28081.
Miller, Leo J., O28011.
Miller, William B., O81054.
Milton, Thornton M., O28032.
Mishtowt, Basil I., O81057.
Mock, Alfred J., O81062.
Monroe, Ernest M., Jr., O38497.
Montague, Jack H., O28625.
Montgomery, Robert A., O28697.
Montondo, Robert D., O82064.
Moore, Carl G., O59455.
Moore, Clarence A., O81066.
Moore, Sterlin C., O84061.

Morefield, William J., O81071.
Morgan, David C., O83610.
Morgan, John P., O81072.
Moriarty, Daniel R., O28607.
Moriarty, Richard L., O50440.
Morley, Harrison A., O83611.
Morris, Edward LeR., O76899.
Morris, Jack W., O28646.
Morris, James H., O81074.
Mosgrove, George G., O81077.
Muir, George C., Jr., O28457.
Munson, Orville O., O81080.
Murphy, Arthur A., O27951.
Murphy, James M., O81082.
Murphy, Wallace S., O63174.
Musser, Robert A., O76901.
Myer, Charles R., O28091.
Newell, Joseph C., O84877.
Nichols, Wayne S., O27999.
Nicholson, Charles A., O81089.
Nick, James T., O82070.
Nishimura, Bert N., O81094.
Novy, James F., O81098.
Nye, Roger H., O28010.
O'Brien, John A., O81100.
O'Brient, Lex E., O76903.
Ochs, Elmer R., O28547.
O'Conner, Patrick J., O28509.
Odom, Alton C., O81101.
Olk, Henry J., Jr., O60115.
Olson, Clifford A., O81107.
Olson, Harry H., O81108.
O'Neil, Donald S., O59837.
O'Neill, Carroll R., O28505.
Ost, Lincoln E., O84655.
Otte, George F., Jr., O28164.
Owen, Thomas S., O28544.
Padgett, Jerry E., O81117.
Pagano, Stephen J., O28463.
Palmatier, Francis M., O28684.
Pankowski, Bernard J., O27925.
Pannell, Napoleon B., O80159.
Pardee, Robert E., O81120.
Pardue, Thomas W., Jr., O28576.
Park, Joseph D., O28597.
Parker, John G., O28250.
Parker, William C., O28140.
Parmly, Eleazar, 4th, O28423.
Parsons, Othal T., O80162.
Patterson, Dallas M., O81124.
Patterson, Edwin F., O84656.
Patterson, Robert F., O28302.
Patton, George S., O28685.
Paull, Joseph K., O81127.
Peck, James M., O76907.
Peck, James N., O83614.
Pence, Arthur W., Jr., O28440.
Pence, William F., O28112.
Pendergrass, Billy P., O27985.
Pennington, Ralph H., O27927.
Pepe, Joseph P., O28471.
Perkins, John, 3d, O27931.
Persons, Wilton B., Jr., O27975.
Perwich, Alexander D., O28193.
Peters, David M., O28581.
Petrone, Rocco A., O27972.
Pfauth, Eugene V., O28256.
Pfeiffer, John V., O81134.
Philips, David E., O81136.
Philips, Robert H., O28708.
Phillips, Merton H., O84659.
Philopena, Raymond C., O82078.
Pierce, Charles S., O27888.
Pilant, Joseph L., O81141.
Pohl, Richard S., O28374.
Pomerantz, Reuben, O28261.
Porcella, Arthur D., O58742.
Post, Jack H., O83615.
Potter, Carleton F., O81146.
Potter, Donald V., O60170.
Poulin, Paul R., O81148.
Powell, Charles J., O85363.
Powers, E. Lloyd, O28045.
Prater, Robert M., O38507.
Price, Herbert H., O81153.
Price, John T., Jr., O28369.
Prost, Louis J., O76908.
Provenzano, Thomas G., O28346.
Quantz, Raoul J., O28169.
Quig, Clayton A., O81156.
Quillian, Eugene L., O84462.
Rasula, George A., O81161.
Ranck, Roger L., O84663.
Rea, Everett L., O28415.
Redding, William V., O81166.
Reeder, William T., O28540.
Reese, Thomas H., O62992.
Reeve, John D., O81169.
Regn, Elmer M., O76909.
Reiss, Matthew W., O56659.
Reitan, Robert V., O76910.
Reynolds, Clifford H., O81172.
Reynolds, Eugene F., O81173.
Rheault, Robert B., O28111.
Rheuark, George DeL., O82085.
Rhodes, Howard D., O50525.
Rice, Herman R., O81176.
Richards, William G., O28460.
Richmond, Robert T., Jr., O28525.
Richter, Francis A., O28347.
Riggsby, Raymond M., O80174.
Riordan, Frank J., Jr., O76911.
Roberts, Gene A., O41349.
Robinson, Elisha M., Jr., O28541.
Robinson, Gerald E., O81186.
Rock, Warren V., O81187.
Rogers, Guy A., O28207.
Rogers, Joseph B., O28233.
Rogers, Selwyn P., Jr., O27991.
Rolfe, Richard L., O82088.
Roller, Harry N., O85447.
Ross, Charles C., O56661.
Rothwell, Joseph B., O84886.
Rouillard, Irving G., O28177.
Rowland, Hampton, Jr., O38512.
Roxbury, Edward J., Jr., O28075.
Ruble, Richard L., O28695.
Rufsvold, Robert M., O27983.
Rumney, Mason P., Jr., O28024.
Rush, Robert I., O28660.
Russell, Lester F., O81195.
Sadler, John A., O28743.
Sandoval, Richard R., O28017.
Sanger, Marshall, O28327.
Saucier, Robert H., O84464.
Saunders, Edward A., O27904.
Saylor, Paul, O84063.
Schaffer, Donald C., O38231.
Scharre, William F., Jr., O28085.
Scharth, Otto P., O41337.
Schmid, William K., O83620.
Schneider, William P., O27979
Schoen, Frank C., O28590.
Schug, Willis E., Jr., O28039.
Schulke, Herbert A., Jr., O28014.
Seaman, Robert W., O28668.
Seeber, William T., O28306.
Senior, Winfred B., O56588.
Setzer, Allen L., O81212.
Shade, Leslie N., Jr., O28698.
Shaper, William O81214.
Sharkoff, Eugene G., O28224.
Shattuck, Amos B., 4th, O28146.
Sheffer, George E., Jr., O28120.
Sheffield, Robert X., O28734.
Shelton, Fields E., O28600.
Shircliff, Robert G., O84670.
Shoaff, Alomon L., O27866.
Shoemaker, Robert M., O28097.
Shroyer, James L., O81219.
Shultz, John M., O28341.
Siegrist, Robert H., O39475.
Silcox, Marshall W., O84671.
Simkins, Roy G., Jr., O28560.
Simmet, Kenneth D., O81222.
Simmons, Charles J., O28133.
Simpson, Charles M., 3d, O27957.
Simpson, John E., O28196.
Simpson, William C. S., O28381.
Sinclair, Christopher B., Jr., O28265.
Sine, Robert R., O81225.
Sitler, Henry O., O81227.
Skelley, James L., O81230.
Skemp, Samuel C., Jr., O28210.
Skidmore, William F., O81231.
Smith, Charles R., O50542.
Smith, Chester R., O76918.
Smith, David H., O27903.
Smith, William R., O28562.
Smith, William S., O38509.
Smythe, Harry C., Jr., O28107.
Sniffin, Charles R., O50437.
Snyder, Arthur F., Jr., O81243.
Snyder, Harry A., O81244.
Sousa, Joseph M., O84673.
Sovern, Charles, O81247.
Sowards, Melvin J., O39473.
Spitzer, Joseph B., O81252.
Sprague, Elmer G., O28555.
Sprinkle, Homer R., O84466.
Stanfield, Norman T., O27945.
Stannard, John E., O28442.
Stapleton, Thomas J., O28285.
Stark, Charles L., O50451.
Stark, Leroy W., O84675.
Starner, Ralph A., O28482.
Steele, Robert L., O28429.
Steen, Kenneth J., O28050.
Sterling, John E., O27952.
Sterling, Thomas M., O59655.
Stevenson, Leland L., O76919.
Stirling, Harold J., O28182.
Stogsdill, Charles H., O82105.
Stone, William L., 3d, O28538.
Storm, Robert W., O28742.
Stovall, Thomas L., O50512.
Street, Oliver D., 3d, O28053.
Streiff, Richard W., O28060.
Strelecki, Joseph L., Jr., O50468.
Strever, John E., Jr., O81264.
Stroud, William R., O28201.
Strube. Richard L., O82106.
Sullivan, John F., O81267.
Sumner, Gordon, Jr., O38489.
Supplee, Charles R. H., O27924.
Svilar, Matthew, O81270.
Talbot, James S., O58082.
Tasker, Clayton B., O57966.
Tassey, George, O38348.
Taylor, Raleigh O., O76922.
Taylor, William W., O81276.
Terrell, Harold A., Jr., O28132.
Terry, Dudley K., O50076.
Terry, Walter C., O81280.
Tessieri, Philip J., O81281.
Thayer, Raymond E., O28275.
Thomasset, William K., O27943.
Thomas, Charles M., O81282.
Thomas, Eldridge, O81283.
Thomas, James D., O76923.
Thomas, Robert L., O84467.
Thomas, William H., O84678.
Thompson, John G., O81288.
Thornton, Samuel B., O81290.
Throckmorton, Elbert S., O28339.
Thurman, John R., 3d, O28225.
Tidler, Calvin LeR., O81292.
Tixier, Lewis B., O28276.
Tongue, Robert C., O27635.
Toohey, James B., O80196.
Torgerson, Allan C., O28619.
Traber, Oscar W., Jr., O28030.
Treadwell, John R., O27976.
Trost, Leonard E., O80197.
Trotter, William H., O28246.
Tuck, Richard C., O27955.
Tucker, Harlan W., O28153.
Tully, Robert B., O28678.
Van Auken, Kennth C., O28168.
Van Buskirk, Lawrence E., O81307.
Van Deusen, Edwin R., O28425.
Vance, Jasper C., Jr., O56715.
Vega, Antonio, O85275.
Ver Hey, William J., O81309.
Vickers, John D., O82116.
Victor, Alfred H., Jr., O27938.
Vinet, William C., Jr., O61194.
Viney, George C., O38516.
Vohs, Ralph H., O76926.
Von Der Bruegge, John, Jr., O38523.
Wagner, Robert T., O28232.
Wagoner, Ray M., Jr., O27940.
Waitt, Thomas M., O50475.
Waldman, Myron, O81310.
Walker, Sam S., O28197.
Wallace, James L., O81313.
Wallace, Josiah A., Jr., O28297.
Wallis, Matthew R., O28068.
Walpole, James R., O38579.
Walsh, Joseph A., O76928.
Walters, Jesse L., O81314.
Warner, Jack W., O81316.
Warrick, Fred A., O81317.

Wary, William D., O81318.
Watkins, Norman C., O28131.
Watson, Donald S., O28316.
Webb, George S., Jr., O28015.
Webb, Harold J., O81322.
Webb, William H., O28263.
Weber, Edwin L., Jr., O28178.
Weinstein, Marvin S., O28149.
Welch, James C., Jr., O28367.
Wells, Thomas M., Jr., O59453.
Wesolowsky, Charles L., O28704.
Westfall, Chester C., Jr., O50489.
Westman, John P., O81327.
Wheeler, Percy L., O28301.
White, Eston T., O84686.
White, James T., Jr., O85389.
White, Loren H., O84470.
Whitehead, Kenneth, O38364.
Whitener, William J., O28041.
Whittington, Jere O., O28411.
Wieben, John D., O82122.
Wieringa, John S., Jr., O28644.
Wildrick, Richard M., O28019.
Willets, Robert T., O81338.
Williams, Benjamin B., O28515.
Williams, Charles T., O27923.
Williams, Jay B., O81340.
Williams, Lawrence H., O58740.
Williams, Robert H., O81341.
Wilson, Minter L., Jr., O28244.
Wilson, Penrhyn, Jr., O84690.
Winfree, Robert T., Jr., O28189.
Winkler, Carl E., O58081.
Winstead, Richard S., O81352.
Wirrick, James E., O28529.
Wiss, John W., O28154.
Wolf, Duquesne A., O28187.
Wolf, John F., O58801.
Wolff, Herbert E., O39485.
Wood, Allen H., 3d, O28672.
Woods, Harris H., O28190.
Wray, William R., O27949.
Wright, Lyle H., O81356.
Wynne, Albert K., O81357.
Yates, Eames L., O50350.
Young, William H., O28333.
Zanin, John B., O81360.
Zimmerman, Albert C., O82130.
Zurek, Charles M., O81364.

To be majors, Chaplain

Andrews, Joseph R., O70250.
Barrett, William P., O67551.
Gefell, Gerard J., O63103.
Griffin, Johnson L., O76791.
Harms, Erhard H., O68818.
Helt, James W., O66161.
Jones, Joseph W., O79685.
Kapusta, Emil F. J., O66171.
McKenney, Ora H., Jr., O60751.
Morrill, James W., O66184.
Sperring, David H., O70513.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Brinegar, Maurine O., L531.
Mason, Harriet M., L556.
Moon, Lou A., L535.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Cranston, Robert, O1588498.
Dunn, John F., O2009677.
Goodwin, Felix L., O2039173.
Johnson, Charles W., Jr., O2046315.
Johnson, Vernon G., O2012785.
Kerns, Merlin C., O1030051.
Reeder, James R., O1284396.
Sullivan, Sardis M., O2032320.

To be captains

Bodman, Walter J., Jr., O2014513.
Briercheck, Raymond D., O442890.
Buddee, Rudolph S., O1115507.
Cook, Robert W., O1338442.
di Lorenzo, David L., O2206672.
Garcia, Roberto V., O2207472.
Henry, Fredrick S., O2005175.
Hoffman, Alan C., O2265212.
Lewis, Vernon B., Jr., O1924633.
Martin, Sidney E., O1893951.
McIntosh, James C., O2000605.
Millican, Henry D., O2206127.
Murry, George S., O1931018.
Otto, Charles B., O1035959.
Overby, Lauren M., O2263740.
Poulnot, James O., O1887032.
Sheffield, James A., Jr., O1297262.
Whiting, Howell T., O995915.

To be first lieutenants

Adamson, George F., O1940679.
Argo, James W., O2104242.
Augur, George M., O4002828.
Backus, Richard J., O4010878.
Burnham, Charles A., O4026967.
Collins, Braxton W., O2003516.
Davis, Thomas C., O2283733.
Ginish, Michael, Jr., O4010499.
Grundvig, Daniel A., O1925917.
Gundaker, Frank J., O4052495.
Gwin, Walter C., O4009478.
Hamberlin, Lawrence M., Jr., O4024169.
Haynes, Harvey R., O4010736.
Horan, Michael J., O4023070.
Huntley, James E., Jr., O4030979.
Hutchens, Douglas L., O2205913.
Jones, Ed E., Jr., O2276610.
Leister, Richard W., O4001986.
Lespasio, Neal A., O2275933.
Locke, Jimmie M., O4009087.
Phillips, Morgan L., Jr., O4026183.
Pretti, John R., O4031421.
Radtke, William P., O4030835.
Smith, Kenneth W., O4036453.
Vernau, William F., O4005387.
Williams, William S., O1877966.
Wright, Edward S., O4071884.

To be second lieutenants

Ankenman, Harold D., O5502162.
Armistead, John W.
Austin, Ralph A., Jr., O4037383.
Babineaux, Sigmund G., O5401147.
Bane, Wista F., Jr., O4070013.
Barbe, Charles D., O5202118.
Benson, William L., Jr., O5200354.
Blandino, Walter E., O406740.
Brackett, John R., O4084646.
Cohan, Morton D., O4065027.
Cross, George B., O5404634.
Crowl, Gilbert W., O2287664.
Crowl, Ronald C., O5203471.
Daniel, William D., Jr., O5301955.
Dikes, Billie N., O5401564.
Donegan, Alfred W., O5305414.
Featherstone, Edward M., O5206558.
French, Charles J., O5400639.
Friedman, Robert G., O4041622.
Glasgow, William L., O4059198.
Goetz, John A., O4061176.
Gordon, Bob F., O5400334.
Hannen, William M., O4069570.
Hart, James E., Jr., O5301971.
Hayton, Samuel L., O5201875.
Hedrick, Robert C., O5304722.
Ivers, Larry E., O5301978.
Kneiss, Richard F., O5203776.
Levy, James A., O4038129.
Liebel, James J., O5401184.
Llewellyn, Marvin D., O5300476.
Lovinggood, Jerry L., O5411081.
Loyd, David R., O5400985.
Magee, Michael H., O5202756.
Mann, Hal G., O5402161.
Marshall, Richard H., O5302963.
Matheson, Edgar M., O4075835.
McAllister, James H., O5203594.
Medford, Dillard E., O4043628.
Mickey, Joseph G., O5201116.
Morin, Raymond J., Jr., O4085434.
Mudd, William C., Jr., O4034376.
Mullins, Lawrence E., O4041770.
Norberg, William G., O4065570.
Padgett, Lary W., O4072054.
Portier, Gerald C., O4071668.
Provine, Carl R., O2289383.
Ray, Richard M., O4066304.
Riscassi, Robert W., O4085535.
Royal, Eugene S., O5400140.
Ryan, John J., O4064621.
Sanchez, Reynaldo, O5400619.
Sanders, Reuben L., O4070496.
Smart, Lee D., O5702506.
Smith, Donald R., O4069449.
Spears, Phillip M., O4026087.
Telfer, Jon R., O5503377.
Tucker, Robert C., O5503933.
Wakeland, Edward W., O4061863.
Warren, Larkin P., Jr., O5403507.
Webb, James R., O2277074.
Webster, Garah L., O5201914.
Whitmarsh, Donald B., O5402196.
Wilson, James F., O5402124.
Wise, Joseph R., O4077241.
Wortman, Marvin T., O5504798.
Zoeller, Robert J., O4052334.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3294, 3291, 3292, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be captains

Andrews, Dale H., DC, O2211141.
Babcock, Richard J., MC, O5003133.
Betz, Peter K., DC, O2270541.
Birge, Jack E., MC, O4064573.
Blair, Lawrence C., MC.
Bloch, Malcolm H., MC, O4071151.
Brandenburg, James H., MC, O2283436.
Brust, Raymond W., Jr., MC, O2282654.
Chamberlin, Martin R., MC, O2041630.
Daniels, John C., MC, O5003102.
Davis, Paul, MC, O996736.
Eagan, Clement D., DC., O4073303.
Ettelson, Donald M., MC, O5003235.
Fitzgerald, Robert E., MC, O5500729.
Fogle, Harold W., MC, O4077967.
Galaszewski, Stanley M., MC.
Gallo, Anthony E., Jr., MC, O5003112.
Garrett, James J., DC, O4051073.
Gleason, Raleigh R., Jr., MC, O5407599.
Gradoville, Paul, DC, O2276864.
Graham, Gene O., MC, O1883234.
Grogan, William W., DC, O2274524.
Hensley, Donald T., MC.
Hersperger, Webb S., MC, O4071087.
Hofbauer, Thomas A., MC, O5500025.
Holland, Robert D., MC, O5500427.
Hose, Gene C. DC, O4069539.
Hovde, DeLarry R., MC, O5003066.
Humma, Gerard T., MC, O4071164.
Hummer, Lloyd M., MC, O2283882.
Jewett, George A., MC, O5701218.
Joseph, Ramon R., MC, O4065256.
LaBarber, Jerauld J., MC, O1875449.
Landolfe, Frank R., DC, O4069551.
Layman, David E., DC, O4069947.
Legters, Llewellyn J., MC, O4071057.
Linnemann, Roger E., MC, O2279361.
Luttrull, John W., MC.
MacDonnell, John C., Jr., MC, O5500180.
MacGarvie, Elizabeth E., ANC, N753855.
Martin, James E., DC, O4043750.
May, Russell L., MC, O5500139.
Mayer, Carl P., Jr., DC, O2276875.
McDermott Michael J., DC, O4069846.
McGinty, John B., MC, O2291725.
McLean, Malcolm, MC, O5301067.
Mittemeyer, Bernhard T., MC, O5701313.
Morelli, Robert J., MC, AO3078121.
Parris, Sam H., DC, O975678.
Paul, Parks S., DC, O2267484.
Puzynski, Donald L., MC, O4071162.
Reid, Robert L., MC, O5200566.
Rieth, Robert D., MC, O2296226.
Salveson, Lawrence C., MC, O5701288.
Saunders, George M., DC, O2201573.
Shelton, Marvin L., MC, O1891873.
Smith, John E., MC, O5500082.
Stribley, Orrin R. J., Jr., JAGC, O2272592.
Strong, Wilbur W., DC, O5202792.
Tompkins, Forrest G., MC, O1877404.

To be first lieutenants

Bagg, Raymond J., Jr., MC, O4036590.
Collins, Dewey F., ANC, N805352.

Cooper, Neill S., Jr., MC, O2289691.
Daly, Anthony F., Jr., MC, O4036773.
Dilworth, John H., MC, O2289832.
Dobbs, Robert M., Jr., MC, O2289833.
Donovan, James M., MC, O4017688.
Evans, Carvel H., MC, O4051242.
Franger, Alfred L., MC, O4024772.
Frick, Ross T., MC, O2289924.
Halaby, Fouad A., MC, O2295076.
Hebertson, Richard M., MC.
Heisterkamp, Charles A., III, MC, O4047638.
Herrick, Clyde N., MC, O4027168.
Johnson, Herbert F., MC, O4043821.
Kutait, Kemal E., MC, O1942140.
Lopez, Ramon E., MC, O4028481.
Murphy, William K., MC, O2289726.
Neil, Alexander L., MC, O2290056.
Nuss, Donald D., MC, O2289707.
O'Rear, John W., MC, O2287786.
Parker, Charles E., MC, O4069825.
Pitcher, James L., MC, O2295020.
Pollard, Richard A., MC, O2289710.
Rupp, Richard N., MC, O4047636.
Torp, Richard P., MC, O2290121.
Weiss, Fred H., MC.
Wettlaufer, John N., MC, O2290162.
Zurek, Robert C., MC, O2291343.

To be second lieutenants

Bigelow, Charles R., MSC, O5403468.
Eason, Lloyd J., Jr., MSC, O5702068.
Gohl, Roger M., MSC, O2296644.
Helser, Carl W., MSC, O5507272.
Milske, Thomas R., MSC, O2296672.
Sites, William G., MSC, O2296652.
Upham, Robert W., Jr., MSC, O4085822.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Brady, Patrick H.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Addison, Charles S.
Andrews, John D.
Banyas, Michael
Beakey, Danny J.
Bizic, Peter, Jr.
Black, Joe D.
Blank, Richard A., Jr.
Brown, Robert C.
Butt, Herbert H., Jr.
Cacolice, John P.
Camp, Junius W., Jr.
Campbell, Ronald E.
Canales, Fred
Carberry, James A.
Carolan, James M.
Cassidy, Denis L.
Cheatham, Fred C.
Daniel, Noah D.
Dassonville, Curtis R.
Downing, David A.
Eaddy, Vanik S.
Elliott, Thomas L.
Evans, Charles H.
Fager, Leland E.
Feaster, Donald R.
Forbes, Bruce L.
Franklin, George G., Jr.
Garcia, Amador
Greenlee, Glenn C.
Goodall, Ralph E., Jr.
Hanson, Wayne A.
Harrison, George R.
Houle, John L.
Hudgens, Larry G.
King, Eugene S.
Kress, Carl F.
Lewis, Cleophus C.
Lewis, Larry M.
Lyons, Daniel J., Jr.
McKnight, James G.
McPhaul, Malcolm G.
Miller, Terry M.
Moody, John W., Jr.
Moore, Emmett
Nicholson, Harold L.
Pattison, Hal W.
Polzello, Carmine R.
Powell, Nick, Jr.
Rice, Bert L.
Santer, Richard A.
Scarangella, Frank H.
Schmidt, Jackie E.
Scott, Ernest K.
Sellers, Robert P.
Shaw, Gene C.
Sherman, Earl T.
Short, Edward A.
Sibley, John L., Jr.
Simon, Benjamin J.
Sweet, Wayne A.
Touhey, Thomas J., Jr.
Trandel, Richard S.
Vargosko, Michael A.
Volponi, Anthony A.
Williams, John S.
Willis, Jerry T.
Zoller, Harvey F.

The following-named officer for appointment as registrar, U.S. Military Academy, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 4331 and 4333, as amended by Public Law 85-600.

Day, Robert S., O26490.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 13, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker.

JULY 13, 1959.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Dr. Lester L. Haws, First Methodist Church, Yonkers, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, source of all strength, wisdom, and courage, we turn to Thee in our need. We thank Thee that Thou art the provider of all things and the director of the destinies of man. We praise Thy name that in this universe Thou hast made man to have dominion over all things.

When we think of our responsibilities we are overwhelmed. When we think of the complexities of our problems our souls quail within us. At such moments we thank Thee that Thou art our strength. Though covered by the dark clouds of human failure we catch sight of Thee, O God, standing, "in the shadows, keeping watch above Thine own."

Abide with the Members of the House of Representatives that in each moment of difficult decision they may be aware of Thy presence—helping them to formulate their thought for good, molding their decisions that they may express the right—so that the ultimate result of Government may be the enrichment of life for all its citizens.

We pray in the spirit of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 9, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, 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. 3460. An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. COOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced 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. 7509. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies in the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7500) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, CARNAHAN, ZABLOCKI, CHIPERFIELD, and JUDD.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 1120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary and subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit this week during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health and Safety of the Committee

on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 11 OF THE CLAYTON ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, S. 726, to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes, and agree to the Senate amendments to the House amendment. These amendments were made by the Senate to clarify and correct two clerical errors:

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendment, as follows:

On page 5, line 3, the phrase "or other," which is a duplication, is deleted; and on page 5, line 10, the words "for time" are stricken and "forth the" are inserted in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if this has been cleared with the minority members.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, it has.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendment were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOME WISE AND MODERATE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATION OF THE ACTIONS OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the able subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services is currently investigating the actions of retired military, naval, and civilian personnel in connection with the awarding of defense contracts. This is an important investigation and one to which great public interest has been attached. It is important that the deliberations of the subcommittee be carried out in such a way as not to impair our national defense in the face of a great and continuing Soviet threat.

In that connection I would like to bring to the attention of the House some very thoughtful, helpful, and moderate recommendations as to the course of the inquiry which the subcommittee should follow offered by the very distinguished military critic of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, which appeared in that great newspaper on July 7, 1959. The article follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON EX-OFFICERS—HOUSE INQUIRY INTO MUNITIONS LOBBY EXPECTED TO FOCUS ON JOBS IN DEFENSE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

An investigation into an alleged munitions lobby by a House committee, which starts today, will center on the conflict-of-interest laws governing the employment of retired officers.

The study will be conducted by a Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services. Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat of Louisiana, heads the subcommittee. Its scope, unlike that of the far-reaching, politically tinged investigations of the so-called merchants of death in the early 1930's, is expected to be somewhat restricted.

The subcommittee's advance billings emphasize that major attention will be paid to the problem of retired officers who hold jobs with defense industries. The somewhat unfair implications of this concentration of the retired officer have been tempered by Mr. HÉBERT. He did this by announcing that he expected to extend his investigation to include former Federal civilian employees and former Congressmen in defense jobs.

There is, nevertheless, a danger that some Congressmen, piqued over recent exposures of congressional nepotism, may distort and reduce the value of an investigation that should be far broader than a conflict-of-interest study. Defense industry, particularly the aircraft and missile industry, is a multibillion-dollar business. Hundreds of thousands of people, entire towns and regions and whole industries are now wholly or largely dependent upon defense contracts.

Government-owned arsenals and laboratories complement industries that in many respects are privately owned in form, but could not exist without public moneys in the form of contracts, loans, fast tax write-offs, and other forms of Government aid.

COMPETITION ON WEAPONS

In some case the two forms of defense facilities—the wholly owned Government arsenal, and the privately owned, Government-supported industry—have vied with each other in the manufacture of competing weapons systems. Thus, it was not only service pride and sponsorship that played a role in the rivalry between the Air Force Thor and the Army Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missiles. Competition between the arsenal concept and the privately owned but Government-supported industry, also played a part.

The pressures generated within the Pentagon and in Washington by the billions of dollars expended annually for defense are enormous and have been growing. Hence the charge of a munitions lobby.

Local chambers of commerce, municipal and State officials, labor unions, industrial associations, the industries concerned, and the Congressmen representing the affected areas all combine to exert pressures in favor of their own areas.

A CALL TO ARMS

When a missile may be threatened with cancellation or cutback, the call to arms is like a tocsin.

The missile's value is advertised—sometimes at the expense of the taxpayer. Congressional delegations and public opinion are mobilized, and economic bogeymen are invoked. Calm, nonpartisan, and technical judgments become difficult.

Therefore, the conflict-of-interest statutes involving retired service officers constitute far too narrow a frame for the pending investigation, as Mr. HÉBERT is undoubtedly aware. So far, however, congressional discussion of the problem has focused attention only upon this phase of the problem.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, for instance, has produced a list of 721 retired officers who are employed by 88 companies that have defense contracts. An accompanying statement by the Democratic Senator had overtones that seemed to imply some sinister intent lay behind the facts.

It is possibe that some of these officers have utilized their service associations too zealously on behalf of their employers.

Yet Mr. HÉBERT's investigation will show that existing conflict-of-interest laws discriminate against the retired service officer. In the first place, none of them can work—after retirement—for other Government departments without giving up their service retirement pay.

By this provision of the law, the Government loses the services of able men who still have contributions to make in the fields of administration, technology, intelligence, and other skills.

RULE HELD DISCRIMINATORY

In the second place, existing laws single out retired officers of the regular uniformed services—but not retired members of the reserve components—for special discriminatory treatment not accorded any other type of Federal employee.

The retired regular officer is subject not only to the criminal code that contains provisions to punish those who conspire against the Government's best interests and are guilty of fraud, liberty, or deceit. He is also subject to a plethora of other laws, regulations and decisions of the Comptroller General. Many of these inhibitions are dated by the years or were passed decades ago to cover special circumstances now ended.

There is also discrimination within the services. A retired Navy or Marine Corps officer, for instance, is more severely restricted in terms of his private employment than an Army or Air Force officer.

Mr. HÉBERT's committee, therefore, can do the Nation a service if it keeps its investigation in perspective. It should recognize that the retired officer is only a very small part of a much bigger problem; that the retired officer's services are needed both by industry and government; that very few, if any, are guilty of any improper acts, and that a clarification, modernization and codification of the conflict-of-interests laws and regulations—with discrimination eliminated—is in the public interest.

CASTRO HAVING TROUBLES OF HIS OWN

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an editorial concerning one Ralph McGill. Everybody in my neck of the woods knows McGill and his left-wing tendencies. McGill, unfortunately, has finagled Washington's best newspaper to subscribe to his daily column. I think this is because the Washington Star had never been accused of being one-sided. Despite McGill, the Star possesses some of the best correspondents in the Nation.

McGill is now in the process of trying to sell Fidel Castro to America. Castro hates this Government like the Devil hates holy water. Castro is up to his

neck with fellow travelers and may not be a Communist, but his brother positively is. At the Communist Congress in Moscow early this year Cuba was cited as one country that carried out the program of the Communist Party in its revolution against Batista. This was no accident. Castro's brother Raul was trained in Russia, and he still has Russians assisting him in Cuba.

