

Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1242. An act to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Arthur Schneier, Congregation B'nai Jacob, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, you have endowed us with the power to speak, to utter syllables and to frame them into intelligible means of communication.

The medium of our daily deliberations is the spoken word. All of us know its power; words heal grief and open wounds, they lift us up and crush us, they bolster our confidence and they rob us of our dignity, used thoughtfully they enhance our regard for one another, used maliciously they splinter reputations. And yet the chaos of the Tower of Babel has reappeared in our time, the value of the spoken word has depreciated, its sanctity and clarity has vanished. For too often our words do not reflect the sincere sentiments of our heart and have become meaningless, subject to misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

Make us realize, O Lord, that words uttered in this Chamber are carefully watched by the entire world; once spoken they are no longer controlled by the speaker. Let us restore to words the value which they have lost. Let us resolve to weigh and not to count our words and to adorn them with the sacred garb of appropriate deeds. May the words of our mouth and the meditation of our heart be acceptable unto Thee, O Lord, our Rock and our Redeemer. Amen.

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

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5805) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 425)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5805) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 11.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$364,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,016,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$23,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$71,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,993,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$190,660,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$80,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
MIKE MONRONEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
STYLES BRIDGES,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the

Senate to the bill (H.R. 5805) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$22,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Division of Disbursement as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$364,250,000 for salaries and expenses of the Internal Revenue Service instead of \$363,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$365,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$4,016,000 for salaries and expenses of the United States Secret Service instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,032,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$23,250,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements, U.S. Coast Guard, instead of \$22,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$24,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing for a limitation on expenditures.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$37,400,000 for payment for public services as proposed by the Senate. The House bill carried nothing for this item.

The committee on conference concurs fully in the language contained in the Senate report, which reads as follows:

"The committee wishes to point out that the total amount of \$37.4 million recommended for Payment for Public Services does not increase or decrease the obligatory or expenditure authority of the Postal Department. This is merely a bookkeeping device to separate that amount of postal cost to be recovered from the users of the mails from that to be recovered from the taxpayer by means of reimbursement from the general fund of the Treasury.

"The committee wishes to make one further important point. Ever since September 24, 1950, the Congress has required fourth-class mail or parcel post to be self-supporting. This recommendation for a public service appropriation does not affect this principle or the manner in which it has been carried out in the last 8 years. Other than in the case of books, library books, and mail for the blind, the committee finds no public service costs attributable to fourth-class mail and believes that the Congress intends that fourth-class mail shall pay its fully allocated costs."

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$71,750,000 for administration, regional operation, and research instead of \$71,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$72,398,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase agreed to in conference is to be used entirely for additional inspectors for investigative duties, and in this connection it should be emphasized that the conferees are alarmed over the large amount of noninvestigative work performed by inspectors. It is hoped that the Postmaster General will give consideration to the use of inspectors primarily for investigative duties.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$2,993,000,000 for operations instead of \$2,988,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,998,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$190,660,000 for facilities instead of \$188,660,000 as proposed by the House and \$194,660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$80,000,-000 for postal modernization instead of \$75,-000,000 as proposed by the House and \$88,-500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Deletes Senate language which would have permitted the appropriation for postal modernization to remain available until expended.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARY. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the final amounts recommended by the conferees are as follows:

Treasury Department.....	\$782, 418, 000
Post Office Department.....	3, 859, 410, 000
Tax Court of United States..	1, 535, 000

Total..... 4, 643, 363, 000

This is \$44,964,000 less than the budget estimates. The House originally cut the budget estimates \$60,230,000. The Senate restored \$35,900,600. The final figure agreed upon in conference therefore is \$15,266,000 above the House figure and \$20,664,600 less than the Senate figure. It will be seen therefore that the House conferees gained better than a 50-50 compromise.

The major increases agreed to in conference provide additional funds for the Internal Revenue Service and the Coast Guard in the Treasury Department and for operations, facilities, and postal modernization in the Post Office Department.

The increases of \$1,250,000 for the Internal Revenue Service provides a total appropriation of \$364,250,000 which will permit that agency to increase its average employment by approximately 550, and the conferees have arrived at this amount with the understanding that emphasis will be placed on the addition of revenue agents.

The increase of \$1,250,000 for the Coast Guard is related primarily to the program for replacement of patrol boats and will permit economies through procurement in volume for that program. The action of the House has prevailed in deleting the provision for an accrued expenditure limitation under this appropriation item.

The conferees have accepted the Senate provision for incorporation of an item in the amount of \$37,400,000 for payment for public services in accordance with the Postal Policy Act of 1958. This action is important in that it recognizes the rate concession concept of earmarking funds for public services. This action has no effect on total funds available to the Post Office Department nor on total funds to be withdrawn from the Treasury.

The conference report includes an increase of \$5 million for the Post Office Department in the appropriation item for operations and is consistent with an increase of 3 percent in mail volume for 1960. The difficulty of accurately fore-

casting mail volume is manifest and the conferees believe their agreement represents the most realistic estimate possible at this time.

The House Members at this conference agreed to an increase of \$2 million in the appropriation for facilities but were in general agreement with the Members of the other body that the vehicle replacement program of the Post Office Department should be carried out on a sustained basis and that large increases in funds such as those requested this year should not be supported.

The amount agreed to in conference for the postal modernization appropriation is an increase of \$5 million over that approved by the House. This is a new appropriation item and is intended to enable the post office to place modern equipment into operation. The total figure recommended should support an active program of modernization in practically all of the post offices which the Post Office Department has planned for this program in fiscal year 1960. The House position has prevailed in striking out the language which would have provided no-year availability of funds under this appropriation item.

In the opinion of the House conferees, Mr. Speaker, the conference report presents a very satisfactory compromise of the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. It represents a unanimous agreement on the part of the conferees and I urge its adoption by the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES WITH CANADA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H.J. Res. 254) to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, after "Congress" insert "or to meetings held in the United States."

Page 2, after line 7, insert "Such appointments shall be for the period of each meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group except for the four members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the four members of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose appointments shall be for the duration of each Congress."

Page 2, line 14, after "made," insert "the House and Senate portions of."

Page 2, line 16 and 17, after "delegation" insert ", respectively."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we might have an explanation? What has happened in connection with this legislation?

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was passed by the House and on yesterday passed by the Senate with corrective, technical amendments which do not affect the substance of the resolution. Does the gentleman want me to explain the nature of each amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. This deals with the parliamentary conference in Canada; is that correct?

Mrs. KELLY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. How much is this going to cost? Does the gentlewoman have any idea?

Mrs. KELLY. \$15,000 is the appropriation, divided between the other body and this body.

Mr. GROSS. Was there any objection in the other body?

Mrs. KELLY. None whatsoever. These are just technical changes, one with respect to the chairmanship and the other with respect to disbursements.

Mr. GROSS. Let the record show that I am still opposed to this proposal. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, as most of the House membership know, a Joint Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor has been engaged for several months in hearings on labor reform legislation. Representatives of practically every phase of our society have been heard. It has not been possible to hear all of those who have requested the opportunity to present their views to the subcommittee, but we have endeavored to select a good cross section of those offering to testify in an effort to bring the best information possible to the committee members.

Within the last 6 weeks, more than 100 requests were received from various points on the west coast, requesting that they have an opportunity to present their views to the subcommittee, and the majority of these requests were from so-called rank-and-file union members, wishing to testify particularly on the section of the bill dealing with the individual union member's bill of rights. After careful study of the requests and consideration of all the problems involved in bringing people from the west coast to Washington to testify and with particular consideration of the very large industrial interests on the west coast, it was the decision of the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member, concurred in

by the cochairmen of the subcommittee, that a special subcommittee be dispatched to the west coast for the purpose of hearing as many witnesses as possible from that section. Consequently, hearings were held in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 28 and 29 from 9 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the afternoon by a special subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Georgia as chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HESTAND]. Approximately 20 witnesses were heard and I believe the other members of the subcommittee will support me in the statement that the testimony delivered to us during the Los Angeles hearings was well worth the expense of sending the subcommittee out to California. We believe the information received will be of tremendous help in the writing of legislation, particularly with regard to the section dealing with the individual union member's bill of rights.

Some conversation has occurred to the effect that it is the intention of certain members of the House Committee on Education and Labor to delay and finally block the passage of any legislation in the labor reform field. I think I can speak for the entire committee membership in saying that no one of us has ever entertained such idea and I can assure you that the close association I have been privileged to have with the chairman of the full committee, the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN, allows me to know that it has been his intention from the beginning of these hearings to report a good bill at the earliest possible time. As a matter of fact, the distinguished chairman has consistently urged the cochairmen of the subcommittee to expedite the hearings and get the committee into executive session for the purpose of writing a bill at the earliest possible date.

It is the sincere hope of the cochairmen of the subcommittee, the Honorable CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, and myself, that hearings can conclude sometime next week, after which the committee will go into executive session and will work as diligently as possible and as long as necessary to report a bill for the consideration of the membership of this House.

The mail addressed to the committee regarding legislation in this field indicates that the general public is demanding that some measure be passed to protect the interests of the working union member, the businessman, and the general public. In my considered judgment, for the House to fail to write an adequate, meaningful bill in the field of labor reform would be a disaster.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Geor-

gia [Mr. LANDRUM] has just said is very important to all of us and we must answer the demand of the people for adequate legislation dealing with organization of labor. The Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings but our difficulty grows out of the fact that a witness will come in, for example Mr. Meany is on the stand today, and will read a long statement, a statement which should have been furnished us a couple of days in advance so that we might have time to read and consider it and to ask a few questions about it. The way it is now all we get is propaganda from a few top witnesses. We do not get as much as we should from the average employee and employer.

My hope is that we will report out a bill without delay then, difficult as it may be, with a comparatively simple bill on the floor.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report, including any supplemental or minority views, on H.R. 7523.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Adair	Diggs	May
Alford	Durham	O'Brien, N.Y.
Baumhart	Edmondson	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Evins	Pfost
Canfield	Forrester	Powell
Celler	Green, Ore.	Randall
Chamberlain	Hays	Rogers, Tex.
Chenoweth	Hollifield	Smith, Va.
Coad	Kilburn	Wallhauser
Davis, Tenn.	Knox	Withrow
Dawson	Lesinski	
Denton	Madden	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further 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.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7454, with Mr. KROGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], a member of the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this committee has had a very tough assignment and I assure you it has been a very tough job. We worked on this matter for over 5 months, mornings and afternoons; we heard over 500 witnesses; there are over 5,000 pages of testimony, and I want you to know that we gave proper attention to this bill, which is over 50 percent of the national budget. That is a lot of money in any language.

It will be \$1 billion under last year's bill, and we cut the President's budget for this year \$400 million. Unless this House has the good judgment to accept the amendments I will introduce later on and the amendments to be introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio on the Bomarc, we will give you a nice little package in which my amendments will increase, his amendments will reduce, and we will come out just about where we are in nice, round, fat numbers.

I want to say, and I want you to know, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has done a terrific job. I agree with him only about half of the time, but he is a hard worker; he has the patience of Job, believe me. First of all, he has to put up with me, and that is no picnic, and also with about six other Members on both sides of the aisle who are headaches in their own right, during these 5 months of hearings. When this bill is signed by the President, I think the taxpayers ought to give Mr. MAHON and his lovely wife a vacation at the taxpayers' expense and excuse him from attending the balance of this session. His was a tough job.

Now, let me add this. Everything all during this debate yesterday and so far today would give you the impression that this has been all sweetness and love; that everybody agreed upon this program; that this was a very duck-wucky arrangement. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. We spent 5 days marking up this bill, Mr. Chairman, and they had to practically call in the marines to get us off each other's neck. I want you to know that there were a lot of strong opinions both ways about this bill, and we hammered it out behind closed doors after great debate and hard work.

Now, there are a lot of things about this bill I do not like; there are a million things in this bill that I do not like. A few of them I will mention. But, we worked together, and I will introduce amendments only on matters of policy. That is the practice of our committee, a practice we agreed on, right or wrong. I want some things, they want some things, and we work it out that way except matters of policy. But, on matters like the end strength of the Army and the end strength of the Marine Corps, I reserve the right to amend it.

Now, let me tell you a few things about this defense setup. Talk about your

great Air Force—and thank God it is a great Air Force. Had it not been for the B-52 bombers, there would have been world war III. World war III never happened, and it is because of the B-52 bombers that it did not happen. But, that is world war III. We turn over that page. That is gone. It did not happen, and that is why. But, you talk about your great retaliatory Air Force, the bombers; that we are going to destroy the world with our bombers. What bombers? You have 2,000 in the Strategic Air Command; 500, in round numbers, B-52's; a great pigeon; none better in the world. What about your other 1,500? The other 1,500 are B-47's. Three-quarters of your SAC command is obsolete today. Do you know that? Three-quarters of your bombers are 10 years old. The life of a bomber is 10 years. Your B-47's are 10 years old. One crash, night before last, killed three men. I am disclosing information to the Russians? Do not be ridiculous. Everything I am telling you they know in spades. Do not worry about me telling the Russians. Now, that is your bomber command; three-quarters obsolete. How do you like that? But, we have got to have them. We are going to have a mixed retaliatory power with missiles. Do not worry about what we can do to them. Anything they can do we can do better, if that makes you feel any better. They will kill a hundred million of you and we will kill a hundred million of them. Now, is that not ducky, especially if you are one of the hundred million? But, if that is the way you want it, that is the way it is. It is in the bill.

Now, what about your Navy? It is a great Navy; a wonderful U.S. Navy. It is wearing out with blocked World War II obsolescence; blocked obsolescence. It will wear out in one big chunk at the same time. Your fighting ships are 20 years' life. The whole block obsolescence of the U.S. surface fleet will wear out in 20 years from World War II ships at one time. But, in this bill you do not have the money to replace the wear-out. You cannot replace the annual wear-out of your fleet. So, your fleet is going down, down, down; not literally but figuratively. What about the manpower? You cannot man the fleet you have got. You cannot man it. So, you can man 80 percent of the fleet becoming obsolescent with no money to replace the wear-out. That is the fleet. How do you like that? Your Army. Well, if it was not for the parliamentary rules, I would use language to tell you what I think about anybody who will cut the Marine Corps and the Army at a time like this. Step out in the hall after I finish and I will tell you in real strong language what they have done to the Army and the marines. I am not sure who did it. I will start with the Secretary of the Treasury, then the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and finally the Secretary of Defense, in that order. I recommend that we approve a uniform for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that has seven stars for that fellow, and that they be lit up with neon lights, that he have pink pants, a Luftwaffe cap, and a riding crop.

The good thing about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and our committee, is that we have put our imprimatur at least upon the bill that came here. We did not squander any of this money; we did not squander anything; we are \$400 million under the bill that was sent up. We just scattered it around a little more intelligently and put it where it should belong; only we were not quite intelligent enough, according to my way of thinking.

Let me give you a word about this Army for a minute. I want you to hear this. Do you know that this administration has cut the U.S. Army one division a year for the last 6 years? Do you know that? Five years ago we had 20 divisions in the U.S. Army. Do you know what you will have when you are through with this bill? Fourteen. That is your Army. This is your idea and the President's idea, not mine.

As for the Marine Corps, the administration has been after it for the last 6 years; you have been trying to emasculate the U.S. Marines and make them a police force or bellhops. Do you know how many combat units hit the beach at Lebanon—Marines? Do you know how many we sent into Lebanon? Six—one, two, three, four, five, six. That is what we hit the beaches with at Lebanon. Do you know how many you are cutting out in this bill? Six? That is a great way to run a railroad, the Marine Corps, or anything else. I guess there "just ain't going to be no more Lebanons." Somebody has a pipeline to heaven. Well, there will be; God forbid. But there will be, all over the world, and you will want marines to hit the beaches. And then they will come back with a supplemental or a sudden request, and they will get it. Everybody will be for it.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Of course.

Mr. FORD. Is it not true that the six battalion landing groups that hit the beaches at Lebanon were somewhat under strength; the ones that will remain in the Marine Corps in fiscal 1960 under this program will be at practically full strength?

Mr. FLOOD. Why, of course.

Mr. FORD. In other words, the battalion landing teams you will have under this program will be stronger than the battalion landing teams they had in the year they went to Lebanon.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. And let me give the gentleman a wonderful answer that I just thought up out of my own little head. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is a great baseball player. He played on our House ball team. He was a great ballplayer for the University of Michigan. I say to him, sir, that on a ball team you have got to have nine men. You may have hitless wonders or you may have world champions, but you have got to have nine men. You cannot play a ball team on the field with six or seven. If you try, you have no ball club. You have something else, but not a baseball team. That is the trouble. Now let me show you what happened.

Let me talk about the Army. Mr. Chairman, if this committee remembers

no other one thing that I say, I beg that they remember this. Now hear this. Shame upon the makers of military policy of the United States of America. Do you know what happened? Our people in this Nation, from the dawn of history, abhorred mercenary troops. Shades of the Hessians that the British brought to America—the Hessian mercenaries. We despise and detest a nation that hires bodies to fight and die for it. Any great nation in the world that did that died, and should die. Well, you are eating pretty high on the hog here. You are pretty fat and sassy and lazy. So you have got to go and hire troops.

You have to hire infantry; do you? Is not that great? How many divisions do you have in Korea? You have two divisions in Korea. The divisions are the 1st Cavalry and the 7th Infantry Divisions. How do you make it up? Over one-third of the troops in this cavalry and the 7th U.S. Infantry Division, the great 7th Infantry Division of Korea, one-third of them are hired mercenary Korean infantry—integrated down to the squad level. How do you like that? I intend no aspersion against the brave Korean soldiers, our allies of proven loyalty. I speak only of integrating into U.S. divisions Koreans as individuals rather than of unit.

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

Mr. FLOOD. In a moment. My friend, you spoke for 1 hour and a half yesterday and you yielded to me once or twice; we are great friends, but just let me alone, will you? Just let me alone.

Now let me tell you, do you know what the Koreans are getting paid—integrated at the squad level? Now, remember, these are not battalions—not integrated Korean command units, but they are soldiers integrated at the squad level—the Korean soldier in your rifle platoon. Do you know what he gets paid by the Korean Government? He gets \$1.44 a month—\$1.44 a month. You give him a tube of toothpaste and a pair of pants once in a while—but \$1.44 a month is what one-third of your combat Korean infantry is paid. The exact figures by number are top secret. I cannot give you the exact figures by division. But any of you men who are cleared at that level can get it. Go to the telephone now and call up. Go to the telephone. Call the Army and ask them. Could I lie to you here? With God's help and the great intelligence of the people of my district, I will be here a long time. I cannot lie to you. I cannot lie to you. But, that is what you have done. When we are considering the bill under the 5-minute rule, I will have more to say about the Army. I will not take much more time on it now. My friend, the gentleman from Ohio, is going to introduce an amendment on the Bomarc. Well, I hope he wins. That is as phony as a \$3 bill—that Bomarc. I know that General Motors ran this town for 4 or 5 years when "Engine Charlie" Wilson was aboard. But, do you know who is running it now? Boeing. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] told us

that Boeing had a backlog of \$2,100 million worth of contracts—\$2,100 million. Do you know how much they are into you for Boeing now? Two and one-half billion dollars—and they have not shot down a starling from off the Archives Building in 6 years. That is it. Do you know how much more it will cost you? Six billion dollars more. Yes; \$6 billion more. Well, they do not have that much money in the House administration fund here—\$6 billion more—and who has a better right, ha? That is the situation. You have this Army and Marine personnel going up and down changing like the phases of the moon. How can you run departments that way? No wonder good men are quitting and getting out of the business. Why would they not—with the Bureau of the Budget breathing down their neck and setting up defense policy? Like an artist trying to draw beautiful designs on a mural from an activated pogo stick. That is what they are trying to do. That is what they are trying to make you do—here today and gone tomorrow. This House—oh, more praise to you—more praise to the House—more praise to the Congress—last year they tried to cut the Army and you would not let them do it—you would not let them do it. You said, “No—the Army was at an irreducible minimum. You are drawing blood. You have cut us six divisions a year. One-third of the Army you have cut. Leave it alone.” God knows you are liable to need it at any minute. Now I belong to that school of thinking—in the minority now but increasing—increasing in size, I believe that the next fighting—the next war, if, God forbid, there is one, there will only be one kind of war that you are going to fight. Nobody is going to fight a missile war. What is the matter with you? Nobody is going to fight a missile war.

Snap out of that. Khrushchev and the sputnik scared you to death. What is the matter with you? He scared you to death.

Everything that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] wants in that bill for missiles I am for giving him; he has got to have it. Every bird he wants to fly I am for. ICBM, IRBM, Polaris—you have got to have them. The other side has got to have them; they have got them; you are going to have them but you are 2 or 3 years behind him, but you will catch up to him, so you will both be loaded; you will have missiles coming out of your ears.

It is then a standoff. Do you think anybody is going to fire one of those? If you do you are out of your mind. But they will fight. The Good Book says “there will be wars and rumors of wars to the end of time”—and there will be; that is “the nature of the beast,” there will be.

Ah, somebody will say “You do not think you can fight Russian divisions, do you? We are not going to fight Russia on the ground.” Then I am supposed to shut up and drop dead. That is the end of the argument. That is nonsense.

I know that. He has got two and a half million in his army, and they are better equipped than you will ever be

the way we are going. He has done over his army, modernized it one and one-half times since World War II, one and one-half times, everything; he is terrific. You have not.

Fifty percent of your hardware in the Army, 50 percent is World War II stuff, 50 percent. Add 15 percent more and you have got obsolescent Korea hardware. Sixty-five percent of the hardware of the United States is obsolescent World War II and Korea hardware. And that is the kind of hardware you want to send your boys out to fight with?

Would you send the Air Force against the Russians with B-17's or P-51 Mustang fighters tomorrow?

What do you want to send the Army out like that for?

Did you see “Pork Chop Hill” downtown this week? That is what your Army will have to fight with, the wrong war, the wrong hardware. That was Korea. That was not good then, and certainly not now, and that is more than half of what you have got.

Two hundred million dollars in this bill to modernize the Army. Ha, ha, ha. Well, now, is not that a joke? We write into that bill \$200 million to be used for Nike-Zeus or Army modernization provided there are promising breakthroughs in the long-haired development. Well, I know what the Army long-haired flat-heeled scientists are going to do with that \$200 million. They will use three-quarters of it for Nike-Zeus. Oh, you ought to hear these boys: Nike-Zeus. What a field day these Olympians are having in this year of our Lord—Nike-Zeus. That is what they are going to do.

Why, the Army will not get even a new truck out of the \$200 million. You wait and see; and, God willing, I will be back here next year to tell you what they did with that \$200 million. You wait and see. Oh, they are fast on their feet.

And they are not so hot in R. & D. The Army spent millions of dollars to make us a new tank. Great deal. We go over to the proving grounds to see this great new American tank that R. & D. has got up for us—with a British gun. Is not that great? A great tank, but a British gun.

What happened to the American gun? Oh, somebody with birds on his shoulder said the English gun is better, the best we could buy.

Now, this is a serious matter. I believe—I believe this sincerely, I want you to understand me, I have been fighting about this all year in the committee—I believe the only kind of war we will fight will be limited war. We will not be fighting Russia. When they are set to have a cancer burst somewhere, when they are set to have a rash break out, it is going to break out at different ends of the world on the same day, 10,000 miles apart; and the local troops will have been infiltrated, and down to the battalion level there will be Russian commanders, and technicians, and logicians, every key position will be filled by Russians. In the line they will have their commissars. And in your line you will have your mercenaries. You two big brave boys,

Great United States of America. Great Soviet Russia. How surely can you rely on the mercenaries?

You want to cut your Army; you have got to balance this budget. I want to balance the budget for you. Restore my 900,000 to the Army; give me the division back you have taken away. Do not take another this year.

You have taken this. The Army is hurting. Give me the 25,000 marines; give me back my 6 combat battalions that you used at Lebanon. I need them tomorrow; give them back to me. The whole thing will cost you \$130 million. You still have \$250 million under the budget. I am not going over the budget.

Now, a lot of people have said to me: “Look, Flood, do not introduce those amendments here because you will get licked. Let us wait until we go to the other body.” I am fed up with that up to here. I am sick and tired that in the House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body in the world, I must stand by when my conscience tells me what to do, and to permit a conference committee, a third house of conference, to act. That is an evil thing. The most dangerous thing under our system of government is this conference system. It is bad; I think it is unconstitutional; it should be examined and purged, something done about it. I am not going to withhold my amendments and let a conference committee write my law.

Not me. I will introduce amendments that I want to introduce and this House will act, if only I am the one who votes for them. I think it is time you did the same thing. Never mind about the other body. We have a right to debate and vote here. Never mind the other body; never mind the third-house conference committee. Do away with the conference committee. It is stultifying. Did you hear that, do you know that, it is stultifying. Wake up.

Let us vote amendments up or down; never mind this fancy footwork. It is a bad thing.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that the committee did not see fit to include funds for an aircraft carrier. I should like to add my voice to that of the many persons in and out of the military departments who feel strongly that an additional aircraft carrier is vital to our needs. I make no more pretension to competence in this field than the members of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. However, it is my strong conviction that as laymen we should all give the most serious consideration to the views of the professionals in matters of this kind. It is my understanding that the Defense Department with its comprehensive view of the overall defense picture, balancing

the needs of the respective military, naval, and air arms, believes that such a carrier is essential. The Navy Department with its intimate knowledge of the requirements for maintaining our global security also is absolutely convinced that to do its job properly it needs such an aircraft carrier.

Our preoccupation with space matters and missiles has warped the judgment of many people in and out of government. Like the young student whose father recently complained that he knew all about space but could not add two and two properly, we are prone to neglect the conventional but essential aspects of military and civil affairs. Certainly ballistic missiles, however necessary they may be, do not render obsolete our conventional weapons either in a global war or particularly in limited local war situations. It is the latter with which we have been faced many times since World War II. On those occasions the aircraft carrier has been an essential part of our strategy. Carriers are extremely mobile and versatile weapons. Obviously, the developments in modern warfare have rendered our earlier World War II carriers obsolescent. The new types of planes carried aboard the ships require advance design and capabilities of the carrier. In almost every respect the supercarrier will do a better job in cutting down accidents in landings and takeoffs. They will have a capacity which was lacking in the earlier carriers that will make them incomparably more effective by reason of the amount of fuel, weapons of all kinds, and types and number of planes that they can carry.

The principal point that I am attempting to make is that we must have balance in matters of defense. I believe that it would be disastrous if we were to concentrate solely to missiles and similar weapons. The spirit, courage, and ingenuity of the American fighting man cannot be installed in a missile. We still have a great need for ships, especially aircraft carriers manned by the fine American personnel that have served us so well in all our military crises.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, as my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania has already indicated to you, I am going to offer an amendment to this Defense Department appropriation bill to strike from the bill the procurement funds in an amount of \$200 million for Bomarc.