Back to Ralph McGill. McGill is trying his best to embellish Castro. This is one job that McGill will find difficult. Castro is giving this country the very devil because his defecting chief of air force is here telling the security committee of the other body something about Castro and that Communists had riddled the Castro setup. Well, you do not have to know anything about Castro. Castro is what he is. Either a Communist or just about 99.44 percent Communist. I suggest McGill direct his talents to explaining to the American people why the American Society of Newspaper Editors invited Castro to this country and how much it cost the taxpayers of this Nation to provide Castro with security.

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., July 11, 1959]

ATLANTA EDITOR MCGILL WHITEWASHES RED ELEMENTS IN CASTRO'S CUBA

Ralph McGill, liberal editor of the Atlanta Constitution, is visiting Cuba. His dispatches from Fidel Castro's country show that Mr. McGill didn't forget his whitewash equipment when he packed his traveling kit.

Mr. McGill has written articles that apply several coats of whitewash to the Castro regime. In the face of strong evidence to the contrary, Mr. McGill says the Communist element in the Castro government "is not large." The junior officer group in the army, Mr. McGill says, "includes a few Communists and others who have made the old error of thinking the Communist party safely can be included in a popular front."

Though more than 500 Cubans have been shot by firing squads after trials before kangaroo courts, Mr. McGill says: "This is by no means a police state."

He also excuses Castro's unwillingness to hold elections.

"Until there is more stability and the emergence of an opposition," Mr. McGill asserts, "it is more honest not to have a free election."

We wonder whether Ralph McGill has considered the question of how there can be an opposition when Castro opponents are shot or chased from the country.

In giving a clean bill of health to the Castro government, Mr. McGill runs counter to facts in the public record and to reports of able anti-Communist observers. U.S. News & World Report recently documented widespread Communist influence in Cuba's new regime.

We hope that Mr. McGill will stop in Miami before returning to Atlanta. He might talk with Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, former head of the Cuban Air Force under Castro, who was forced to flee July 1 after charging Red infiltration in his country's armed forces. For bringing this matter to the attention of Fidel Castro, Major Diaz was charged with treason.

Speaking in Miami, Major Diaz said:

"I consider all these actions against me due exclusively to the fact that I have always opposed acts that would permit Communists to take prominent positions within the rebel army and within dependencies of the Government."

We cite the McGill whitewash because U.S. citizens must not misunderstand what is taking place in Cuba. The events in that island republic could be more meaningful to the United States than the much-publicized talks at Geneva. If the Communists gain control of Cuba, the Caribbean might become a Red lake and the United States would have a Red satellite 200 miles from its shores.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District of Columbia day.

ST. ANN'S INFANT ASYLUM

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 7907) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate St. Ann's Infant Asylum, in the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1863, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill require the expenditure of any money from the Federal Treasury?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that it does not require a cent of expenditure on the part of the Federal taxpayers.

Mr. GROSS. This only has to do with an expansion of property; is that correct?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The bill does just three things. In the first place, it permits them to expand their property. It is a charitable organization, of course, and the bill will permit them to carry on their wonderful philanthropic activities outside of the District of Columbia. And, there is another provision to change the name.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not anticipate that in the future there will be any call for funds from the Federal Treasury as a result of this legislation?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is correct; I do not anticipate any expenditure of funds.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate Saint Ann's Infant Asylum, in the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 798), as amended by the Act of October 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 768), is further amended (1) by striking out "Saint Ann's Infant Asylum" and inserting in lieu thereof "Saint Ann's Infant and Maternity Home"; (2) by striking out "in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia,"; and (3) by striking out "not exceeding in value at any one time $1,000,000,".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, St. Ann's Infant Home was incorporated under a special act of Congress, approved March 3, 1863—12 Stat. 798. Since this time it has been operated as an infant's asylum in the District of Columbia and is presently located at 2200 California Street NW., which is at the corner of California Street and Phelps Place NW., Washington, D.C. The nature of the neighborhood in which St. Ann's is located precludes further expansion of its limited facilities, which expansion is most desirable due to the increase in its use as an infants' asylum as well as the fairly recent use of the facilities of the asylum for maternity cases. In an attempt to relieve the pressure for expansion, it has become apparent that it will be necessary to move the asylum into the suburbs, and at present a location just over the District line in Maryland is being given serious consideration. Construction on this site is now contemplated to exceed a total cost of $1 million.

The first paragraph of the original act of incorporation limited the value of the property which the corporation could hold at any one time to be $100,000. This limit was increased by the amendment of 1942—56 Stat. 768—to $1 million. Furthermore, this same paragraph limited the asylum's area of operation to the city of Washington, District of Columbia. Because of the increased facilities required and because it is apparent that these facilities must be placed outside the District of Columbia, and finally because of the necessary addition of maternity services to the asylum, it is deemed advisable to:

First. Remove the restrictions of $1 million on the value of the property that may be held by the asylum.

Second. Remove the limitation as to the location of the asylum to the city of Washington, District of Columbia.

Third. Change the name of the institution from St. Ann's Infant Asylum to St. Ann's Infant and Maternity Home.

REGULATING LIFE INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 7145) to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 35 of chapter III of the Act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An Act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia" (sec. 35–535, D.C. Code 1951 edition), as

amended, is amended by striking out the figure "40" in the first clause of subsection (5)(a) and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "33⅓".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the present law allows District of Columbia domestic life insurance companies to make first mortagage loans on real estate worth at least 40 percent more than the amount loaned. This means that a mortgage loan may amount to as much as 71.4 percent of the full value of the real estate by which the loan is secured. The proposed amendment would allow mortgage loans up to 75 percent of the full value of the real estate. This is accomplished by changing the statutory provision to allow domestic life insurance companies to make mortgage loans on real estate provided the real estate is worth at least 33⅓ percent more than the amount loaned. This requires only that the present figure, 40 percent in the statute, be changed to 33⅓ percent.

Seventy-five percent mortgage loans, under current mortgage lending practices, are in demand by borrowers and are safe investments for life insurance companies. In at least 11 States, including Maryland and the States of domicile of the largest companies, the insurance laws allow life insurance companies to make 75 percent mortgage loans. This creates a substantial disadvantage for the District companies in competing for many prime loans. The proposed amendment will correct this disadvantage.

The amendment has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Superintendent of Insurance, the domestic life insurance companies, and the Washington Board of Trade.

AMENDING ACT MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1911

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the Senate bill (S. 866) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1910, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in the law under consideration, 36 Statute 380, a provision for contingent and miscellaneous expenses, and reference is made to the maintenance of horses, carriages, and buggies in the District of Columbia. Does the gentleman not think that at some future time the Committee on the District of Columbia, while amending this law, they might propose striking out that provision since it has to do with the maintenance of horses, carriages, and buggies?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This reference to horses and buggies just sort of skipped my attention.

Mr. GROSS. I noticed in reading the bill that provision is still made for that purpose. Apparently, the horses and vehicles were once used for the transportation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Can the gentleman say whether horses and buggies are now used to transport the Commissioners on their rounds of official duties?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman is talking about the same bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am talking about the report accompanying the bill, S. 866, presently under consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As far as I know there are no horses used in the District of Columbia, in the Police Department, or elsewhere.

Mr. GROSS. There is no money in the bill, then, to shoe horses and maintain carriages and buggies?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; the horse and buggy days are pretty well over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second proviso of the first paragraph under the caption "CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES" of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eleven, and for other purposes", approved May 18, 1910 (36 Stat. 381; sec. 1–239, D.C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further,* That hereafter no department, board, office, or agency of the government of the District of Columbia shall include any illustration in any annual report prepared by it unless such illustration be authorized under order or regulation approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX EXEMPTION ACCORDED VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 7683) to provide that the tax exemption heretofore accorded the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to certain property in the District of Columbia, formerly owned by such organization but never used for its intended purpose, shall apply instead to other property subsequently acquired and used for that purpose, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia", approved July 19, 1954 (Public Law 510, Eighty-third Congress), is amended by striking out "the property situated in square 724 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lots 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, and 824" and inserting in lieu thereof "the property situated in square 757 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lots 38, 20, and 19".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO ASSOCIATION OF OLDEST INHABITANTS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 303) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized and directed to convey, without monetary consideration, to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, all right, title, and interest of the District of Columbia in and to the real property in the District of Columbia described in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The property referred to in the first section of this Act is part of lot 47 in square 1200 described as follows:

Beginning for the same on the south line of M Street at a point distant 127.50 feet west of the west line of Wisconsin Avenue and running thence east along the said south line of M Street 38.50 feet more or less to a point distant 89 feet west of the west line of Wisconsin Avenue, thence south 90 feet, thence west 38.50 feet, and thence 90 feet to the beginning:

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, immediately before the period at the end of the first section insert the following: ": *Provided,* That whenever the said real property no longer is occupied by the said Association for the purposes of said Association, all right, title, and interest of the said Association in and to such property shall revert to the District of Columbia.

"As used in this section the term 'purposes of said Association', means substantially the purposes of the said Association as they were set forth in the constitution and bylaws of said Association as of January 1, 1957, and such purposes shall be deemed to include the housing and care of such firefighting equipment belonging to the District of Columbia or to said Association as was being housed and cared for by said Association as of January 1, 1956. No conveyance pursuant to this

Act shall be effective until such time as there shall be filed with the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia a certified copy of said constitution and bylaws, and an itemization of said firefighting equipment approved by the said Board of Commissioners: *Provided,* That the said Board of Commissioners may, without effecting a reverter, withdraw from the custody of said Association such of the firefighting equipment as is the property of the District of Columbia."

On page 2, strike lines 3 through 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Beginning for the same at a point on the south line of M Street, said point of beginning being 127.50 feet west of the west line of Wisconsin Avenue; and running thence east along the south line of M Street 38.38 feet to the center line of the west wall of the premises 3208 M Street NW; thence in a southerly direction along the center line of said wall and a continuation thereof 90.0 feet; thence in a westerly direction along a line parallel to the south line of M Street 38.88 feet, more or less, to a point 127.50 feet west of the west line of Wisconsin Avenue; thence in a northerly direction 90.0 feet to the point of beginning: all as shown on plat of survey recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia in survey book 51, page 66."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the District of Columbia to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

The Association of the Oldest Inhabitants in the District of Columbia was forced to give up property, which they occupied, some time ago and now have an opportunity to acquire a piece of property that is owned by the District of Columbia government and is not used for any purpose whatsoever.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have agreed to deed this property to the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia in return for having given up quarters which they formerly occupied in an old engine house at 19th and H Streets NW.

The Commissioners are favorable to this legislation but suggest certain amendments to the bill which were written in by the subcommittee which considered this legislation and the full committee at the time it was reported so as to safeguard the rights of the District of Columbia whenever the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants no longer occupies the property for the purposes of the association. In other words at the time the title and the property will revert to the District of Columbia.

The other amendment written into the bill simply gives an accurate property description of the property being transferred by the bill.

A public hearing was held by the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House District Committee on June 10, 1957, and no one appeared in opposition to this legislation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS CORPORATION ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (S. 660) to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) Any registered agent of a corporation may resign as such agent upon filing a written notice thereof, executed in triplicate, with the Commissioners, who shall forthwith mail one copy thereof to the corporation at its registered office and another copy thereof to the corporation at its principal office in the District as shown on the records of the Commissioners. The appointment of such agent shall terminate upon the expiration of thirty days after receipt of such notice by the Commissioners or upon the appointment of a successor agent becoming effective, whichever occurs first. No fee or charge of any kind shall be imposed with respect to a filing under this subsection."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 14 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended (1) by striking out the period at the end of clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "the time of payment and the dates from which dividends on cumulative shares shall be accumulative, and the extent of other participation rights, if any.", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause: "(7) Any right to vote with holders of shares of any other series or class and any right to vote as a class, either generally or as a condition to specified corporate action.".

SEC. 3. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 20 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act are amended to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 15 of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate in the District of Columbia the transfer of shares of stock in corporations and to make uniform the law with reference thereto', approved December 23, 1944 (58 Stat. 927; D.C. Code, sec. 28–2915), every certificate representing shares the transferability of which is restricted or limited shall state upon the face thereof that the transferability of such shares is restricted or limited and upon the face or back thereof shall either set forth a full or summary statement of any such restriction or limitation upon the transferability of such shares or shall state that the corporation will furnish to any shareholder upon request and without charge such full or summary statement.

"(c) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, every certificate representing shares issued by a corporation which is authorized to issue shares of more than one class shall set forth upon the face or back thereof, or shall state that the corporation will furnish to any shareholder upon request and without charge, a full or summary statement of the designations, preferences, limitations, and relative rights of the shares of each class authorized to be issued, and, if the corporation is authorized to issue any preferred or special class in series, the variations in the relative rights and preferences between the shares of each such series so far as the same have been fixed and determined and the authority of the board of directors to fix and determine the relative rights and preferences of subsequent series."

SEC. 4. Section 22 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Where it cannot be determined that shares which have been issued and outstanding for more than twelve years are fully paid and nonassessable, a determination by the board of directors that the net assets of a corporation applicable to such shares have a fair value at least equal to the stated capital represented by such shares, shall, in the absence of fraud, have the same effect as if such shares had been issued in consideration of such net assets upon such a determination made at the time of issuance, except that no such determination shall affect any rights of any then existing creditors."

SEC. 5. Section 26 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by inserting immediately after "meeting is called, shall" the following: ", in the absence of a provision in the bylaws specifying a different period of notice,".

SEC. 6. Section 29 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended (1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "A proxy purporting to be executed by a corporation shall be presumed to be valid and the burden of proving invalidity shall rest on any challenger.", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) Shares standing in the name of a partnership may be voted by any partner. A proxy purporting to be executed by a partnership shall be presumed to be valid and the burden of proving invalidity shall rest on any challenger.

"(f) Shares standing in the name of two or more persons as joint tenants, or tenants in common, or tenants by the entirety, may be voted in person or by proxy by any one or more of such persons. If more than one of such tenants shall vote such shares, the vote shall be divided among them in proportion to the number of such tenants voting in person or by proxy unless a different apportionment of the vote is requested by such tenants."

SEC. 7. Section 31 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) If a quorum is present, the affirmative vote of the majority of the shares represented at the meeting and entitled to vote on the subject matter shall be the act of the shareholders, unless the vote of a greater number, or voting by classes, is required by this Act or the articles of incorporation, and except that in elections of directors, those receiving the greatest number of votes shall be deemed elected even though not receiving a majority."

SEC. 8. Section 35 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by striking out "by the board of directors" and inserting in lieu thereof "by affirmative vote of a majority of the remaining directors, though less than a quorum of the board of directors, unless the articles of incorporation otherwise provide".

SEC. 9. (a) Subsection (c) of section 42 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by inserting immediately after "certified by" the following: "or otherwise represented in a written report of".

(b) Section 42 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) No suit shall be brought against any director for any liability imposed by this

Act except within three years after the right of action shall accrue."

SEC. 10. Subsection (d) of section 45 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by inserting immediately after "written request" the following: ", stating the purpose thereof,".

SEC. 11. Subsection (a) of section 90 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(3) in an action by a shareholder when it is established that the directors are deadlocked in the management of the corporate affairs and the shareholders are unable to break the deadlock, and that irreparable injury to the corporation is being suffered or is threatened by reason thereof;

"(4) in an action by a shareholder when it is established that the shareholders are deadlocked in voting power and for that reason have been unable at two consecutive annual meetings to elect successors to directors whose terms had expired."

SEC. 12. Subsection (a) of section 98 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended (1) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively, and (2) by inserting immediately after paragraph (1) a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) the address, including street and number, if any, of its principal office in the District, if such office is other than its registered office;".

SEC. 13. (a) Paragraph (g) of section 103 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) A brief statement of the business it proposes to transact in the District."

(b) Paragraphs (f), (i), and (j) of such Act are repealed, and paragraphs (g), (h), and (k) are redesignated (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

SEC. 14. Section 107 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection.

"(e) Any registered agent of a foreign corporation may resign as such agent upon filing a written notice thereof, executed in duplicate, with the Commissioners, who shall forthwith mail a copy thereof to the corporation at its principal office in the State under the laws of which it is organized as shown on the records of the Commissioners. The appointment of such agent shall terminate upon the expiration of thirty days after receipt of such notice by the Commissioners or upon the appointment of a successor agent becoming effective, whichever occurs sooner. No fee or charge of any kind shall be imposed with respect to a filing under this subsection."

SEC. 15. (a) Subsection (a) of section 108 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by inserting immediately after "principal office" the following: "in the State under the laws of which it is organized".

(b) Section 108 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as (c) and (d), respectively, and by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) If any foreign corporation shall transact business in the District without a certificate of authority, it shall, by transacting such business, be deemed to have thereby appointed the Commissioners its agent and representative upon whom any process, notice, or demand may be served. Service shall be made by delivering to and leaving with the Commissioners, or with any clerk having charge of their office, duplicate copies of such process, notice, or demand, together with an affidavit giving the latest known post office address of such corporation and such service shall be sufficient if notice thereof and a copy of the process, notice, or demand are forwarded by registered mail, addressed to such corporation at the address given in such affidavit. Service pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to the requirements of the last sentence of subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 16. Paragraphs (f) and (i) of section 112 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act are repealed, and paragraphs (g) and (h) are redesignated (f) and (g), respectively.

SEC. 17. The District of Columbia Business Corporation Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 148. Wherever any provision of this Act authorizes or requires the service or forwarding of any process, notice, or demand by registered mail, such provision shall be deemed to include as an alternative the service or forwarding of such process, notice, or demand by certified mail.

"SEC. 149. All civil actions under this Act which the Commissioners are authorized to commence, and all prosecutions for violations of the provisions of this Act, shall be brought in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 150. The Recorder of Deeds, after publishing notice of his intention so to do, is authorized, one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this section, to destroy all duplicate original corporation papers filed in his office pursuant to this Act prior to October 2, 1957. Such notice shall describe in general terms each class of papers affected, and shall be published once a week for three consecutive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the District of Columbia, the third publication of such notice to appear not less than thirty days prior to the date after which such papers may be destroyed. Any corporation shall be entitled to the return to it of any paper authorized by this section to be destroyed upon written request to the Recorder of Deeds accompanied by a fee in the amount of $1 for each such paper to cover the cost of postage and handling."

SEC. 18. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of the bill amends section 11 of the act to provide a procedure for resignation of registered agents of domestic corporations.

Section 2 amends section 14 of the act to add to the permissible variations between different series of shares of the same class, such as variations in the time of payment and the dates from which dividends on cumulative shares of stock shall be accumulative, and the right to vote as a class.

Section 3 amends section 20 of the act by adding a provision to relieve a corporation of the necessity of printing on a stock certificate a summary or full statement of (a) limitations and restrictions upon transferability, or (b) the designations, preferences, limitations, and so forth, relating to shares covered by the certificate, but provides that a statement shall be printed on each stock certificate that a summary or full statement of such restrictions will be furnished upon request of the shareholder.

Section 4 amends section 22 of the act to provide for a method of establishing that shares of a corporation which have been issued for more than 12 years are full paid and nonassessable.

Section 5 amends section 26 of the act to permit a different period of notice than is now specified in the act if the bylaws of the corporation provide for such different period.

Section 6 amends section 29 of the act by clarifying rules with respect to the status of a proxy purporting to be executed by a corporation; voting of shares of a partnership, and the voting of shares standing in the names of two or more persons as joint tenants, tenants in common, or tenants by the entirety.

Section 7 amends section 31 of the act to make it clear that when a quorum is present at a shareholders' meeting the affirmative vote of the majority of shares represented shall be controlling, unless a larger vote or voting by classes is required by the act or the articles of incorporation, but subject to the exception that, in the election of directors, persons receiving the greatest number of votes shall be deemed elected.

Section 8 amends section 35 of the act to provide that a vacancy occurring in a board of directors—other than by an increase in the number of directors—may be filled by affirmative vote of the remaining directors, though less than a quorum is present, unless the articles of incorporation provide otherwise.

Section 9 amends subsection (c) of section 42 of the act to provide that a director shall not be liable in assenting to declarations of dividends or distribution of assets if he relied on and acted in good faith upon financial statements certified or represented, in a written report of an independent public or certified public accountant, to fairly reflect the financial condition of the corporation, and sets a 3-year period of limitation on any suit brought against a director based on any liability imposed by the act.

Section 10 amends subsection (d) of section 45 of the act to provide that a shareholder submitting a request for a statement of the affairs of the corporation shall state the purpose of his request.

Section 11 amends subsection (a) of section 90 of the act to provide for the liquidation of a corporation by the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia, when there is a deadlock among the directors, which the shareholders are unable to break, or a deadlock in voting power of shareholders with resulting inability to elect directors at two consecutive annual meetings.

Section 12 amends subsection (a) of section 98 of the act to require the annual report of a domestic corporation to give the address of its principal office in the District, if such office is other than its registered office.

Section 13 amends section 103 of the act to provide that the application of a foreign corporation for a certificate of authority to transact business in the District of Columbia shall contain a brief statement of the business the corporation proposes to transact in the District. The purposes for which the corporation is organized appear in the articles of incorporation which are required to be filed with the Commissioners. The

section also eliminates provisions requiring the names of the States in which such corporation is admitted to transact business and the requirement to give detailed information as to its authorized and issued shares.

Section 14 amends section 107 of the act to provide a procedure for resignation of a registered agent of a foreign corporation.

Section 15 amends section 108 of the act to provide that a foreign corporation transacting business in the District of Columbia without a certificate of authority is deemed to have made itself subject to substituted service of process on the Commissioners as its agent. A clarifying change is made in subsection (a) of section 108.

Section 16 amends section 112 of the act by eliminating the requirement that the annual report of a foreign corporation contain the names of the States in which the corporation is qualified to transact business and to give details as to its authorized and issued shares.

Section 18, by adding new section 148 to this act, authorizes the use of certified mail as well as registered mail in serving or forwarding any process, notice or demand. Either form of mail would be permissible under this section.

Section 19 provides that this bill take effect on the 30th day after enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS OF MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4192) to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with communications made by or to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the parties to such communications, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to bring to the attention of the Speaker and the Members of the House that in committee discussion of the language in lines 3 and 4, "that no priest, clergyman, rabbi, or other minister of any religion," it was intended to include Christian Science practitioners.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no priest, clergyman, rabbi, or other minister of any religion shall be examined in any civil or criminal proceedings in the courts of the District of Columbia—

(1) with respect to any confession, or communication, made by him, or to him, in his professional capacity in the course of discipline enjoined by the church or other religious body to which he belongs, without the consent of the person making such confession or communication, or to whom such communication was made, or

(2) with respect to any communication made by him, or to him, in his professional capacity in the course of giving religious or spiritual advice, without the consent of the person seeking such advice, or to whom such communication was made, or

(3) with respect to any communication made by him, or to him, in his professional capacity, by or to either spouse, in connection with any effort to reconcile estranged spouses, without the consent of the spouse making the communication, or to whom such communication was made.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to prohibit the examination in the District of Columbia courts of any priest, clergyman, rabbi, or other minister of any religion in connection with any communication made by him or to him in his professional capacity without the consent of the parties to such communication.

Under existing law in the District of Columbia physicians are the only professional people who are specifically exempt from testifying in regard to information obtained in their professional capacity; this does not apply in criminal cases where the accused is charged with causing death or personal injury.

Many other jurisdictions have made information obtained by ministers of religion a privileged matter and do not require such ministers to disclose in court confidential communications.

Under common law, the following rule has been followed unless statutes have been enacted to the contrary:

Under the common law, communications to clergymen, or other church or ecclesiastical officers, are not privileged, although judges have been reluctant to compel the disclosure of such communications; that rule still obtains except insofar as it has been changed by statute (58 Am. Jur. 296; see also 22 A.L.R. 2d 1154 citing cases).

In view of a recent case in the District of Columbia municipal court on about March 12, 1957, MacArthur against MacArthur, presiding judge, Frank H. Myers, a case in which a minister was required to testify, it was felt that the ability of a minister of religion to be of assistance to the people who come to them for help or spiritual guidance would be seriously hampered without the enactment of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM ACT WITH RESPECT TO PARKING AREAS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6893) to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 with respect to motor-vehicle parking areas, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order against the consideration of the bill and the report. When is the proper time to seek recognition for this purpose?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the proper time for the gentleman to make his point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to rule XIII, paragraph 3. It reads as follows:

Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof, it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italic, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices, the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the language in the bill beginning with line 9, page 3, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Act entitled, An Act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes, approved June 4, 1949 (D.C. Code, Sec. 2–1708), as amended, is amended by inserting "and related motor vehicle parking areas" immediately after "in connection with the operation of the Stadium."

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to report No. 643, accompanying the bill H.R. 6893 and specifically to page 7 of the report, District of Columbia Code 2–1708, 62 Stat. 341, 69 Stat. 498, section 8, to which the language in the bill refers.

I submit that no amendment is set forth as required under the rule to section 8, either on page 7 or page 8 of the report where the amendment, as contained in the language of the original bill, should be found. I point out that there is italicized language on page 8 of the report dealing with a wholly unrelated subject. I am confused by that italicized print because an amendment to that effect is not to be found in the bill, but I do not make a point of order against that. I make my point of order against the language found on page 3, line 9, of the bill, section 2, which, under rule XIII, must be stated in the accompanying report in italicized or other distinctive print.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, and make the point of order, that this report No. 643, does not conform to rule XIII, otherwise known as the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the request I made regarding this bill be withdrawn and that the matter go over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his request?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. What was the request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman withdraws his motion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And that the bill be recommitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SURRENDER AT GENEVA?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I know not how other Members of this body may feel, but as for myself, I am becoming increasingly apprehensive of the position of the U.S. Government with respect to the future of Berlin, and specifically with reference to our point of view at the Geneva foreign ministers' discussions which begin again today in Geneva.

This Government has repeatedly and frequently announced not only to the people of Berlin but to the people of the world that it intends to "stand firm" in Berlin and not to back down or sell out the people of Berlin under Soviet threats. This policy has in turn been fully supported by both political parties in the Congress and by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly disturbed at hints which have recently been made that the United States may in fact be preparing to accept an outcome of the Geneva talks which will represent a fairly definite concession to the Soviets, will be a substantial retreat from the announced policy of standing firm, and will represent a solution highly unpalatable to our friends and allies, the 2 million people of West Berlin. In fact a hint of this development was dropped unwittingly by Secretary Herter at his press conference the other day, when he said he expected the people of Berlin might not be happy at the result of the Geneva Conference.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of Berlin the Soviets have continued only to threaten and bluster. We on our side have so far failed to take any obvious steps to make it clear that we mean what we say by standing firm in Berlin. If we are now prepared to accept a retreat from our position in Berlin in return for nothing more substantial than a Soviet assurance that they were not really threatening us in the last Geneva Conference, an assurance that can be withdrawn and no doubt will be withdrawn at will by the Soviet Government, then I think the future is very serious indeed, and the American people ought to be made aware of what is going on.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to bring to the attention of every Member of the House a penetrating article on this subject which appeared in this morning's edition of the New York Times by correspondent C. L. Sulzberger.

The editorial follows:

IS A TIME OF TROUBLES AT HAND?

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

GENEVA, July 12.—The United States had both maximum and minimum objectives when the Big Four Foreign Ministers Conference started 2 months ago. The maximum objective was never clear, but it aimed vaguely at securing our position in Berlin and setting Germany along the road to unification.

The minimum objective was more specific. This was to reassure continuation of the Berlin status quo. We hoped to keep the Geneva negotiations guided by a broad enough agenda so that the Berlin and German unity questions would not be separated from each other. And we insisted, to ourselves at any rate, that we would not agree to a change in the existing Berlin situation in which the Western Powers maintain garrisons by legal agreement with Russia.

The parley resumes tomorrow under clearly unfavorable circumstances. We have already abandoned any expectation of attaining maximal aims. We are now only talking about Berlin, not about all Germany. We have accepted East Germany's presence at the council table on an equal advisory basis with West Germany.

NEW BASIS FOR TALKS

We are reviewing negotiations on a totally different basis from that prevailing in May. We have already offered concessions below the minimum level we had previously set. We suggested that allied forces in West Berlin be reduced and that allied propaganda and intelligence facilities in that city might be curbed, in exchange for Soviet concessions—that have not yet been offered. We imply that talks can carry on harmoniously and with distinct prospects of success if only the Russians will but state that threats they have been making should not be interpreted as threats.

Furthermore, although the three Western Ministers have worked as an admirably united team, sharp divisions have developed within the democracies' camp. The United States is having such a disagreement with General de Gaulle that it has decided to move its atom bomb jet squadrons out of France. And Chancellor Adenauer's internal ruckus in West Germany has weakened that country's political dynamism.

KHRUSHCHEV'S SUMMIT?

When we began these parleys we believed Khrushchev was so eager to have a summit meeting that he would make concessions here to insure its convening. He yielded nothing. Nevertheless, demands for such a meeting continue to gain strength in the West. The British want it. Governor Harriman has come out for it. And it is an open secret, in advance of this second Geneva sitting, that Washington reckons there will be such a conference in September.

The Western Powers tend to comfort themselves that things will work out all right if only the Russians assure the world they are not menacing us by their very menacing statements. We point out that Khrushchev has still to carry out his announced intention to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany and award to that satellite control of access to West Berlin. The sword of Damocles, however, still dangles.

This second session will be tough. The West has already granted favors with nothing in return. To give meaning to our toughness we may find it necessary to reinforce words with actions.

POSSIBLE MOVES FOR WEST

What could such actions be? We do not wish to appear hasty, nervous, or upset. For this reason the United States—as bellwether of the democratic flock—has turned down Pentagon suggestions that partial mobilization might be in order.

Instead, with deliberate calm, we might: First, make preparations for an emergency airlift to support West Berlin's massive supply stockpile; second, alert aircraft squadrons for possible sudden transfer to West Germany, Italy, and Turkey; third, restrict leaves and limit weekend passes for our troops in West Germany, knowing that Soviet intelligence will immediately pick up this fact from grumbling GI's and comprehend the warning.

For, despite lack of success in our efforts to negotiate a modus vivendi with an overconfident Khrushchev, we do not intend to give up the substance of our Berlin position. Khrushchev must be made to understand as much. And if Gromyko cannot fully convey this fact to the Kremlin, perhaps the only alternative is to take strong steps, hoping that Moscow's espionage system is brighter than its diplomatic service. The next 3 weeks are likely to be anxious.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a resolution of the City Council of Portland, Oreg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the proudest accomplishments of this 86th Congress was the admission of Hawaii to statehood, and the admission of her people to the full rights of citizenship in this Republic. The 85th Congress was marked by a similar act of justice, in granting to Alaska and Alaskans the status to which their citizenship had long entitled them. The passage of these statehood bills has had the result of making the anomalous status of the District of Columbia an ever more glaring example of discrimination. The fact that nearly a million hard-working, taxpaying Americans who reside in the Nation's Capital are still deprived of the rudiments of self-government cannot be defended. The people of the District of Columbia are a living refutation of the principles of democracy and liberty to which we have all pledged our allegiance. It is long past the proper time for action on legislation admitting these patriotic Americans to the same status which every one of us here, and every one of our constituents enjoys.

I am proud that the distinguished and able members of the council of my home city of Portland, Oreg., have in this 100th year of Oregon's own statehood, seen fit to endorse the efforts of those courageous District residents who are working for home rule. Under unanimous consent I include a resolution of July 8, 1959, adopted by the Portland City Council, in

the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. And may I say that I join with the City Council of Portland in complete and uncompromising support of their views.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 28063

Whereas the city of Washington, D.C., the center of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, has been governed by the Congress through a Commission established in 1878, and its people, numbering in excess of 800,000 within the city limits, have been denied the right of self-government, not only since the establishment of the Commission, but since the city itself was incorporated in 1802; and

Whereas the cost of the government of the city has been, and is being, borne largely by the residents thereof, with certain supplemental payments from the Congress; and

Whereas, in the public interest, the citizens of Washington should have the right of suffrage and the right of self-government in order to carry out the principles of home rule and self-determination on the local level; and

Whereas it is of mutual interest to all cities in the United States to foster and support the efforts of the residents of the city of Washington, and of the District of Columbia for such home rule: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Portland, in regular session assembled, To endorse the efforts of the residents of the District of Columbia, and particularly those residing within the city of Washington, to achieve self-government, by the Congress granting home rule to the District; and be it further

Resolved, That the auditor of the city of Portland file certified copies of this resolution with the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States and the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk of the Senate; the Senate Standing Committee on the District of Columbia, Leo A. Casey, chief clerk; and the House Standing Committee on the District of Columbia, William M. McCloud, Jr., clerk; the Honorable Wayne Morse and the Honorable Richard L. Neuberger, U.S. Senators from the State of Oregon; and to the Honorable Walter Norblad, the Honorable Al Ullman, the Honorable Edith Green, and the Honorable Charles O. Porter, Representatives from the State of Oregon.

A NEW HOUSING BILL

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Housing bill has been vetoed and that there is no legislation before the Congress at the present time, I have today introduced a housing bill which, with very careful thought, contains those things urgently needed for an adequate housing program for this year. It is not inflationary. It does not provide for any deficit spending. It contains no public housing. It does provide adequate authorizations for FHA housing loans, for urban renewal, for college housing, for elderly housing. It is the kind of bill that in my opinion can be accepted by any Member of this Congress who is seeking to prevent inflation and to stay within budgetary requirements.

My bill will provide $600 million for urban renewal for a 2-year period. It will also provide $200 million to continue the college housing loan program and grant FHA sufficient additional insurance authorization to assure unimpaired operations.

My bill will stimulate the homebuilding industry because of its provisions for liberalized downpayments for building homes for the elderly and for the continuation of the urban renewal and college housing programs. I strongly feel this program will continue the fine progress being made in the building field during the current year and at the same time avoid unwarranted inflationary impact on the economy. It is a bill within sound budgetary limitations.

As compared to the inflationary vetoed bill that provided for deficit spending and exceeded sound budgetary requirements, my bill eliminates all of these undesirable features. I firmly believe that all Members of Congress interested in fighting inflation and achieving a balanced budget will want to support this bill and I believe that its early passage by the Congress is necessary in the public welfare.

I am submitting with my remarks a statement of the differences between the bill I am introducing and the bill that was vetoed and a section-by-section analysis of the bill for Members of Congress to read in the RECORD tomorrow:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NEW HOUSING BILL AND S. 57

The new housing bill differs from S. 57 as follows:

FHA INSURANCE

1. Extends FHA title I program for 2 years instead of 1 year.

2. Increases mortgage ceiling for single-family homes from $22,500 in S. 57 to $25,000.

3. Omits provision increasing maximum maturity for FHA sales housing from 30 to 35 years.

4. Increases maximum interest rate for rental housing and cooperative management housing from 5¼ percent in S. 57 to 5½ percent. Also increases maximum interest rate for cooperative sales housing from 5¾ percent in S. 57 to 6 percent.

5. Omits increase in mortgage ceilings for FHA relocation housing in normal areas, as distinguished from high-cost areas. Also deletes new provision for relocation sales housing for two- three- and four-family structures.

6. Omits provision for FHA acquiring mortgages in default. Retains provision for including in debentures the amount of interest after default.

ELDERLY HOUSING

7. Omits direct loan program for the elderly.

FNMA

8. Omits provision restoring FNMA par purchase and further lowering FNMA fees in special assistance program.

9. Omits additional FNMA special assistance authorization for cooperatives.

10. Modifies S. 57 increases in ceilings for mortgages eligible for FNMA purchase so that section 220 mortgages would not be given special ceiling.

11. Omits new FNMA loan program in secondary market.

URBAN RENEWAL

12. Adds safeguards to S. 57 provision for early acquisition of urban renewal land in order to protect against Federal financial loss.

13. Reduces additional urban renewal capital grant authorization to $350 million for this fiscal year and $250 million for next fiscal year. Requires that, before grant contracts are executed, appropriation act must approve use of new authorization.

14. Changes authority in S. 57 for Government backup of private financing of urban renewal so that authority could be used only as approved in appropriation acts.

15. Revises prohibition in S. 57 on rationing of urban renewal funds in order to permit equitable processing.

16. Modifies relocation payment provision in S. 57 to delete authority for payments to persons displaced by other Government programs. Also deletes increase in dollar amounts which may be paid to each family or business.

17. Changes provision in S. 57 fixing purchase price for urban renewal land sold for public housing, so that price would equal fair value of the most likely private alternative use.

18. Revises authority in S. 57 to count, as urban renewal credit, local improvements built over 5-year period. Would require eligible improvements to be built after, and in accordance with, a community renewal program authorized in new bill (and also in S. 57).

19. Omits authority in S. 57 for counting expenditures by colleges as part of city's local contribution to urban renewal. Would retain waiver of predominantly residential requirement for urban renewal project related to college construction.

20. Adds requirement that information be made public regarding urban renewal redevelopers and proposed redevelopments.

PUBLIC HOUSING

21. Omits all of title of S. 57 relating to public housing.

COLLEGE HOUSING

22. Reduces authorization for college housing loans from $300 million in S. 57 to $200 million. Requires that, before loans are made, use of authorization must be approved in appropriation act.

23. Omits new loan program for college classrooms.

24. Omits authority for college housing loans to cooperatives.

MISCELLANEOUS

25. Omits authority for expenditures for making surveys of public works planning.

26. Omits authority for additional grants for farm housing research.

27. Omits increase in maturity of VA loans from 30 to 35 years.

28. Omits requirement that Housing Administrator study migratory workers' housing.

29. Omits priority for prior landowners acquiring section 608 or title IX land.

30. Omits authority for appropriations for hospital construction.

31. Omits authority for Federal savings and loan associations to lend for land development.

32. Omits authority to appropriate for city planning scholarships.

33. Increases extension of voluntary home mortgage credit program from 2 years in S. 57 to 3 years.

34. Narrows broad authority in S. 57 for Government to revise existing contracts and mortgages with cooperatives regarding Lanham Act housing sold to them. Would limit

authority to specific project referred to in report of Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 57.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF NEW HOUSING BILL

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Property improvement loans

Section 101: Amends section 2(a) of the National Housing Act so as to extend for 1 year (until October 1, 1960) FHA's home improvement and modernization insurance program.

Section 203 sales housing mortgage insurance

Section 102(a)(1): Amends section 203(b) of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum amount of an insured mortgage covering a one- or two-family residence from $20,000 to $25,000.

(2) Amends section 203(b) to provide a new downpayment schedule for FHA section 203 sales housing as follows:

Valuation:	Down payment (percent)
Up to $13,500	3
$13,500 to $18,000	10
Over $18,000	30

(3) Amends section 203(b) to permit FHA to accept VA inspection as sufficient to warrant a "new construction" loan-to-value ratio.

(b) Amends section 203(b) to make a nonoccupant mortgagor (builder or realtor) eligible for mortgage insurance in the same amount as that available to an owner-occupant under that section, in order to facilitate trade-in financing and avoid duplicate closing costs, if he places 15 percent of the mortgage amount in escrow to be applied to reduce the mortgage should no purchaser be found within 18 months. Under existing law, the mortgage of a nonoccupant is limited to 85 percent of the mortgage which an owner-occupant could obtain.

Low-cost housing in outlying areas

Section 103: Amends section 203(i) of the National Housing Act (relating to low-cost housing in outlying areas) to increase the maximum mortgage amount from $8,000 to $9,000, and to make mortgages on existing housing (as well as mortgages on new construction, to which existing law is limited) eligible for such insurance, with a reduced loan-to-value ratio (90 percent instead of 97 percent) for existing housing less than 1 year old which was not subject to FHA or VA inspection during construction. Removes $100 million total insurance authorization for farm homes insured under section 203(i).

Section 207 rental housing insurance

Section 104(a): Amends section 207 of the National Housing Act (the regular rental housing program) to increase from $12,500,000 to $20 million the maximum amount of a mortgage which may be insured under that section.

(b) Increases dollar limits (per room and per unit) on FHA section 207 program, as follows:

	Present law		New	
	Per room	Per unit if under 4 rooms	Per room	Per unit if under 4 rooms
Garden type	$2,250	$8,100	$2,500	$9,000
Elevator type	2,700	8,400	3,000	9,400
Increase for high cost areas	1,000	----------	1,250	----------

Also amends section 207 to increase the mortgage limits for trailer courts or parks from $1,000 to $1,500 per space, and from $300,000 to $500,000 per mortgage.

(c) Amends section 207 to increase the maximum interest rate for mortgages insured under that section from 4½ percent to 5½ percent.

(d) Adds a new subsection (r) to section 207 authorizing the Commissioner to require mortgagors on housing hereafter insured under that section or any other provision of the National Housing Act to agree to pay a service charge (in lieu of the mortgage insurance premium) if the mortgages are later assigned to FHA.

(e) Amends section 207 to delete all provisions relating to housing for elderly persons, since the bill (in title II) establishes a new FHA section 231 program of mortgage insurance for elderly persons' housing.

Cooperative housing insurance

Section 105(a): Amends section 213 of the National Housing Act to increase from $12,500,000 to $20 million the maximum amount of a mortgage on cooperative housing which may be insured under that section.

(b) Amends section 213 of the National Housing Act to increase multifamily dollar limits per room and per unit as follows:

	Present law		New	
	Per room	Per unit (under 4 rooms)	Per room	Per unit (under 4 rooms)
Garden type:				
Nonveteran	$2,250	$8,100	$2,500	$9,000
Veteran	2,375	8,550	2,500	9,000
Elevator type:				
Nonveteran	2,700	8,400	3,000	9,400
Veteran	2,850	8,900	3,000	9,400
High-cost area, increase	1,000	----------	1,250	----------

Also amends section 213(b)(2) of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum loan ratio from 90 percent of replacement cost (95 percent of replacement cost if 50 percent of the cooperators are veterans) to 97 percent of replacement cost.

(c) Amends section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit community facilities to be included in sales-type housing mortgages and to permit both community and commercial facilities to be included in investor-sponsor-type mortgages.

(d) Amends section 213 to increase maximum interest rate of management-type co-ops from 4½ to 5½ percent; increase maximum interest rate of sales-type co-ops from 5 to 6 percent.

(e) Amends section 213 to extend the cooperative housing program to existing structures acquired by consumer cooperatives.

Mortgage ceilings for Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii

Section 106: Amends section 214 of the National Housing Act to make clear that the 50 percent higher mortgage amount which the FHA Commissioner, at his discretion, may allow in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii, may be applied to high-cost-area mortgage amounts in the programs where such high-cost-area provisions pertain.

General mortgage insurance authorization

Section 107: Amends section 217 of the National Housing Act to increase FHA's general mortgage insurance authorization by $5 billion upon enactment, and to provide that after September 1, 1959, insurance outstanding at any time may equal the insurance and commitments outstanding on that date plus $5 billion.

Repeal of obsolete provision

Section 108: Repeals section 218 of the National Housing Act, an obsolete provision, which at one time permitted the transfer of application fees from the FHA expired section 608 program to the section 207, regular rental housing program.

Housing in urban renewal areas

Section 109(a)(1): Amends section 220 of the National Housing Act (urban renewal housing) to increase the maximum mortgage amount which may be insured by FHA on sales housing, as follows: From $20,000 to $25,000 on one- and two-family homes and from $27,500 to $30,000 on three-family homes.

(2) Amends section 220 of the National Housing Act to provide a new downpayment schedule on FHA section 220 sales housing as follows:

Valuation:	Down-payment (percent)
Up to $13,500	3
$13,500 to $18,000	10
Over $18,000	30

(3) Amends section 220 relating to the sales housing provisions to permit a nonoccupant mortgagor to obtain a mortgage in the same amount as that available to an owner-occupant by placing 15 percent of the mortgage amount in escrow to be applied to the reduction of the mortgage if no purchaser is found within 18 months, the same as is proposed for section 203(b) of sales housing program by section 102 of this bill.

(b) Amends the rental housing provisions of section 220 to increase from $12,500,000 to $20 million the maximum amount of a mortgage which may be insured thereunder.

(c) Amends section 220 to increase dollar limits (per room and per unit) on rental housing program consistently with the changes proposed for the regular section 207 rental housing program by section 104 of this bill.

(d) Amends section 220 to permit exterior land improvements (as defined by FHA Commissioner) to be included in the mortgage without being computed as a part of the per room or per unit cost limitation.

(e) Amends section 220 to permit the inclusion of such nondwelling facilities as the FHA Commissioner deems adequate to serve the needs of the occupants of the project and of other housing in the neighborhood.

Relocation housing

Section 110: (a) Amends section 221 of the National Housing Act (relocation housing) to extend the benefits of the program to any family displaced within the environs of a community that has a workable program provided the community requests such mortgage insurance.

(b) Perfects language of section 221(d) relating to sales housing and increases the dollar amount limitation per family unit for

mortgages insured thereunder in high-cost areas from $10,000 to $12,000.

(c) Amends the existing rental housing program for nonprofit organizations under section 221(d) in order (1) to increase the per unit mortgage limitation in high-cost areas from $10,000 to $12,000 and (2) to provide that, in the case of new construction, the mortgage shall not exceed 100 percent of replacement cost rather than 100 percent of value.

Also amends section 221(d) to establish a new rental housing program for profit organizations similar to the section 220 rental housing program. The maximum loan ratio for mortgages under the new program would be 90 percent of replacement cost in the case of new construction and 90 percent of value in the case of rehabilitation projects; and the Federal Housing Commissioner would be authorized to require the mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation. The maximum dollar amount limitations per project and per family unit would be the same as in the case of the section 221 rental housing program for nonprofit organizations.

(d) Permits inclusion of commercial and community facilities as necessary to serve occupants.

(e) Conforming amendment.

(f) Amends section 212(a) of the National Housing Act to make the labor standards provisions of that section applicable to rental housing projects constructed by profit organizations with mortgage insurance under section 221.

Servicemen's housing mortgage insurance

Section 111: (1) Would permit servicemen to receive the benefits of mortgage insurance under section 222 of the National Housing Act (which provides for the FHA insurance premium to be paid by the Military Department) where the home meets the standards under section 203(i) of the National Housing Act which relates to low-cost housing in outlying areas. (2) the maximum mortgage amount under section 222 would be increased from $17,100 to $20,000, except that in the case of a home meeting the standards of section 203(i) the $9,000 mortgage limitation proposed by the bill for that section would be applicable as well under section 222.

Cost certification

Section 112. Amends section 227 of the National Housing Act to revise the cost-certification requirements affecting FHA, section 221, and new sections 231 (profit housing for elderly) and 810 (military housing) in accordance with amendments made by other sections of this bill.

Voluntary termination of insurance

Section 113: Amends title II of the National Housing Act by adding a new section 229 to authorize the FHA Commissioner to terminate any mortgage insurance contract covering a one- to four-family home upon request of the mortgagor and mortgagee, without putting the mortgagor who wishes to retain a mortgage loan to the expense of refinancing the mortgage.

Avoidance of foreclosure

Section 114: In order to help avoid foreclosure where default by the mortgagor is beyond his control and appears curable, this section would authorize the FHA to include in debentures payable to the mortgagee if foreclosure eventually takes place the amount of interest lost by the lender as a result of earlier forbearance in foreclosing.

Mortgage insurance for nursing homes

Section 115: This section adds to title II of the National Housing Act a new section 232 establishing a program of FHA mortgage insurance for nursing homes.

(a) Declares that it is the purpose of the new section to assist in the provision of urgently needed nursing homes.

(b) Contains definitions of terms. The term "nursing home" would mean a proprietary facility (i.e., a facility privately owned and operated for profit) which is licensed or regulated by the State (or a political subdivision thereof where there is no State licensing law) for the accommodation of convalescents and other persons who are not acutely ill and not in need of hospital care but who require skilled nursing care and related medical services; such care or services would be prescribed by, or performed under the general direction of, persons licensed by State law to provide it.

(c) Authorizes the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure mortgages (including construction advances) on new or rehabilitated nursing homes and to make commitments for such insurance prior to the execution of such mortgages or disbursement thereon.

(d) Any such mortgage would have to be executed by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner; and the Commissioner could require the mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to charges and methods of operation and, if the mortgagor is a corporation, as to capital structure and rate of return. Mortgage would be limited in amount to $12.5 million, and to 75 percent of the estimated value of the property. The maximum interest rate would be 6 percent of the outstanding principal balance (exclusive of premium charges for insurance), and the maturity would be determined by the Commissioner.

No mortgage may be insured under the new program unless the Commissioner has received a certification of the need for the nursing home from the State agency which has been designated under title VI of the Public Health Service Act to survey the need in the State for the construction of hospitals and for the furnishing of hospital, clinic, and similar services. The State agency would also be required to certify that there are reasonable minimum standards for licensing and operating such homes.

(e) Authorizes the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of any mortgage insured under the program.

(f) Makes the provisions of section 207 of the National Housing Act which relate to premiums and payment of insurance applicable to mortgages covering nursing homes under new section 232.

Another provision of the bill makes labor standards (contained in sec. 212 of the National Housing Act) applicable to the construction of nursing homes financed with insurance under new section 232.

Technical amendments

Section 116: Makes various amendments in the National Housing Act to add necessary cross-references between section 204 of that act (relating to payment of insurance) and five of the insurance programs (the title I property improvement program, the section 220 sales housing program, the section 221 relocation housing program, the section 222 servicemen's housing program, and the section 809 program for civilian housing at defense installations) to which the section 204 procedures apply.

Inclusion of conveyance costs in debentures

Section 117: Amends section 204(k) of the National Housing Act to permit the Federal Housing Commissioner to include certain costs of conveying property to FHA in the debentures issued to mortgagees on default under any of the title II sales housing programs and under the title VI and title IX programs.

Investment insurance

Section 118: Removes mortgage insurance authority ceiling under title VII of the National Housing Act.

Legal notifications sent by mail

Section 119: Amends section 512 of the National Housing Act to provide that certain legal notifications sent by the FHA Commissioner be considered notice if properly mailed to the last known address.

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY (FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM)

Section 201: Adds a new section 231 to the National Housing Act authorizing mortgage insurance for both nonprofit and profit-making rental housing for the elderly. (Provisions now in the National Housing Act with respect to nonprofit rental housing for the elderly would be repealed under another section of the bill.)

Eligible property would include rental housing which may consist of eight or more new or rehabilitated living units, not less than one-half of which are specially designed for the occupancy of elderly persons. The property covered by the mortgage could include such commercial and special facilities as the Federal Housing Commissioner deems adequate to serve the occupants.

Eligible occupants would be any person at least 62 years old.

The insurable mortgage could not exceed $12,500,000, except that where the mortgagor is a public instrumentality or a nonprofit organization subject to certain governmental controls, the mortgage maximum would be $50 million. There would also be a per-unit limitation of $9,000 for garden-type apartments and $9,400 for elevator-type apartments, except that these limitations could be increased by $1,250 per room in high-cost areas. In the case of a mortgagor which is a public instrumentality or a private nonprofit organization, the mortgage could not exceed 100 percent of the estimated replacement cost if the construction is new and 100 percent of the estimated value if existing structures are being rehabilitated. In the case of profit-motivated mortgagors, this percentage would be 90 percent.

The maximum interest rate on the mortgage would be 5½ percent.

The maximum maturity would be established by the Federal Housing Commissioner.

Labor standard provisions (in sec. 212 of the National Housing Act) would apply to the housing but the Federal Housing Commissioner could waive them where services are voluntarily donated without full compensation.

TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Increase in mortgage ceilings

Section 301: Amends section 302(b) of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum mortgage which FNMA may purchase from $15,000 to $20,000 in the case of mortgages purchased under the secondary market operation and from $15,000 to $17,500 in the case of mortgages purchased under the special assistance function. Under the bill, as under existing law, these limits would not be applicable to mortgages insured under section 803 of the National Housing Act or to mortgages covering housing located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii.

Financing of existing housing

Section 302: Amends section 304(a) of the National Housing Act to make the standby commitment feature of FNMA secondary market operation applicable to the financing of existing homes as well as proposed construction.

Investments by FNMA

Section 303: Amends section 304(b), 306(b), and 301 of the National Housing Act to

authorize FNMA to invest its excess funds in obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, or public funds, as well as in obligations issued or guaranteed by the United States.

FNMA purchase of mortgages held by HHFA

Section 304: Amends section 306 of the National Housing Act to authorize FNMA to purchase (pursuant to commitments or otherwise), service, and sell any mortgages offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or a constituent unit or agency thereof.

TITLE IV—URBAN RENEWAL

Statewide agencies

Section 401: Amends section 101(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to direct the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to give particular encouragement to the utilization of local public agencies which are established by States to operate on a statewide basis in behalf of smaller communities undertaking or proposing to undertake urban renewal programs, subect to local government approval, whenever the utilization of such agencies would promote the slum clearance and urban renewal program.

Clarifying amendments

Section 402: Amends section 102 of the Housing Act of 1949 to make it clear that loan contracts under that section may cover the total cost including interest payments of financing definitive loans to local public agencies.

Early land acquisition and clearance

Section 403: Amends section 102(a) of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize the HHFA Administrator to make temporary loans for land acquisition and clearance prior to the signing of a loan and grant contract if local law permits such early acquisition and clearance. No contract for a temporary loan for this purpose shall be made unless (1) the local governing body has approved the acquisition and clearance, and (2) the Administrator has determined that the loan will be adequately secured by a mortgage or other lien upon the real property or by a pledge of the credit of the State, county or municipality in which the property is located, or is otherwise adequately secured. The contract must provide that the local public agency shall not dispose of the real property (except in lieu of foreclosure) until the local governing body has either approved the urban renewal plan for the project or consented to the disposal of the property.

Urban renewal loan authorization

Section 404: Changes the basis for determining the extent to which the urban renewal loan authorization has been used. It would be revised to reflect the fact that most of the outstanding loan commitments made by the Federal Government to local public agencies do not result in the disbursement of Federal funds but are, in effect, guarantees for local obligations sold to private lenders. The use of the loan authorization would be measured in terms of actual and expected disbursements. To "back-up" this private financing, the President would be given discretion to increase the present authorization. However, this increase would have to be first specified in an appropriation act, as would any further use of the authorization.

Grant authorization

Section 405: Amends section 103 of the Housing Act of 1949—

(1) to authorize the appropriation of $350 million, and an additional $250 million after July 1, 1960, to provide additional funds for urban renewal grant contracts. The appropriations will remain available until expended.

(2) to authorize the use of urban renewal grant funds to repay Treasury loans made to finance urban planning advances which are now uncollectible because of cancellation of the project;

(3) to provide that where urban renewal assistance may be granted to a locality or local public agency within the applicable dollar amount and percentage limitations prescribed by title I of the 1949 act, the amount of such assistance shall not otherwise be restricted, except on the basis of relative need and feasibility as determined by the Administrator; and

(4) to authorize the Administrator to make grants for the preparation or completion of community renewal programs. Such a grant could not exceed two-thirds of the cost of the planning.

Public improvements by Federal agencies

Section 406: Amends section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide clear authority for a Federal agency or the District of Columbia to assume the obligations required of all urban renewal land developers, except that the obligation "to begin within a reasonable time any improvements" of the property required by the plan would be applicable only to the extent that the acquiring agency is legally authorized to proceed with construction and has available the funds needed for that purpose.

Public disclosure by redevelopers

Section 407: Adds a new subsection to section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit a local public agency from entering into an understanding or contract with respect to the disposition of land in an urban renewal area until after the local public agency has made public (1) the name of the redeveloper, together with the names of its officers and principal members, shareholders and investors, (2) the redeveloper's estimate of the cost of any residential redevelopment and rehabilitation, and (3) the redeveloper's estimate of rentals and sales prices of any proposed housing involved in the redevelopment and rehabilitation.

State loan ceiling

Section 408: Amends section 106(e) of the Housing Act of 1949 to eliminate the provision in existing law that not more than 12½ percent of the total loan authorization may be obligated in any one State; but does not alter the 12½ percent State limitation on grant authorization.

Relocation payments

Section 409: Amends section 106(f) of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize relocation payments when the displacement is a result of structural changes or code enforcement undertaken in connection with an urban renewal project in the urban renewal area, in addition to the payments (permitted by existing law) when the displacement results from the acquisition of real property by a local public agency.

Hotels and other transient housing

Section 410: Amends section 106 of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit hotels and other transient housing from being constructed in urban renewal areas unless the community obtains a competent independent analysis of the local supply of such housing and determines that there is a need for additional units.

Low-rent housing in urban renewal areas

Section 411(a): Amends section 107 of the Housing Act of 1949 to facilitate the development of federally assisted low-rent housing in urban renewal areas by providing that where land to be acquired as part of an urban renewal project is to be used in whole or in part for low-rent public housing, it shall be made available to the public housing agency at a price equal to the fair value of the site for the most likely alternative private use. The amount of such price shall be included as part of the development cost of the low-rent housing project. The local contribution in the form of tax exemption or tax remission required under the public housing law with respect to any such project shall be accepted as a local grant-in-aid under the urban renewal program.

Planning requirements

Section 412: Amends section 110(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize the Housing Administrator to expedite urban renewal projects by permitting him to omit or to simplify present detailed requirements for the urban renewal plan.

Nonresidential development

Section 413: Amends section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit up to 20 percent of the future capital grant authorization to be used for areas which are not predominantly residential, and which are not to be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses, even if such areas do not include a substantial number of slum dwellings as required under the present 10 percent exception.

Noncash grants-in-aid

Section 414(a): Amends section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that in any community which has a federally-aided community renewal program, improvements and facilities that are otherwise eligible and which were provided after approval of the community renewal program, may be credited as local grants-in-aid to an urban renewal project where their construction was commenced not more than 5 years prior to the authorization of a loan or capital-grant contract for the project, and the project is in conformity with the community renewal program.

(b) Waives the requirement in section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 for communities whose projects could not obtain Federal recognition during the period from July 1, 1957, through December 31, 1957, because of limitations on the Housing Administrator's authority to make capital grants or to reserve funds. Under existing law, such Federal recognition is required to enable the local community to include local activities and facilities as noncash grants-in-aid.

Credit for interest payments

Section 415: Amends section 110(e) of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize the inclusion in gross project cost of an amount equivalent to interest on local public funds spent in carrying out an urban renewal project.

Uniform date

Section 416: Amends section 110(g) of the Housing Act of 1949 to make uniform the date for determining the application of the "going Federal rate" of interest under urban renewal contracts.

Technical

Section 417: Makes conforming amendments.

Urban renewal areas involving colleges

Section 418: Adds a new section 112 to the Housing Act of 1949 to waive the predominantly residential requirement in areas involving an educational institution where the local governing body determines that the undertaking of an urban renewal project in the area will further promote public welfare and the proper development of the community (1) by making land in the area available for disposition to the educational institution for redevelopment in accordance with the urban renewal plan, (2) by providing a cohesive neighborhood environment compatible with the functions and

needs of the educational institution, or (3) by any combination of (1) and (2). The term "educational institution" is defined as meaning any private or public nonprofit educational institution of higher learning.

Urban planning

Section 419: Rewrites existing law to broaden the scope of the urban planning grant program and to increase by $10 million the authorization of appropriations for Federal matching grants to assist State and urban planning.

The scope of the program is broadened by authorizing Federal matching grants to State planning agencies for the provision of planning assistance to municipalities having a population of less than 50,000 (now less than 25,000), counties with a population of less than 50,000 (now only to counties with populations of 25,000 or more in cases of disaster), any group of adjacent communities having a population of less than 50,000 and common planning problems resulting from rapid urbanization, and any cities and counties which have suffered from major disaster (cities and counties of 25,000 or more with major disasters now eligible).

Where there is no State planning agency, Federal grants could be made to a State agency designated by the Governor of a State, if the agency is acceptable to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

The law is further broadened by authorizing Federal matching grants directly to any city and county which has suffered a major disaster (grants may now be made only to such a city and county having a population of 25,000 or more).

Grants to State, metropolitan, and regional planning agencies would expressly be made available for metropolitan or regional planning under interstate compacts in addition to such planning under State or local laws as presently provided.

The existing program is further broadened by authorizing matching Federal grants to State planning agencies for State and interstate comprehensive planning and for research and coordination activity related to such planning. Comprehensive planning could include preparation of general physical plans with respect to land use and the provision of public facilities, programing of capital improvements, coordination of related plans, and intergovernmental coordination of related planned activities.

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized, in areas embracing several municipalities or other political subdivisions, to encourage planning on a unified metropolitan basis and to provide technical assistance for such planning and the solution of problems relating to such planning. It is also stated that it is the intent to encourage comprehensive planning for States, cities, counties, metropolitan areas, and urban regions and the establishment and development of the organizational units needed for such planning.

TITLE V—COLLEGE HOUSING

Authorization of funds

Section 501: Amend section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 to authorize appropriations, not exceeding $200 million, to provide additional funds for college housing loans. Of this increase, up to $25 million may be made available for such related facilities as cafeterias and student centers and up to $25 million may be made available for loans to hospitals for housing interns and student nurses.

Labor standards

Section 503: This sections adds to section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 a new subsection (e), requiring that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on a college housing project commenced after the date of enactment of the bill (1) shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, and (2) shall be employed not more than 40 hours per week unless the employee receives wages for employment in excess of 40 hours at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rates at which he is employed. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may waive the application of these new labor standards provisions in cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of a project, voluntarily donate their efforts without full compensation for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the savings are credited to the educational institution.

TITLE VI—ARMED SERVICES HOUSING

Extension of program—Increase in maturity—Reduction in certain insurance premiums—Labor standards

Section 601(a): Amends section 803(a) of the National Housing Act to extend the armed services housing mortgage insurance program until September 30, 1960. Under present law the program expired June 30, 1959.

(b) Amends section 803(b)(3) of such act to increase from 25 to 30 years the maximum maturity of mortgages insured under the program.

(c) Amends section 803(b)(3) of such act to permit the inclusion in a project of nondwelling facilities to serve the occupants.

(d) Amends section 803(c) of such act to permit the insurance premium on a Wherry Act project acquired by the Defense Department to be reduced below the present minimum of one-half of 1 percent.

(e) Amends section 803 of such act by adding a new subsection (k) which requires, as a condition of mortgage insurance, that the principal contractor or contractors engaged in the construction of the project involved certify that the laborers and mechanics employed on the project are being paid time and one-half for overtime employment in excess of 8 hours in any one day or 40 hours in any one week.

Military housing (Wherry Act) and regular rental housing at military bases

Section 602: Amends section 404(a) of the housing amendments of 1955 to authorize the Secretary of Defense to acquire section 207 rental housing completed before July 1, 1952, which is situated adjacent to a military installation and was certified as necessary military housing, in the same way that he is authorized under present law to acquire Wherry housing.