At the very outset, though, I would be remiss if I did not today say what an honor and what a wonderful education it has been to serve on the Defense Subcommittee of this great Committee on Appropriations. I can truthfully say that there is no committee of this House or subcommittee of this House that works harder and longer hours than does this subcommittee. I know that from my own personal experience.

I can also say that I know of no subcommittee that has considered legislation on a more bipartisan, nonpartisan if you wish, basis than has this distin-

guished subcommittee. We might have argued and pulled at one another's hair, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania said, on certain facets of this bill, and I agree in the main with the basics of this bill, but when the chips were down the vote was on a bipartisan basis.

Yes, I offered my amendment in the subcommittee and it lost by a very close vote of 11 to 8.

I also would be remiss, Mr. Chairman, if I did not say what a distinguished chairman, a most preeminently fair chairman, we have heading our committee in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He has conducted the hearings with fairness, with complete candor, and I can say he is one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my privilege to know.

Of course, I can say equally the same thing and equally as much for the distinguished ranking minority member of this committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. As you all know he is one of the most able and well-liked Members of Congress. He has been very helpful to me. When I spoke to him about offering my amendment, he said, "BILL, you go ahead and do what in your good judgment you think is right." As to the amendment which I will offer later, I have these brief remarks to make.

Let us look at the record—in the defense of the continental United States—against a manned aircraft attack.

At the outset I want to emphasize that I have no ax to grind for any of the armed services—nor do I want to become involved in an interservice fight. But the facts must be pointed out.

Defense authorities feel we do need protection against manned aircraft today—and I agree. What do we have in the way of missiles fired from the ground against enemy aircraft? Aside from the Navy Talos and several other missiles with a capacity against low-flying aircraft, the Army has developed two Nike air defense missiles—the Ajax and the Hercules. The Ajax now is operational at approximately 200 batteries. It is no longer being produced, having been superseded by the Nike Hercules, a much improved air defense weapon with a range of approximately 80 miles and an atomic warhead. The Nike-Hercules now in operational at some 50 batteries.

The Air Force has initiated another anti-aircraft missile system, a ground-to-air weapon—the Bomarc. The Bomarc program was started in 1951. It now is 4 years behind schedule. It was not until a little over a year ago that it finally successfully shot down a slow 300-mile-an-hour World War II B-17 Drone. The Bomarc A has had its only success against subsonic targets. Its only firing at a supersonic target was completely unsuccessful. In range even the Bomarc A has not approached its 200-mile objective.

After 9 long years, there is not yet an operational Bomarc site with the Bomarc A, the first missile in the system. Some Bomarc A missiles now are on order.

With delivery of these, the Bomarc A program will be concluded. The present dispute involves only the Bomarc B. On paper, the Bomarc B is an improvement on the "A," having a different propulsion system, different guidance, and a designed hoped-for on drawing board range of 400 miles.

The funds of which I am speaking today include \$200 million for procurement for the Bomarc B program and \$84.6 million for testing and evaluation. My amendment takes nothing from Bomarc A which is completely funded. The Department of Defense sought an additional \$162.7 million for procurement, but this amount was eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

My objective is to eliminate the remaining \$200 million for procurement for fiscal 1960.

The committee report on page 16 on the defense appropriation says:

The committee would be willing to appropriate the full budget estimate and more if it had full confidence in the proposed Bomarc missile—if it had the assurance that the system would actually work. The contractor for the missile has already received over a period of years commitments in excess of \$1.1 billion. Before further commitments and expenditures pile up, a hard, new look should be given to the proposed Bomarc and the whole air-defense problem.

The Defense Department concept of air defense in depth has obvious merit. Nike-Hercules would cover the distance of 80 miles from the area being defended. On paper, Bomarc B would reach out to 400 miles. Manned interceptors would cover ranges beyond this. If we could spend money today and buy this concept, I would be 100 percent in favor of it, and would not be offering my proposed amendment.

The fact is, of course, that no funds voted today would do any such thing.

The Air Force wants to produce the Bomarc B based on highly inconclusive tests of the Bomarc A. The Air Force doesn't even have a B ready for full testing. The Air Force claim that the manufacturer's first test flight a few days ago was highly successful is a gross exaggeration. If the B fails to meet its programed requirements to the same extent as the A, we shall have spent billions without improving to the slightest degree our National Defense against manned aircraft.

Even if the Bomarc B does live up to its programed requirements, it will be of little value by the time it becomes available in an acceptable operational role.

The Air Force's own date for the first operational Bomarc B is early 1961. Even if the program continues on schedule, the missile will operate with minimum capacity until 1964.

Who in this House believes that the Soviet threat in 1964 or later will be primarily a threat of manned aircraft? The long-range ballistic missile is not a threat today, but it will have become one by the time the first Bomarc B is operational in 1961 and certainly will be the major danger long before 1964 and certainly thereafter.

We thus are being asked to vote \$200 million additional now in order to have a

weapon which will be outmoded and obsolete by the time it joins the U.S. defense arsenal.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that one point?

Mr. MINSHALL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman is aware with reference to Bomarc that if and when Bomarc B is operational—about a 2 to 3 year period—on or about the same date, the Russian Air Force will have operational, most probably, since we will, its Hound Dog air-to-ground missile; which means that the Russians will be firing an air-to-ground missile from Russian airplanes 500 miles away from the target, and the extreme range of the Bomarc is 400 miles. So on the day Bomarc is operational it will be 100 miles short of its target at maximum range.

Mr. MINSHALL. I am glad the gentleman brought out that point. I shall go into it later. But I should like to interject at this time, that Bomarc, even if an air-to-ground missile were within range, does not have the capability of hitting a Hound Dog-type missile.

These millions of dollars in the 1960 budget constitute only a fraction of Bomarc cost. The Bomarc program, by the Air Force's own estimate, already has cost approximately \$2 billion. It is expected to cost between \$3 and \$4 billion more by 1962. This does not include the SAGE control system on which Bomarc B is completely dependent. SAGE will have involved a cumulative expenditure of another \$7½ billion.

I cannot understand the validity of committing ourselves to additional billions of dollars or an additional \$200 million for a weapons system which will not be available in quantity until its usefulness has passed.

Let me emphasize that Bomarc is not a missile which will knock down enemy ballistic missiles. This is not its purpose. Nor is it a defense against air-to-ground missiles which may be launched by enemy bombers against our surface targets. It would only have a capability against air-breathing, ground-to-ground missiles or manned aircraft. The Russian emphasis is on ICBM's against which the Bomarc is useless.

Never have the Congress and the public been subjected to a more professional sales and promotion campaign than has been characterized by this billion dollar boondoggle.

These high-pressure salesmen in and out of uniform have parlayed an unproven—and as yet unavailable—weapon into a \$2 billion operation. They have every intention of doubling that figure if we in Congress do not call a halt.

Proponents have taken the Bomarc A—a miserably unsuccessful weapon—and increased its range and accuracy with a series of supercharged promises and veiled half-truths. A classic example of this is the full page advertisement on the Bomarc which appeared recently in publications throughout the country. To the uninformed, the impression is very definitely left that the Bomarc is on site—ready to fire to defend our homes. The truth of the matter is that after spending \$2 billion on the program, we do not have

one single Bomarc unit deployed in the defense of this country. After spending \$2 billion and 9 years—we do not have one cent's worth of protection out of the Bomarc system. In fact, the Air Force will not even have a Bomarc A unit operational until this fall.

My conviction is that we should "wash out" the program completely. Since we have spent so much money on it already, perhaps it is discretionary to provide some funds for further testing and evaluation. So far as I am concerned, this program promises nothing except more promises. In deference to those of my colleagues who do not share my conviction, however, I am willing to give Bomarc enough rope with which to hang itself. This rope is in the \$84.6 million for testing and evaluation provided by our committee in the bill now before you.

I do not pretend to be a military expert who is wise enough to tell the Defense Department what mixture of air defense weapons is desirable. I am quite prepared to agree with those who are authorities that our best defense system would be Nike-Hercules, Bomarc, present manned century series interceptors and such long-range to be acquired interceptors as the F-108. But the program we are asked to vote for today would not give us that mixture until the threat is no longer from manned aircraft.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to say that I expect to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio. As I understand it, if the gentleman's amendment prevails, \$200 million for the procurement of Bomarc will be stricken from the bill, but there will remain in the bill \$84.5 million for testing and evaluating the Bomarc program; is that correct?

Mr. MINSHALL. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. I certainly think we should stop, look, and listen before spending \$200 million for the procurement of a missile that has never been produced, and never been fired, with no record of any kind but the miserable record of failure.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I certainly agree with him.

The argument has been made that the Russians will follow a ballistic missile attack with an attack of manned bombers, using their own mix of attacking weapons. It is claimed Bomarc would thus be useful even in 1963.

This does not seem feasible to me. Bomarc B will be dependent upon a \$7 billion SAGE system—semiautomatic ground environment. These electronic computer control centers are not scheduled to be hardened against attack by ballistic missile. So that the initial ballistic missile attack would deprive us even of the capability of using Bomarc in those later years against aircraft coming in after the first waves of ballistic missiles.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize:

Bomarc is a \$2 billion failure.

The Bomarc program, launched in 1952, has cost nearly \$2 billion, yet has

not produced a single operational missile on site.

Tests of Bomarc A repeatedly revealed its unreliability against subsonic targets. In its one effort against a supersonic target, it failed miserably. It never reached its 200-mile-range objective.

Bomarc B was evolved from Bomarc A. On paper it shows changes in propulsion and guidance systems and an increase in hoped-for range capability. Like Bomarc A, Bomarc B is useless against ICBM's.

During the next 3 years, it will cost \$3 to \$4 billion more to develop the Bomarc system.

And today after spending 9 years and nearly \$2 billion, we still are not receiving one cent's worth of protection from the Bomarc system.

Bomarc will be obsolescent before it is operational.

It will be at the very least 2 years before Bomarc B may become available. Even if the program is on schedule, it is expected that the missile would operate on minimum capacity until 1964. Our best estimates show that as early as 1961 the threat will be the ICBM. Bomarc is useless against such missiles.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to take this opportunity as a Member of the Ohio delegation in the Congress and the House to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], for the hard work and the excellent study he has given to his assignment as a member of this very important subcommittee. All of us in the Ohio delegation are very proud of the record he has made here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, would be the last speaker.

Mr. MAHON. That is the understanding.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman from Texas have any other speaker?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. FORD. That being the case, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues on the committee in the sentiments they have expressed as to the chairman and ranking member. This is my first year to serve as a member of this committee. It is an interesting, challenging, and frustrating experience. During the hearings, senior members of the committee often pointed out the impossibility of any one person ever being completely informed on all of the elements of our complicated and huge defense system. I was continually and progressively impressed with the importance of improving our systems of obtaining information and exercising informed control over the expenditures of funds so that Congress can make its

maximum contribution to an adequate defense system on the most economic and efficient basis.

Almost everyone, I believe, will agree that this country can afford and the American citizen is willing to pay for an adequate defense system to assure, insofar as possible in the world in which we live, our peace and security. The extent of our military undertakings, however, must be limited by common sense and our economic capabilities, with due consideration to other requirements of Government and the overall drain of Government on the economy.

We are considering a defense budget and appropriation, but it is not a war budget and appropriation. Rather, it is to provide for peace. All of us hope for more acceptable means. We must constantly continue to explore such, but for the moment the peace and security of the United States and of the free world must be maintained through strength; adequate strength to deter any possible aggressor.

Based on the unanimous, considered judgment of our military leaders, the budget submitted by the President and the Defense Department provides in the overall for an adequate defense posture. The committee, particularly the chairman, made certain that this question was specifically answered by each appropriate witness. In this respect, Secretary McElroy stated, at page 49, volume 1 of the hearings:

Beyond 1962 I do not think there is too much value in our trying to guess. But in those years between now and 1962—which is as far as I think we can accurately judge—I think our position will still be one in which we will have adequate force to retaliate against an attacker, with the result that the effectiveness of that force will be sufficient to deter him from starting a general war.

General Twining, at the same page of the hearings, stated:

I would like to concur in everything the Secretary said, but I would like to point out in addition on the military side of the house our planning is to do this clear down the road, even to 1964 and 1965, and to always have this under control. It depends upon the annual budget. That can change, but if we get the budgets we need to support the program we have in mind, the answer is "Yes."

He further answered "Yes" to the question, "Do we have in the present military budget, the groundwork, the necessary provisioning of ourselves that we can follow through and accomplish the objectives which you have suggested?" Each of the chiefs of the separate services, although having reservations about specific programs, similarly agreed to the overall adequacy.

That the budget as presented, as was the fact, is a good and well-considered budget, does not mean that there should be no changes in the provisions thereof. The preparation of budget recommendations is a long process. I am advised that work is already going forward in the Pentagon on the preparation of next year's budget. The fiscal year 1960 budget which the committee had before it was based upon conditions existing as of last summer and last fall. With the

rapid changes in today's world, these conditions necessarily change. Secretary McElroy stated, at page 65 of the hearings:

In all of these areas of new technology, Mr. Chairman, you find technical knowledge advances very rapidly, really almost month by month. As soon as we found that the program could be accelerated as our understanding of the technical problems involved advanced, we put in the additional funds. The reason we did not ask for these additional funds last year was that we did not know then how to make proper use of them. When we found that we could make proper use of additional funds we did so.

This was to explain the expenditure of an additional \$114 million above the program for fiscal year 1959 on the Minuteman missile. The Defense Department regularly reprograms funds as conditions change, as it should do. Similarly, changed conditions between preparation of the budget and our consideration of it justifies some alterations.

There are many items which I would like to discuss with you, but I shall largely confine myself to the committee recommendations for changes in the Atlas and Minuteman missile program. General thinking is that these are weapons of general war rather than limited war. It must be recognized, however, that our ability in the missile field has a definite deterrent effect upon limited wars as well as general wars. The two, cannot be isolated and considered separately. Criticism has been made of the budget on the basis that it does not adequately provide for limited war forces. There can be no doubt of the desirability of improving our limited war capabilities, but the fact is, as per the testimony, that over 60 percent of this budget goes to those forces. The committee has made significant changes for the further strengthening of these elements.

Our objective is to deter, not to fight war, and thereby to preserve the peace. I refer to the missile as a deterrent weapon. To evaluate this, and particularly the numbers required, we must recognize the problems, questions, and differences of opinion which arise in determining what constitutes an adequate deterrent force. We most frequently hear that to deter war, we must have a sufficient military force, the will to use such force, and that any possible opponent must know and believe that we have both.

The real problem, though, is to determine how our various capabilities, as determined by the level of our military forces, will affect any aggressor in either starting or not starting a general or limited war, by reason of how he thinks that force would inflict damage upon him, or would affect our will to use that force. As the hearings moved along, I appreciated the complexity of this problem and the difficult decisions that lie ahead of us as to the size of a military force which we will maintain. Some believe that we would have an adequate deterrent force if we have sufficient response capability that with minimum warning of an attack, we could have enough on the way before the attack hits us, together with enough left over

for surviving after the attack, to add up to a retaliatory strike that the opponent could not, or would not choose to absorb. Some believe that it is sufficient if we have such a retaliatory force to be capable of destroying the aggressor's population centers without regard to specific military targets.

It is most important that we analyze that on the basis of the effect that it would have on increasing the likelihood of limited wars. The important element, of course, is how it will affect the possible aggressor's thinking with regard particularly to our will to use our forces. This would have a very marked effect upon all of our diplomatic negotiations. Prior to this so-called missile era, we have endeavored to maintain a military striking force sufficient to destroy the military capabilities of any possible opponent. Therefore, in determining whether to start a limited war or a diplomatic position, any opponent must say to himself that we have the power to destroy him and his ability to destroy us. If, however, we are to adopt a concept with missiles that we have only a retaliatory force sufficient to destroy the opponent's population centers, then the possible opponent must, in determining whether or not to start a limited war or upon deciding upon the diplomatic position, determine whether or not we are willing to absorb destruction to stop him. In other words, instead of being in the position of saying to a possible opponent, "If you go too far, we will destroy you," we would in effect be placed in the position of saying, "If you go too far, we will destroy each other." Most important under such circumstances would be the possible opponent's estimate of our continued will to use the forces available to us, to either prevent or stop a limited war. For this reason, some people believe that in order to maintain an adequate deterrent force we must, in addition to our retaliatory capability, have sufficient missiles or other weapons to be able to knock out the opponent's significant military targets and means of devastating ourselves and our allies, as a means of stopping or preventing a limited war.

This also involves a most difficult problem of detecting the targets. I am inclined to believe that this is the type of deterrent force which we must develop. Whether or not this is feasible and whether or not we will undertake to develop such a force is the most difficult decision facing us militarily in the immediate years ahead.

Not so long ago, much was read in the press, giving specific figures of the so-called U.S. missile gap. I would first like to emphasize that these figures were not a fair basis for comparison. Figures used for the Soviet were based on their estimated capability, as opposed to what we will actually have in being. Estimated capability seldom measures up to what is actually done. A striking example of this is the previous estimated capability of the Soviet to have at this time a total of 600 or 700 advanced long-range bombers. They did not build them, have a much lesser number, and we have a clear superiority in this area.

Even if the figures were accurate, numbers alone form no sound basis for comparison. Recent studies have emphasized the importance of the effect of hardening the missile site. By hardening is meant the protecting of the missile in concrete and steel, underground. It appears to be proven that one hardened missile has the retaliatory effect of many missiles placed in an exposed position.

Some people have insisted that we should exactly match the Soviets in the numbers of our ICBM's. This is not the measure at all. If you contemplate what I have just previously said, you will appreciate that such could be too much for an adequate retaliatory deterrent force, and yet would be completely inadequate to give us a positive deterrent force capable of knocking out the aggressor's significant military targets and means of devastation.

It is important, I think, that we realize that the missile is a vehicle, a means to deliver a nuclear warhead. As such, it is only one of the means. Some have made an attempt to isolate the ICBM's and to judge the relative strength of the United States and the Soviet at a given time on this basis alone. This cannot be done. Basically, as a delivery system or a vehicle, the ICBM gains speed and time. The ICBM is capable of delivering its warhead to Moscow or from Moscow in 30 minutes, as compared to the 6-hour delivery time for the bomber presently in use. Its bomb load is smaller, but it eliminates much of the necessity for overseas bases. There are many other factors too numerous to discuss, such as reliability, reusability, and so forth.

The President's budget, as presented, I think provided for a well-considered program. Since that time, however, there have been substantial changes. When the budget was in its final stages of preparation, the Atlas missile had not been fully tested. Since that time, there have been significant developments as to the Minuteman. The Minuteman is a solid-propellant advanced missile. I think we must recognize, it is presently not a weapon in being, but is one under development. I think it is important to note that the full amount of the Air Force requests for both the Minuteman and the Atlas was approved by the Defense Department, and in turn by the President. Because of subsequent developments, however, it is estimated that additional funds could be expended on the Minuteman, and that we could thereby speed up the estimated time when it would be available as a weapon in our arsenal by approximately 6 months. To accomplish this, the committee has recommended an addition of \$87 million to the program.

Although much is claimed for the Minuteman, with confident estimates that it will prove out, it was uniformly agreed that the best way of increasing our missile capabilities in the years 1961, 1962, and 1963, which were considered to be the critical years, was by acceleration and expansion of the Atlas program. This again becomes a reasonable consideration by reason of developments since the budget was prepared. Prior

to that time, the missile had not been fully tested. Since that time, the studies on the effect of hardening of the launching site have been completed. As a matter of fact, a new guidance system has been developed which permits the hardening of the Atlas missile sites.

As a result of changes in the situation, the committee proposes to add \$85 million for incremental financing of an additional eight Atlas squadrons. The Congress should not be misled with reference to the real cost of this program. In addition to the \$85 million for the missile itself, there will be required to carry out this expanded program, again on an incremental financing basis, that \$193 million be added in the military construction program, which is the subject of a separate bill. The total additional funds for this year is thereby \$278 million. To fully finance the eight additional squadrons in this and subsequent appropriations will require \$1,360 million. I believe that the committee is justified in making these funds available, on the information available to it; but in my opinion it should not be considered as a directive to the Defense Department or the President that these funds should in all events be expended.

What is the changed situation? There is now no doubt that the Atlas is a good weapon. General Schriever, then Commander of the Ballistic Missile Division and now heading the Air Research and Development Command, testified to this effect before our committee and recommended an expanded program. As a matter of fact, even more ambitious programs were suggested. Different proposed alternatives and their costs appear at page 629 of volume 5 of the hearings. General Power of the Strategic Air Command, which has operational responsibility for the Atlas as well as our strategic bombers, had this to say:

I think you should produce the Atlas at the maximum logical, practical rate, because you are going to get it first. It is the only ICBM weapon system that has really fired up to now and it is a good weapon. It is almost a proven weapon. It has had a very successful R. and D. But read the papers, and you would think the missile had been unsuccessful. Actually, it has been more successful than we ever expected it to be. It has had a very high degree of success. I think we ought to get it as fast as we can, and get it in hardened sites. I think it is a very good deterrent weapon system.

There has been some suggestion that, because of its liquid-fuel characteristics, the Atlas would become obsolete in the very near future, or as soon as the Minuteman was operational. So far as I know, no responsible military opinion supported this. Refinements and improvements can be expected in the Atlas. Secretary McElroy summed up this very well when he stated that the Minuteman will complement and not replace the liquid-fueled missile. Both the Atlas and the Titan will carry a larger warhead than is programmed for the Minuteman, which will be more suitable against certain types of targets.

Just as I have indicated, with new developments, there is and should be a continuing review and rereview of pro-

grams within the Defense Department. During the course of our hearings, we were advised that the Air Force was reviewing the requirement for additional Atlas squadrons. Before the bill was reported by the subcommittee, we were informed that following such review the Air Force had recommended to the Secretary of Defense the eight additional squadrons for which funds are provided in the committee bill. Although in January, when Secretary McElroy and General Twining appeared before the committee as our first witnesses, it was made quite clear by them that they were not recommending an additional or accelerated Atlas program by April; but when former Secretary Quarles appeared before the committee, he had this to say:

We are, however, restudying it in the light of subsequent experience, particularly the test experience with Atlas, as the most significant aspect of the thing. I would say that it is still possible, we feel, within the next few months that there could be a better mix, shall I say, of these programs than the ones presented at that time.

On the basis of these and other developments, I think the committee and the Congress is quite justified in providing the funds required to carry out the additional eight-squadron Atlas program. These reviews should be continued. If the Defense Department concurs in the recommendation and the President agrees, they will be available to execute the program without delay. Should this concurrence not be forthcoming, then the funds need not be released and expended. This is as I think it should be.

Several reductions have been made in this bill which have resulted in it being reported at about \$319 million below the President's budget request. Some of these specific cuts I did not support in committee. Others which I did support did not prevail. I think that we must strive for increased economy and efficiency, while at the same time maintaining an adequate defense. Thereby, we in fact contribute to the maintaining of the best possible defense. The reductions of 1 percent in operation and maintenance and procurement are, in my opinion, well considered. We, together with the Executive, should continue to strive for means whereby we can eliminate waste, duplication, and inefficiency.

Nevertheless, I do support the overall committee bill. I think it is most significant and important that the committee has stayed within the President's budget request. As I have mentioned, all responsible military opinion expressed to the committee suggests that this in the overall is adequate to maintain the necessary deterrent effect and the peace and security. As additional testimony is received and the bill is considered in the other body, there will undoubtedly be some restorations. There may be justification for some increases or decreases. Generally speaking, however, I think that this must be kept within the area of the President's budget request, and that our conferees should insist upon this. Failure to do so, in light of the military testimony, would appear to be completely irresponsible.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned over what has happened to the Army of the United States since the advent of atomic warfare. I need not remind the Congress, except briefly, of the impact of air power on military thinking and planning as a result of experiences of World War II. The Hiroshima blast started off a growing philosophy of doubt for the need for land troops which we subscribed to increasingly through the years, despite our knowledge of numerical superiority by the Communist bloc Korea should have taught us the advisability of maintaining, at all times, a sufficient, modern Army, ready for any war.

In this era of the space age our U.S. Army finds itself in a situation similar to that faced by David when he went down to fight Goliath. David was armed with a sling and five smooth stones, Goliath carried a shield and sword and wore body armor. Our Army is also being asked to face a better equipped opponent and I feel that this is unnecessary.

You may well ask how this situation came about. Why is our Army not the most modern, the most mobile, the best equipped Army in the world? I'm afraid that all of us must share some of the blame for this. Ever since the end of World War II, with a short respite during the Korean war, we have been engrossed in the idea of putting all of our eggs in the massive retaliation basket. We have allocated tremendous amounts of money to the atomic weapons stockpiles, we have developed and built hundreds of modern airplanes, we have developed a number of guided and ballistic missiles, but we have, to all intents and purposes, overlooked the requirement to provide our Army with weapons and equipment that is adaptable to the atomic battlefield of today. I admit that Congress provided funds in last year's budget specifically for Army modernization, but there has been no major initiation of this program by the Department of Defense to date.

Very basically this is the situation facing the Army: There is not enough procurement money in this year's budget to replace the equipment that is wearing out or becoming obsolete, much less to attempt any modernization program. If this situation is permitted to continue our Army stocks will be steadily decreased and our preparedness will correspondingly decrease.

The Army Chief of Staff, General Taylor, realizes that this situation if it is permitted to continue will eventually mean a poorly equipped inadequate Army. He has proposed a 5-year program calling for the expenditure of \$2.8 billion a year, which would provide \$1.2 billion for producing new weapons and equipment for all the Army's active divi-

sions and some of the National Guard and Reserve divisions, and some \$200 million for tooling and production facilities. The Army admits that this plan involves some risks, but it would be a starting point for a modernization effort and for that reason it should be supported.

I sincerely believe that the American people want their sons who are serving in the Army to have the very best and latest equipment that can be found, and that they would be appalled if they did not think that every effort was being made to provide this equipment.

We should insure that the appropriations for fiscal year 1960 includes adequate funds for Army procurement of modern equipment and we should strongly urge the Department of Defense to utilize these funds without delay. Only by taking such action can this body be certain that we have done everything in our power to provide for a modern hard-hitting Army.

I have heard much of the Pentomic concept of smaller forces with greater weapon, offensive or defensive, capacity. As I understand the concept, it cannot materialize unless the troops have the most advanced weapons, and the background training to use them with superiority.

We need sufficient troops.

We need superior weapons.

I have been informed that one of our military men has recently stated:

In terms of dollars, approximately 60 percent of the Army's inventory today was procured during World War II or the Korean war. Ten percent of it is pre-World War II vintage.