(b) Amends section 404(b) of the housing amendments of 1955 to provide that the Secretary of Defense must acquire all of the section 207 rental housing of the type described above which is located at a military installation where section 803 housing is being constructed. This same requirement already applies under existing law to Wherry housing. The amendment also imposes the same requirement of mandatory acquisition, applicable to both Wherry housing and section 207 rental housing, where such housing is located at or near a military installation which the Secretary of Defense determines to be a permanent part of the Military Establishment.

(c) Amends section 407(f) of the Military Construction Act of August 30, 1957, to provide that neither Wherry housing nor section 207 rental housing shall be declared substandard because the units in such housing do not meet the minimum floor-area requirements prescribed for other military housing.

New FHA mortgage insurance program for military housing

Section 603: (a) Amends title VIII of the National Housing Act by adding section 810 to authorize a new FHA mortgage insurance program to provide not more than 5,000 units of housing for military and essential civilian personnel. Housing could be multifamily, or single family, and would not be required to meet the test of economic soundness. Certification of necessity of the housing and other factors by the Secretary of Defense would be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance. If FHA determines the housing is not an acceptable risk, it can require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the FHA military housing insurance fund against loss.

A mortgage on multifamily rental housing cannot exceed $2,500 per room ($9,000 per family unit if the number of rooms is less than 4 per family unit), and 90 percent of estimated value of the project. The limit per room could be increased by not more than $1,000 in high cost areas.

A mortgage on projects for eventual sale of single-family dwellings cannot exceed the total of the mortgage amounts which would be permitted if the dwellings were being sold to occupants under FHA sales housing program (section 203). Mortgages can have maturities within such terms as are prescribed by FHA and can bear interest at not more than the rate applicable to section 207 rental housing. A project mortgage can be replaced by individual mortgages covering the individual dwellings in the project. An individual mortgage can have a term not in excess of that under the section 203 program, or the unexpired term of the project mortgage, whichever is greater, and can bear interest at not more than the rate applicable to section 203 mortgages.

(b) Amends section 808 of the National Housing Act to make applicable the provisions of section 227 of the National Housing Act (cost certification).

(c) Amends section 212(a) of the National Housing Act to make applicable the prevailing wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Passyunk and Newport war housing projects

Section 701(a): Extends by 2 years the period during which military personnel may continue to occupy the Passyunk war housing projects (which are presently owned by the Housing Authority of Philadelphia pursuant to section 406 of the Housing Act of 1956), with occupancy preference and without regard to their income. It would also permit civilians employed in defense activities to continue to ocupy the housing during this period without regard to their income.

(b) Amends section 406 of the Housing Act of 1956 to provide a similar 2-year extension in the case of the housing project which was conveyed to the Housing Authority of Newport, R.I., under that section.

Purchase of participating interests by savings and loan associations

Section 702(a): Amends section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to permit savings and loan associations to purchase (without regard to the existing area restriction) participating interests in first mortgages on one- to four-family homes, subject to two limitations: (1) No more than 20 percent of an association's assets may be used to purchase such interests; and (2) the aggregate of such participations plus all outstanding loans which the association has made under the existing exception from the $35,000 and 50-mile limitations may not at any time exceed 30 percent of its assets.

(b) Further amends section 5(c) of such act to provide that participating interests in FHA or GI mortgages shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of loans which a savings and loan association may make within any of the percentage limitations contained in that section (the existing 20-percent limit on loans made without regard to the $35,000 and 50-

mile restrictions, the new 20-percent limit on the purchase of participations, and the 30-percent combined limit.)

Voluntary home mortgage credit program

Section 703: Amends section 610 of the Housing Act of 1954 to extend the voluntary home mortgage credit program for 3 years, until July 31, 1962.

Defense housing projects

Section 704: Amends section 606 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1950, to permit the commingling of Lanham Act and low-rent project funds and the use of all residual receipts for reduction of any Federal annual contributions contract under the consolidated contract. This will permit the consolidation of Lanham Act war housing projects which have been conveyed to a local housing authority with other low-rent housing projects being assisted with annual contributions.

Disposal of project

Section 705: Authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, whenever he deems it desirable, in the public interest, and in the fulfillment of the purposes of the housing disposition provisions of the Lanham Act, to consent to the modification of any contract, sale, mortgage, or other agreement with the Southmore Mutual Housing Corporation with respect to the sale to that Corporation of a Lanham Act war housing project. The purchase price, repayment period, rate of interest, time of payment of any installment on pricipal or interest, security, or any other term of the contract or agreement, may be modified.

Real estate loans by national banks

Section 706: Adds to section 203 of the National Housing Act a new subsection (j) providing that mortgage loans insured under that section shall not be taken into account in applying the existing limitations (contained in the Federal Reserve Act) on the total amount of real estate loans which a national bank may make in relation to its capital and surplus or its time and savings deposits.

CANADIAN PORK IMPORTS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. A recent U.S. Department of Agriculture report shows that the United States imported $512 million worth of livestock, meat, and meat products—excluding wool—during 1958. This was 78 percent above our 1957 imports and 97 percent above the 5-year—1951–55—average. In the same year, 1958, U.S. meat and meat products exports were $287 million, or down 25 percent from 1957 and only 9 percent above the 5-year—1951–55—average. As a result, the United States changed from a net exporter of $93.2 million in 1957 to a net importer of $225.2 million in 1958. The reason given for this change was decreased U.S. slaughter and high U.S. prices which tended to discourage exports while encouraging imports.

This same report indicates that 1959 will bring greater exports in variety meats, lard, tallow, and mohair, with lower exports in hides and skins. The outlook for 1959 is also for reduced cattle imports with greater hide and skin imports, while heavy meat imports are expected to continue.

These are two facets of this import-export picture which disturb me as a representative of an extremely important livestock area. The first is that we are importing more livestock and livestock products than we are exporting at a time when we are facing a bumper corn crop and declining hog prices. Although 1958 was the first year in the last 5 years that we imported more livestock and livestock products than we exported, we should strive for a continued development of the American market for the American farmers.

The second disturbing aspect of the situation is the sharp increase recently in Canadian hog marketings, reportedly up 33 percent above the first quarter of 1958. The price-support program on hogs conducted by the Canadian Government is apparently building up pressures to dump the excess production of pork into the United States and make up the difference between the depressed market price and the support price with compensatory payments to Canadian hog producers. Everyone is for mutually advantageous trade between the United States and her neighbors, but we cannot sit idly by if Government-subsidized pork is dumped into the United States in competition with American livestock farmers who produce for the market without such a subsidy.

Our imports from Canada are already high. In 1958 we imported some 62 million pounds of pork, an increase of 126 percent over 1957. We also imported from Canada 54 million pounds of beef and veal and 636,862 head of dutiable cattle in 1958, or a 13-percent increase for beef and veal and a 74-percent increase for dutiable cattle.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we should carefully observe developments in both world trade and Canadian policies if we are to properly safeguard our domestic livestock industry, the most single important segment of American agriculture.

COMMEMORATION OF BELA KOVACS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty to commemorate a great Hungarian political leader who passed away a few days ago. Bela Kovacs has been unquestionably, one of the most respected and beloved figures in Hungary during the last 15 years. He mobilized this people's aspirations for freedom and democracy. His life, full of sacrifices and tragedy, exemplifies the enormous efforts of small nations behind the Iron Curtain to regain their freedom and independence. His heroic struggle inspires me, and most certainly it will inspire many people all around the world, to call upon fellow countrymen to follow the path he has taken against our common enemy, communism and Soviet imperialism.

Who was this man and how did he become this legendary leader of the Hungarian people?

Bela Kovacs was the son of Hungarian peasants. Born in 1908 at Mecsekalii, Baranya County, Hungary, this young peasant boy worked on the family farm and studied at the same time. As his parents did not have the means to provide him higher education, he continued his studies himself. He won great respect of his friends by his courage, sense of justice, and devotion. After the First World War his view of the serious economic crisis which fell upon the Hungarian peasantry led him to study the ways and means to ameliorate the living conditions of the Hungarian peasants.

When the threat of Nazism began to overshadow Hungary, this young leader entered the field of national politics. Hiding in the countryside during the entire period of German occupation of Hungary, he assumed an important role in the anti-Nazi underground.

Unfortunately, the hope that the Central European peoples would obtain their deserved freedom and reestablish their democratic constitutions was not realized; Soviet troops, as a result of several international agreements of the wartime allies, occupied the once free and independent countries in this area of Europe, while the Kremlin leaders did their best to destroy freedom and to put the Communist Parties into key positions everywhere.

The war and the Soviet occupation of Hungary swept away the traditional institutions. While economic chaos reigned in the country, democratic political parties were reorganized and the best sons of the people worked for the return of normal life in the country.

Free elections first had to be held in order to stabilize the political situation. The Hungarian people, despite their preoccupation with clearing and repairing the war damage and the economic chaos, found time to reestablish a democratic political system. Bela Kovacs played a prime part in this regard, and the important Smallholders Party elected him their secretary-general.

This dynamic young man, sparked by great energy and willpower, mobilized millions of Hungarians during the election campaign and won an outstanding victory over the Communists. His party obtained 57 percent of the votes while the Communists, despite all their advantages in controlling transportation and communication facilities and in being able to intimidate people by the presence of Soviet troops, obtained only 17 percent of the vote.

The Hungarian people, as well as all the Central-Eastern European peoples, defied the Communist threat and the Soviet machinations in 1946 in the hope that the peace treaties and other international agreements would force the evacuation of Soviet troops from their homelands. It became obvious, however, that Moscow meant to retain their influence in these countries. Hungary itself became one of the most important

targets of Soviet expansionist aspirations. With the support of the Soviet Red Army, the Hungarian Communist Party attempted to disintegrate the majority Smallholders Party through intimidation by terror and demoralization; furthermore, in gross disregard of the election results, Communist agents were appointed to high state and political positions.

Bela Kovacs name appeared many times in the American and world press after 1946. Rising above all party or class interests, he fought for the entire Hungarian people in the attempt to preserve their freedom and maintain their democratic institutions, those aspects of life which are the most dear to us.

Bela Kovacs urged the proportionate representation of political parties in the coalition government formed after the 1945 elections. His stand received approval among all sections of the Hungarian people. He led this struggle with boldness and imagination and warned the Communists that without the disbanding of the secret police the political situation could not be stabilized and the country would head toward an inevitable revolution. Later he declared that the Communists must subordinate themselves to the interests of the Hungarian people or leave the Government coalition since "Muscovite agents cannot be the leaders of the Hungarian people." His political statements filled the people with hope and determination.

On the other hand, however, Moscow could not tolerate this defiance by the Hungarian people; Bela Kovacs' challenge endangered Soviet aspirations of world domination. Although the Hungarian Communists controlled the secret police, they did not dare to arrest the Smallholders' leader. Unable to intimidate the Parliament into withdrawing Bela Kovacs' parliamentary immunity, the Communists asked the Russian occupation troops to seize him. On February 22, 1947, a large group of Soviet soldiers surrounded his house in Budapest and arrested him for alleged plots endangering the safety of the occupation troops.

This flagrant and unjustified interference by Russia into the internal affairs of the Hungarian people moved the United States to send through its representative on the Allied Control Commission for Hungary a total of three protest notes concerning the Hungarian situation in general and the Bela Kovacs' case in particular. The notes, sent on March 3, March 17, and June 11, 1947, stated in part:

> Unable to achieve their political ends through normal constitutional processes, the Hungarian Communists, together with other members of the leftist bloc, have endeavored to implicate a number of representatives of the majority Smallholders Party in a recently revealed plot against the Republic and, by demanding the withdrawal of parliamentary immunity from Smallholder deputies, to weaken the parliamentary position to which that party was duly elected by the Hungarian people. * * *
>
> The Soviet high command in Hungary has now, by direct intervention, brought the situation to a crisis. Following the refusal of the Smallholders Party to abrogate, in connection with the investigation of the conspiracy, the parliamentary immunity of Deputy Bela Kovacs, Soviet occupation troops have arrested Mr. Kovacs.
>
> The grounds given for that arrest are allegations that he actually participated in the formation of subversive and anti-Soviet terror groups and in organized espionage against the Soviet Union. * * * The U.S. Government believes these grounds and the charges are unwarranted. * * * There is no indication that he might be suspected of activities against the Soviet occupation forces.

The Soviet Union did not, of course, honor any of the three U.S. protests. Instead, what came thereafter followed the well-known Communist and Soviet pattern. Torments, physical and mental exposures, and tortures were skillfully used in filthy, wet prisons to force Bela Kovacs to confession. He was then sentenced to life imprisonment and deported to the Soviet Union.

The case of Bela Kovacs and of Hungary clearly demonstrated the real intentions of the Soviet Union in Central-Eastern Europe. The Smallholder leader's arrest initiated a long period of darkness for Hungary behind the Iron Curtain, and even the last dim lights were almost extinguished.

Nevertheless, the Communists failed in their attempt to slander Bela Kovacs' name before the Hungarian people; his memory far from fading, became more bright with every day. And after the death of Stalin in 1953, the thaw resulted in the releasing of many political prisoners. Bela Kovacs was among the group released, and early in 1955 he finally returned to his village with a body broken by ill-health but with an invincible soul. Being fearful of his influence, especially when he refused to join their government, the Communists kept him heavily guarded under house arrest.

The spontaneous Hungarian revolution of October 23, 1956, shook off the chains of slavery. The first achievement of this great event was the formation of a government headed by Imre Nagy, who immediately asked Bela Kovacs to join his Cabinet as the Minister of Agriculture. He came to Budapest to support, with his enormous prestige and ability, the government of the people. In the reorganization of the political parties, the Smallholder's Party elected him their President. The Hungarians had eloquently demonstrated their determination to regain their freedom and independence; Bela Kovacs' personality had its stamp on this national feeling.

For a few days it seemed that Hungary was marching with sure steps toward political and economic stabilization. However, this short freedom was crushed by 12 Soviet armored divisions on November 4, 1956, and a new wave of terror swept through the country. These events caused serious deterioration in the health of Bela Kovacs, but he never gave up the struggle for his people. He remained in Hungary as a living memento to the Communist puppets that bloody terror will never pay in the end.

The head of the Soviet-imposed regime attempted several times to induce Bela Kovacs to join the government. Promises and threats were to no avail and so he was again put under house arrest and interrogated in the usual dreadful way. Finally, the Communists satisfied themselves with statements which supported the regime but which were given most certainly under heavy duress.

Almost 3 years have passed since the crushing of the Hungarian revolution. The hopes of the people to regain their freedom and independence within the near future fade away. One can easily imagine the mental torments this courageous man, Bela Kovacs, was forced to suffer after the reestablishment of the Communist regime. Finally, he succumbed to the pressure of so many years of sacrifice, tragedy, and labor in the service of his people and of freedom.

We mourn in the passing away of Bela Kovacs a great and heroic champion of freedom in the cause of mankind. We express our deepest sympathies from this Capitol to the relatives and friends who surround his grave today. His life and work gives us inspiration to continue the struggle against the flood of communism which is threatening the very existence of freedom and human dignity.

Let us pay our tribute to this small but heroic and spiritually great nation. Let us turn in spirit to the grave of this great Hungarian hero, and let us pledge ourselves that we will not cease to labor until he has found his eternal rest in the soil of a free Hungary.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Wall Street Journal contains an editorial "Passing the Wheat" which suggests falsely that not a man from a wheat-growing State wants to do anything to avoid further surplus accumulation.

The Saturday, July 11, New York Times reports that the administration wants a wheat bill which will reduce price supports and remove controls. The same issue contains a story by William Blair pointing out that the corn crop this year will be 4.2 billion bushels as against last year's 3.8 billion bushels. Blair also notes that this is the first year corn has been free of all acreage controls and has lower price supports.

I would point out to those who are concerned about doing something in regard to wheat, that most of us predicted at the time restrictions were taken off of corn and the support price was reduced, that the corn farmer would do the sensible thing of trying to maintain his gross income by increasing his planting and increasing the total crop.

It seems to me that if the administration will not learn from the mistakes of its previous history it might at least learn from the mistakes of its current history. It is almost indecent that, on the same day that the record corn crop is being predicted, we should be asked to do for wheat what is now working so badly for corn.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks so as to include a letter I am sending to the Wall Street Journal noting these inconsistencies, as well as the newspaper articles referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

JULY 13, 1959.

The EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a representative from a wheat-growing State and as an economist, I have some interest and some responsibility with respect to the Nation's wheat program.

In today's editorial you say that "high price supports are the primary cause of the vast surpluses." This is, of course, the position Benson and the President took in asking for lower supports and less Government control.

I call to your attention a story by William Blair in the New York Times of July 11, noting that the corn crop this year is expected to be 4.2 billion bushels as compared to 3.8 billion bushels a year ago. The corn crop is now free from all acreage controls, and the price support is down from a year ago. The only trouble with the administration theory is that it isn't sustained by the facts and it ignores the economics of farm operation. But how one can continue to ignore current experience is beyond my comprehension.

Corn yields per acre are expected to be lower but are more than offset by the increased acreage planted. The simple economic fact is that as prices drop, the farmer does his best to maintain his gross income so as to cover all of his costs and have a little net income to live on.

The wheat bill which went to the President's desk offered the wheat farmers an increase in parity support from 75 to 90 percent and a small payment in kind (wheat) in exchange for reducing acreage by 25 percent. While this would not quite have maintained their gross income, it might have approximately maintained their net incomes. At the same time the gross output next year on some 42 million acres could be expected to be a little below the total annual domestic use plus exports, thus cutting into the surplus.

It is evident from the corn crop predictions (which every representative from a feed grain area anticipated in advance) that reducing parity support and removing controls would, of course, increase the total production.

I would have been happier to vote for a straight bushel marketing quota—such as Canadians use—than for an acreage quota, but I submit that a further 25-percent cut in acreage would guarantee a reduction in output. To say that the farmers would take the poorest acres out of production is of little consequence in face of the sharp cuts he has already taken in acreage.

I think all of us from wheatgrowing areas who have worked soberly and responsibly to secure competent legislation have a right to resent the innuendo in your comment, "Their philosophy is to avoid doing anything that might stop further surplus accumulation." The responsibility did, indeed, rest upon the Congress. The Congress discharged its responsibility competently. Moreover it gave the farmers the choice between adequate supports and controls versus no controls and a 50-percent support price, which is apparently what Secretary Benson wanted. Apparently the administration has no confidence in farmer acceptance of its own program for it chose to veto this bill, rather than submit it to a vote by the farmers.

Our task of securing passage of responsible legislation is not made any easier by editorials which (1) fail to understand farm economics; (2) ignore current experience; and, (3) attack the integrity of Congressmen seeking to resolve the issue in the national interest.

For a more complete statement I invite your attention to my testimony before the Wheat Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. We will, of course, continue to do what we can in face of misrepresentation and calumny, for our obligation extends to the American taxpayer and consumer as well as to the farmer.

Sincerely yours,

BYRON L. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 13, 1959]

PASSING THE WHEAT

Now some of the farm bloc lawmakers want President Eisenhower to call a big White House conference of leaders of the farm organizations and agricultural experts in and out of the Government. The purpose would be to solve the $3 billion wheat glut.

It's a quaint idea, typical of a time which seems to put great reliance in conferences "at the highest level." Somehow we doubt a conference can pass a wand over those mountains of wheat and make them go away. Especially when the different farm groups have different views of what should be done. Anyway, all those views and many others are long since exhaustively on record.

So the real purpose of the proposal is evidently not to pass a wand but to pass the buck. Congress tried to ram through a wheat bill calling for higher price supports, but the President vetoed it—understandably enough since high price supports are the primary cause of the vast surplus. Congress refuses to consider the administration's wheat recommendations, which at least have the merit of not boosting price supports.

The attitude of Congress was clearly displayed the other day when Secretary Benson again referred to these recommendations. Chairman Cooley of the House Agriculture Committee scolded him thus: "Not a man on this committee from a wheat-growing State agrees with that philosophy." In other words, their philosophy is to avoid doing anything that might stop further surplus accumulation. That being their attitude, they are naturally eager to transfer the problem elsewhere.

But that does not alter the fact that the responsibility rests squarely on Congress. The farm bloc caused this national scandal and it knows perfectly well what the national interest requires. The lawmakers are not going to fool many people by trying to pass the wheat to the White House.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1959]

BENSON IS HOPEFUL ON NEW WHEAT BILL

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, said today he still had hopes that the Democratic-controlled Congress would pass a wheat program that the Republican administration could accept.

He told a news conference that his hope was based mainly on what he called a growing public demand for action to halt the costly accumulation of wheat and other farm surpluses.

President Eisenhower recently vetoed a wheat bill passed by Congress because it went in a direction opposite from that recommended by the administration.

It provided tighter production controls and higher price supports than the present program. The administration wants lower supports and less Government control.

Mr. Benson said he believed that he could recommend White House approval of a bill that would allow growers, voting in a referendum, to choose between a program of low supports and less controls and one of higher supports and more rigid limitation on production.

Wheat farmers will vote July 23 on whether to continue the present program of marketing quotas, acreage allotments, and price supports. These are about midway between the levels sought by the administration and those proposed by Congress in the vetoed bill.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 1959]

RECORD CORN CROP PREDICTED BY UNITED STATES—NEW SURPLUS HEADACHES AND HOG PRICE SLUMP FEARED

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—The biggest corn crop in United States history is in prospect for this year.

It appears to spell more trouble for the Government, farmers, and taxpayers already beset by a surplus farm production that, many officials believe, threatens the collapse of agriculture's price support programs.

A crop of 4,200 million bushels of corn, the key feed grain, was indicated today in a report by the Department of Agriculture.

This prospective production would be a record by a wide margin. It compares with the peak of 3,800 million bushels of last year. In the 1948-57 period the average has been 3,300 million bushels.

On hand in Federal storage and on farms are more than 1,500 million bushels valued at $2,475 million. These stocks include production from the 1955, 1956 and 1957 crops, as well the record 1958 production.

This is the first year corn has been free of all acreage controls under a new program. It allowed corn farmers to produce as much as they wished but reduced the Federal price guarantee.

The Administration-supported program guarantees farmers a price support for this year of $1.12 a bushel. The price is derived from the average corn prices for the last three years.

The price support last year was about 1.18 cents a bushel under the old parity system. The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, has urged Congress to abandon that old system, which still applies to some crops.

The prospective 1959 corn crop is on 14 percent more acres than last year, the result of the removal of Federal acreage allotments. The acreage increase in the great Midwest Corn Belt, where Republicans have been making political trouble, is 19 percent. The Midwest produces about 80 percent of the corn crop.

Corn is the raw material for beef, pork, and dairy products and poultry. Big corn crops induce more feeding of hogs and cattle.

This year's spring pig crop, which was 12 percent above a year ago, was the largest spring crop since 1951.

Many officials and farm economists have forecast that pig production will continue to increase. Some fear "disaster" price levels for hogs by the fall of 1960. This would coincide with the Presidential and congressional elections and compound Republican problems in holding the farm vote.

Cattle numbers are at a record. Midwest farm economists say that desipte increased consumption of beef in an industrially expanding economy, beef prices will weaken, perhaps by late 1960 or early 1961, under the impact of big feed supplies.

Corn yields an acre may be lower but are more than offset by the increased acreage planted. The yield by the acre naitonally was indicated at 50.1 bushels as compared with 51.7 bushels last year.

FEED GRAIN TOTAL LOWER

Overall crop production this year seems likely to be "second only to last year's phenomenal record," the crop board said.

Planted acreage of 340 million acres is above 1957 and 1958, but well below other recent years.

"It now appears," the crop board said, "that harvested acres for all crops will total 325 million acres, slightly above the low levels of the past 3 years, but smaller than other years since 1939."

Weather conditions have not been as favorable in some areas as last year when nature's lushness helped modern farming to turn out record production.

THE CURRENT CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss briefly the current Cuban situation which has caused great concern to me and to many other Members of this body, as well as to vast segments of the American people, and indeed the world.

There has been increasing alarm in recent months at the course which Cuban affairs have taken, and in recent days it has appeared that Cuba—that important little nation 90 miles from our shore, which has always been so close to us, has become dominated and is being run by Communists. Many Americans had great hopes that Fidel Castro was himself not a Communist, and might take a democratic path in Cuba. However, it seems that if he is not a Communist, he is being used by the Communists, and the results are the same. Fidel Castro has been absolute dictator since January 1, 1959.

There are many people who believe that the United States is being challenged in this hemisphere by Russia, and it behooves us to take the necessary steps to keep this hemisphere free.

The recently enacted Cuban agrarian reform law could well be a deliberate Communist effort to block the flow of American capital to all Latin America, create eventual chaos, and soften the hemisphere for communism. I am told that this agrarian reform has little chance to succeed. But take the land from those who have cultivated it, and maintained it, and turn it over to those to work with varying degrees of state interference, some feel can only lead to disaster, which would soon wreck the Cuban economy and cause serious famine in the island.

A great deal has been said about spreading the land in Cuba and having an agrarian reform which would benefit the people. There are very few who would oppose such noble aims. However, in this case, it begins to look as if the government, and not the people, is to receive the land. In addition, it seems that very little consideration has been given to the fact that large areas of Cuba do not lend themselves to cultivation, some is inferior coastal land, some is not fertile land, and some of it is comprised of large areas subject to flooding, which because of their nature cannot be drained. In addition, much of the land is already infested by Marabu—a very serious jungle pest—extremely difficult to eliminate permanently. It appears that land such as this can only be made productive by keeping the Marabu shaded out, by sugar cane or certain introduced grasses. No ordinary crop can be grown on this land. American investors have done a great deal in making this land cultivatable.

Through this agrarian law, the Castro government is actually attempting to confiscate American property, even though they state that they are expropriating the property. This attempt at confiscation could well result in the destruction of the democratic processes of government in Cuba, the usurpation of individual freedom, and the very clever crippling of the flow of American investment capital. It might be intended to bring to a standstill the flow of American investment capital to all Latin and South American countries, as well as other areas of the world, because of confiscation such as is taking place in Cuba.

I can think of no other acts which would more please Russia, than world communism.

In addition to these main reasons involving national security, the United States cannot but look with alarm on the Cuban Government's attempt to take American property without adequate compensation and without any recourse to judicial review. This agrarian reform law is to be administered by an institute, which we are told, will allow no appeal from its decisions and is valuing land at ancient levels, far below their worth. Payment is to be in 20-year Cuban peso bonds, whose worth is open to serious question. This is not expropriation, but confiscation, and is contemptuous of accepted standards of international law.

It seems we should stand behind our citizens who are being so attacked in Cuba. In this Cuban case, the United States could recover the losses to its citizens, by taking away the preferential treatment accorded Cuban sugar imports, by increasing the tariff on these imports, in order to reimburse our citizens for the true value of their property.

It should be clearly pointed out that the United States has, in effect, extended for generations a protective umbrella to the entire Cuban economy by sharing with Cuba the benefits of our economic system and our sugar legislation. Cuba has been accorded such preferential treatment as a favored neighbor and friends as to seemingly make our bonds inseparable. We have sought by this favored treatment to allow Cuba to share in the economic growth of the United States. This has raised the Cuban standard of living, trade has increased, and good for all has resulted.

Now, however, such movements as the nationalization of land by the agrarian reform, and other drastic measures recently promulgated are having the effect of orienting the Cuban economy away from the free enterprise system in such a way as would ruin the Cuban economy, lower wages, make the Cuban citizens servants of the state and rip asunder the historic ties with the United States thereby destroying the trade and intercourse so essential to the well being of both peoples. The Cuban peso, always par with the dollar, has already been seriously weakened by the irresponsible acts of the Cuban Government.

We might as well serve notice that if this course continues we will withdraw the benefits of our economy from them, remove their sugar quota, cut off any present or future aid and if necessary, impound their funds to pay for this confiscated property.

It is, however, to be fervently hoped that Cuba will soon become a truly democratic nation and seek to maintain its close historical ties with the United States in order to promote a safer and more stable hemisphere. The United States capital, which has played such an important part in Cuba's development really hopes for the opportunity to continue to do so and to be of assistance to Cuba and its people.

However, just last week Fidel Castro's brother Raul made abundantly clear the true nature of the Castro movement when he said:

> The Cuban Revolution cannot be considered as solely Cuban because in reality it signifies the awakening of Latin America. Cuba has become the beacon and guide of the continent which sooner or later must become one great country.

Not only in Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere our country at the present time appears to be the subject of the strongest and most sinister attack that communism—both Russian and homegrown—has yet mounted against us. It is, therefore, paramount that we command respect and exert leadership in the Americas—with tact and friendship whenever possible, but with intelligent firmness of purpose when this is called for in any special situation.

This is indeed a most difficult and alarming situation, and I am deeply saddened by the necessity which requires me to speak out in this manner, but the United States can have no course but to make it clear, what its position will be in this case. I feel that our State Department should take all necessary action immediately, so that our position is made abundantly clear, and by so doing hope that we can avoid a disaster which might, in part, be based on our own failure to state our honest intentions and desires.

IS IT SMART TO SELL IMPORTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking the well of the House today is to try and clarify the thinking of my colleagues on a question that concerns not only the life of many American industries, but it also concerns the maintenance of a stable national economy.

The question I shall try to answer, "Is it smart to sell imports?" is being asked across the length and breadth of America. The answer must be made now—not tomorrow, or some indefinite time in the future, but now.

In the preparation of this address, I am greatly indebted to the editor and management of the American Lumberman. Mr. Richard W. Douglass, executive editor of the Lumberman, has kindly consented to allow me to give the Congress the basic facts uncovered in a recent crosscountry survey in order to find an answer to this question that has arisen to plague the businessmen of America.

Strange to say, many dealers here in America, anxious to make profits, and with little or no thought to the general welfare of the Nation or their next door neighbors, are waxing fat in this harebrained scheme to buy America short.

Reasons for selling imports—according to dealers:

First. Less expensive than similar U.S. item.

Second. Offers something new and different to promote.

Third. Customers like aura of foreign goods.

Fourth. Quality satisfactory, sometimes superior.

Fifth. Packaging—nails—for customer convenience.

Sixth. Price competition forced us into imports.

Seventh. Offers products not obtainable in United States.

Eighth. Draws store traffic.

Ninth. Customer thinks he is getting a better deal.

Reasons for not selling imports—according to manufacturers:

First. Quality inferior to comparable U.S. items.

Second. Poor quality hurts dealers' reputation.

Third. Reduces size of overall sale, also profit.

Fourth. Servicing and reordering difficult.

Fifth. Throws Americans out of work.

Sixth. Disturbs traditional distribution channels.

Seventh. Encourages off brand merchandise.

Eighth. Fails to meet U.S. operational and structural standards.

Ninth. Fewer sales helps, no product guarantee.

The editor of the American Lumberman, under the caption "It Isn't Funny Anymore," handles this problem without gloves. He asks and answers some pointed questions aimed at awakening the American businessman to the dangers that lie ahead.

His editorial comments follow:

Shortly after the war, a few foreign cars started to trickle into the country. Women thought they were cute and the men admired them for other reasons, which Detroit is still trying to analyze.

Only 7,542 foreign cars were imported in 1949, hardly enough to cause a ripple in the Detroit flood. Last year the figure skyrocketed to 383,000 cars and imports exceeded exports for the first time in automotive history.

Foreign car sales in this country gained 91.5 percent last year while sales of American-made cars declined 26.6 percent. Another 35 percent sales boost is predicted in foreign car sales this year.

The ripple of 1949 has developed into a merchandising storm that has led domestic auto manufacturers to rush competitive small cars into production.

What began as fresh material for the cartoonist and jokester has developed into a competitive threat of no laughing matter.