Let us see what we know the Soviet has. I am sure our intelligence is incomplete, but we believe they have—

First, 160 to 175 divisions;

Second, standardize small arms at 7.62 millimeters and have equipped their forces with these weapons;

Third, recoilless rifles and antitank guns that fire shaped charges;

Fourth, an excellent family of tanks up to a heavy tank;

Fifth, tracked armored personnel carriers;

Sixth, a family of helicopters; and

Seventh, estimated stockpile of items adequate to support a 300-division army for 6 months or more.

Is the U.S. Army outgunned and outmanned? Some of our experts tell us so. They ought to know. If they are armed with World War II and Korean weapons, they are outgunned.

The Army did an excellent job at Redstone Arsenal. Shall we quit there?

What do we need beside more troops? I believe we need—

First, Honest John rockets in infantry and armor division and Little John rockets in its airborne divisions.

Second, An air-transportable M56 90-millimeter self-propelled gun.

Third, New tanks that weigh less, have greater operational range, and carry improved guns.

Fourth, The new M60 machinegun, a general purpose weapon.

These are just a few. I am not an Army man but I am interested in having a good Army. Now, if we are not going

to give them numbers, let us give them sufficient appropriations for modern, the best possible, equipment.

In order to effect ground mobility the Army needs jeeps, mechanical mules, and most importantly, a lighter and faster armored personnel carrier, like the all-aluminum M113 personnel carrier.

Weapons and machines that will give our pentomic divisions the mobility and striking power that they must have if our Army is to be qualitatively superior to the Soviet army are available for production. The problem has been and is to obtain sufficient funds to produce them in sufficient quantity to give us qualitative superiority.

I am not privileged to set on either Armed Services or Appropriations. I know they work hard. I also know they are beset by the responsibilities of watchdogging the defense of this country. I salute the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for his hard work and dedication to high purposes.

My purpose is to incite us to do a little more for our Army. It is a great, a necessary service; it should be given the opportunity to do what we intend for them, defend; and if attacked, counter-attack; and above all, win. They cannot do the job without sufficient troops or the best modern weapons.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the committee action in recommending an increase of \$200 million for Army modernization is exceedingly wise and deserves the wholehearted support of this House.

This Nation cannot forget that it must be prepared to meet the sudden threat of conflict at thousands of points across the globe. The United States is the principal guarantor of peace. It is a major concern that we be prepared to keep that peace.

Yet the budget submitted for the Army provided approximately \$1.2 billion for procurement of missiles and equipment, while it takes \$1.4 billion to permit the Army to maintain its present inventory. There is a gap there, too, that requires attention.

This is what the committee has done in putting the \$200 million back into the budget. This sum will allow the Army to maintain its present level of inventory and stay even with the wear-out and obsolescence rates. Some new equipment can now be put into the inventory.

This is a positive step in the right direction. It is a most important step when you consider that more than half of the Army's equipment was procured during World War II and the Korean war. Of the \$14 billion equipment inventory that the Army has now, \$5 billion consists of World War II models or older.

There are many disturbing things about the forces that now are programmed to maintain the peace. We see, for instance, that under present strength ceilings, the Army must plan to cut by one-fourth the force it maintains as its top priority strategic reserve.

We see that the United States can only maintain its 8th Army at full strength in Korea by using wholesale

infusions of Korean personnel to fill the ranks. In Europe, our 7th Army depends on a large number of foreign nationals maintaining its lines of communication.

We have heard a good deal in recent years about more bang for a buck. Yet, while there have been pleasing exclamations about the advanced firepower that can be put in the soldier's hands, the truth remains that it has not been put in his hands. As the committee notes on page 58 of its report, the budget does not make adequate provision for equipping the Army with the firepower weapons it has finally developed, particularly the new M-14 rifle, the new machinegun and the Davy Crockett weapon.

In fact, at the recommended rates of production in the fiscal 1960 budget as General Taylor testified to the Appropriations Committee, the forces in Europe will not be reequipped with the M-14 rifle until fiscal year 1962; the Strategic Army Corps Reserve until 1964 and the entire Regular Army until 1968 or later.

Let me point out a way in which this slowness of mobilization affects the readiness of our reserve military structure. We have heard in recent years of Trainfire, a system of rifle marksmanship training that has been introduced in the Regular Army. It is a combination of the old musketry and combat range techniques with new mechanical equipment that is available.

That method was widely introduced in the regular services last year. It is a matter of providing new ranges. Shortage of funds is slowing the building of these special ranges and it will take several years for the system to spread Army-wide. Yet it is a definite improvement over present known distance range training. To deny it to any soldiers is to slow down their training and weaken the effectiveness of our forces in being.

While it may slowly reach the Army as a whole, it will be still later in coming to the National Guard and Reserves that are a vital part of the Nation's strength. The National Guardman estimates this month, on the basis of advice from CONARC, that not until fiscal 1962 will funds be available for construction at active installations and State-owned camps to provide this type of training.

From training to the front lines, this slowness of modernization affects the Army. We have heard a good deal about the new Pentomic divisions and the advantages they are claimed to represent. Yet these divisions will reach maximum effectiveness only when modern equipment has been issued to each of them.

Their flexibility depends on the new mobility and communications equipment designed for the nuclear battlefield, but we have not yet been able to replace the World War II types of communications in the hands of troops. And what about the allied forces on which we may place heavy reliance in time of war?

In order to understand the Army's need for modernization, it is necessary to balance the present inventory of \$14 billion against a \$20 billion modern inventory required to support combat forces in the first 6 months after D-day.

Also, we must look at the Soviet Union and consider that, since World War II,

the Soviets have re-equipped their 160 to 175 divisions with newly designed weapons, transport, and other equipment. In selected categories, the U.S.S.R. has five times the modern equipment that we have.

They have standardized their small arms—rifles, light machine guns, and submachine guns—at 7.62 millimeter and have equipped their forces with these weapons.

In addition to surface-to-surface missiles of ranges from 10 miles to 1,500 miles, they have developed a new family of guns and howitzers, mortars—one of 240 millimeter is judged to be capable of firing an atomic warhead—recoilless rifles, and antitank guns with shaped charges.

They have an excellent family of tanks up to a heavy tank with a 122-millimeter gun. They have tracked armored personnel carriers with an estimated range of 165 miles.

They have standardized on a diesel engine that they use in 15 pieces of equipment—tanks, self-propelled artillery, personnel carriers, and so on. It is estimated that a tank powered with one of those engines burns no more than a gallon of gas a mile. They have a family of helicopters similar to ours, except that they have also exhibited a giant one capable of carrying a 27,000-pound payload.

Despite the fact that they can plan to wage war with inner lines of communication, they are also reported to be building a large fleet of long-range air transports. Most, if not all, of these modern pieces of equipment are in the hands of their troops—not in a paper budget.

Competent authorities have estimated that the Russian stockpile of items in readiness are adequate to support a 300-division army for 6 months.

General Taylor has summed up Soviet advances in these fields by observing that the second generation of Soviet equipment now appearing "typifies simplicity in design, mobility, ease of manufacture, interchangeability, and standardization."

I have already pointed out that our own forces still largely are armed with World War II and Korean equipment. The noticeable exceptions are the surface-to-surface missile commands, and the question that may be raised immediately is whether we have enough.

But the most important question remains the armament of the pentomic division and the battle group. The combat effectiveness of these divisions is directly related to the modern equipment available within them. The Army has not been allotted funds in fiscal 1959 or in fiscal 1960 to obtain the equipment needed to modernize the divisions.

What does the Army need?

For atomic firepower, it needs Honest John rockets in infantry and armor divisions and Little John rockets in its airborne divisions. Atomic warheads are needed for 8-inch guns. These are first-generation, division-type atomic weapons. Funds are needed to provide enough production so that our divisions can be armed with them.

For conventional firepower, many more items are needed:

A conventional artillery piece similar to the versatile 175-millimeter gun which combines the advantages of a howitzer and a gun. New tanks that weigh less, can move farther and fire farther. New machineguns already approved, and new M-14 rifles just going into production. The present funding rate, incidentally, would stretch out rearming the entire peacetime Army with these new weapons until 1975.

Take communications. The Appropriations Committee has heard of new radios that represent a definite step forward. There are plans for new drones and battlefield surveillance instruments.

Take ground mobility. There is a lighter, faster, all-aluminum personnel carrier that has been approved that the Army should have. In the air, the Army needs more helicopters and light aircraft.

All of these items are ready for production. The problem is money. If the Government tries to stretch out this procurement too long, it runs a risk of having to duplicate sources of supply while two generations of weapons are in the hands of troops.

How much can we afford to spend on such modernization? How much can we afford to spend on survival? We have dispatched troops to all corners of the earth to maintain freedom and insist on peace. We owe it to them to see that they are equipped to carry out their mission, and to see that no lives are lost because of inferior arms.

Nor is this something that can be ended with one effort. We need to keep searching out new and better arms, and buying them when we are assured they are necessary. Modernization is never finished.

We are only making a start toward giving the Army what it needs. I wish we were doing a great deal more, but I commend the committee on having added \$200 million to correct a serious deficiency in the Army budget. To those who would cavil over this cost, I would like to quote some words of Sir Winston Churchill, delivered in the House of Commons in the year 1675. This, quite obviously, was an ancestor of the present Sir Winston, but he too, stood up for adequate defense of his country when he reminded critics:

Saving money is no argument, when saving the nation is the case.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have considered today a subject which is of great concern to every man, woman, and child in the free world. We have been asked to vote some \$38 billion for the operation of our Defense Establishment. As we should expect when dealing with a subject so vital, there has been a good deal of controversy, both on and off the floor.

We can never be sure that the funds we appropriate for national security will be sufficient. We must rely on the best judgment of those who have held the hearings and worked on the bill and presented their arguments to us.

The committee has given careful study to the many provisions of this bill. I commend the members for their work and for the manner in which this bill has been handled on the floor.

Through the years, I have always supported every dollar that the Department of Defense and the committee felt was necessary for the defense of this country and I shall do so again today.

ARMY GROUND TROOPS NEED MODERN WEAPONS CAPABILITY FOR BRUSH FIRE WARS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank and commend the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and members of his Defense Department Subcommittee, for their diligence and thorough study of these budgetary estimates and their patience during long hours of testimony from the top civilian and military officials at the Pentagon.

As a member of the full Appropriations Committee, I was particularly pleased with our committee's action in providing for more funds than was asked for in the budget for equipment modernization. Funds for Army procurement have been increased by \$200 million to provide for advances in the Nike-Zeus anti-ICBM program and equipment modernization.

MANY NEW WEAPONS DEVELOPED AT SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

The research and development of many of these new and smaller weapons has been accomplished at the historic Springfield Armory in my home city of Springfield, Mass. The armory is now in pilot line production of the newly adopted M-14 Springfield rifle, and it is my understanding that the first of this type of shoulder weapon will be off the production line in about a month. In addition, the armory is also setting up the pilot line for the recently adopted M-60 machinegun.

Only last week, the Ordnance Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill., awarded contracts to the Springfield Armory for pilot line production of the M-73, 7.62 millimeter tank machinegun, and the T175E2 .50 caliber machinegun.

ARMORY WILL PRODUCE NEW TANK MACHINE-GUNS

The M73 tank machine gun was designed and developed at the Springfield Armory and was standardized and adopted by the Army last May 14. It is scheduled for use on the M60 tank, the Army's new main battle tank. The T175E2 .50 tank machine gun was also developed at the Springfield Armory for tank use. Initial delivery date for the M73 weapon from the Armory pilot lines will be in June 1960 while the T175E2 is scheduled for delivery in October 1960. It is my understanding that studies are currently being made by the Army on both weapons for further application to other ground combat vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation of an additional \$200 million for equipment modernization is necessary if we are to have a program for limited war preparation, as outlined by Army Chief of Staff, General Taylor, before the subcommittee.

UNITED STATES FACES LIMITED WAR THREAT FOR MANY YEARS

Here we are dealing with the question of limited versus general war and, as the committee report states, it is doubtful whether this issue can ever be fully resolved. However, the United States

must have the modern weapons at its command to deal with brush-fire type wars that may erupt. The threat of such warlike incidents, such as the crisis over Berlin, or those over Formosa and the Mid-East last year, may be with us for a long time. The Soviets will exert pressure on the West in any section of the world where they think we are weak, and one of their pressure exercises might result in shooting. Our Armed Forces, particularly the ground troops of our Army, must have a capability to cope with such incidents and make sure that the localized brush fire war does not grow into an all-out nuclear war. American troops must be adequately equipped with the best and most modern weapons.

FIRST M-14 SPRINGFIELD RIFLE TO BE PRODUCED THIS MONTH

Our distinguished colleague, Congressman SIKES, a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee, pointed out on the floor of this House last August 19 that American ground forces were sent into Lebanon carrying the M-1 rifle that had been adopted by the Army in 1936 and Browning automatics adopted in 1918. In contrast, Arab Republic troops were carrying modern lightweight rifles and machineguns somewhat similar to the new M-14 Springfield rifle and the M-60 machinegun. It is gratifying to know at this time that this situation is fast changing and soon our ground troops will begin receiving supplies of the new M-14 Springfield rifle and the M-60 machinegun. The first M-14 will come off the pilot line at the Springfield Armory within a few weeks.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, I am very much disturbed by the fact that the Defense Department appropriation bill before us does not carry the requested \$260 million for a new aircraft carrier. I realize that the subcommittee has a large and difficult task in writing a bill of the proportions of this one, but they can err. I am convinced that they have erred in eliminating this vital item.

Providing for this carrier this year means that it would be available 5 years from now. I believe that we can rely on the statements of the Department of the Navy authorities when they tell us that in 5 years our Essex class carriers will not be operational and at that time we will have only 10 carriers capable of transporting the modern manned aircraft.

I am sure that a study of my record will disclose to the membership of this body that my record has not been one of wild spending; in fact, I am sure you would agree that my record is very definitely on the conservative side, but I have supported necessary defense expenditures. This carrier definitely falls in the necessity class. I want the House to know that I definitely favor the inclusion of funds for this carrier in the fiscal 1960 budget for the Department of Defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the remaining portion of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 33 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if this bill as passed by the House today fails in its objective there will shortly be no need to pass further bills of any character or spend more money for any purpose.

This is the one vital bill of the session under which the Nation survives or perishes.

And if we fail, if this bill fails to serve the purpose for which it is reported by the committee to the Congress and serve it adequately, it is merely a question of time before all these other purposes for which we are spending money and for which we are legislating, will revert to the Russians, and nothing else will matter.

Mr. Chairman, this is an annual bill. We have been passing these bills regularly every year. And the bills which we previously passed since 1945 have failed to achieve the purpose for which they were enacted.

Judged by the supreme criterion of results secured, they have dropped behind the objective. Every year we have been slipping. Every year we have fallen further behind; further behind in world leadership; further behind in our race with Russia; further behind in our capability and capacity for national defense, and further behind in the security of world civilization. If anybody has any objection to that statement, or facts which will contradict it, let us have them now.

At the close of the World War in 1945, upon the deck of a great battleship, we summoned the representatives of Japan and Germany, the two greatest military powers of their day; we said, "You sign on the dotted line." And they signed.

We did not negotiate with them. We did not go through all this rigmarole we have been going through over in Korea and at Geneva. We said, "Sign," and they signed.

Why? Because we were at that time the greatest military power the world had ever seen. We had the greatest Navy, we had the greatest Army, we had the greatest Air Force, we had the greatest undersea force ever mobilized.

We had developed that vast military potential, mobilized that magnificent Army and launched those armadas of seapower with just such bills here in this Chamber as the bill which we have before us today.

And America was safe, and the world was safe.

Now it is with no little trepidation that we view the world situation today. Time marches on. And we have not kept pace with it. We have been slipping while Russia has steadily forged ahead.

Oh, I know that high-ranking officers have come before the committee and said, "We are perfectly safe; we can win any war; we can destroy any nation. Have no concern about it at all." They have lulled us to sleep with that sort of sedative, and they got away with it until the Russians put their sputnik into orbit. They couldn't deny that. That set them back on their heels. They could not explain that away. We had

been trying to put a missile through the stratosphere over a long period and we had not been able to do it, and for more than a year after we were not able to do it. But they did it.

And it is still there. It is still there for the world to see—our allies, our enemies and the neutrals.

And we are still earthbound. Of course there are the monkeys. But the Russians made monkeys of us long ago.

So these last bills have failed. That is no fault of the great committee which reported them out, and which has reported out this bill. It certainly was not through any neglect of the great chairman who is in charge of this bill today, and who, in my opinion, after many years of observation is not only one of the greatest American statesmen of his time, but has ahead of him a brilliant career as one of the greatest American statesmen of the future—if we have any future.

No one can say today, not even these beribboned and bemedaled gentlemen from the Pentagon, whether we have any future. Certainly not unless this bill is superior to those reported out in former years.

That is the question before us this afternoon. Will this bill do the work? Will it retrieve the situation? If not, then we are nearing the end of everything. The shores of time are strewn with the wreckage of nations that thought they were impregnable—nations in which personal considerations were allowed to usurp the place of the national interest. So it behooves us to consider carefully what is before us. It could be the last war bill we will have opportunity to consider.

The amount of money in the bill is comparatively unimportant. It is not so much a matter of how much money the bill appropriates. You could have ten times the amount of money in this bill and still fail completely.

It is how you spend the money that you do have in the bill. It might be possible to take this bill and cut it down one-half and take the other half and spend it as it ought to be spent and get a better bill than you have before you today. The thing to be emphasized is how you spend it. And we have not been spending it on the right things during these last years. Nobody can deny that.

We have failed miserably in that respect. And as a result the United States is today a second-rate power. All we have is the chance of redemption—that is a mere chance. It is later—much later—than many of us think. We have been sleeping. We have not been spending the money in these bills for the right things and in the right way these later years. Too many other considerations have been allowed to affect our judgment when the bill was sent up here from the Pentagon.

And it must also be noted that even if we pass the bill that we ought to pass, a bill that will make us impregnable, a bill that will keep the Russians on the other side, that still does not mean that the war potential of our allies will also be taken care of.

The truth of the matter is that we might as well concede now that when we finally fight, if fight we must, we will have to fight alone. Now, none of our allies would willingly desert us, of course, but they will be in a position directly under the gun and will have no choice. Unless we in this bill make America strong enough to take care of ourselves, nobody else is going to take care of us.

In all of these last wars England and France protected us. After war was declared, England and France kept the enemy off us until we could get ready and arm ourselves and train an army. That is no longer possible. There is no longer any ally anywhere who can protect us for one day, one hour or one minute.

The war will be fought in America. Khrushchev has told us that. He said, "You have always fought in Europe and Asia, but, the next war will be in the United States." Now what does that mean?

A high official in the Armed Forces of the United States said just the other day that if we are attacked by missiles or by bombers, we might be able to knock down 10 percent or 20 percent of them. Maybe by good luck, we could knock down a few more. But he said that the rest were coming through. When they start from Russia do not entertain any misapprehension about that—more than half of them will hit the target.

What did he say about that? He said if we would could knock down 20 or 30 percent we might save 20 or 30 million people.

Mr. Chairman, we have no 20 to 30 million people to give them.

It would mean the wreckage of every American city. There would be no vestige of this Capitol remaining, and you who are here would go with it. Do not entertain any illusions about that.

Let us consider the elemental facts. First, if a war starts, Russia will start it; we will not start a war. So we are at a disadvantage to begin with; they get the first blow.

They would attack 84 American cities simultaneously, and 1 bomb to a city is enough. When we hit Hiroshima one bomb did the work, but that bomb was as a Model T Ford compared to a modern Cadillac. When they hit a city or an army this time it is all over. Let us entertain no doubt about that.

In the first place, Russia will start it. In the second place, they will attack from the air. Does anybody have any doubt about that?

They are not going to bring an army over here; they are not going to bring a navy over here. What good would our Army do and what good could our Navy do when they attack 84 cities simultaneously from the air at midnight?

There will never be another war with rifles. Absurd. We will never send another expeditionary force to Europe. If war came the first big problem would be how to get out of Germany the men we already have there.

For us to talk about fighting Russia's 175 divisions on the ground is utter idiocy, Russia would be delighted if we tried. If they attack they will attack from the air.

The question before us this afternoon is whether this bill will protect us in such contingency.

I put in the RECORD, a year ago, a secret report by the Navy. The Navy never denied the authenticity of the report.

The report said that 12 submarines deployed along our coasts, could destroy 70 percent of our economy, 70 percent of our cities. It was an official statement.

You know there are a lot of things they do not tell us down there. Too often they go on the theory that what we don't know won't hurt them.

They held a very elaborate review a couple of years ago. Months were spent preparing for it. It covered some 12 States. The Army was divided equally—half took the part of defenders. The other half attacked. Within 23 minutes as reported by the newspapers which were not censored, the attackers (the supposed Russians) destroyed 80 percent of the home bases, knocked out half of the defender striking force, and took complete control of the air. The decisive phase of a world war was over in 40 minutes and the United States was helpless.

So in any event it will not be a long war. It is going to wipe you fellows out in a hurry. You will not suffer, you will not have much time to think about it. It will all be over before you know it.

One of the greatest enigmas of all time is the fact that the United States in 1945 was the undisputed master of the world, with the greatest force ever mobilized in the history of mankind, yet in the short time that has elapsed, since, we are hopelessly behind. We invented the submarine, we invented the airplane, we invented the atomic bomb. Then the Russians came in, took them away from us, and went us one better. Today they have more planes than we have, they have more submarines, they have more ground troops, and they are better armed. They are superior to us in every branch of the service.

How did it happen that in this bill every year, with the advice of the Pentagon, we have allowed Russia to outstrip us in every phase of warfare when we had the start and every advantage? How has it happened? Who can answer that? I ask any man here to tell us how it happened.

The Russians had hardly emerged from barbarism. They had no mechanics, no industry, no inventive geniuses, no scientists. And we had everything. We had it all. We were the most scientific, the most advanced, the most progressive Nation in the world. How has it happened that we have passed this bill every year to defend the Nation, and it has not defended the Nation? We have dropped steadily behind every year, every bill.

It is very simple. Our admirals were not interested in submarines. They do not want to go down in pig boats. So they came out with the great carriers. These carriers, the most expensive piece of machinery ever built in the history of any nation, cost more, took more strategic materials, required more sci-

entists and technicians. But were as vulnerable as an eggshell.

We have it from a supreme military authority, that those planes might get off the first flight but they would never get off the second time. Somebody says you can hide them and take the enemy by surprise. I was very much impressed by many things that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] said. We might read very carefully what Mr. Flood said. He said we were not going to take Russia by surprise. She knows as much about our plans as we know ourselves. She would know where that carrier was every minute of the day or night.

They objected so strongly to going down in submarines and so ignored our one chance of survival, that had it not been for one man, Admiral Rickover, we would be in a desperate situation today. We will never be able to fully evaluate the service he has rendered the Nation. He inspired the building of the nuclear-powered submarine, the *Nautilus*. It can penetrate under the polar ice cap and come up anywhere. And when they come up the Russians are at their mercy.

Now, another thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] said. I do not like to emphasize so many things that this truly great legislator has said, but he has emphasized the one deterrent which has prevented a third world war because, as he said, we had SAC, and the Russians, knowing that they would be destroyed by SAC, bided their time and deferred the attack, waiting until SAC is neutralized. The gentleman is right about that. We would have had a third world war if it had not been for SAC. But, time is running out for SAC. Russia has already developed a device which will, they claim, stop our bombers at the border. When they neutralize SAC, then the submarines will take its place. They cannot spot the submarine. They cannot find it, and when they find it, they cannot destroy it. A nuclear-powered submarine coming up under the ice cap within the range of Russian cities will take over where SAC leaves off.

They say we must be prepared for the brush wars. What brush wars are they winning today? They are losing every brush war in the world today. They will continue to lose them.

Communists are taking Iraq—second greatest oil producing center on the globe. Its loss will have a very serious effect on the war and even on our peace economy.

The Communists are in Afghanistan. They are building what they call civil air fields—only 50 miles from the border of Pakistan—obviously runways for Russian jet fighters. Soviet engineers are building motor roads in Afghanistan. Any casual observer can see that these roads are capable of carrying tanks and mobile guns through Afghanistan to India. The Communists have established training schools to train Afghans to reconnoiter over adjacent territory. These roads and these fields have direct access to Iran and Pakistan and both countries are warning us of what is going on. But our carriers are doing nothing

about it. Of course they can do nothing about it. The carriers are losing the limited wars.

Over in Tibet the Communists have violated every agreement, every treaty, every tenet of civilized warfare and are crushing the Tibet Government and religion. It is the most pitiable outrage in all the long list of Communist atrocities.

What are the army and the Navy doing about it. Especially what are our vaunted carriers doing to win the limited wars. Some of our statesmen are claiming to be limited war men. How are they meeting these limited wars? How are they extinguishing these brush fires?

But our nuclear-powered, missile firing submarines—if we have enough of them—if we had been building them while we were wasting time and material and money and technicians building carriers—can rise through the Arctic ice cap at any selected spot and blow any Russian city off the map. The Russians laugh at our carriers and our improved rifles. But they do not laugh at submarines or missiles.

If Russia knows that attacks upon allies or neutrals can be followed—and will be followed—by prompt submarine retaliation they will control their hatchets both at home and abroad. Nothing else will satiate their appetite for world conquest and world slaughter, plunder, and rapine.

In West Berlin neither the Army nor the Navy can hold the 175 divisions of Russian troops—not to mention the innumerable Chinese hordes—when they get ready to move. Carriers could not get within half a continent of them. Submarines which they can neither find nor combat but which can rise in the polar wastes undetected and drop nuclear oblivion on cities and concentration centers of production, mobilization, communication, and supplies after SAC is neutralized will change world history.

The carriers are losing every limited war on the globe. But this bill wisely provides extra funds for submarines and missiles. It is a race against time but it is our only recourse, our last chance.

How are they resolving the limited wars in Indonesia, in Malaya, in Indochina, in Korea where the Communists are violating every promise and butchering Christians daily? How are they alleviating the bloody repressions in Pohnan, in Hungary, in Muscat, and Oman?

The Russians have as much respect for the carriers as they would for so many rowboats.

Now, the most important consideration of this bill. This bill is not written or at least it should not be written to win a war. We do not want to win a war. We cannot afford to win a war. We cannot afford to have our cities wrecked and millions of our people destroyed even if we win. So, the purpose of this bill is to deter Russia from attacking us.

I want to say, my friends, that I am not an Army man; I am not a Navy man; I am not an Air Force man. All I want to do is keep the Russians out of the United States. And the only way to do it is for them to understand that

when they attack us they, too, are going to be wiped out, just as we are.

Now, as to the submarines and the missiles, may I express my deep appreciation of the services of the great chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. His influence always has been to collaborate and to cooperate and to coordinate all of our forces, all of our committees. He had exceeded the budget on missiles and submarines, and those are the only two things which will stop the Russians.