Many building materials—nails, glass, plywood, small tools, hardboard, and hardware—have followed the same pattern with grave consequences in prospect for the American manufacturer and possibly the dealer.

In 1951, Japan sold 1.5 percent of the American hardwood plywood market; last year, they sold 40 percent in this market. Imports from Japan alone equaled 87 percent of the total domestic output, says the Hardwood Plywood Institute: Imports of hardboard increased 446.2 percent in 1957, according to testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee. In just 1 month, February of this year, 825 cases of mechanics' tools arrived from England, Germany, Japan, Italy, and Finland.

What is the result?

Some manufacturers have frankly cut the quality of some lines of merchandise to meet foreign competition—and lost; others have turned to specialty items that are less competitive; still others have made arrangements to produce certain items abroad for sale in this country at a price.

Some have tried to meet the challenge with better packaging and improved point-of-sale helps. But many manufacturers admit that imports have caused a problem, critical in some cases, that you can help solve.

"Feed dealers seem to realize the serious threat they are creating by handling foreign-made products," remarked Thomas B. Andrews, sales manager, Southern Screw Co. "If the trend continues, within 5 years this country will have the greatest unemployment problem in history."

There is no quarrel with fine, quality merchandise from abroad. The hand craftsmanship of European artisans found in knobs pulls and escutcheons is unequaled here, domestic hardware manufacturers readily admit. This is high-class merchandise at a high price in contrast to many of today's imports, which are low quality at a low price.

What is happening in building materials is just a small part of the overall import picture. As one sales manger pointed out, it will take a united front up and down the line, with pressure for quotas and heavier duties, to stem the tide.

Caught between an appeal to "Buy-and-sell American" and a need to meet competition, the dealer who cares to think about it, faces a neat dilemma: what happens when the profit motive collides with patriotism?

J. H. Walsh, merchandising manager for the Lufkin Rule Co., has an answer:

"Our research indicates that the sale of cheaper foreign items does nothing more than cut down on the total sales of profits of those dealers handling these items. Lower prices do not by themselves increase the total market unless the quality is equal to the higher priced item."

Your decision to sell or reject imports counts just as surely as your vote—or failure to vote—at the polls.

Growth of imports in selected building materials and products

(Statistics from U.S. Department of Commerce)

Wrenches, vises, hammers, etc:	
1958	$2,699,789
1957	2,132,934
1956	1,913,795
1955	2,154,699

Growth of imports in selected building materials and products—Continued

(Statistics from U.S. Department of Commerce)

Mechanics' tools:[1]	
1958	$669,370
1957	622,109
1956	483,410
1955	412,602
Hardboards one-eighth inch (from Sweden):	
1958	102,240,000
1957	89,428,000
1956	75,744,000
Hardware hinges and hinge blanks:	
1958	1,003,900
1957	1,065,794
1956	1,495,571
1955	1,363,490
Wood screws (iron or steel):	
1958	1,126,416
1957	1,175,338
1956	1,452,218
1955	1,280,887
Builders' Hardware (NES[1]):	
1958	427,900
1957	366,036
1956	324,595
1955	268,395
Nails (over sixty-five thousandths in diameter or 1-inch long):	
1958	29,313,304
1957	20,813,497
1956	15,987,903
1955	17,455,898

[1] Not elsewhere specified.

The following facts make it clear that imports hurt both the dealer and the consumer. These facts are supplied by the American producers who want to keep this business for American firms and American workmen.

One of the Nation's major manufacturers of builders' hardware went in the red last year for the first time in 19 years.

The president of this firm, in his annual report, blamed imported residential hinges for the firm's deteriorating financial position. These hinges had been a bread-and-butter item for the company for many years. Foreign hinges had stolen this segment of their market.

To a lesser degree, this same story is being repeated by the manufacturers of plywood, hardboard and many other building materials, which are being undersold by imports.

"CAN'T LICK 'EM? JOIN 'EM"

Some manufacturers have given up trying to compete with foreign items and have decided to manufacture abroad.

The Lufkin Rule Co., for example, recently made arrangements with a firm in England to manufacture a line of Boxwood rules under their own brand name for importation into this country.

It has become impractical to manufacture these items in this country and maintain a reasonable price—

Explained J. H. Walsh, merchandising manager—

There is a very limited demand for these items, but we feel it is in the best interests of our distributors and retailers to make these items available. This is the only item in our line which we cannot manufacture and match both price and quality of imports.

Paul Robin, sales manager, Penn-Akron Co., a major hardware manufacturer, said that competing foreign cabinet hardware can be produced for

20 percent to 70 percent below their costs. His firm is considering setting up a separate corporation to handle imported hardware to supplement their American-made lines.

The only answer I can see—

Declared Robin—

is, "if you can't lick 'em, join 'em."

Retail lumber dealers are hurting themselves, as well as their customers, by selling most imported goods, domestic suppliers warn.

STEM THE TIDE

B. S. Falk, sales manager, Independent Lock Co., made this comment:

While many buyers may be attracted to foreign-made goods because of the price, they will soon find out by experience that they are only hurting themselves in the eyes of their customers and they will have more returns and trouble than they ever anticipated.

I strongly believe that when more and more dealers compare notes in this regard, the tide will be stemmed and the trend reversed. Furthermore, I believe that dealers should give very careful consideration to such elements as service, deliveries, replacement parts, repairs and, above all, the reliability of the manufacturer and the possibility of recourse when something goes wrong.

Falk said that a recent survey among quite a few of their distributors indicates they are dropping these lines because of inferior quality.

Many dealers, warned industry spokesmen, fail to realize their own responsibility as vital links in the chain of distribution.

One of the dealers' main concerns should be customer satisfaction and he is jeopardizing this by attempting to sell inferior, imported products—

Declared P. H. Grevengoed, advertising manager, Dexter Industries, Inc.

Thomas B. Andrews, sales manager, Southern Screw Co., also emphasized this point:

Actually, we do not believe that lumber and building supply dealers realize the serious threat to their own business that they are creating by handling foreign products.

Many of these foreign products that can be produced to advantage costwise because of cheap labor are products that are manufactured in the United States by large numbers of American workers.

Andrews said his firm is trying to lick imports by stressing quality, variety, easy availability, attractive packaging, useful literature, and so forth.

In fighting imports, Grevengoed said Dexter Industries stresses quality, dealer service, reputation, and availability of continuous supply. He pointed out that the difference between inexpensive and quality hardware is only a few dollars per home—less than 1 percent of the cost of a $15,000–$20,000 home.

HARDBOARD SITUATION

The hardboard industry has been increasingly feeling the impact of imports. So much Swedish hardboard is being imported that in 1954 the Secretary of the Treasury found that it was being dumped in this country. Although the finding is still in force, imports from Sweden continually increase.

What does a building material dealer lose in order to gain a temporary price advantage?—

Asks Donald Linville, executive secretary, Hardboard Association.

Delivery schedules cannot be relied upon. The dealer does not enjoy the benefits of the promotional and advertising programs designed specifically for them. Imported boards are not offered in a wide range of sizes, types, and speciality boards, as are continually being developed domestically.

The dealer and industrial users of hardboard rely heavily on the technical and the sales engineering staffs of domestic producers when problems arise. Importers of foreign hardboard offer no such service. They do not support any orderly distribution pattern. Furthermore, they do not recognize the lumber dealer as their only outlet; they also sell direct to the dealers' customers.

Although labor union headquarters publicly support the free-trade theory, their locals have always supported the industry's efforts for reasonable tariff protection. Plant employees know that increased imports of hardboard result in exporting jobs abroad.

LOWER PROFIT MARGIN

We believe that, in the long run, dealers should realize that they make less profit when they handle imported merchandise—

Declared Charles M. Jones, vice president for sales, C. Hager & Sons Hinge Manufacturing Co.

They should also take into consideration that they are taking money away from people who produce in this country and eventually they, too, will be affected.

Inferior imported door closers were mentioned specifically by two spokesmen for builders' hardware suppliers.

We have tested a lot of foreign door closers—British, Swedish, West German, and Japanese—and none have met the quality standards of American closers.

Declared L. Curtis Booth, vice president, American Hardware Corp., P. & F. Corbin Division.

J. E. Fox, Jr., sales manager, residential hardware division, Sargent & Co., said that one imported spring closer in particular is causing trouble:

It doesn't meet Government specifications and sells for about $2 under a comparable domestic product—

Fox said—

We've run tests on them and find they have a short life.

"Imports are a critical problem," declared Richard C. Fritz, advertising manager, McKinney Manufacturing Co.:

In a year when building generally was at its highest level ever, we sold hardware at prewar price levels in order to hold our volume against the imports. Obviously, this is a losing proposition in face of substantial increases in operating costs.

Our trouble started about 5 years ago—

Added Fritz.

First, it was English hinges that gave us trouble; the German hinges pushed the English out of the picture and now the Japanese are pushing out the Germans.

Fritz said the U.S. wage scale is about 20 times the Japanese scale and 4 times the German scale:

To meet Japanese competition on residential hinges, we've cut our prices but the Japs still undersell us. Consequently, we have turned to specialty items like sliding door hardware, which do not lend themselves readily to importation.

However, the only real solution to this problem—

Concluded Fritz—

is some kind of a quota on imports, which compete with American-made goods simply because their producers have ignored American standards of quality in order to make them cheaper.

Now that the Japanese have stolen the hardwood-plywood market, the American hardwood-plywood industry has begun to fight back.

Imported hardwood plywood has struck a hard blow at the domestic market. In 1951, the year the duty on hardwood plywood was slashed 50 percent, imports represented only 8.3 percent of the domestic consumer market.

Today hardwood-plywood imports have taken over 53 percent of the U.S. market, says Clark E. McDonald, managing director, Harwood Plywood Institute, in a statement to American Lumberman.

Just when the domestic market was ready to expand—flush doors were becoming a factor, wall paneling was on the upswing, and hardwood plywood was moving into the kitchen and family room—Japan entered the market with prices under American production costs.

In many cases, McDonald says, the American producer was forced by imports to discontinue the type of panel he could make best and cheapest and compete with other American producers in markets not yet invaded by imports. Disastrous competition resulted. He says:

The American hardwood-plywood industry has no thought of accepting defeat and turning its markets over to the Japanese and a few other foreign producers.

It has appealed under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, calling for a rollback of plywood imports to a reasonable quantity in relation to the demands of our market.

Failing favorable action, says McDonald, "the Government by its own actions will have served notice on the forest products industry and other American industries that it is open season on American producers and foreign producers need no hunting license."

It shall be my purpose in a later article to further enlighten my colleagues on the dangers to America and American economy through the tendency of American capital to go abroad to erect factories and to export American jobs by exploiting the cheap labor available there. Already a minimum estimate is that 1 million American jobs have been exported.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for calling attention to a very difficult problem. It is one that concerns my district as well as that of the gentleman. I should like to ask a question. That is whether the gentleman feels that this sort of trade can be eliminated entirely.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think it can be eliminated. It possibly should not be eliminated.

May I say to the gentleman, who is a new Member of Congress, that for the number of years that I have been in Congress, some 12 or 14, I have taken a position not against our reciprocal trade policies. But what I am trying to do is to throw greater safeguards around American manufacturers so that they may continue to make a profit and continue to supply jobs for men and women who need jobs here in America.

THE DOMESTIC SHRIMP MARKET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation designed to alleviate the severe slump in the domestic shrimp market. The shrimp industry in the United States is presently undergoing its greatest struggle for survival due to a combination of factors.

Of great consequence to those whose livelihoods depend on this industry are a record carryover of frozen shrimp from 1958 and an abundant new supply of fresh shrimp from U.S. production areas. Without the aggravating influence of yet a third and more important factor, foreign imports, these problems would soon pass through the law of supply and demand. Continually increasing foreign imports of shrimp in various forms are crippling the industry to the point where a remedy must be found, and found soon, lest our domestic market in the very near future find itself in bankruptcy.

For several months now I have been studying this problem which is a matter of great concern to me in particular because the shrimping industry is a very big business to thousands of my constituents along the Georgia coastal waters. I have watched the situation steadily worsen until it now presents a rather alarming picture. Along the Georgia coast, in my district, a year ago shrimp (running 31 to 35 to the pound headed) wholesaled for 72 to 75 cents a pound. The same grade shrimp last week brought only 48 cents a pound wholesale. I have been advised that this price trend is reflected similarly in other parts of the Nation. It can be readily seen how particularly severe this price decline is when it is remembered that the shrimp industry is one which counts its profits in pennies.

As an example of how tremendous these increased imports have been, I would like to quote a statistic furnished by the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries. According to the Bureau, shrimp imports for the month of March 1959 totaled 8,492,000 pounds, or almost double the 4,986,000 pounds imported during March 1958. Some 40 countries ship at least some shrimp imports to the United States.

With the domestic market becoming more and more distressed I prevailed upon appropirate officials of the regulatory agencies to advise me on some possible administrative remedies to meet this critical situation. What I had in mind was some quota system by which the import nations could sell their shrimp in the United States without flooding our domestic market and driving it into bankruptcy.

But the executive branch of the Government, I find, is powerless to set a quota or duty on shrimp. The Tariff Act of 1930 placed shrimp on the "free" list, and foreign countries have been able thereby to sell their shrimp in the United States without burden of quota or import duties. In fact, shrimp imports are under no control except as to being fit for human consumption, a test made by spot checking.

A quota system certainly would be more advisable than the enactment of a duty, but any quota set by Congress would conflict with international trade agreements which Congress already gave the President authority to make. Congress last year extended this authority to the President for 4 additional years.

Only Congress has the power to grant this overburdened industry relief, and the only relief available is by passage of a duty on the foreign imports of shrimp. The bill I have introduced would establish such a duty but only temporarily, for a 2-year period, to give the domestic market an opportunity to overcome the present unrestricted imports. My bill would place a 33⅓ percent ad valorem duty on fresh, frozen, and breaded shrimp. Canned and other processed shrimp would not be affected by the bill. The measure would amend the 1930 Tariff Act by shifting fresh, frozen, and breaded shrimp from the "free" list to the "duty" list of import commodities.

Since the enactment of the Tariffs Act of 1930, Congress has shown much reluctance to adopt any legislation that would shift commodities from one list to another and correctly so, because with most attempts to do this, there was some administrative remedy available. But there is no administrative action that can be taken to save the shrimp industry from foreign shrimp imports. Only Congress can grant this industry some relief. I hope every Member of Congress will give his most serious consideration to the importance, the urgency, and the need for passage of this bill.

WEST VIRGINIA IS GETTING SHORTCHANGED

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that during the Korean conflict, my home State of West Virginia ranked first—at the very top of the list in percentage of its population serving the Nation during that time.

And I should like to add that a larger number of West Virginians were killed in battle than those from any other State—based on the percentage in service.

I believe this proves conclusively that West Virginia has contributed generously to the defense of our Nation in days past. Should the need arise, I know that my great home State would do so again.

And yet West Virginia, which gave more men and lost more men on the basis of its population, ranks a dead last in Defense Department spending and installations.

For the ninth time on the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to this shameful discrimination against the Mountain State.

Every other State—many smaller in size and in population—has a bigger share of the defense budget, bigger payrolls, more installations.

I have figures—the Defense Department's own figures—to bear out my contentions, and I am appending them to this statement to confirm West Virginia's great contribution to the Nation's armed service in the Korean conflict.

Yet our reward, seemingly, is to remain absolutely last in the modern, cold war Defense Department budget, despite our record of patriotism, valor, and duty.

I have said previously, and I now repeat, that it is a national disgrace for West Virginia to be first in war, first in peace, and last in the hearts of the Pentagon.

	Number serving in the Korean conflict as a percentage of total population	Estimated number serving in the Korean conflict [1]	Population, 1950 [2]
1. West Virginia	4.73	95,000	2,005,553
2. Maine	4.59	42,000	913,774
3. New Hampshire	4.50	24,000	533,242
4. Vermont	4.50	17,000	377,747
5. North Dakota	4.35	27,000	619,636
6. Oklahoma	4.29	96,000	2,233,351
7. Rhode Island	4.29	34,000	791,896
8. North Carolina	4.23	172,000	4,061,929
9. Alabama	4.21	129,000	3,061,743
10. Virginia	4.18	139,000	3,318,680
11. Kentucky	4.17	123,000	2,944,806
12. South Dakota	4.13	27,000	652,740
13. Nebraska	4.07	54,000	1,325,510
14. Tennessee	4.07	134,000	3,291,718
15. Utah	4.06	28,000	688,862
16. Massachusetts	4.05	190,000	4,690,514
17. Florida	3.96	110,000	2,771,305
18. Oregon	3.94	60,000	1,521,341
19. Arkansas	3.92	75,000	1,909,511
20. Idaho	3.90	23,000	588,637
21. Kansas	3.88	74,000	1,905,299
22. Connecticut	3.88	78,000	2,007,280
23. South Carolina	3.87	82,000	2,117,027
24. Arizona	3.86	29,000	749,587
25. Pennsylvania	3.85	405,000	10,498,012
26. Wisconsin	3.84	132,000	3,434,575
27. Minnesota	3.82	114,000	2,982,483
28. Iowa	3.81	100,000	2,621,073
29. Wyoming	3.78	11,000	290,529
30. Georgia	3.77	130,000	3,444,578
31. Missouri	3.76	149,000	3,954,653
32. Nevada	3.75	6,000	160,080
33. Montana	3.72	22,000	591,024
34. Texas	3.72	287,000	7,711,194
35. New Mexico	3.67	25,000	681,187
36. Indiana	3.63	143,000	3,934,224
37. Colorado	3.62	48,000	1,325,089
38. Maryland	3.62	85,000	2,343,001
39. California	3.58	379,000	10,586,223
40. Louisiana	3.57	96,000	2,683,516
41. Washington	3.57	85,000	2,378,962
42. Mississippi	3.53	77,000	2,178,914
43. Michigan	3.49	223,000	6,371,766
44. Illinois	3.42	298,000	8,712,176
45. Ohio	3.41	271,000	7,946,627
46. New Jersey	3.37	163,000	4,835,329
47. New York	3.25	482,000	14,830,192
48. Delaware	3.14	10,000	318,085
49. Alaska	1.94	2,500	128,643

[1] Source: Department of Defense.
[2] Source: Bureau of the Census.

	Number killed in battle in the Korean conflict as a percentage of total number serving	Estimated number serving in Korean conflict [1]	Population, 1950 [2]
1. West Virginia	0.84	95,000	2,005,553
2. Arizona	.81	29,000	749,587
3. New Mexico	.78	25,000	681,187
4. Kentucky	.70	123,000	2,944,806
5. California	.67	379,000	10,586,223
6. Ohio	.65	271,000	7,946,627
7. Michigan	.64	223,000	6,371,766
8. Nevada	.63	6,000	160,080
9. Indiana	.62	143,000	3,934,224
10. Louisiana	.62	96,000	2,683,516
11. Oklahoma	.62	96,000	2,233,351
12. North Dakota	.62	27,000	619,636
13. Colorado	.61	48,000	1,325,089
14. Maryland	.61	85,000	2,343,001
15. Virginia	.61	139,000	3,318,680
16. Arkansas	.60	75,000	1,909,511
17. Minnesota	.60	114,000	2,982,483
18. Missouri	.60	149,000	3,954,653
19. Montana	.60	22,000	591,024
20. Tennessee	.60	134,000	3,291,718
21. South Dakota	.59	27,000	652,740
22. Texas	.59	287,000	7,711,194
23. Illinois	.58	298,000	8,712,176
24. Nebraska	.57	54,000	1,325,510
25. Pennsylvania	.57	405,000	10,498,012
26. Georgia	.56	130,000	3,444,578
27. New Hampshire	.56	24,000	533,242
28. South Carolina	.56	82,000	2,117,027
29. Wyoming	.55	11,000	290,529
30. Kansas	.54	74,000	1,905,299
31. Maine	.54	42,000	913,774
32. Vermont	.54	17,000	377,747
33. Washington	.54	85,000	2,378,962
34. Wisconsin	.54	132,000	3,434,575
35. Idaho	.53	23,000	588,637
36. Alabama	.52	129,000	3,061,743
37. Mississippi	.52	77,000	2,178,914
38. Iowa	.50	100,000	2,621,073
39. Florida	.50	110,000	2,771,305
40. Utah	.49	28,000	688,862
41. New Jersey	.48	163,000	4,835,329
42. Oregon	.46	60,000	1,521,341
43. New York	.46	482,000	14,830,192
44. North Carolina	.45	172,000	4,061,929
45. Massachusetts	.44	190,000	4,690,514
46. Delaware	.43	10,000	318,085
47. Rhode Island	.42	34,000	791,896
48. Connecticut	.39	78,000	2,007,280
49. Alaska	.36	2,500	128,643

[1] Department of Defense.
[2] Bureau of the Census.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HARRIS, for 40 minutes, on July 16.

Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. PRESTON, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $297.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. STRATTON.

Mr. GUBSER.

(At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. HECHLER.

Mr. FARBSTEIN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 14, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1188. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the sixth report of the Department of State on its activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1189. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1190. A letter from the Acting Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Canal Zone Government for the period July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1191. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to the case of Gilbert Ochoa, A-2302786, involving suspension of deportation under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1192. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 20, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Smokes Creek, N.Y., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, House of Representatives and U.S. Senate, adopted March 16, 1954, and May 16, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 200); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1193. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the report of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council on the mass transportation survey of the Washington region; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5257. A bill to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis; without amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. S. 1120. An act to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits; without amendment (Rept. No. 651). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 8171. A bill amending the act of February 20, 1931, as amended, with respect to a rail transit crossing across the bay of San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 8172. A bill to provide for the construction of a road across the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range in South Dakota; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 8173. A bill to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8174. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 8175. A bill to prescribe limitations on the power of the States to impose income taxes on business entities engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 8176. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 8177. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act requiring filing of rules and regulations on operation of track motorcars and other self-propelled equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8178. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers by railroads engaged in interstate commerce by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 8179. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for carrying out provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct timber access roads, to permit maximum economy in harvesting national forest timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 8180. A bill to amend section 101 of title 13 of the United States Code so as to require the Secretary of Commerce to collect certain statistics relating to crime; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 8181. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provisions and improvements of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 8182. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of foreign excess property for educational and health purposes in certain cases; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 8183. A bill to amend section 20 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that certain pensions and annuities shall not be counted as income for purposes of determining eligibility of a widow or child for death pension under Veterans' Administration laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H.R. 8184. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on fresh, frozen, or breaded shrimp imported during the next 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 8185. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States which was reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the Attalla City Board of Education, Attalla, Ala.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8186. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, with respect to Reserve commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 8187. A bill to impose certain restrictions on disposing of radioactive material by depositing it in the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 8188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 8189. A bill to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of captain to the grade of major; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 8190. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provisions and improvements of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 314. Resolution authorizing an increase in the allowance for stationery for each Member of the House of Representatives, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. LAIRD presented a memorial of the Wisconsin State Legislature memorializing Congress relating to termination of Federal control over the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 8191. A bill for the relief of James W. F. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF (by request):

H.R. 8192. A bill for the relief of Henri Kirschen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 8193. A bill for the relief of Josefine Lepschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 8194. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Lauder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 8195. A bill for the relief of Manolis N. Triantafillou and Carmen Armbruster Triantafillou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 8196. A bill for the relief of Everet Bumgardner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8197. A bill for the relief of Lawrence M. Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8198. A bill for the relief of Martin Ackerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8199. A bill for the relief of James J. Manning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8200. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in the State of Louisiana to Maurice L. Troxclair, Paul E. Troxclair, Marie O. Troxclair, Marie Eleanore Zeringue Troxclair, Noel Nicholas Troxclair, Dunkin Joseph Troxclair, Virginia Marie Simon Troxclair, Mabel Lucy Troxclair, Alvin L. Troxclair, Roland Andre Troxclair, Marie Rosalie Troxclair, Laurent Jean Troxclair, Laurence Anne Troxclair, Alma Rita Troxclair, Donald Joseph Troxclair, Marie Stella Rome Troxclair, Emile Joseph Troxclair, Mamie Marie Troxclair, Lea Marie Troxclair, Stanley Etienne Troxclair, Ethel Ann Troxclair, Stella Rose Troxclair, Lillie Eugenie Troxclair, Marguerite Mary Troxclair, and their heirs, successors, and assigns; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 8201. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Bougdanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

236. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ray Smith, city auditor, Portland, Oreg., relative to endorsing home rule for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of July 11, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District of Texas)

A FABLE (?)

Once upon a time two men went into the building business together. Partner A agreed to draw up a budget for the firm and sign the checks to pay the monthly bills. Only Partner B, however, was empowered to authorize expenditures. Though the business got off to a good start, Partner B began to purchase items beyond the budgeted necessities, each item seeming desirable, if not necessary, for the welfare of the business. When Partner A complained about exceeding the agreed budget and said there wasn't enough money to pay the bills, B retorted: "Well, you're running the paying end of this business, and," (wagging a finger) "don't run up a deficit. Besides," said B, "I have reduced spending on some of the items we did have budgeted, namely, office furniture and decoration. I'm saving money." "Yes," Partner A rejoined, "but you are running around charging other items we didn't budget; and on top of that you authorized a subcontractor to withdraw construction funds from our bank account as he needs it."

Not convincing his partner, but facing the stark reality of more due bills than money at the end of the month, "A" had but two alternatives, short of bankruptcy. Either he must raise more income or borrow money from the bank to cover the bills. He arranged a 90-day loan. Meanwhile, old "B" continued to make unbudgeted purchases, charging them to the firm's account, and the subcontractor was drawing money directly from the bank account as he needed it.

The 90-day loan was extended and increased. Then, unable to extend the loan again, a loan from another bank was arranged to repay the first. As time passed, and the spending and refinancing continued, Partner A knew that a sad day of reckoning was coming.

A tried to counsel his partner: "The way we're spending more than we're taking in and borrowing more to cover our debts, our credit is getting shaky and I am having difficulty refinancing. Even now I am forced to pay higher interest rates. We've got to tailor our spending to our income, and now, before our creditors lose confidence in us." To this wise advice, his partner replied: "Now, wait a minute. Each of these things I am buying is something our company ought to have—a colorful neon sign, the automatic opening door, the brocade draperies, carpeting—these things add class and are necessary for the welfare of our business, for our success and growth."

As though A didn't have troubles enough, B often added insult to injury by loudly criticizing the company's growing indebtedness, and the fact that A was having to pay higher interest rates for the borrowed money. Sometimes he even slyly inferred that his partner was just paying these higher rates as sort of a favor to his banking friends. As fiscally responsible partner A pondered this stalemate, his problem loomed larger. How could he reason with this fellow who was consistent only in his appalling misunderstanding of even the most rudimentary facts of economic life? How could he avoid alarming the creditors? And how could he explain the situation to the other investors whose money was involved? Finally, how could he set them on the course to solvency?

Fable? Now let's look at Government: Partner A, the administration, prepares our budget and must sign the checks to pay our bills; but only partner B, the Congress, may authorize expenditures, and is expected to provide the income (through taxes) to pay the bills. As spending by Congress exceeds

income ($13 billion last year), the administration must meet its bills by borrowing more money, and refinancing older debts as they come due. Since there is more demand for available loan money—for the use of other people's savings (and that $13 billion worth of Government demand is quite an item in itself), the price for the use of money automatically goes up. And that's all interest really is—the price paid for the use of money. The more people who want to use what money is available, the higher will be the price charged for it.

The root problem again is spending. Without continual deficits and the inflation they cause, the Government's borrowing problem would not be as acute, nor would interest rates go up. Ironically enough, however, some of the very Congressmen who vote for the big spending want also to decrease the Government's income (taxes) and will loudly blame the administration for any rise in our indebtedness or in interest rates.

It's no wonder that the technical nature of this subject often confuses the voter and that political orations larded with such terms as "tight money," "monetizing the debt," etc., only serve to worsen the confusion. As soon as enough voters understand that interest rates are not "set" by anybody; that interest is simply the price for the use of the commodity, money, and is regulated by supply and demand just as every other price must be; that when the Government must borrow heavily in the short term loan market, it thus competes for the use of money with newlyweds who need furniture and families who need automobiles. Then the administration's problem will be greatly simplified. Then the voter can point his finger at the real culprit, the "big spender" in Congress, reckless in his eagerness to "provide something-for-everybody" (sometimes he calls this promoting growth or expansion) and who refuses to recognize that continued spending beyond income brings inevitably nearer the day of reckoning, and hurts most of all the so-called little man and those average families who foot most of the tax load and are most cruelly hurt by inflated prices.

OBA Corp. Should Be Complimented for Promoting U.S. Savings Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8107, a bill introduced by Congressman MULTER to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use of U.S. Savings Stamps for trade promotion, is in direct opposition to our great American ideals of free enterprise. This bill is directly aimed at OBA Corp., an organization founded by a group of public-spirited businessmen, to aid the sale of U.S. savings stamps and bonds by encouraging public collection of the stamps.

These businessmen wish to sell their products, yes, but if they can, at the same time, interest millions of American housewives and their families in purchasing U.S. savings stamps, should this be called a crime?

The Government should be very grateful that there are some leaders of American business who are concerned enough about the economic future of our country to direct hundreds of thousands of dollars toward a reawakening of the savings stamp program. This program is especially valuable to our children, where we wish to encourage thrift and sound economic thought. The OBA Corp. plan to distribute free savings stamps and savings books—none of which cost the Government anything at all—through the use of coupons on various consumer products is entirely consistent with the highest standards of business-Government cooperation as evidenced by the entire savings bond program, and I heartily endorse the program. I wish to compliment the businessmen who have begun this program and I urge others to join with them in this most worthwhile effort.

Representative Fulton on U.S. Defense Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is sometimes overlooked that while the Soviet Union is a distant neighbor, Moscow being 4,700 miles from New York, it is also a fact that the U.S.S.R. is only a few miles distant across the Bering Strait from our 49th State, Alaska, and within relatively short range of our advance bases throughout the world. Representative JAMES G. FULTON, the senior minority member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and a senior member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, has written an important commentary on this question published in the Sunday, June 28, Washington Post and Times Herald.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 28, 1959]

WHERE SHOULD THE UNITED STATES CONCENTRATE ITS DEFENSE BUILDUP?—REPRESENTATIVE FULTON SAYS FORWARD BASES PUT A PREMIUM ON IRBM MISSILE

(By Representative JAMES G. FULTON)

Big nation power plays today are as fast as a big league baseball game. A crack of the bat or a line drive down center field, and the strategic positions of the teams change and the stands are electrified.

The two big league powers, United States of America and U.S.S.R., are and have been winning and losing ball games for the last 12 years. But it is still a tight series and no one has a really decisive advantage.

Anybody who tries to give the results of this world series during the tight 12th game is permitting his bravery to get beyond his reason.

Neither the U.S.S.R. nor United States of America has such overwhelming strength that it can eliminate the other. Each has sufficient current strength in various fields so that neither could destroy the other without being nearly destroyed itself, which is clearly unprofitable.

So, does the argument of who is ahead in the ICBM race really profit us? In the missile and rocket field, each nation surpasses the other in different ways but neither presently has an effective strategic superiority.

We have no information that the Soviets have operational ICBM weapon capability, nor do we know that there has been a successful target reentry by a Soviet ICBM in which the CEP (circle of probable error) has been accurate enough to indicate that it is at this date even a partially successful military weaponry system. I challenge anybody to prove otherwise.