Nobody will study this bill, nobody will study this report, as carefully as the Russians. They have been watching it. They will keep on watching it. They laugh at air carriers. They have not got one. They have copied everything we have produced which was effective in warfare, but they have not been foolish enough to build an air carrier. So if they find when they read this bill that we are going to depend on air carriers to keep them out of America, they will plan to be right over. But when they find our committee has laid the emphasis on submarines and on missiles, they will take a sober second thought.

Mr. Chairman, there is another phase which is to be considered here. Every newspaper is discussing today the question of a conference at Geneva.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask that in my time the Reading Clerk of the House read a resolution which I offered this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, for the present, the peace of the world will not be served by a conference of heads of nations at Geneva or elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret I do not have time to say why this resolution has been offered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

Military personnel

Military Personnel, Army

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training), expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members absent without leave, including payment of rewards of not to exceed \$25 in any one case, \$3,233,063,000, and, in addition, \$281,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the Army Stock Fund.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I have a series of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 2, line 12, strike out "\$3,233,063,000" and insert "\$3,292,063,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments dealing with this same problem. Because of the budget structure, one is personnel and the other is operation and maintenance.

I ask unanimous consent that the third amendment and the first amendment be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Do both of these amendments to which the gentleman refers pertain to the increase in Army personnel strength from 870,000 to 900,000?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. That is all?

Mr. FLOOD. That is all.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we are going to have the other amendment read; are we not?

Mr. FLOOD. I am going to ask now to have the second amendment read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the second amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania referring to the so-called third amendment?

Mr. FLOOD. I have not yet asked the so-called third amendment to be read yet.

Mr. FORD. Then we are now limiting ourselves to the first and second amendments, and the first is as to military pay for the Army and the second has to do with O. and M. for the Army; is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the so-called third amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which under the unanimous consent request will be considered with the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 3, line 13, strike out "\$596,900,000" and insert "\$632,400,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that the amendments we were to consider en bloc at this point were amendments only to the Army section, one to the Army military pay and second to the Army O. and M. As I understand the amendment which has just been read, it refers to Marine Corps military pay.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say, Mr. Chairman, there is at the Clerk's desk a series of amendments, and the chances are

they may be intermingled. May I ask the Clerk to examine the amendments and make certain that only the two amendments are read which deal with Army personnel and O. and M.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] to select the so-called third amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object until I have heard the amendments read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] reserves the right to object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 2, line 12, strike out "\$3,233,063,000" and insert "\$3,292,063,000."

On page 8, line 14, strike out "\$3,065,390,000" and insert "\$3,108,390,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it one of these amendments goes to page 8 of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. Under our budget structure, you are dealing with the operation and maintenance under our new system, and the first amendment deals with personnel. They affect the Army, and I am asking that these two amendments be considered en bloc, if the gentleman will bear with me, so that instead of doing this twice, they deal with the exact same subject so that it can be done together. I assure the gentleman there is no intent at any evasion of any sort. One is for operation and maintenance and the other is for personnel. I am merely trying to save the time of the House by dealing with both subjects at the one time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Clerk has not read beyond line 15 on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that despite the fact that the Clerk has not read beyond page 2, in view of the circumstances as to the budget structure in this bill that both of the amendments that have been read by the Clerk be considered en bloc since they deal with precisely the same subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in my direct argument I dealt at length with the subject. This is a problem with which you are all well acquainted. I will not be impertinent and presume to instruct you with reference to this, but we have dealt with this amendment for several years and for the same purpose. Last year this committee and the House of Representatives in its sound judgment passed this amendment. We raised the Army to 900,000. You will hear it said that quality is better than quantity.

Mr. Chairman, this Army has been cut one division a year for the last 5 years. Five years ago we had 20 divisions in the U.S. Army. If this bill passes, as it is, you will have 14 divisions. You have lost six divisions—one-third of the Army.

You cannot cut it any more. Quality, that is not the point as against quantity. I have listened to that argument once a year for 6 years, and down, down, down has gone the Army. I want you to leave it at 15 divisions. God knows that is bad enough, bad enough.

This amendment will restore a division. This amendment will give us one Battle Group to be moved any place in the world at any time. It will strengthen the logistics and the combat effectiveness of the four great STRAC divisions which are the defense to be left in the United States. Just a few years ago I heard the Pentagon say, "We will give you four great divisions in reserve in the United States to be flown any place."

Do you know which division they cut? One of those four. This bill cuts out one of the four. There will be only three. Ridiculous. Dangerous.

They speak of the Reserves. We are putting a floor under the reserves of 300,000 and a floor under the guard of 400,000. Mr. Chairman, my State has one of the greatest guard divisions of the country, the 28th; one of the four or five best divisions of the guard; yet we cannot put the 28th in the field in less than 4 months. If you cannot put the 28th Pennsylvania guard division in the field in less than 4 months, you cannot put others in the field in less than 8 months. That is the testimony I developed in the hearings; and the Reserves, great as they are, are to be integrated into buildup divisions; they will not, except in a few cases, be sent in as units and groups.

With all due and great respect to the guard and the Reserves I am talking about the Regular Ready U.S. Army, to be ready at once.

We will not have them. We will not have them.

You talk about the Marines; and we will talk about them later. But the Marines at their greatest and their best, and God knows they are great and the best, are sent in to hit, not to hold. The Marines went into Guadalcanal and hit it; you sent the Army in to hold it for the long pull. The Marines are not intended to hold. They are a limited high-combat attack unit that establishes beachheads. The Army holds when they move in over the longer period. That has always been the practice; they work together, but the purposes ultimately are different.

Quality goes only so far. General Taylor said to us in the committee:

We are at the point of no return with the Army. This is the irreducible minimum, 900,000 men; you cannot take any more or you will bleed the Army.

You cannot take any more.

I remember my grandfather saying that a million men would spring to arms overnight. A great American tradition. Take the rifle from over the mantelpiece and fight the enemy. Not in this man's

war, grandpa, not in this man's war you will not do that.

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

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has conducted an exhaustive penetrating study of our defense structure, its needs, its strengths and weaknesses. To those of you who have not had the opportunity to digest the committee report on the defense appropriation bill, I recommend it as required reading. I believe the Congress and the Nation at large is indebted to the illustrious chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and all the members of his subcommittee for a masterful analysis of the state of our defenses.

The committee recommends \$200 million above budget recommendations for Zeus, the anti-ICBM missile and for modernization of Army equipment. This is a completely sound recommendation based on thoughtful judgment.

On page 34 of the committee report, the committee states that it regrets that the funds appropriated last year to maintain the strength of the Army at 900,000 men were not used and that strength reductions are being applied. In commenting on the reduction, the committee language was admirably restrained.

It is, indeed, regrettable that defense authorities have seen fit to reduce the Army from 900,000 to 870,000, although the Congress has provided the funds to maintain the higher strength and has expressed its desire that this strength be sustained. The committee states that it gave serious consideration to providing funds for a 900,000-man Army in the fiscal year 1960 bill.

I can understand their ultimate decision not to do so, for the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff steadfastly maintained that the lower strength of 870,000 was adequate. On the other hand, the Secretary of the Army and General Taylor recommended an Army of 925,000, and staunchly held that the very minimum should be not less than 900,000. It is difficult, indeed, to make a judgment and recommendation to the House under these trying circumstances. Obviously, the committee was seriously disturbed on this point and calls to our attention its regret that the Army is being reduced today.

I submit that the gentlemen of the committee require the active support of this House. Last year we expressed ourselves as opposing this cut in the Army. The international situation is no less perilous now than it was last year. Let us assume some of the burden which the committee has borne and demand, even require, an Army of proper strength. We know in our hearts it is not logical or sensible to reduce the Army now. Let us say so now, and let us applaud the

strength and judgment of the committee in pointing out this problem for us.

I have heard the Department of Defense arguments in justification of the reduction: greater personnel stabilization, improved reenlistment rates, higher quality personnel, more effective weapons, improved disciplinary situations. These are splendid accomplishments, I certainly agree, but however you measure it, an Army of 870,000 will be composed of just that many and no more, regardless of improved quality in men and weapons. If it takes two good men to man an improved weapon and you have only one good man available, the improved weapon is of doubtful use. What we must have is an Army of adequate strength with adequately modern arms and equipment. Anything less will give us a second-rate defense; a second-rate defense, for example that depends upon the soldiers of a foreign nation to maintain the strength of two of its divisions overseas. What a dreadful condition for us to have to own.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania because in my judgment the 870,000 Army strength recommended by the President in January for fiscal 1960 is sufficient for our national security.

Over the last few years the Congress has been asked by the executive branch of the Government, and we have responded, to pass certain legislation which would improve the quality of our Armed Forces.

We passed the Military Pay Act in 1958 which added millions and millions of dollars to the cost of operating our Military Establishment. In 1957 we passed the Servicemen's and Veterans Survivors Benefit Act, and it added substantially to the cost of the Army.

In 1958 we passed the preinduction screening program which was aimed at improving career quality of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This, of course, has cost considerable money in order to get a real career service, a service of tested personnel.

What has been the result? The result is precisely this: From January 1957 to September 1958 there was a tremendous capability improvement in the personnel of the Army. In January of 1957, 28 percent of the Army was in what we call category 4, that is a group who by test are considered to be of low potential. By September of 1958 this figure had gone from 28 percent to 16 percent; in other words, the quality of the Army has improved substantially under the legislation which we enacted and which has been implemented by the Department.

The pay legislation and other fringe benefit legislation which we have passed has resulted in a tremendous increase in reenlistments. In every category reenlistments have gone up substantially. This has brought about a combat improvement as a result of a lesser training burden. I can recall one colloquy between a member of our subcommittee and the Secretary of the Army where he said that as a result of a certain improve-

ment in reenlistment rates they were able to reduce their induction by some 3,000 and as the result of the reduction of that number of new inductees the training load, the number of trainers, had been reduced something like 600. In other words, by keeping people in on the higher reenlistment rate we improved the Army's experience and lowered the training burden for the Department of the Army, which means you transfer people from noncombat assignments to combat assignments. That is where we want them to be.

It is interesting to note since this legislation I referred to has been enacted that the number of people in the Army, the enlisted personnel, with 4 or more years' service went up from 30 percent in 1957 to 37 percent in 1958.

In addition to the improvement of personnel quality we have had a tremendous improvement in a number of other areas. Specifically, let us talk about the issue of fire power. The Army is procuring in 1960 what we call the Davy Crockett, which is an atomic weapon for the field soldier. It will come into the inventory in substantially larger numbers in 1961 and 1962. This increased fire power will be a tremendous asset to the Army, and, of course, when you have a greater fire power you rely to a lesser degree on large numbers of personnel. Obviously you can reduce the personnel provided they are of the quality we want. We are now getting that quality.

If you will look through the hearings and turn to page 407 of volume I, you will find that General Taylor said the Army had improved substantially its mobility and its communications ability.

Of course, we are all familiar with the improvement of the National Guard and of the Army Reserves. At the present time the Army National Guard is approximately 400,000. Compare this, if you will, with the size of the Army National Guard in 1950 when it was 326,000, plus the fact that the Army National Guard has the best equipment and they are better trained than at any time in the history of that organization. Of course, the Army Reserves are in the same category. The Reserves are an increasingly important asset in our defense program.

Because of all the factors I support the President's view that Army strength should be 870,000 and therefore oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, and that I have the concluding 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLOOD. Depending on the outcome of the vote on this amendment, I have another type and kind of amendment to the same line, same section. Would I be restricted under this motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Texas pertains to the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] to provide funds to maintain our Army at 900,000 men. I would also support any move to write into this bill language which would prevent the Pentagon from cutting the figure back to their proposed 870,000.

First, I should like to commend the committee on the fine job they have done in this bill. They have made judicious cuts in the bill proposed by the administration so that the total recommended is about \$400 million less than the budget request, and more than a billion dollars below last year's figure. At the same time, they have provided some increases above the budget which were most vital to the national defense, and I have in mind funds to maintain civilian components at 700,000, the \$200 million added for Army modernization to meet the Nation's most likely threat, limited war—even though this is less than one-tenth of what is needed—and to advance the Nike-Zeus which is our Nations' only answer to the most terrible threat that faces us, assault by intercontinental ballistic missiles with hydrogen bomb warheads.

Still more must be done if we are to plug the gaping holes which still exist in our national defense. The greatest of these holes is our vulnerability to limited war threats, essentially ground conflict.

All of us can agree with the statements from our top leaders quoted by Mr. MAHON and summarized in the committee report that, as expressed by Secretary of Defense McElroy, "a limited war is more likely than a general war." Now, while I am going to talk mostly about limited war, I fully realize that this is but one facet of our defense and that America must be able to fight and win, no matter what the time or place or weapon of the Soviet attack, in the air, on the sea, or in the sea, or on the ground. Unfortunately for us, there are advantages to being the aggressor. These advantages, we have learned in tactics, accrue to the attacker, who seeks surprise and chooses the time, the place, and the weapons of conflict. We must be prepared to meet, and defeat, every Communist aggression, whether political subversion, economic warfare, all-out nuclear warfare or limited war, each of which, by threat or action, has won the Soviets victories in the past. If the Communists can defeat us in any field, with any weapon, they will. There is no one-shot defense, no easy way out, no way to slash the budget and still provide for the national security.