Statements giving the U.S.S.R. this capability are pure guesswork. Of course, the Soviets have their IRBM land range, and their southwest-to-northeast ICBM land range, largely over Siberia. But successful missile flights of the length that the United States has completed over the Atlantic missile range from Cape Canaveral to Ascension Island, would fall in the Pacific Ocean on Russia's ICBM range. Their range is too short for land fall and there is no evidence of successful Russian ICBM sea reentry shots such as this country has publicly announced.

There is no doubt of American superiority in the guidance and control fields, and in tracking and telemetry. We and our allies have a worldwide network of ground stations aiding us in these fields. The U.S.S.R. has none outside of her territory and satellites.

Do not underestimate our advances in the production and use of IRBM's for the defense of the United States and the free world from European bases, as well as from over 250 free world bases scattered everywhere. We can get to a target with more missiles, more accurate CEP, in half the time and at half the expense of the ICBM long-range missiles.

Russia must depend on an ICBM range of 4,000 to 8,000 miles launched from her own territory. The United States has been smart in moving her defenses to forward bases outside her borders with ranges for ICBM missiles of only 400 to 1,500 miles to target areas on the average.

Why should the United States take Senator SYMINGTON'S advice and adopt Russia's strategy of ICBM's? Now—we should fill out our U.S. defense production immediately to support our forward bases which give us defense in depth, and we must now continue emphasis on research and development in the ICBM field rather than production.

We should not now make the decision to match Russia's 1961–62 strength as predicted by Senator SYMINGTON to be 3,000 ICBM's—they are probably the "Big Bertha" cannons of World War I transferred to world war III.

The ICBM capability of all nations has been tremendously handicapped already by the high-space nuclear shots by the United States in September 1958, in the South Atlantic which can knock out most of our present electronic missiles guidance systems.

Address by Hon. Dennis Chavez of New Mexico, Before Non-Partisan Statehood Association of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered before the Non-Partisan Statehood Association of Puerto Rico, at San Juan, P.R., on July 3, 1959.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE DENNIS CHAVEZ, U.S. SENATOR, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW MEXICO, BEFORE THE NON-PARTISAN STATEHOOD ASSOCIATION OF PUERTO RICO, SAN JUAN, P.R., JULY 3, 1959

My friends of Puerto Rico, I am most happy to be with you and to discuss with you briefly what I believe are matters of importance to every person on the island.

It is not my purpose or intent to interfere in any way, shape, or form, in the political business of Puerto Rico, or to tell you how you should run your political business. I am most happy to feel that under your present status, and under the Governorship of the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, you have made great advancement, both politically and economically.

But there are other things, in my opinion, in which you are interested—whether you want to continue under the present political status or want to become part of, and not only an associate to, the United States of America.

I repeat—what you do, I still maintain, is your business.

I, for one, believe it is in the interest of your future welfare, your economic progress, and the history of your past under the American flag, to be part of, and not associated with, the United States.

What are the requirements for statehood?

Hawaii and Alaska aside, the case for Puerto Rican statehood can stand on its own merits.

The traditionally accepted requirements for statehood are defined in a 1953 report (Senate Rept. No. 1029) of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as follows:

"1. The inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with and are sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

"2. The proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and carry its share of the cost of Federal Government.

"3. A majority of the electorate wish statehood."

Does Puerto Rico qualify? I firmly believe that it does.

No one who knows the beautiful island and its industrious people can doubt the Puerto Ricans' devotion to democracy. Puerto Ricans distinguished themselves with great valor on the battlefields of World War II and the Korean war. They have demonstrated a keen awareness of the Communist menace to freedom. Their determined efforts and sacrifices to provide widespread education, adequate housing, proper standards of health, and opportunities for their youth—all by means of democratic processes—are akin to our own deepest aspirations and methods for achieving them.

Does Puerto Rico meet the population requirements? Look at the statistics. Its 2.3 million is over 10 times the population of Alaska and almost 4 times that of Hawaii. Actually, 24 States of the Union (not including Alaska and Hawaii) have less people than does Puerto Rico. In fact, the island contains more than Nevada, Wyoming, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Delaware put together. Moreover, while Alaska has only 1 city with a population of over 25,000, and Hawaii but 2, Puerto Rico has 6.

A further requirement for eligibility is that the proposed new State can support State government and carry its share of the cost of Federal Government. Puerto Rico's economic self-development is impressive. Puerto Ricans have demonstrated a remarkable industriousness and self-sufficiency. In 1957, the last year for which figures are available, the island exported merchandise valued at $457 million and imported a total of $732 million worth of goods. Of that total, a whopping $640 million worth was purchased in the United States, while Puerto Ricans shipped us over $430 million worth of products.

Unfortunately, comparative statistics for Hawaii and Alaska are not available. But statistics showing the trade of all three with other nations of the world are published, revealing again that Puerto Rico leads. In 1957, Puerto Rico's imports from other countries totaled around $93 million, compared with Alaska's $3.8 million, and Hawaii's $27 million. On the other side of the ledger, Puerto Rico's exports to other countries amounted to more than $27 million, compared with Alaska's $8.5 million and Hawaii's $20 million.

What of the third requirement, that a majority of the electorate wish statehood? It must be remembered that Public Law 600 which was submitted to the Puerto Rican people on June 4, 1951, for their acceptance or rejection authorized them to "organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption." Delegates to the constitutional convention had no opportunity to vote on statehood inasmuch as the convention concerned itself exclusively with setting up a commonwealth form of government. Public Law 600 did not imply such a restricted frame of reference. In any case, Public Law 600 does not set an irrevocable status for the island. There is still the opportunity to put the question of statehood before the electorate.

I, for one, urge that a plebiscite be held as soon as possible. And I hope that our Puerto Rican citizens vote for statehood.

What are the advantages of statehood?

Admission of Puerto Rico to the Union has a number of striking merits. The Communists throughout Latin America have seized upon Puerto Rico as an issue to stir up old resentments against the United States. Everywhere Vice President NIXON went in South America, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower in Central America, they were assailed with Communist-inspired accusations of United States imperialism in Puerto Rico.

Of course we know that Puerto Ricans voted to stay affiliated with the United States—and they can vote to secede any time they want to. Puerto Rico is our best propaganda weapon to counter the Communist big lie.

Admission of Puerto Rico as a State would abruptly pull from the Communists one of their major propaganda weapons in their campaign to drive a wedge between the United States and its Latin American neighbors.

Another point to be considered is the strategic geographic location of the island. It stands at the gateway between the Caribbean and the Atlantic and athwart the approaches to the Panama Canal. Extreme nationalist sentiment which wants independence is today far in the minority. Yet in Puerto Rico's still indeterminate political status, the Communists could have readymade allies among a handful of resentful people who would seek any ally in their struggle to achieve independence. Statehood would end forever this insidious threat.

For Puerto Ricans, themselves, statehood would bring incalculable benefits. Those who have made their homes in the United States would certainly feel an added sense of belonging to the community.

Full-fledged citizenship, on a par with citizens of other States of the Union, would imply the responsibilities as well as the privileges which Puerto Ricans already enjoy. These responsibilities—electing Representatives and Senators to Congress, and paying taxes for the support of their Federal Government—far from being burdensome, would put the Puerto Ricans on an equal psychological footing with citizens of every other State.

There is one remaining argument for Commonwealth status.

In the final analysis, the only possible argument left—both on the mainland and in Puerto Rico—against statehood, is the one of economic advantages under the Commonwealth. We hear fervent arguments to the effect that the tax concessions which Puerto Rico can offer new investors are a decisive factor in attracting new industries to the island. I believe, on the contrary, that the sense of political insecurity growing out of the neither fish-nor-fowl status of the island is a major barrier to investment of capital in the island.

Many mainland investors today look upon the island with a degree of suspicion. They have read the sensational stories about the attempt to assassinate President Truman and of the shootings from the gallery in the House of Representatives.

We know that those were the deplorable actions of a handful of fanatics. But potential investors, wondering about the unsettled political status of the island, probably recall the incidents, and think twice. Once Puerto Rico took its place alongside its sister States in the Union, once the Puerto Rican people had registered their final, irrevocable intention to cast their lot permanently with the United States, all doubts would necessarily disappear.

Another prong in the economic argument used by Commonwealth supporters is that with statehood, Puerto Rico would have to pay Federal income taxes and excise taxes, spelling economic ruin for the island. It can be argued just as cogently that such advantages are offset by the loss of Federal appropriations, which accrue to the States.

I hold that the economic, cultural, psychological, and strategic advantages weigh heavily in favor of Puerto Rican statehood. Whatever the outcome, I think that Puerto Rico should have a plebiscite on the question of statehood to find out the real wishes of the Puerto Rican people. Whatever your views, I urge you to vote. For your vote is the essence of the democracy, which in the final analysis, is the fundamental political right we all share.

The admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union casts a new light on Puerto Rico's status. Creation of our 49th and 50th States buried once and for all the old arguments used to block Puerto Rico's admission. The old arguments are dead.

Opponents on the mainland to Puerto Rican statehood used to argue that Territories outside the continental limits of the United States should not be integrated into the Union. The fact that Puerto Rico is closer to Washington, D.C., in travel and communication time than Boston and New York were when the United States was founded, left die-hard opponents unmoved. Now, however, the questions of continental contiguity and distance are no longer even open to debate. Neither Alaska nor Hawaii are contiguous. Alaska's capital lies about 3,000 miles from Washington; Honolulu about 4,800 miles; while San Juan is but 1,550 miles away.

Then there was the contention that the historical, linguistic, cultural, and racial differences between Puerto Rico and the mainland would make statehood inadvisable. Pointing to our own Spanish heritage in the Southwest and in Florida made only a little dent in that argument. The admission of Hawaii to full-fledged membership in the Union pulls the rug out from under that point of view. Everyone knows that over three-fourths of Hawaii's population are non-Caucasians, with orientals predominating.

We have outlined and briefly discussed requirements.

Let us for the moment discuss the military participation of Puerto Rico in the forces of the United States since 1898. In the First World War, in the Second World War, in Korea, thousands of your citizens who were serving the United States in an American military uniform (and not the uniform of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) did not come back to their dear ones or to be buried in this beautiful island.

The Veterans' Administration advises that as of December 1958, Puerto Rico had 114,000 veterans who served the United States of America, in American uniforms and following the flag of the United States in war—willing to make the supreme sacrifice, if need be, for the flag they followed.

Puerto Rico contributed many fine men, the soldier, the corporal, the sergeant, up to and including generals, such as Gen. Raul Esteves, General Codero, and Gen. Pedro del Valle of the U.S. Marines, who commanded the 3d Division at Okinawa. He didn't lead troops of the associated Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but American—U.S. Marines.

Going a little further on the number of veterans that you now have—if you were a State, in my opinion, you would have not only a 200-operating-bed hospital at San Patricio, you would have hospitals sufficient to take care of the 114,000 veterans.

But who will fight for them?

At the moment in Washington, as far as Puerto Rico is concerned, under your present status—and I do not doubt the sincerity of purpose, the desire and inclination of your Resident Delegate to help the veteran, he can't vote to give that veteran 1 cent, or provide 50 cents for the construction of a hospital. It is not his fault. It is the island's status.

Think it over. Think carefully.

There should be a plebiscite, submitted under congressional direction, to the people of the island to determine just exactly what they want the island to be.

I thank you good folks for your patience and indulgence. Hasta luego.

West Virginia Welcomes a Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, my State of West Virginia rapidly is becoming a leader in efforts to attract new industries. We know that we have many of the features which industries are looking for, and we have been accelerating our programs for explaining these advantages. We look forward to the day when the State no longer will depend on the ebb and flow of the coal market, but will have a broadly based, diversified economy.

Now I am happy to report that another of the world's great corporations has recognized our immense potential, and may serve as a beacon to lure additional businesses to our area. And this is no raid on another section of the country—it will not take one dime from any other region's pockets.

The Montecatini Societa Generale per l'Industria Minerari e Chimica of Milan, Italy, has just announced plans to build a magnificent new $10 million chemical plant on the Big Sandy River near Neal, Wayne County, about 8 miles from Huntington.

The benefits which will be derived from the Wayne County plant—located in an area sorely wounded by the still-current recession gripping our State—should be immense.

Montecatini is locating a plant in our district of the United States when many American industries are resituating their plants in foreign nations. This should be an object lesson to American corporations, who need only to look to Montecatini to reaffirm that American workers are the best labor supply in the world—and that they fully deserve to be the best fed, best housed, and best paid.

In fact, I had the pleasure recently of meeting with the company's senior American representative, Mr. Lucio Lucini, of New York. Mr. Lucini has had long experience dealing with industrial labor both in America and abroad, and he made a remark about the reasons for Montecatini's selection of the Wayne County site that I regard as exceptionally pertinent. Not only did the firm decide upon the Wayne site for the usual advantages such as coal, water, power, and accessibility to markets, Mr. Lucini said, but also because of the human element.

This factor, less tangible but no less important to an industry seeking sites to expand or relocate, was not inconsiderable in Montecatini's selection.

We liked the people—

Mr. Lucini told me.

The working people of West Virginia are good people. They are quick to learn complicated jobs, they are conscientious and they work hard. This was one of our big considerations.

I believe this clinches arguments in favor of West Virginia for new plant sites. West Virginia is an ideal location from a standpoint of abundant raw materials and other blessings, but it also has the kind of people with which industry likes to be associated.

And if the Montecatini company is happy to be working with our West Virginians, it is equally true that the people of West Virginia are happy to welcome Montecatini.

This company has become truly global in scope since its founding as a small copper mining concern in 1888. Today, it embraces an industrial empire of 174 plants in 25 different nations, employing 60,000 persons.

The firm has kept up with the tremendously rapid and complex changes taking place in the chemical world of today. Five percent of the company's gross income is poured back into fundamental or applied research, and another 1 percent for the education and added training of its workers on every level.

It is hardly surprising that Montecatini is one of two great Italian firms cooperating on the first application of atomic energy developed in Italy—and I should like to point out that this will be peaceful atomic energy, not war production.

The Wayne County plant will be producing another fabulous new product which Montecatini research has developed—the marvelous discovery Moplen, which may be as important to the plastics industry as the development of nylon a couple of decades ago.

Moplen, described by chemical experts as a true breakthrough in the polyolefin chemical group, is going to be one of the real workhorse plastics of the future. It has broken the so-called 100° centigrade barrier which defied many earlier plastics compounds.

Moplen's high melting point, low density, excellent electrical characteristics, rigidity, toughness and tensile strength make it ideal for a galaxy of uses.

Moplen is a product evolved from a research miracle by Dr. Giulio Natta, who found a means of actually altering the molecular structure of the gaseous olefin chemical group—derived from petroleum—to meet given needs in the manufacured or finished form.

Thus, Moplen can be literally tailormade as it is being produced to provide specific qualities for the product into which it is to be fabricated.

This will make its application in the plastics field incredibly wide as production expands. And our plant in Wayne County will be one of the pioneers in manufacturing this miraculous new product for industries and consumers alike all over the world.

So keen was the interest in Montecatini's new venture that a bond issue of $10 million for construction of the new plant through an American subsidiary was oversubscribed almost as soon as it was announced.

Montecatini's Wayne works will provide needed jobs for our West Virginians, a vital new product for the world's future, and a closer bond between America and a stanch European ally.

With all these benefits in sight, it is no wonder that West Virginia extends a cordial welcome to Montecatini, and looks forward to many years of happy and fruitful association.

It is altogether possible that Montecatini will blaze a trail for many, many other industries to recognize the great potential of the Ohio Valley, "the American Ruhr," and other sections of West Virginia, and locate new industries there.

Getting the Job Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the delegates to Delaware's annual convention of Federation of Democratic Clubs were recently given an opportunity to hear one of our distinguished younger Members, Senator VANCE HARTKE, deliver an enlightening address on affairs in Washington.

Senator HARTKE's able analysis and presentation received widespread comment throughout the First State.

In order that others may benefit from his observations, I ask unanimous consent that his timely and interesting mes-

sage entitled "Getting the Job Done," be printed in the RECORD.

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

GETTING THE JOB DONE

(Address by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, to annual convention of Federation of Democratic Clubs, Dover, Del., Apr. 25, 1959)

Nearly 3 years ago I was at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago as an observer, the young mayor of a struggling industrial city down on the Ohio River in southern Indiana. Here, I met representatives of the great State of Delaware.

My associates and I struck up acquaintances with several men from the State in which I appear tonight. Since then many things have happened to the country, to your State and mine, to our party, to me personally. In a sense, they are interwoven.

They form a part of the tapestry that is the state of the union, 1959. The central theme of that tapestry is largely that of our party.

In the heat of the summer of 1956 I could not know that your great Senator, ALLEN FREAR, and I would become friends and associates in the U.S. Senate. It is, in part, this association which brings me here tonight.

But before I discuss any further the things I have come to talk over with you, I want to say some words about your distinguished Senator. He is one of the most respected and best liked men in the Senate. Even when someone has differences of opinion with him his opponent acknowledges the intelligence and the sincerity of the Senator from Delaware. I know Delaware is proud of ALLEN FREAR as I am to serve with him.

So we are together tonight in part because of ALLEN FREAR—my friend and yours. We are together in part because of the failings of our opposition. We are together in part because of our Democratic program and leadership. We are together because of our mutual success.

It is a success upon which we draw for inspiration for the future. Ours never was a party to promise rather than perform. Or to look backward and not forward. Or to be content with a record of the past.

You and I know and glory in the record of past achievement by Democrats in the White House, on Capitol Hill, in your own State capitol, and in mine. But this is not enough.

With victory have come obligations and responsibilities. I report to you in all sincerity and humility. We are accepting them.

We cling to the ideas and ideals of a party devoted to service, a party concerned with the welfare of the people who together make up this Nation.

If I have learned anything in Washington, it is that not everything is clearcut right and wrong, black and white, good and evil. People of differing views—even within our party—can have equally deep convictions. These keep our party healthy as different views have kept our Nation healthy.

To find common ground among these differing views is not compromise of ideals or principles. It is, rather, getting the job done.

There are those in politics who play to the grandstand rather than work with the them to get the job done. I heard an old hand ask one day, "Do you want us to make a lot of noise about this or do you want to get legislation passed?"

I am proud to report to you that most of the Democrats on Capitol Hill want to get legislation passed. And this was the mandate of the voters which last fall gave us almost a 2 to 1 majority in the Congress—and if the recent polls are correct, that majority would be larger if it were election day today.

They saw in our party the doers. We seemed to have the new young faces. We seemed to have the vigor and the program—the ideals and the ideas. We seemed to be willing to work to get the job done instead of just talking about it.

And what have we done to carry out the mandate we were given?

In the Senate we have passed—

A bill to help areas with heavy unemployment to help themselves.

A new housing bill, which includes funds to revitalize our large cities, clear slums, help ordinary people own homes and assist our veterans.

An airport construction bill designed to get caught up with the jet age.

Hawaiian statehood.

Assistance for educational TV.

Continuation of jobless benefits for those out of work long periods.

An extension of the draft.

Participation in the World Bank monetary fund.

A workable labor reform bill which, while it does not contain everything that everybody believes should be in such a bill, was approved by committee 13 to 2 before winning a floor okay this week.

A plan for a study of unemployment and how to lick this problem which today finds some 4½ million Americans out of work.

Considering that we have been in session only about 3 months and considering that there has been a flood of minor legislation, I believe the record we are writing in Washington is one of which all Democrats can be proud.

It is being done with thorough investigation, adequate debate and due deliberation.

This is the trademark of real leadership. The U.S. Senate is blessed with many great Democratic leaders. But a great deal of the credit for our record must go to our majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

In view of some of the things which have been said about the leadership, I would like you to know that the majority leader has never been too busy to discuss legislation with me, to listen to my ideas and to trade information and ideas. Senator JOHNSON has made this a practice with anyone who seeks him out.

I wonder if we have not come so far in recent years that we Americans have forgotten what real leadership is.

If there is anything for which we may indict the Republican Party on a national level, it is for not doing what has been necessary for the well-being of the vast majority of the people. There is great fear right now, for instance, whether there may be some vetoes of our work in Congress.

Unfortunately, when we received our mandate last November, the White House and the administration did not go with it. If the people could have had it within their power to do so, I feel certain they would have given us this additional authority.

Instead of leadership in the administration, however, we continue to have sham—study, stall, and stumble.

More than a year ago we were told that the unemployment problem was improving. The tune remains the same. Not long ago Labor Secretary Mitchell said he would eat his hat if unemployment did not drop below 3 million by October.

And what about the 3 million who are left? There seems to be no concern for them among the stalwarts of the administration.

Some weeks ago Secretary Flemming of Health, Education, and Welfare announced a program of assistance for better schools. He proposed—in all seriousness—that we pass the program now because it is needed now, but postpone putting it into effect for a year or two.

Meantime, the administration asked Congress to pay certain bills due next year this year.

Now, this is foolishness.

If we Democrats would propose anything like this, we would be held up for national ridicule in the newspapers of the country.

But I suppose we have come to expect not alone lack of leadership and lack of concern, but often a lack of good common sense as well.

Our administration has now embarked on a program of bungled budget balance. In the first place, this so-called balanced budget is a fairy tale.

If we raise taxes and fees of seven different kinds—and if business improves some 30 percent, and fail to assume our proper responsibility—then the President may have sent us a balanced budget.

But balance itself is not the test. If it were, then the sure method would be to remove all taxes and spend nothing. Result: Income 0, spending 0.

Government is designed to accept responsibility and to do a job. If we are attacked or if your friends are attacked, we will fight. This is our resolve.

Of course, we must work to keep our spending within balance of what we expect to take in. But you can balance your budget at home by buying yourself a new car instead of food, or a fur coat for the wife instead of milk for the children, or a new roof on the house instead of new lights in the living room.

What we Democrats have said thus far is that we are concerned that there is unemployment and a need for so many things here at home. We are worried about the state of our Armed Forces and our defense research and production. We are worried about an adequate farm program. These things cost money. So do airports, hospitals, roads, houses.

Every spending proposal that comes before Congress is getting careful scrutiny because of this. We are going to decide that we need food and milk before a new car or a coat. We are going to decide whether we should rewire the living room or fix the roof. And we believe we can probably do both.

We are determined to balance the budget, not because this is an end, but because it is the right way to proceed.

We are equally determined to bring back prosperity because this is right and because we know recession is something we cannot afford.

We are determined to have better education, less sickness, more and better housing, a better defense, a workable farm program, hospitals, parks—new tomorrows, greater futures, better living for all of us.

The people have confidence in us.

We are going to perform—just as we have been performing in the past.

Contrast the performance of the past 6 years in Congress with that of the past 6 years of the Republican national administration—or for the moment go back more than 6 years. I recall too well during the recent recession the attempt to pacify the fears of the people held out these reassuring thoughts: Have no fear. Everything is going to be all right. Prosperity is just around the corner. We will not have another depression like the thirties. And here is why: We have found built-in economic stabilizers. They are:

1. Unemployment insurance.
2. Social security programs.
3. Bank deposit insurance.
4. Stock market controls.

These built-in economic stabilizers will prevent another depression.

And they probably did.

But where did these far-reaching, forward-looking programs originate? Did they come from the Madison Avenue slogan masters? No. They came from clear-thinking Democratic administration. When they were proposed, they were violently objected to by the Republicans. Yet, in time of stress,

danger and fear, the Republicans reassuredly pointed to these Democratic measures as the safeguards of the Nation. And as I said a few moments ago, during the past 6 years contrast the forward-looking programs of the Democratic-controlled Congress with the inept administration, the same clear contrast of action compared to inaction, retrogression compared to progress, looking forward compared to looking backward can be found.

Our party and our country will profit most from a program of action * * * decisive, bold action to solve the problems and get the job done. I am less concerned about who leads this fight or the exact course it will take than I am about getting on with the task.

I am far less concerned about who will lead us in 1960 than I am whether he will have the tools with which to lead. We must give him the program, the record, the accomplishments. With this, he will win, whoever he is.

Your part in this is to help us with ideas, ideals, and advice. It is to correct us when we are wrong, boost us when we are right. It is to tell the story of what we are doing, how we are doing it and why.

We are, I believe, on the threshold of greatest success, success in which everyone in this room can benefit morally and materially.

Let us promise each other, now, we will work together to get the job done.

Why TVA Self-Financing Bill Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the House has passed the TVA self-financing bill. It was passed by a vote of 245 to 170.

Last week the other body also acted favorably on this legislation. This bill was passed by a vote of 73 to 17. Two years ago the Senate also passed a similar bill by a vote of 61 to 20.

I express the hope and the belief that the President will be fair and approve this legislation when the bill comes to his attention.

First. The President himself first proposed this legislation to the Congress in his budget message on January 17, 1955. The President has repeated his request for self-financing legislation for TVA in his budget messages of 1956, 1957, 1958, and again in January of this year—on five separate occasions.

Second. Committees of the Congress have worked for 4 years to write a reasonable and workable bill.

Third. Extensive hearings have been held—five sets of hearings—on this legislation in both Houses of the Congress.

Fourth. Both the House and the Senate have acted favorably on this bill and there has been 5 years of debate on this measure, both inside and out of the Congress.

Fifth. The bill represents a reasonable compromise of many views. It is considered satisfactory in the main, not only to the TVA, but also to the private utility companies bordering on the TVA area.

Sixth. The Secretary of the Treasury has expressed his approval of desirable features of the financing phases of this bill—and indeed all approved the measure except a limited few who want TVA destroyed and dismembered.

Seventh. The bill puts a fence around TVA—a territorial limitation is prescribed—and not a kilowatt of power can be sold outside the area.

Eighth. The TVA will make a far greater return of payments into the Treasury than under the present law.

Ninth. TVA is a creature of Congress—will remain under the control of the Congress. The President can make recommendations for changes at any time and the Congress can enact changes at any time.

Tenth. All three members of the Board—Chairman Vogel, former Congressman Hays and former Deputy Director of the Budget Bureau, Jones, have all been appointed by the President, and surely they can be depended upon to carry out the provision of this legislation in a responsible manner.

With the territorial limitations, with Treasury Department control, and congressional control, and Presidential control through the naming of the Board members, no further control should be desired.

When we are appropriating millions for the development of water resources throughout the country—and billions throughout the world—surely it is just and fair that the citizens of a great area would be given the privilege of voting bonds for self-financing, bonds that are taxable, and bonds that are not included, but outside, the national debt.

I express the hope again that the President will be objective and fair and not disapprove this needed and meritorious legislation. Such approval would permit the TVA to operate in a businesslike fashion, but without undue political and partisan influence and to a large degree eliminate the annual congressional fight over TVA's operations, and would be in line with statements and assurances of the President of his friendship and support for this great agency of the Government.

House Armed Services Subcommittee Investigation Into Activities of Retired Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services began its investigation into the activities of retired military, naval, and civilian personnel in connection with the awarding of defense contracts. Because this action grew out of action that first took place on the floor of the House in connection with the 1960 defense appropriation bill, and a suggested amendment to that bill which I opposed on the floor, I believe that some Members may be interested in the text of testimony which I was privileged to submit to the subcommittee on July 10. Under leave to extend my remarks the testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL S. STRATTON, DEMOCRAT, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES REGARDING THE EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MILITARY AND FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN DEFENSE CONTRACTING, JULY 10, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee today in connection with the broad question of the employment of retired governmental personnel, both military and civilian, in the field of defense contracting. I have no particular special interest in this field except that I happen to be a Reserve officer in the Navy and I do represent a district which includes two major defense manufacturing concerns, the General Electric Co. and the Alco Products Co., both of Schenectady. Since Schenectady is an area which has been most heavily hit by unemployment our people are naturally concerned about any action that might further impair the likelihood of a fair share of the employment connected with the defense industry from coming into our area.

This subject arose in the first instance, if my recollection is correct, in connection with the employment of retired military personnel, and it came to a head on the floor of the House on June 3 in an amendment offered by my friend and colleague from New York State, Congressman SANTANGELO, to the Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 providing that no defense funds could be expended for the payment of any contract with any firm which employed retired military or naval officers of general or flag rank who had been retired for less than 5 years. Although the amendment came to the floor in the course of debate and was entirely unexpected, I believe the RECORD will show that I was the only Member of the House to rise and speak out against it specifically on the merits. The amendment failed by a single vote on a division of the House, but only after the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. MAHON, had indicated that he felt the subject raised by Congressman SANTANGELO should be fully explored by this committee rather than be tacked on hastily to a major appropriation bill. Since the committee is now in the process of undertaking the inquiry to which the gentleman from Texas referred, my only purpose here is to restate most emphatically the opinions that I expressed on the House floor at the time the original suggestion was made, and to offer to this subcommittee, most respectfully, my own suggestions as to the proper course that this investigation should take.

In my judgment the amendment originally offered by Mr. SANTANGELO was unwise and unsound. It could only have had the result of damaging many entirely innocent retired officers, and it would have had a most disastrous effect on the conduct of our whole defense program. Certainly this committee would not, I am sure, desire to do anything either to impair the defense program or to cause injustice to be done to loyal officers of our armed services who have completed their service and retired pursuant to law.

The original amendment appears to have been offered on the assumption that retired

officers who have gone to work in defense plants are, if not always at least in most cases, utilizing their knowledge of defense matters and their acquaintances among defense personnel to the detriment of the Government, the taxpayers, and the defense program as a whole. The suggestion has even been made that thousands and perhaps millions of dollars might be saved, without any impairment whatsoever in our national defense, if retired officers were barred from any position in a defense contracting organization.

I am not aware whether any evidence exists to support such a charge. It may well be that there are instances where retired officers have used their abilities improperly to the detriment of the country and at a waste of the taxpayers' money. That, of course, will be one of the things to which this committee will address itself in the course of this inquiry. But it would be my own feeling that such instances of a betrayal of trust will be very few and far between, and that as a general rule it may be assumed that the retired officers of this country, regardless of their rank, are loyal, honest and conscientious individuals who are no less anxious to serve the interests of their country after their retirement than when they were in uniform. Certainly those retired officers who now occupy positions of importance in the General Electric Co. and Alco Products in my home city—and there are a substantial number of them—most definitely meet this standard.

And so I believe it would be a grave mistake if this committee were to proceed on the assumption that there is something inherently wrong with a retired officer going to work for a defense contractor, and I do not believe that the committee intends to create any such impression. On the contrary, there would seem to be evidence to suggest that this kind of procedure is actually extremely helpful to the national defense. In the first place, the defense contractor greatly benefits from the advice and recommendations of individuals who have spent their lives in the defense field. How better could a civilian manufacturer understand the requirements of the defense program than with the help of someone in his own company who had been closely connected with that kind of program? In the second place, what more natural thing for a retired officer to do than to find retired employment in the field with which he is most directly familiar and in which he has spent his life? All of us, as members of the Armed Services Committee, are well aware that the retirement income for officers is not excessive. Most of our officers are retiring these days at comparatively young ages, many while their families are still in the process of completing their education, which is the period of heaviest demand on one's income. To expect that a retired officer should live and provide for his family entirely on his retirement pay is, of course, completely unrealistic. Only recently our committee approved the Navy hump legislation which would force senior officers out of the service earlier than they would normally expect to retire, and we acknowledged the economic burden this would place on them by providing for the payment of a special separation bonus to such officers. Many of these officers, by the way, though in the rank of captain, will be promoted to flag rank upon their retirement, and therefore would fall within the terms of the original Santangelo amendment. Wouldn't we be causing them a grave injustice to force them out of uniform ahead of the normal period of time and then foreclose automatically to them the one civilian field where they would be most likely to find employment?

Actually, if our defense program is to succeed—and judging from the continuing behavior of the Soviet Union we will have a defense program of some magnitude with us for a long, long time to come—then there must be the closest possible liaison and understanding between those in the military service and those in the manufacturing field. How better can we hope to achieve this necessary liason than by means of a free and untrammeled interchange of personnel?

If there are abuses then of course these should be dealt with. But it would be my recommendation that any legislation designed to prevent any such abuses be directed toward the specific abuses the committee uncovers rather than toward retired officers and defense contractors generally. Surely we need not throw out the baby with the bath. This was the basic flaw in the Santangelo amendment; and had it been enacted the whole defense program would have ground to an abrupt stop.

Specifically, the implication that retired officers employed in Defense Establishments is a bad thing would seem to be based on the assumption that defense contracts are awarded by one or two individuals, in which case personal friendships and individual favoritism might be controlling. Frankly, my own limited experience has been that this is not the case, that before any contract can be awarded the decision must pass through many different hands and many different boards. Personal acquaintances might well enable an individual company to grasp more quickly Defense Department requirements and be able to locate more readily the first stage in the procurement process, but they would not be likely to have any decisive influence on the outcome.

I would respectfully suggest that the committee direct its attention to this particular field. If it develops that important contracts can be awarded by single individuals on the basis of nothing more substantial than favoritism, then in my judgment corrective legislation ought to address itself to the contract-awarding machinery, to insure a close check on the actions of any single individual.

These are only tentative suggestions, Mr. Chairman, and I make them with some hesitation in view of my status as a very junior member of this distinguished committee. I know that the subcommittee has very broad experience in the whole field of defense procurement which cannot be duplicated by any individual member. But what disturbs me most about this investigation, Mr. Chairman, is what I might describe as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand, suggesting that we in America may gradually be moving back toward the view of a bygone day that might best be expressed by the term "the devil theory of war." I had thought that as a result of our experiences in World War II and our experience during the cold war that has followed it, that we had at last grown out of the rather naive assumptions that were prevalent in the 1920's and 1930's that the military operations of World War I were not the result of broad political, economic, and social forces at work, but rather were the result of the schemings and machinations of one of two sinister and evil individuals.

I hope we are not today allowing ourselves to fall into the same trap by implying that the heavy financial and psychological burdens of continuing to stand up against the massive threat of Soviet communism are not the result of equally massive political and economic forces at work in the modern world, but rather have been caused by the evil machinations of just a few individuals and that when these individuals are removed we can live quietly and easily and cheaply once more. Can we honestly believe that there is some sort of "devil" explanation of this kind for the high cost of military budgets? Can we honestly believe that if we only push aside one or two retired generals or admirals we can provide for our military security on a painless and almost costless basis?

As a boy, I grew up in a day, Mr. Chairman, when the professional military men of this country were not held in very high regard. It was quite fashionable when I was in college to sneer at anyone in uniform and to assume that no individual worth his salt would ever be so silly as to consider a professional military career. I hope, Mr. Chairman, we never go back to that kind of thing again. Thank God that, in spite of that common view, we had able career officers ready when World War II came, to win the victory for America. And unless we can continue to attract and retain in our armed services the ablest and most competent men and women to solve some of the fantastically complex problems that confront us in maintaining our national security, we will be in desperate straits indeed in the years ahead.

Let this subcommittee certainly root out all evildoing that may exist. But let us not also lend ourselves, even unwittingly, to the support of any campaign that would suggest that those who have dedicated their lives to the defense of their country are actually men and women who are undermining it. Let us do nothing that will, even indirectly, discourage wise and intelligent men and women from going into the career service of our country. Let us instead recognize that this Nation has indeed a right to expect those who have served in uniform to continue to make their skills available to the defense of their country as long as life and breath permit.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Is Only a Foretaste of What Is Possible in the Future for Americans of Faith and Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there are few things that can happen only once in all of history. One of them is the St. Lawrence Seaway. There was no other place on this planet where a whole new ocean could be created by man. Completion of the seaway will prove to be an event of greater significance than we probably can realize at this time.

The seaway begins at Duluth, Minn., 2,300 miles inland. On July 11 there was an enthusiastic celebration at Duluth of the seaway's dedication. Governors attended from four States, Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska—which for the first time in their history are given a seaport.

The main address at the Governors dinner on Saturday night, July 11, 1959, was given by the Honorable Fred A Seaton, Secretary of the Interior. Because of the unusual scope and perspective of the address—and its vision of the future possible to Americans of faith and courage—I am including it here:

ADDRESS BY FRED A. SEATON, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE GOVERNORS' DINNER, HOTEL DULUTH, DULUTH, MINN., JULY 11, 1959

It is of course an honor to participate in the dedication of the seaway Port of Duluth, here at the extremity of the fourth seacoast of the United States on what has now become the fifth ocean of the world.

On such an occasion it seems only fitting to remind ourselves of the fact that the

newly opened St. Lawrence Seaway is many things.

First of all, it is a magnificent physical symbol of the friendship between the United States and Canada, and of nearly a century of peaceful cooperation between our two countries.

It is a major source of hydroelectric energy, with a power dam as Massena, N.Y., surpassed on this continent only by Grand Coulee and Niagara—a power dam which will serve consumers on both sides of the international boundry.

It is a pathway for ships—big ships, flying the flags of countries on six continents, exporting from and importing to the infant seaports of Buffalo and Erie and Cleveland and Chicago and Duluth-Superior. In less than 2 months after its opening on April 25, more than 1,500 vessels traveled this waterway. And long after the parades and pageantry of the formal dedications of the seaway end, such deep sea vessels will go on year in and year out, weaving their pattern of peaceful international trade.

Eight American States border the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. They presently have 25 percent of the total number of American farms, 40 percent of the American population, and 46 percent of America's gross income. The port of Duluth-Superior directly serves two—Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Stretching out beyond them is America's heartland, including Canada and western sections of the United States rich in natural resources. To all these areas and to the lake ports which serve them, the new seaway offsets tremendous opportunities for economic expansion.

Opportunities, however, are not gifts. Rather are they circumstances to be seized upon by the bold, the intelligent, and the energetic. So it is that the cities which reap the major rewards to be offered by the seaway will be those which look ahead, plan ahead, and build ahead. It is perfectly evident to me that you in Duluth are well aware of that fact. You deserve congratulations on your Arthur M. Clure Public Marine Terminal, dedicated today, and on the private facilities which will join it in the years to come. I honor you for your initiative and foresight.

As you well know, the total tonnage of cargo through Duluth-Superior has historically ranked second only to that through the port of New York. With the gradual exhaustion of Minnesota's high-grade iron ore reserves, some people have feared that your port would sink in the national scale. The new seaway puts such doubts to flight and brings Duluth new hope for the future.

There is ample evidence to support such a conclusion.

Since 1915 the tonnage through the Panama Canal has increased 10 times. In the past 10 years traffic on the U.S. inland waterways, excluding the Great Lakes, has nearly doubled. Recognizing the leaping growth of our population and economy, we may well expect a repetition of these historic waterway patterns here.

Before the seaway was widened and deepened, the volume of cargo that moved through it every year totaled about 13 million tons. In this first year of the improved seaway, the volume is expected to be nearly twice as great—25 million tons. And in another decade, it should double again, going to 50 million tons, as our population grows past 200 million and the gross national product of our economy leaves the one-half trillion dollar mark behind it.

Tonight is indeed a night for rejoicing over the fulfillment of a dream nearly 3 centuries old. In 1680 Francois Dollier de Casson worked out a plan for a route around the Lachine Rapids at Montreal—a plan, incidentally, which never went into effect. One hundred years later, George Washington caught a glimpse of what might happen to the economy of his new Nation if it could but "open the road" between the Great Lakes and the sea. More than another century later the United States and Canada undertook joint studies of the St. Lawrence, and from 1903 forward vessels with a draft of less than 14 feet could travel up the little seaway.

The big seaway, however, was still a big dream when the United States and Canada signed the Seaway Treaty of July 18, 1932, during the Presidency of Herbert Hoover. It remained but a big dream for nearly another quarter of a century, perennially supported by leaders of both major political parties, never enacted; always a bill, never a law—a permanent portrait, many thought, in the gallery of noble and futile causes.

To those doubters, the seaway was in a class with statehood for Alaska and Hawaii—the class of good things that just couldn't be accomplished.

Today all those doubts have been resolved—affirmatively. The St. Lawrence Seaway is a fact. Alaska and Hawaii have become States. And, I submit to you, it is no accident that all three things happened at long last during the Presidency of one man, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Largely because of his strong leadership the promises have become realities, and inaction has been translated into action. Having voted for the seaway as a Member of the United States Senate, in 1952, I take pride—I hope pardonably—in the fact that after 25 years of frustrating talk and delay, the necessary legislation was passed by a Congress made up of a majority of members of the same political persuasion as the President. Valuable bipartisan support was given, of course, and for that we should all be grateful.

Just 1 week ago today it was my privilege, at the tri-State border of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia, to dedicate the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park. Through that hallowed historic area in the year 1775, Daniel Boone and 30 axmen drove through the 200-mile Wilderness Road making possible settlement beyond the Alleghenies in the fertile grasslands of Kentucky.

Just 2 weeks ago the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, with bipartisan support, approved legislation establishing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park—a park preserving for posterity a canal built in the first half of the 19th century, which once carried freight over the 180 miles between Washington, D.C. and Cumberland, Md.

Just 1 month ago it was my honor to dedicate the Glendo Dam in Wyoming—a major new reclamation dam authorized in 1954, and now completed—at a site on the historic Oregon Trail, over which a century ago pioneers pushed westward to the Pacific.

The men who hacked out the Wilderness Road, dug the C. & O. Canal, and trudged westward to California and Oregon were the kind of people who neither accept horizons as impassable barriers nor walk backward into the future with their eyes forever fixed on the past. They were men who seized the future, and the road, the canal, and the trail all remain today as monuments both to their daring and their determination and ability to gaze far ahead.

Among such monuments in our own time, the St. Lawrence Seaway is a towering colossus.

It is, however, only a single symbol of the Eisenhower administration's leadership and the foresight of the Congress of the United States in the fields of commerce and transportation. There are many others.

Going vigorously about the job of meeting the 20th century needs of the American people, the administration in 1956 launched a $38 billion Federal highway program, which in 13 years will have provided the most modern Federal roadways all over America to meet our growing needs for roads, both for defense and economic purposes.

Last year there was established for the first time in our history a Federal Aviation Agency, designed to discharge increasing responsibilities of the Federal Government in the field of commercial aviation.

The view from my office window in the Department of the Interior Building in Washington looks out over the Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln Memorials. Further out on the horizon is the National Airport. Screaming airliners rise up from behind the trees to pass almost directly over the temple which we have built to honor Lincoln. And as they do, I can't help thinking of horse-drawn carriages of Washington and Lincoln's time plowing up the mud on a rainy day on Constitution Avenue. The airplane is a symbol of a technological advance to a present which would stagger the imagination of our ancestors and of a future which surely would stagger ours.

In your lifetime and mine, one of the most important Federal agencies may well be the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, set up last year to carry out aeronautical and space research and development.

Satellites have been placed in orbit around the earth and the sun and have sent back their radio messages. The monkeys Able and Baker have made the trip into space and returned to the Pentagon to be the guests of honor at one of the most hilarious and memorable press conferences in the history of Washington. Soon the X–15 rocket plane will attempt to take a human pilot into space and return him safely to earth.

Seven fine, courageous young Americans now stand ready, after the most rigorous kind of training and conditioning, to make the first manned flight in a satellite into outer space.

Moreover, at the urging of the administration, in the past few years the Congress has approved other Federal activities which could well revolutionize transportation right here on our own planet—particularly transportation under, on, and over the water.

Last August 3 the atomic submarine *Nautilus* made the first undersea voyage in history beneath the polar icecap. A week later the submarine *Skate* did the same thing. Currently, the Department of Commerce is working to develop the undersea merchant ship, nuclear powered, as a freight boat of the future, capable of speeds of 30 knots or more.

In just 10 days, the first lady of the United States, Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, will launch at Camden, N.J., the U.S.S. *Savannah*, the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, capable of carrying, at a speed of 20 knots, 60 passengers, 130 crew members, and 10,000 tons of cargo. Visiting ports of call all over the world, it will ride the waves as a symbol of the American people's determination to put nuclear power to peaceful application.

Next year the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce plans to begin building an 80-ton hydrofoil test craft—a ship that in effect would ride on a wing-like structure, skimming the surface of the water without leaving any wake, reaching the almost incredible speed of 80 knots. If such a ship of commercial size proves feasible—and we shall soon know—it could make the trip from New York to Southampton in England overnight.

In addition, the Maritime Administration has begun investigating the feasibility of the levitation ship—one that wouldn't even touch the water, once under way, that would have its weight lifted above the surface by a jet of air forced downward, and that could

speed along carrying tons of cargo and hundreds of passengers at 100 or more knots an hour.

All these accomplishments and plans of the Federal Government, under the leadership of a great President, to me reflect the dreams and hopes and wishes of a people—the American people—who, like the pioneers of the 18th and 19th centuries, have their eyes fixed with hope on the future.

History, I am sure, will vindicate that hope. Probably in our lifetime—certainly in the lifetime of our children—citizens of Duluth and Chicago and Toledo and Buffalo will grow familiar with sights which would be strange indeed to our eyes: Such sights, possibly as atomic-powered freight-carrying submarines, atomic merchant ships, hydrofoil ships, levitation ships, speeding along this great 2,300-mile international seaway and other waterways of the globe, bringing the products of the world to our docks and carrying American products of farm and factory to the ends of the earth.

Faint-hearted despair is frequently a product manufactured by a salesman with a purpose, peddled with such noise, and all too often bought by the gullible. A free country, of course, will not and must not outlaw even the demagogue and the fool. But a free people, while permitting such individuals to talk, can also refuse to listen to them and certainly refuse to follow them.

On such a night as this we can with reason rejoice in great achievements and yet see them only as forerunners of even greater ones to come. Yes; this is a night for being true to our forebears, and in a large sense it is also a night for resolving to do in our time what they did in theirs: Look to the future with intelligence and confidence and courage.

Trinity River Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has announced the intention to consider on July 24 the administration's proposal for joint development of the Trinity River power project by the Federal Government and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in California, as authorized by the 84th Congress, directed the Secretary of the Interior to study and report back to Congress on proposals to sell the falling water to a non-Federal agency. He did so, and recommended that the company's offer be adopted by Congress because: First, the company, not the Federal Government, would put up the $60 million to construct the power facilities; second, through the sale of the falling water the Government would gain $175 million in CVP surplus; third, the Government would gain $83 million in Federal taxes; and fourth, Federal construction of the powerplants would result, the Secretary said, in a financial drag and a drain on water development.

More than 230 California organizations have actively supported joint development of the Trinity project power facilities; these include irrigation groups, the California and the American Farm Bureau Federation, business groups, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO, as well as some 80 daily and weekly newspapers and other publications.

The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last year heard the testimony, but a vote was not permitted. The American Farm Bureau Federation spokesman, accompanied by the President of the California Farm Bureau Federation, testified, in part:

It is clear that the interest of water users is to obtain from Trinity the maximum contribution to Central Valley project that the marketability of the power will warrant, and that this objective will be furthered by private development. * * * Why should the users of water and power on the various units of the Central Valley project be required to pay or help pay for the Federal Trinity powerplants? We believe this would defeat the purposes as declared by Congress in enacting the Central Valley Project Act of 1937. The net result is that, in order to comply with the intent of Congress in authorizing the Central Valley project, relating to revenues from electric energy "as a means of financially aiding and assisting" the project, it is necessary that joint development of the project be authorized by the enactment of the proposed partnership legislation.

He then went on to show that if the Federal Government were to construct the facilities, it would not only be out the construction costs, the falling water payments, and the taxes which the company would pay, but the water users would be deprived of their just due.

I quote from the federation's statement again:

We see no reason for the entry of the Federal Government into the power business on the Trinity division of the Central Valley project when the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is ready, willing, and able to participate in joint development of the project.

After detailing the financial benefits to the taxpayers and water users which would be lost under Federal construction, California's ambitious plans for solving its water problems were cited:

A great deal of irrigation development remains to be accomplished in California. To make such developments a reality, the State will need maximum revenues from power to assist irrigation development. The recently published California water plan outlines for ultimate construction 270 reservoirs, with a total capacity of 60 million acre-feet and hundreds of miles of canals to transport water from surplus to areas of deficiency. This program will cost between $12 and $13 billion. In addition, water resource development projects have been authorized by the Federal Government, which will cost millions of dollars.

The senior Senator from California, on March 5, 1959, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of tables showing that there remains to be completed on active, authorized California projects about $850 million of Federal funds. Should the House also pass the San Luis bill—the Senate-passed version calls for $290 million—the California total would be well over a billion dollars.

The Friant Water Users Association, representing the majority of the Central Valley project water users, have recently declared that if Trinity is constructed federally, an increase in the rates for non-Federal customers should be demanded in order that power will financially aid and assist water development, as intended by the original act authorizing the Central Valley project.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, on June 30, 1959, carried a UPI report of a press conference at which Interior Department Secretary Seaton also said he has not dropped his position favoring partnership development of electric power by private industry in the Government's Trinity reclamation project in California. If Congress orders the Federal Government to spend $60 million for power facilities on the project, Seaton said the money would have to be taken from other western reclamation projects unless Congress votes extra money for the Trinity job. Seaton said chances of getting extra money would be very slim.

There is no more reason to deprive the Central Valley project water users of their intended benefits than to deprive other western projects of needed money; neither would be necessary, and the Federal Treasury would be far ahead, under joint development.

Private War on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since there has been considerable interest manifested in the article "Private War on Communism" published in the June issue of the New Age, the magazine of the Supreme Council 33d Degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction, United States of America, which had picked it up from the American Mercury magazine, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it might be more widely available:

PRIVATE WAR ON COMMUNISM

(Hon. B. CARROLL REECE, 32°)

In the late 1920's an ordinary debate in the Czechoslovakian Parliament degenerated into a near riot. The Communist leaders jeered at their opponents, refused to listen to any proposal other than their own, and indulged in wholesale violence as a means of intimidation.

An anti-Communist, meeting Klement Gottwald, Communist leader, outside the hall, asked: "Just what do you Communists really want, anyway? Why are you always so embittered and unreasonable? Why are you against everything and why do you refuse to compromise on even the least important matters?" Then, before the belligerent Gottwald could reply, the anti-Communist threw the $64 question at him. "What," he demanded, "would you do if you were in the majority instead of being in the minority?"

Gottwald had the answer for that one. "When we take power," he snarled, "we shall hang you, you scoundrel."

The anti-Communist was stunned. "Surely you don't mean that?"

"I mean precisely that," Gottwald threatened. "We intend to hang all you bourgeoisie and bloodsuckers."

The rest of the story is history. Twenty years later the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia, rounded up their enemies, and rushed them off to concentration camps. Thousands of them—labor leaders, army officers, businessmen, and intellectuals—have not been heard of to this day. Presumably they were murdered on the ground that they were bourgeoisie and bloodsuckers. That is communism in action.

"But," thousands of well-meaning Americans will tell you, "that could never happen in America. The American Communist is a different brand. He could never resort to such methods."

What do the Communists themselves have to say on this subject? Perhaps William Z. Foster is as definite an example as we can cite. In his book "Toward Soviet America," he answers this question with such frankness that even the dullest-witted do-gooder cannot fail to comprehend its full significance:

"The American revolution, when the workers have finally seized power, will develop even more swiftly in all of its phases than has the Russian revolution. This is because in the United States objective conditions are more ripe for revolution than they were in old Russia."

But Foster did not stop at that. He added:

"All capitalist parties—Republican, Democrat, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated—the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses."

Does that have a familiar ring? Does it bear a close resemblance to Clement Gottwald's threat to the anti-Communists in Czechoslovakia? This is the Communists' plan. It is the blueprint to be followed when the day comes for them to take over America. "When we take power," you can almost hear the Communists snarl, "we intend to hang you bourgeoisie and bloodsuckers."

What can you—the ordinary man or woman in the street—do about this threat? First, you must realize that merely being "against communism" is not enough. You must do better than that if you are to become a vital force in saving America from the fate of Czechoslovakia. What shall you do? Here are a few suggestions which should be helpful:

1. UNDERSTAND THE SUBJECT

The American Bar Association in its "Brief on Communism" says:

"There is widespread ignorance and confusion throughout the United States concerning the nature of communism and the objects and purposes of those people in this country and elsewhere who embrace and follow Communist teachings."

In order that you may be certain of your facts, you must read authoritative publications regarding communism, i.e., the American Legion magazine, National Republic, Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post and a few other periodicals which publish objective articles on this important subject.

You should listen to statesmen fired with patriotic zeal, read the publications of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Internal Security, and other congressional organizations which are engaging in this all-out struggle against communism, the battle of the century.

In your reading you will learn that Communists and their vast corps of secret allies are tireless missionaries. They never waste their effort trying to convince or convert each other, but are continually working to seduce and subvert outsiders.

This gives you a valuable cue: Become an equally fervent and tireless missionary for Americanism. Never let a day pass but what you attempt to persuade those who seem less dedicated than you to the American way of life. You will do this by sharing with others the information you have obtained—the tragedies of communism, the glories of Americanism.

2. BE AN EFFECTIVE CITIZEN

Just what does this entail? These things: Take an active and intelligent interest in your local civic, State, and national affairs. Follow your State's legislative and congressional activities. Remember, you are a free citizen of a Republic—not a helpless subject of an all-powerful state. Act the part.

3. BE AN OPINIONMAKER

You will find the Communists and their secret allies have infiltrated every strata of our society—PTA, powerful national organizations, and even some churches. The comrades may have their representatives in your lodge, community, and even in your small local clubs. These people try to direct the activities of every group. They offer suggestions, persist in their opinions, and absolutely refuse to compromise. There is but one way to deal with them. Refuse to agree with them in any detail whatsoever. See to it that you, and others who are thoroughly American, make the opinions, rules, and regulations of your lodge, church, and community.

4. EXPOSE COMMUNISTS

The thing which Communists fear most is exposure. This is because it isolates them from the rest of the population. And isolation, the Communists know full well, means death to their most effective weapon—the fifth column.

"How," you ask, "can the ordinary man in the street do this?"

The process is simple. It consists of two steps: First, recognition that one is a Communist; second, leading others to that realization. It is relatively easy for one to learn the ingredients of communism. He then is in a position to decide that a given individual is, or is not, composed of those elements.

But step two is more difficult. Here is the way the astute citizen proceeds in this aspect of fighting communism:

"Never say," counsels a noted authority on this subject, "that one is a Communist. Instead, cite evidence which will lead others to the inevitable conclusion." He illustrates thus:

"If I point to a two-legged befeathered waterfowl the size and shape of a duck and call attention to its webbed feet, to the fact that it quacks like a duck, that it swims like a duck and eats like a duck and associates with ducks, the average, fair-minded American will conclude that the waterfowl is a duck."

That is an effective way of operating. It enables the other fellow to come to his own conclusion. Your job is to supply the evidence. There is no better way of exposing Communists.

5. ATTEND AND SUPPORT YOUR CHURCH

It is generally known that Communists are frantically and militantly atheistic. "We Communists," Earl Browder has said, "do not distinguish between good and bad religions because we think they are all bad."

"Is there," you ask in complete sincerity, "really a danger that some churches are helping communism?"

J. Edgar Hoover, 33°, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has this to say on the subject:

"I confess to a real apprehension so long as Communists are able to secure ministers of the Gospel to promote their evil work and espouse a cause that is alien to the religion of Christ and Judaism."

In other words, even among the clergy, you will find individuals who, knowingly or not, are working for communism. Your job, then, as a disciple of Americanism, is to identify these subversives no matter who or where they may be and to expose them.

How?

By applying the very same principles to your church-going acquaintances that you apply to your office colleagues, lodge brothers, neighbors. The fact that one is a church member—or an official in the church—certainly is no guarantee that he is an American. In fact, some of the most dangerous Communists in this country are respected members of various churches. To say that they are wolves in sheep's clothing is a gross understatement.

6. EXAMINE YOUR SCHOOLS

"Give us the child for 8 years," Lenin announced years ago, "and it will be a Bolshevik forever." To that end the Communists have planned for your child in the name of education.

"They mean to take him from the nursery, put him in uniform with the hammer and sickle flag in one hand, a gun in the other, and send him out to conquer the world," reports the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"If they have their way, he will be guided from the kindergarten straight through college so that he will have anything except a mind of his own.

"He will be trained but not educated. He will be taught to solve problems that are handed to him and to consider it a crime to think for himself. He will be the child-man of communism."

The alarming thing is that this is happening in some elementary and secondary schools, in our colleges and universities Some of the most effective Communists in this country have been teachers.

What can you do about this?

Plenty. Simply apply the same yardstick to the schools and teachers that you used with others. Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

Learn what the schools are saying regarding history, economics, social welfare. What do the teachers say about international communism? Do they see it as a real threat or as a fad that amounts to but little? What do these same teachers have to say about Americanism? Is it an outdated philosophy of government or something to be prized above all else?

If you find that a teacher is selling America short, expose him. It is a part of an American teacher's duty, especially today, to instill in the pupil's mind a deep American way of life. Any teacher who fails to do that bears the closest scrutiny tag.

7. PREACH AMERICANISM

It is true that you are but one person. You may feel that you are not too important. And consequently, you may think that there is little you can do, personally, to fight communism. However, you must remember that no matter who or what you are, you are free to take an individual stand on this subject. You can make sure that, every day, through your words and actions, you preach Americanism. And there are more than 160 million people in the United States today. In view of these facts, can there be any doubt but what you and you are a tremendous force?

To adopt this attitude does not mean that you will indulge in a continual flag-waving act. But it does mean that, in your contacts with colleagues in the office, lodge, church, union, and community, you will unwaveringly advocate the principles of free speech and religious freedom, of free enterprise and free elections, equality, justice, trial by jury, and majority rule.

These are the ingredients of Americanism. These are the elements which communism would destroy and Americanism must preserve. Your role in this drama can hardly be

overestimated. You, really, are the very keystone of Americanism.

Here, then, is a statement of what you, the individual, can do in this world-shaking struggle between international communism and Americanism. Here are the principles, the steps which you must take if you wish to become an effective soldier in the greatest conflict the world has known. Here, in short, is the blueprint for your private war on communism. See that you use it well.

H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I have submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means in support of H.R. 4700:

STATEMENT OF HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN, OF NEW YORK, ON H.R. 4700

May I first congratulate this committee for holding hearings on H.R. 4700 which is of the utmost importance to our older men and women.

The miraculous advances of this century in the medical sciences have resulted in longer and healthier lives for the people of this Nation. The number of persons 65 years and older today is 15 million and is expected to reach almost 25 million by 1980. At that time this age group will constitute between 9.0 and 10.6 percent of the population.

I join the rest of you here today who are concerned with the plight of our older men and women. What will these aged look forward to after years of hard work? Most of them will be forced to live on low and limited incomes. Many of them will suffer from any one of the numerous long-lasting and expensive chronic diseases. These diseases continue each year to make up a larger total of the illnesses in this country. In addition, chronic illnesses are more likely to affect the elder than any other age group. The dilemma of the older person is how to meet ever spiraling medical costs on fixed retirement incomes.

It is my sincere conviction that the best solution to this problem is embodied in H.R. 4700, introduced by the Honorable AIME J. FORAND. This practical and sensible measure proposes the inclusion of coverage for certain medical expenditures within the existing social security system. Beneficiaries of old age and survivors insurance would receive hospital, surgical and nursing home benefits.

In my opinion, this plan has two major advantages. In the first place there can be no hidden exclusions or cancellations in a publicly supported system. Secondly, the cost for the program would be shared by nearly the entire working population at a time when they are well able to afford the low increase in payroll deductions necessary to finance the program.

This problem has received the careful study and attention of a number of groups. Even those who cry out against the approach of H.R. 4700 cannot ignore the serious plight of the aged in meeting their medical costs. Most recently the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a very thorough report to this committee on this subject. I concur with Representative FORAND'S judgment that the report pointed clearly to the urgent need for passage of H.R. 4700. Among other very interesting facts, the report showed that in 1957 more than 80 percent of the hospitalized social security beneficiaries had medical bills of $1,000 or more.

I do not ask that we ignore the great advance in coverage of medical costs by nonprofit and commercial insurance companies. Nevertheless, I am astounded by a recent report in the New York Times which quoted the New York State Labor Department's monthly magazine as stating that an average of $2 out of every $3 spent by Americans on health were not covered by insurance policies.

For the aged the problem is especially serious because the cost of insuring the elderly is much higher than for the rest of the population. It is, therefore, not surprising that a recent study of the National Opinion Research Center shows that only three out of eight persons 65 years of age or older had some form of voluntary health insurance coverage in 1957. Nor is it astonishing that of this number an even smaller percentage were fully covered for hospital costs. The same study reports that more than half of these persons favor Government insurance.

Within recent months there has been a floor of publicity on plans especially designed for persons 65 and over offered by commercial and Blue Shield companies. Let us not be misled by the outward claims of these plans. Their shortcomings are evident upon careful examination. The premiums are high, the benefits low. Often no more than half the average cost of hospital room and board is covered for a time shorter than usually needed. Exclusions for preexisting conditions and limitations on services covered further limit the usefulness of these plans to the aged.

The failure of voluntary health insurance to meet the needs of persons 65 years and older is clear. It is equally evident that the most effective way of meeting their demands is through a fair broad-based, well-run system. Our Social Security System meets these criteria.

New York has been in the vanguard of attempts to improve health insurance coverage for her population. I am sure I speak for the people at home when I urge the passage of H.R. 4700 as another step in this direction.

Our increased national life expectancy is a precious gift, but it also offers a pressing challenge. We have the opportunity to lessen one of the heaviest burdens of our older citizens, their staggering health bills.

H.R. 4700 is a worthy national solution to a national problem.

The Laying of the Cornerstone for the Extension of the East Front of the U.S. Capitol, July 4, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 13, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 this year, a significant event occurred in the laying of the cornerstone for the east front of the Capitol. This ceremony marked another milestone in the history of this edifice which holds a special place in the hearts of free men everywhere.

Since I have been in Congress I have been intensely interested in this building and its history. It has been very difficult to piece the complete story together, however, because adequate records have not been kept of proceedings like this.

So that future generations might not have the same difficulty I place in the RECORD a full account of the program as it actually took place, including the address of President Eisenhower, the remarks of the distinguished Speaker, and the Masonic ceremony which was a part of the proceedings.

It is also fitting that some facts and interesting information about our Speaker who was the prime mover of this important project, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, and the Architect of the Capitol, George Stewart, should be included as a part of this historic record:

PROGRAM OF CEREMONIES AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE EXTENSION OF THE EAST CENTRAL FRONT OF THE U.S. CAPITOL BY PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 4, 1959, 12 O'CLOCK NOON

Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol: Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Chairman; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate, member; Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, minority leader of the Senate, member; Hon. Charles A. Halleck, minority leader of the House of Representatives, member; Hon. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, member.

OPENING OF CEREMONIES

The Honorable J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, opened the ceremonies with the following statement:

"Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, distinguished and honored guests, the ceremonies of the laying of the cornerstone of the extension of the east central front of the U.S. Capitol will now commence. I now slightly digress from the printed program and call upon the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate, for the invocation."

INVOCATION BY DR. HARRIS

Prayer, Cornerstone Laying, Capitol Extension, by Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, Saturday, July 4, 1959

"God of our fathers and of their succeeding race: We come seeking Thy grace and favor as with grateful and contrite hearts we bow reverently at this shrine of each patriot's devotion whose white dome in these days of destiny is lifted into the view of all the earth, as it is revered from sea to shining sea in this free land of hope and glory.

"In this high hour we would be conscious of the unsullied form of one who, in the agony of Valley Forge, lifted up his heart to Thee and who, after victory had come, laid the cornerstone of this edifice of state which loomed prophetically in his heart, but which was a promised land he was never to enter.

"Amid all the babel of today's angry voices we would listen to the calm and reassuring voice of the Father of our Republic, who being dead, yet speaketh, as turning from all pedestals of selfish ambition he warns us, in this year of our Lord, that without a genuine religion decay of moral standards and values follows as the night the day.

"Where there are signs of crumbling deterioration in the fabric of our freedom may there be fashioned out of the very ground of democracy stronger and fairer columns of spiritual verities, of religious faith, of moral integrity, and of high principles that scorn expediency.

"As the stately cathedral of our cherished liberties is thus constantly rebuilt and restored as the centuries pass, may it always

be that the glory of the latter house may be greater than the glory of the first, as at the altar of national devotion a nation of free men lifts the never-ending prayer, 'America, America, God mend thine every flaw.' And so—

"On this stone now laid with prayer,
Let our faith rise strong and fair;
Ever, Lord, Thy name be known
Where we lay this cornerstone.
"By wise master builders squared,
Here be living stones prepared
For the temple near Thy throne,
Under God, its cornerstone.

"We lift our petitions in the name that is above every name. Amen."

PRESENTATION OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Architect of the Capitol then presented the Chairman of the Commission, with the following remarks:

"It is my great honor and high privilege to present the Chairman of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN."

INTRODUCTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Chairman of the Commission made the following remarks in introducing the President:

"Mr. President, members of the Commission and friends, we meet here today in historic surroundings, on the grounds of the Capitol of the United States.

"On September 18, 1793, President George Washington laid the cornerstone of the Capitol of the United States on these grounds.

"And it was here on November 17, 1800, that the second session of the Sixth Congress of the United States met for the first time in the infant city of Washington.

"In 1851 President Millard Fillmore laid the second cornerstone on these grounds.

"Today, on July 4, 1959, we meet to lay a cornerstone for the rebuilt east front of this Capitol.

"This is a building of which all citizens of the United States—whether they have seen it or not—are proud.

"The Capitol of the United States houses the legislative branch of the Government which must act before there are any laws to execute or any laws to interpret.

"We trust that this whole building will stand throughout the ages, and it will unless irresponsible and mad men determine to destroy everything. We express the hope here today that this will never happen.

"So on this another historic day of the laying of the third cornerstone on this hill, we have another President of the United States to lay this stone in the person of the present President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower."

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

"Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stewart, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are here today for the ceremonial laying of a cornerstone—a ceremony that has twice before marked the history of this building, the Capitol of the United States of America.

"By this symbolic gesture we do more than to recognize and provide for new needs resulting from national growth. We rededicate ourselves to the principle of representative government. We reaffirm our devotion to the values upon which this Republic rests.

"These values, unequivocally stated in the Declaration of Independence, in our Bill of Rights, and in other parts of that remarkable document, the American Constitution—are both the hallmarks and the handtools of freedom. In a free society they must be prized and they must be used, lest freedom wither.

"In the collision of ideas between freedom and despotism, freedom is neither won nor held in a climate of spiritual stalemate. Its preservation is a many-sided and never-ending task.

"Complacency today speeds the erosion of liberty tomorrow. Inertia will destroy it; dynamic dedication assures its lasting vitality.

"On this Fourth of July, 183 years since our Nation embarked on its course of independence, we are reminded that our Declaration of Independence did more than galvanize the idea of freedom for our own people.

" 'The generation that produced our Declaration of Independence,' said Lincoln, 'meant to set up a standard maximum for free society which should be constantly looked to, constantly proximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere.'

"Each of these three cornerstone ceremonies has marked stages of America's evolution.

"In 1793, when President Washington laid the cornerstone of the original Capitol Building, a young but vigorous Nation was struggling into political existence.

"Fifty-eight years later, when President Fillmore laid the cornerstone of the House and Senate wings, the Nation was no longer in its infancy.

"On that day a proud Daniel Webster extolled the progress of the United States since 1793—from 15 States to 31; from 209 post offices to 21,000; from 35 colleges to 694—and why it had become necessary to enlarge the Capitol Building.

"Again this ceremony represents growth. America has come a long way since the laying of the 1851 cornerstone.

"Yet it is somehow unnecessary to commemorate this occasion by reminding ourselves of the bare statistics of cultural and material growth—for example, that our Nation's colleges and universities have grown from 694 to 1,957.

"Rather, we come here today to remind ourselves of our responsibilities, to the world and to ourselves.

"We come here to rekindle our faith that this building, the central home of America's representative Government, will house wisdom, understanding, and compassion for all people.

"Finally, we gather on this Fourth of July, as our forefathers did at Independence Hall, more than ninescore years ago, to emulate them as they pledge their common adherence to basic principles, and their common obligation to uphold these principles regardless of differences of opinion, even of policy.

"So long as we never waver in our devotion to the values on which these men began the building of the Nation, no differences of partisan policy or partisan feeling can cause America to falter on her upward course.

"As we now lay this new cornerstone in the U.S. Capitol, we are grateful for the courageous beginnings of a new Nation, represented by the first stone; for the pioneering effort and the bountiful growth represented by the second; and for the confidence that if we make ourselves worthy, this third stone will forever symbolize America's unending purpose to lead along the path toward peace, with justice for all peoples."

LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE

At this point, Mr. Stewart stated, "We will now proceed with the laying of the cornerstone."

The President of the United States, accompanied by Speaker Rayburn, Senator Dirksen, and Mr. Stewart, descended to the site of the cornerstone and proceeded to lay the cornerstone, spreading mortar with the trowel used by the first President of the United States, Hon. George Washington, in laying the first cornerstone of the Capitol in 1793, and also using the gavel used by the first President of the United States on that occasion and by President Millard Fillmore on July 4, 1851, at the laying of the cornerstone of the Senate and House wings of the Capitol. The trowel and the gavel were presented to the President by the Grand Master of Masons, Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., and were returned to him by the President after their use.

At this point in the proceedings the President departed from the Capitol.

MASONIC CEREMONIES

Following the convening of the Grand Lodge of Masons of the District of Columbia by Most Worshipful Brother Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., Grand Master, at the Masonic Temple, on Saturday, July 4, 1959, at 10:30 a.m., the Grand Lodge proceeded to the site of the cornerstone commemorating the construction of the east front of the U.S. Capitol at Washington, D.C., to perform their ritual in laying the cornerstone in accordance with the principles and practices of the craft of Freemasonry. This ceremony was performed at the request of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol.

The cornerstone, lowered during the ceremonies attended by the President, was raised and the Masonic ceremonies attending the cornerstone laying were commenced.

The Grand Master of Masons accompanied by the officers of the Grand Lodge surrounded the cornerstone for the purpose of carrying out the Masonic service. In calling attention to the fact that the Grand Lodge was assembled for the purpose of laying the cornerstone of the U.S. Capitol and that the members, as Masons, being taught that we should implore the aid of our Supreme Grand Master in all laudable undertakings, requested all to join the reverend and worshipful grand chaplain as he invoked the blessing of Almighty God. The prayer of the grand chaplain, Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, D.D., follows:

"O, Eternal God, who art the source of life, the supporter of free men and the Saviour of the world—we pause in silence before thee and before this undertaking, invoking Thy blessing upon us and praying that in that spirit we may do our work.

"We are mindful of the experiences which bind us together and for our faith in democracy which makes us one people. Petty are the vices which divide us and great are the virtues which unite us. So, we pray, remove from our mind all narrowness, all prejudice, all fear, and may the power of a passion for the princely principles of goodness, truth, and beauty rule all our minds and all our hearts to the end that we may now and ever be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"May this cornerstone be the symbol of our spiritual foundation, making and keeping us, as a people, the champion of justice, the safeguard of freedom, and the guarantee of democracy in our world. We pray in the name of Him by whose truth men shall be free—Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The Grand Master then proceeded with the prescribed rites and ceremonies of the Masonic fraternity, the whole of which follows:

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Grand Treasurer, you will deposit in the case the several articles as they are called by the Right Worshipful Grand Secretary."

The following Masonic deposits were made:

Masonic Code, District of Columbia, 1951 edition.

Proceedings of the Grand Lodge, 1958.

Masonic calendar, 1959.

Replica of Bible upon which Brother George Washington took the oath of office as the first President of the United States on April 30, 1789.

History of Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4.

Replica of the trowel employed by Brother George Washington at the laying of the

original cornerstone of the U.S. Capitol on September 18, 1793.

Chronological facts concerning the George Washington gavel used by Brother George Washington on September 18, 1793.

History of Potomac Lodge No. 5.

The following deposit was made by the Chairman of the Commission, Hon. SAM RAYBURN: Sealed envelope containing a copy of his remarks.

The following deposits were made by the Architect of the Capitol, Hon. J. George Stewart:

Articles deposited in the cornerstone of the extension of the east central front of the U.S. Capitol, July 4, 1959

House document No. 385, 58th Congress, 3d session: Extension and completion of the Capitol Building, report of the Joint Commission, March 3, 1905.

Hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session: Legislative appropriations for 1956, request for authorization of the project and for $5 million to start project.

Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, 84th Congress, 1st session on H.R. 7117, "Making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes": Legislative branch appropriations, 1956, request for authorization of the project and for $5 million to start project.

Hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2d session, on S. 2883, "A bill to amend the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, to eliminate the requirement that the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the U.S. Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905," February 17, 1958: Extension of the U.S. Capitol Building.

Legislation Appropriation Act, 1956, Public Law 242, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved August 5, 1955, H.R. 7117, "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes": Authorizing extension of the Capitol project. Creating Commission to direct the project. Providing initial appropriation of $5 million.

Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1956, Public Law 406, 84th Congress, 2d session, approved February 14, 1956, H.R. 9063, "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes": Amending original law, Public 242, 84th Congress, 1st session. Granting indefinite contract authority.

Mimeographed statement setting forth text of Public Law 242, 84th Congress, 1st session, as amended by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957, Public Law 624, 84th Congress, 2d session, approved June 27, 1956, H.R. 11473 "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes": Providing additional appropriation of $12 million.

Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, Public Law 86-30, 86th Congress, approved May 20, 1959, H.R. 5916, "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes": Providing additional appropriation of $4 million.

Minutes of meetings, Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol: First meeting, March 26, 1956; second meeting, August 30, 1957; third meeting, February 21, 1958.

Directives of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol to the Architect of the Capitol authorizing letting of contracts and performance of work under the project: August 5, 1955; July 24, 1956; October 28, 1957; February 24, 1958; March 25, 1959.

Press releases issued by the Architect of the Capitol at the direction of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol: April 20, 1956; February 21, 1958; June 23, 1959.

Reports:

Report of the Architect of the Capitol on the preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the extension of the U.S. Capitol, August 1957.

Copy of foregoing report as carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 12, pages 16640-16647.

Report of the Architect of the Capitol dated February 13, 1958, to the Senate Committee on Public Works on the project.

Report of the Architect of the Capitol, March 24, 1958, to the Chairman of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, transmitting a report of the Associate Architects for the extension of the Capitol project, supplementing report of the Architect of the Capitol, dated February 13, 1958, to the Senate Committee on Public Works.

Report of the Architect of the Capitol on the status of the project as of May 8, 1959.

Other items:

Coin, bearing the name and bust of Millard Fillmore, found during excavations in the removal of the portico and steps.

Telephone directory, U.S. Senate, February 1959.

Telephone directory, U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress.

Copy of the official program of the cornerstone laying, July 4, 1959.

Speech of President Eisenhowever, autographed Dwight David Eisenhower, July 4, 1959, delivered at the ceremonies of the laying of the cornerstone July 4, 1959, taken from the lectern upon completion of the speech and deposited in the cornerstone. This speech was placed in an envelope.

Sealed envelopes from Members of Congress and others.

Weather map, July 4, 1959.

Newspaper accounts of the ceremonies.

Photographs:

East front of the Capitol prior to start of the project.

Groundbreaking, February 24, 1959.

East front of the Capitol with portico removed.

Signatures of the Architect of the Capitol, Assistant Architect, Second Assistant Architect, and other members of the office staff; names of east front project field employees; and a list of contractors working on the project and their employees.

The trowel was presented to the Grand Master, who explained: "The trowel will be used in spreading the cement which shall unite this building into one common mass. May the trowel symbolize to us the spreading of the cement of friendship and affection which should unite the brotherhood of man into a sacred band, among whom no contention should ever exist save that noble contention, or rather emulation, of who can best work and best agree."

Cement was first spread by the Grand Master and thereafter by Speaker Rayburn, Senator Dirksen, and Mr. Stewart, and the stone was lowered into place by three distinct motions to its proper position at the cornerstone of the foundation.

The Architect of the Capitol presented the working tools of the profession to the Grand Master, the square, the level, and the plumb, saying:

"Most Worshipful, the necessary preparations having been made for laying the foundation-stone of this edifice, I present you the square, level, and plumb, those useful implements of the craft by which you will be able to ascertain that the material which is to constitute the chief cornerstone of the future edifice, and which you are about to lay in its appropriate position, is well formed, true, and trusty."

The Grand Master handed the square to the Deputy Grand Master, the level to the Senior Grand Warden, and the plumb to the Junior Grand Warden:

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Deputy Grand Master, what is the proper implement of your office?

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. The square, Most Worshipful.

"GRAND MASTER. What are its moral and Masonic uses?

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. To square our actions by the square of virtue, and prove our work.

"GRAND MASTER. Apply the implement of your office to that portion of the foundation-stone that needs to be proved, and make report.

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. Most Worshipful, I find the stone to be square. The craftsmen have performed their duty.

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Senior Grand Warden, what is the proper implement of your office?

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. The level, Most Worshipful.

"GRAND MASTER. What is its Masonic use?

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. Morally it reminds us of equality, and its use is to prove horizontals.

"GRAND MASTER. Apply the implement of your office to the foundation stone and make report.

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful, I find the stone to be level. The craftsmen have performed their duty.

"GRAND MASTER. Right Worshipful Junior Grand Warden, what is the proper implement of your office?

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. The plumb, Most Worshipful.

"GRAND MASTER. What is it Masonic use?

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. Morally it teaches rectitude of conduct, and its use is to try perpendiculars.

"GRAND MASTER. Apply the implement of your office to the several edges of the foundation stone, and make report.

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful, I find the stone to be plum. The craftsmen have performed their duty.

"GRAND MASTER. This cornerstone has been tested by the proper implements of operative masonry, and I find that the craftsmen have skillfully and faithfully performed their duty. I therefore declare the stone to be well formed, true and trusty, and correctly laid according to the rules of our ancient craft. May the all-bounteous Author of Nature assist in the erection and completion of this building, protecting the workmen from every accident, and may He long preserve this structure from decay."

At this point the symbolic use of corn, wine, and oil becomes a vital part of the ceremony, and is best described by the following wording of the Masonic ritual:

The Deputy Grand Master presents to the Grand Master the vessel of corn, saying:

"DEPUTY GRAND MASTER. Most Worshipful Grand Master, it has been the immemorial custom to scatter corn as an emblem of nourishment. I therefore present you this vessel of corn."

The grand master scatters the corn upon the stone, saying:

"GRAND MASTER. In the name of the Great Jehovah, to whom be all honor and glory, I now scatter this corn, and invoke a continuation of the prosperity and manifold blessings which He has unceasingly bestowed upon our country and its people."

The Senior Grand Warden presents the vessel of wine, saying:

"SENIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful Grand master, wine, the emblem of refreshment, having been used mystically by our ancient brethren, I present you with this vessel of wine."

The Grand Master pours it upon the stone, saying:

"GRAND MASTER. In the name of the Holy Saint John, I pour out this wine to virtue. May the Giver of every good and perfect gift bless and prosper all our undertakings and

inspire the present generation with wisdom and virtue to transmit to the latest posterity, unimpaired, so priceless a heritage.

The Junior Grand Warden presents the vessel of oil, saying:

"JUNIOR GRAND WARDEN. Most Worshipful Grand Master, I present you, to be used according to ancient custom, this vessel of oil.

The Grand Master pours it upon the stone and extending his hands, says:

"GRAND MASTER. I pour out this oil, an emblem of joy. May health, prosperity, and peace, symbolized by corn, wine, and oil, plenteously abound throughout the length and breadth of our land. May the Great Ruler of the Universe bless and consecrate the edifice which shall rise on this foundation stone.

"Amen. So mote it be."

The Grand Master then strikes the stone three times with his gavel, and the brethren give the public grand honors three times.

These ceremonies having been completed the working tools were returned to the Architect, the Grand Master admonishing him in the following words:

"Worthy Brother having thus, as Grand Master of Masons, laid the foundation-stone of this structure, I now deliver these implements of your profession into your hands entrusting you with the superintendence and direction of the work, having full confidence in your skill and capacity to conduct the same."

The closing feature of the Masonic ritual is the charge addressed to all the people by the Grand Master. This charge follows:

"Ladies, gentlemen, and brethren, be it known unto you that we be lawful Masons, true and faithful to the laws of our country, and engaged by solemn obligations to aid in the erection of public buildings by placing in position the chief cornerstone whenever called upon to do so by those having charge of the same. These ceremonies which you have witnessed have come down to us from time immemorial, and are in themselves invaluable to us as purely symbolic of that spiritual building which each one of us is engaged in erecting during our natural life; and as in this temporal building about to be erected we have proved the chief cornerstone to be well formed, true, and trusty, let each one of us be sure that in the spiritual building our chief cornerstone be likewise well formed, true, and trusty."

Benediction

Upon conclusion of the Masonic ceremonies, Mr. Stewart asked Rev. Bernard Braskamp, the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, to offer the benediction.

Dr. Braskamp then pronounced the following benediction:

"Now may the Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace, through the merits and mediation of the Prince of Peace we ascribe unto God, the Supreme Builder and Ruler of the universe, all majesty, dominion, and power. Amen."

At the conclusion of the ceremonies the Grand Lodge returned to the Masonic Temple and was closed in due and ancient form by the Grand Master.

The officers of the Grand Lodge, A.F. & A.M., of the District of Columbia, are as follows, and were assisted in the ceremonies by three visiting grand masters:

Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., grand master; J. August Johnson, Jr., deputy grand master; Ralph W. Wolfe, senior grand warden; Convass B. Dean, junior grand warden; Raymond N. Babcock, grand secretary; Dean Hill Stanley, grand treasurer; George W. Feidt, grand lecturer; Edgar E. Bageant, grand lecturer emeritus; Edward G. Latch, grand chaplain; John H. Eiseman, senior grand deacon; Charles B. Gilley, junior grand deacon; Harry B. Savage, senior grand steward; Lex L. Dodds, junior grand steward; Richard H. Hart, grand marshal; Alfred J. Steffen, grand sword bearer; Charles T. Macdonald, grand pursuivant; Karl T. Weimar, Jr., grand tiler.

Assisting: S. Dexter Forbes, grand master of Virginia; A. Wayne Reed, grand master of Maryland; Charles W. Lewis, grand master of Delaware.

The masters, officers, and large numbers of members of the 48 constituent lodges under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge were present at the opening of the Grand Lodge and at the ceremonies on Capitol Hill, and rendered brotherly assistance and encouragement to the Grand Master.

Assisting in the Masonic ritual were the master and other officers of Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4, A.F. & A.M., of Fredericksburg, Va.; the master and brethren of St. Johns Lodge No. 1, A.Y.M. and F. & A.M., of New York City; the master and members of Potomac Lodge No. 5, F.A.A.M., of Washington, D.C.; and the master and members of Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22, A.F. & A.M., of Alexandria, Va. These brethren brought with them the masonic treasures now entrusted to their keeping and described in the accompanying history.

"Bibles, travel, square, level, and gavel

"The Great Light of Freemasonry, the Holy Bible, used in these ceremonies comes to the Grand Lodge of Masons of the District of Columbia through the courtesy of St. John's Lodge No. 1, A.Y.M. and F. & A.M., of New York City, and it was upon this Bible that George Washington took the oath of office as the first President of the United States on April 30, 1789, in New York City, and also succeeding Presidents, upon request, the last being President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 20, 1953.

"The other Holy Bible used by the Grand Chaplain is the property of Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4, A.F. & A.M., of Fredericksburg, Va., comes through their courtesy, and is the Bible upon which President George Washington assumed his masonic obligations.

"The trowel, the square, and the level are used through the gracious cooperation of Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22, A.F. & A.M., of Alexandria, Va. These implements were employed by Most Worshipful Brother George Washington, designated Grand Master of Masons, on the occasion of the laying of the original cornerstone of the U.S. Capitol on September 18, 1793, and by succeeding Presidents in similar ceremonies at other U.S. Government structures, and by officiating dignitaries to lay cornerstones of churches, schools, cathedrals, masonic and other temples. The plumb is the proud possession of the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia, and has been used by dignitaries of public and semipublic office, and by grand masters of Masons for many years.

"The gavel is the property of Potomac Lodge No. 5, F.A.A.M., of Washington, D.C., and is used today through the courtesy of that lodge. The gavel was first used by President George Washington at the original cornerstone laying of this building on September 18, 1793, and on numerous similar occasions by other Government officials, including President Millard Fillmore on July 4, 1851."

Others appointed by the Grand Master to assist the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia are as follows:

Bearer of the great lights: Brothers Francis W. Springer, master (St. John's Lodge No. 1, New York City) and Edward H. Cann, grand junior warden (Fredericksburg Lodge No. 4).

Bearer of the lesser lights: Brothers J. August Johnson, deputy grand master; Ralph M. Wolfe, grand senior warden; Conbass B. Dean, grand junior warden.

Trowel: Brother Odie R. Howell, Jr., master (Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22).

Gavel: Brother James R. Hughes, master (Potomac Lodge No. 5).

Square: Brother Reuben A. Bogley, Sr., past grand master.

Level: Brother Renah F. Camalier, past grand master.

Plumb: Brother William E. Schooley, past grand master.

Corn: Brother Horace S. Allen, past grand master, Delaware.

Wine: Brother A. Wayne Reed, grand master of Maryland.

Oil: Brother S. Dexter Forbes, grand master of Virginia.

Masonic committee: Renah F. Camalier, past grand master, chairman; Reuben A. Bogley, Jr., grand master; Reuben A. Bogley, Sr., past grand master; William E. Schooley, past grand master; Edwin S. Bettelheim, Jr., past grand master; R. Baker Harris, past grand master; Raymond N. Babcock, grand secretary; Samuel T. Beacham, past master; Crawford C. Heerlein, past master; James C. Smith.

SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN'S ROLE

I think it is fitting and proper to call to the attention of the House, and through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the attention of future historians, the leading role played by Speaker SAM RAYBURN in this enormous undertaking.

"Mr. SAM'S" love of the historic, the traditional, the familiar is legendary. He is a man with great reverence for the past, and his feeling for this Capitol Building and its traditions might be likened to the pride which an archbishop has for his ancient cathedral.

But the Speaker also is a great believer in common sense. When he became convinced by the testimony of expert engineers and architects that an extension of the east front was the wise, sensible thing to do, he gave the project his undivided backing.

For a time a great storm broke out with angry protests from some newspapers, private citizens, and the leadership of the American Institute of Architects. One newspaper declared, "The Capitol does not belong to SAM RAYBURN."

On the floor of this House, the Speaker replied, "Propaganda does not drive me around, because I do not know anybody around here who can take criticism better than I can. I am not afraid of it. When I am right, as I think I am on this proposition, nobody is going to drive me off it."

For the past 4 years Speaker RAYBURN has devoted countless hours to this east front project, watching each detail of its progress. People around the Capitol know him as the most active of all the "sidewalk superintendents" who are watching this mammoth undertaking with great fascination and a realization of its historic importance.

On August 5, 1955, the President signed the bill setting up the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol which put this project into motion. When the Commission had its organization meeting on March 26, 1956, Speaker RAYBURN was unanimously elected its chairman, a position he has held ever since. He was nominated by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, who was minority leader of the House of Representatives.

In the summer of 1956 the first contracts were let for the east front project, and the Commission made it clear that it was determined to have it completed in time for the inauguration of the next President of the United States in January, 1961.

In the spring of 1958 a great storm of protest arose over the carrying out of the project. Bills were introduced in both the House of Representatives and the Senate to halt the project.

I had introduced such a bill in the House of Representatives, but after making an exhaustive personal study of the matter and after personally inspecting the building and learning firsthand of the absolute necessity

for the project, I announced to the House of Representatives on March 31, 1958, that I was withdrawing my bill, giving my reasons for it.

Speaker RAYBURN took the floor to discuss the project.

"Architects of great worth who have looked at it say that it (the east front) is a hazard to human life. They say it may fall down. Suppose that the best judgment of men everywhere is that this is a hazard and that it should come down. What difference is there between extending it out 32½ feet and doing this necessary work for the convenience of Members, and reestablishing it where it is?" he asked.

The Senate voted down, 47 to 32, an effort to halt the project.

On May 28, 1958, Speaker RAYBURN appeared before the National Press Club for the first time in many years, and he chose the east front extension as the subject of his address.

He pointed out that the most important purpose of the project is the preservation of the building itself, but that additional advantages of the plan are the correction of the architectural defect caused by the overhanging dome of the Capitol, and also the creation of desperately needed additional space in the Capitol for work purposes.

The Speaker reminded his listeners that "our Capitol was not a building constructed in its entirety at one date, to remain frozen and unchanged in any detail for all time to come. It has been added to, altered, and improved as common sense and changing needs dictated."

RAYBURN declared that "any time I am convinced that the Congress needs more room to discharge its work for the American public, I will ask each and every time for additional space."

He recalled the statement of a colleague that "the Capitol is a workshop, not a museum."

On August 26, 1958, the first scaffolding arrived to be used in the dismantling of the old east front, which began immediately thereafter.

The ground breaking for the new east front took place on February 24, 1959, when Speaker RAYBURN used a silver spade to break the ground.

In his speech on that occasion he declared that "I am one of those who has a great regard and respect for tradition. I like the old things if they are historic. I want them to be used as long as it is possible to use them. We did not remove this east front because we needed more room. It was removed principally because it was in a dangerous condition.

I might say that in this building is housed the legislative branch of the Government, that part of the Government that is closest to the people because it comes directly from the people. The legislative branch of the Government is the most important branch of the Government because there would be no laws to execute if the legislation were not passed by the Congress. There would be no laws to interpret if the Congress did not pass laws to be interpreted," the Speaker continued.

"The east front of the Capitol, when this work is over, will be built of beautiful, light gray, almost white, Georgia marble. And it is my hope that we will be able to sandblast the Senate and the House wings, because many people do not know that they are of light Massachusetts marble. When this old hill has sitting upon it this magnificent, almost white structure, it will be the pride and joy of everyone."

J. GEORGE STEWART, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

On October 1, 1954, J. George Stewart was appointed by the President of the United States as Architect of the Capitol. Upon assuming office he became the eighth man to hold the position since it was established, in 1793—following William Thornton, Benjamin Latrobe, Charles Bulfinch, Thomas U. Walter, Edward Clark, Elliott Woods, and David Lynn. He is the second man from the State of Delaware to hold this office, William Thornton having become a citizen of the United States in Delaware on January 7, 1788.

Mr. Stewart serves as a member of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the District of Columbia Zoning Commission.

He is charged with the structural and mechanical care of the following buildings: The Capitol, Senate Office Buildings, House Office Buildings, Capitol Powerplant, Legislative Garage, Robert A. Taft Memorial, Library of Congress Buildings, U.S. Supreme Court Building, and the U.S. Court of Claims Buildings.

Mr. Stewart is also charged with the operation of the House Restaurants and the U.S. Botanic Garden (as Acting Director).

He is responsible for the acquisition of real property and for the planning and construction of buildings and other improvements committed to his care by the Congress. At present the major construction projects are: Construction and equipment of the nearly completed additional Senate Office Building; remodeling of the Old Senate Office Building; construction and equipment of an additional House Office Building and remodeling of the present House Office Building; development of additional areas as part of the Capitol Grounds; construction of security vaults and underground transportation systems; extension and completion of the Capitol Building; and changes and improvements to the Capitol Powerplant.

The Architect of the Capitol is in charge of the works of art in the Capitol, totaling about 340; administers the laws governing Statuary Hall; arranges for the reception of new statues from the States, with the attendant ceremonies of acceptance.

In cooperation with the proper authorities, he makes arrangements for ceremonies and ceremonials held in the Capitol and on the grounds and for the reception of visiting dignitaries.

Every 4 years, the inaugural stands are built under his direction and he cooperates with other officials in carrying forward the inaugural ceremonies at the Capitol.

Mr. Stewart was born in Wilmington, Del. He was educated in the public schools of that city and studied at the University of Delaware in the engineering school from 1907 to 1910. He left the university in 1910, without taking his degree, to join his father's construction firm—Stewart and Donohue. In September of last year, the University of Delaware admitted him to the degree of bachelor of science in engineering, class of 1911. The citation for conferring this degree stated that: "In his position as Architect of the Capitol * * * he has deeply impressed those with whom he has worked * * * as a man of sincerity, vision and courage.

"John George Stewart, it is now 47 years since you normally would have received your degree. You have richly earned it by your accomplishments."

In his association with his father's firm, he served in all departments of his general construction business—as waterboy, timekeeper, apprentice mason, gang foreman, superintendent, partner, and, finally, as president of the company.

From January 1935 to January 1937, Mr. Stewart served as Representative in Congress from the State of Delaware.

From January 1947 to February 1951, he was with the District of Columbia Committee of the U.S. Senate. He served as clerk of the committee for 2 years. Beginning in 1949, he served as minority clerk and professional staff assistant.

In 1952 and 1953 he was engineer consultant to the Lands Division, Department of Justice. He was also engineer consultant for the Corps of Engineers (Washington District).

Mr. Stewart is licensed in the State of Delaware as a professional engineer.

In May of 1957, he was elected an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects as "one who has rendered distinguished service to the advancement of architecture and the allied arts and sciences."

Other activities:

Member of Delaware State Emergency Relief Commission, 1931 and 1932. Appointed by Hon. C. Douglass Buck, Governor of Delaware.

Member of original Delaware State Athletic Commission, 1932 to 1934. Appointed by Hon. C. Douglass Buck, Governor of Delaware.

Foreman of New Castle County, Del., Grand Jury, 1939.

For 5 years, chairman of building and grounds committee, Wilmington General Hospital.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 1959

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

Dear God and Father of us all, whate'er our name or sign, under the canopy of Thy goodness and mercy which have followed us all the days of our life, we pause to seek Thy face.

From the framing of laws and the forming of policies, holding in their reach the woe or weal of the commonwealth and of the world, amid all the shattering events and tempestuous emotions of our times, we are grateful that—

From every stormy wind that blows,
From every swelling tide of woes;
There is a calm, a sure retreat—
'Tis found beneath the mercy seat.

There it is that, with the clamor of the contending world shut out, we hear those voices which tell us of the meaning and worth of life.

At that mercy seat we lift our prayer for all those who are shaping public opinion in these crucial times, for all who by speech or pen hold aloft the torch of truth in a world that has lost its way.

Fit us faithfully to protect the Republic to which we have pledged our allegiance from outward aggression and from the treason of inner betrayal.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 13, 1959, was dispensed with.