We are in a vulnerable position, in some ways a weak position, because we have fallen victim to the siren's song that we could concentrate on the means of massive retaliation, that we could develop weapons so horrible that all men would recoil from their use, that with the

products of our research laboratories, our factories, and with the aid of our physicists, our nuclear scientists, our rocket men, and our production men we could meet all threats with a "push button" defense. We have believed that it would not be necessary any more for men to fight and die on the battlefield, we have not even provided the men or the means to adequately carry out our worldwide commitments for mutual defense. We have been wrong in thinking that our intercontinental bombers, or intercontinental missiles can maintain peace in Laos, or Korea, or Berlin. We have cut back our Army and its means to fight so far as to endanger our national security. Russia is not making this mistake. She is putting twice as much of her national product into the military effort as we are. She regards the army as the dominant service and the army gets the lion's share of the Russian budget. The Sino-Soviet bloc has 8 million men in her ground forces. She will use them if she thinks she can profit by that use. As an example of how ground war could develop, let us examine the situation in Berlin: We have over in Berlin a group of American military forces, probably less than a division of men. Facing them and the few troops that our allies, France and Great Britain have in Berlin, is, in fact, an armed force of more than 100,000 men in the so-called peoples' police who are in barracks in East Germany. This East German force, ruled by the Russians, is equipped with tanks, aircraft, and heavy armament. To call this army a police force does not change the facts. This Soviet East German element is in addition to the 20 to 22 Soviet divisions stationed in East Germany. Contrast that, if you please, to the equivalent of less than one division of allied combat troops in Berlin. True, we have about 15,000 to 16,000 West Berlin police, but these are strictly city-type police. The forces of the United States, Great Britain, and France in Western Europe are about 10 or 11 divisions, well armed and trained and backed up with sizable tactical air forces. If war comes over Berlin, it will start as a ground war. If nuclear weapons were not used, it is obvious that the three Western powers would have only about one-half the strength of the Soviet and East German forces.

The Soviets would not hesitate to use their soldiers and conventional weapons if they knew that we would not use our nuclear weapons. In the Soviet Union the air force and the navy are considered to be mere adjuncts of the force which the army will use to seize ground and control populations—people. The biggest air force in the world, the biggest intercontinental ballistic missile, the biggest aircraft carrier on the high seas—not one of these can seize the geographical area itself and exercise control over the people of that area. Obviously, all our military forces, integrated as a team in any conflict, are vital to our ultimate success. Each has a significant and essential role. In the concluding battle, however, the fighting will be man to man.

These limited wars, or brushfire wars, require a force in being ready for combat. That in the 7th Army in Europe,

plus the so-called STRAC force, and the U.S. Marines. These forces have the major responsibility for dealing with limited military outbreaks. It is these men in uniform who must be able to deal with the emergencies on the ground.

How can we meet this manpower threat posed by the Communist high command?

We do have STRAC, the Strategic Army Corps, consisting of four divisions kept in the continental United States. STRAC was formed with the idea of being ready to go anywhere on the globe in a hurry and ready to hit hard. STRAC was planned to be the Army's thunderbolt in this atomic age when the swift extinction of a small fire is just as important as the power to expand a large one until whole continents are fried to a crisp, by nuclear attack. Yet STRAC does not have enough modern equipment, it does not have enough air transport, it does not have enough sea transport. If the Pentagon goes through with their budget cutting, it will no longer be four divisions, but only three. Not only will STRAC forces be below minimum safe strength levels, but they are not sufficiently mobile.

STRAC airborne troops could be ready to move within 24 hours, but with present planning and equipment it would take 17 days to airlift a single division. By that time, as you well know and can understand, the Soviet divisions could have pushed through and seized their objectives in that part of the world.

This is the confusing, sometimes contradictory picture that the public sees, that the world sees—that Khrushchev is going to take advantage of if he can—not by waging war, but by waging blackmail. The best reaction against blackmail is not to say "We will pay only \$1,000 of the \$10,000 you demand." The effective answer is to refuse to pay and to be prepared to strike back effectively.

We need to make STRAC the effective force it was planned to be. We must accept the fact that the initial stages of any conflict, at any time in the next couple of years at least, will be between ground forces. We must be prepared to equalize the present disproportion of manpower with tactical atomic weapons. We must be prepared to win a limited war.

Out in my home State of Montana we are still close to pioneer days, and I have known some of those frontiersmen who carried a Colt six-gun in the days when it was the protector of life and property. They had a name for that Colt—"the Equalizer"—because it made the little man the equal of any 6-foot, 200-pound bruiser. We have just such an equalizer in the tactical atomic weapons that today are flowing into the hands of our troops along the Iron Curtain.

With this "equalizer" we can and will carry out the sword-and-shield concept of NATO defense, but we need to restore the Army to 900,000 men.

Whether or not there is any use of mass destruction weapons, and I do not see such use during the next 2 years at least, a Soviet or satellite ground offensive will be inevitable in any imminent conflict. The basic objective of our

sword-and-shield concept is that this offensive or penetration must be blunted, preliminary to isolating the salient and defeating the enemy piecemeal. This is clearly the first combat role of ground forces in Europe. It can be accomplished best by the use of small yield tactical atomic weapons with discriminating characteristics. Use of large-scale nuclear weapons, with great disaster imposed on friendly countries and their peoples, would not avail in this situation in the theater of operation, Western Europe. Nor could we hope to meet the flood of Communist manpower with our smaller forces and conventional weapons.

Do not expect that any possible conflict with the Communists would develop in such a way that we could choose an all-out nuclear attack on the U.S.S.R. as an alternative to limited war. The U.S.S.R. by clever use of her satellite troops will see that we never have that choice. Like it or not, the blackmail today is based on satellite ground forces, and that is the threat we must meet.

And do not conclude, either, that this limited war must or would necessarily develop into all-out war. Bad as limited war under these circumstances might be, it is still better than incinerating the world with general use of hydrogen bombs. Certainly our planning should take into account the possibility of localizing the conflict, because we could win that limited war and no one could win a general war.

In the summer of 1950 we committed U.S. ground forces to action in Korea. There followed a grim period when these forces were crowded back into the Pusan perimeter and all but pushed into the sea by a relatively primitive enemy. The Army's 2d Infantry Division was rushed from Fort Lewis, Wash., to Korea as the first reinforcement of U.S. troops committed from Japan. I say they were rushed, and they were. But before they could be rushed, the Department of the Army had to draw equipment and men from all over the continental forces to fill up this division before it could move. We almost lost this war at its start, and yet, of all the places in the world where the Communists could have instigated a local war, Korea was the one place where the United States could respond in any positive degree. This was so because of our forces and logistic base in Japan.

Why did we come so near to losing at the start? The U.S. Army was neglected and inadequately supported. I state this as an historical fact and, please understand me, without re-priming or pointing a finger at anyone. I intend nothing more than to state a fact.

The reason I state this fact is that I am seriously concerned lest we repeat our mistake. I am concerned over the evidence that is again on the road to stripping the Army of its means to meet its assigned missions.

Let me draw your attention to the situation which is causing my uneasiness. In 1955, we had an Army of 1.4 million men with 20 active divisions. This force has diminished at present to

900,000 men with 15 divisions. Now it is being reduced further to 870,000 men with 14 divisions in fiscal year 1959.

This reduction below 900,000 and 15 active divisions, it is obvious, does not reflect the judgment of the Department of the Army, nor does it reflect the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They did not approve the reduced strength of 870,000.

The Soviet threat today most surely does not indicate we should reduce the Army below 900,000. I need not dwell long on this threat. The bare headlines of your daily newspaper manage to convey much of the story. We cannot shut our eyes to the Soviet military forces of 4 million men, which includes an army of 2½ million. To this must be added a Chinese Communist force of another 2½ million.

Consider, now, the 15 active divisions we presently have—5 in Europe, 2 in Korea, 1 in Hawaii at reduced strength, and the remaining 7 in the continental United States and Alaska. This is little enough for the Army to meet its commitments. A reduction from 900,000 to 870,000 means one less division, which must come out of the strategic Army force here in the United States, and the loss of essential combat and logistic support for oversea and continental forces.

This means reduced ability in the Active Army to carry on training and to support a paid drill Reserve force of 700,000 which we most certainly must have—a National Guard of 400,000 and a Reserve of 300,000. Viewed against these basic necessities, it is my firm conviction that to reduce the Active Army to 870,000 or the Reserve force below 700,000 is dangerously unrealistic.

This continuing reduction in our Army and the lessening of its capabilities results in a continued sole reliance upon a strategy of massive retaliation, thus greatly reducing our capability for dealing with any aggression short of general war; weakening our collective security system; encouraging neutralism among our allies; and encouraging aggression by the Communists. To stop such a trend, I sincerely believe we must have an Active Army of 900,000, including 15 divisions, which are well equipped with modern weapons and the latest equipment, and a 700,000 paid drill Reserve force structure with units equipped and organized exactly the same as our active units.

Always, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with the question: How much is enough; what does it cost, and can we afford it? To my mind, we are now faced with an obvious fact that this proposed Army of 870,000 is not enough. The present 900,000 with 15 divisions is a bare minimum. I do not think there is a question of whether we can afford to spend \$59 million to keep the Army force at 15 divisions. The question is whether we can afford not to spend it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI].

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I not only learned a great deal from his talk, but

I enjoyed it very much. However, I rise in opposition to his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment for two fundamental reasons: First, I cannot vote for any program which will draft a single young man that we do not need; and, second, I cannot vote for one dollar that the Army does not need. I think this program requires unnecessary expenditures, and the men are not needed in the Army. I am convinced the Army is adequately staffed.

Let me give you some figures. As of March 31, 1959, only 2 months ago, the Army had 878,692 men. It had 15 divisions. In other words, it would appear from the Army report that 878,692 men are sufficient to support 15 divisions. Today we have 14 divisions and approximately 870,000 men. If the amendment is for the purpose of giving us 15 divisions, then let us amend this bill so that it will give us 15 divisions and not increase the number of men.

I would like to also tell you where I believe the Army can find these men. In my survey in Washington, limited only to three Army installations, one large and two small, I found about 500 enlisted men performing nonessential duties, working as servants for colonels, generals, and other officers, working in officers' clubs and in messes and sorting groceries in commissaries. The Navy, Air Force and Marines are in the same boat. These 500 men are available for the 15th division. By extrapolating these findings, I am convinced that throughout the Army the 8,692 men that are needed for the 15th division can be found and should be found, and that the Army is not playing ball with the country and with the Congress.

Therefore, I shall support only such a program as will give us the 15 divisions, but will not support an increase of 1 penny or one drafted soldier when we do not need the money or the men.

I cannot vote for any personnel increases in the military service until they utilize the manpower they now have effectively and efficiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close the debate on the pending amendments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by my able friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. Flood. The amendment provides for an increase in the bill in the sum of approximately \$100 million. We cannot let budgetary matters predominate when the security of our country is involved. But we are interested in budgetary matters and in the taxpayers' dollars and in fiscal responsibility. Most of the appropriation bills that have been brought in this year have been brought in below the budget. It seems that we are making a fairly good record for economy. We should continue to do the best we can.

I would hesitate, after we had made a \$400 million reduction below the budget in the pending bill, to wipe out one-fourth of that reduction in this instance unless the reasons were most compelling.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out clearly what the issue is here. The

issue is whether or not we will provide funds for 30,000 more men in the Army than we will have on June 30 when this bill is scheduled to become effective. Last year we had a controversy over this matter, but at that time the Army was approximately 900,000. Today it is approximately 875,000, and at the time when this bill will take effect, on July 1, 1959, we will have 870,000.

To say that you have got to go out and draft 30,000 additional men and pay them, train them, and buy the equipment for them, does not seem necessary under the circumstances. This could not, in my judgment, be a decisive action in any future conflict in which we might become engaged.

I was interested in the discussion of the gentleman from Connecticut who just preceded me. He is, I understand, a graduate of West Point, a former Army colonel. He says that he will not sanction the drafting of additional men or increasing the size of the Army as long as the Army is failing to utilize appropriately several thousand people which it now has. I understand he and others of the Committee on Armed Services are working on legislation which may be fruitful with respect to the question of more effective utilization of Army personnel.

So I trust that the House will support the position of the committee, the position of the Secretary of Defense and others. The bill provides funds to continue during the coming fiscal year the same size Army, manpowerwise, as we shall have at the end of the current fiscal year.

That seems to be a sensible conclusion, particularly in view of the fact that in order to be better prepared for limited war we are already considerably over the budget with respect to the Army. And not only that, in an effort to take precautions for a limited war of some duration and to strengthen our position in this field we have gone above the budget in the Reserves, and we have gone above the budget in maintaining 400,000 men in the National Guard. So I trust, Mr. Chairman, the committee will be supported and that this amendment which calls for an additional appropriation of \$100 million will be defeated.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Who decides this question as to what will be the size and strength of the army—the Committee on Armed Services of the House or the Committee on Appropriations? Whose responsibility is that?

Mr. MAHON. We have before us a budget for supporting an army during the coming fiscal year of 870,000 men. We have provided funds for that number. It is up to the Congress to decide what it wishes to do with respect to funds.

Mr. BONNER. Has the present size of the Army been designated by the House Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe the present size has been fixed. There are members on the Committee on Armed Services present who might comment in more detail.

Mr. BONNER. I am just trying to find out who to follow in this matter.

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe there is a definite fixed ceiling with respect to the size of the Army.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. In this bill we are putting a floor under the Guard of 400,000 and under the Reserve of 300,000. My purpose is to do the same thing for the Army and for the Marines.

Mr. MAHON. But, we have a reserve strength now in the National Guard of 400,000 and we provide in this bill for continuation of the same strength as of June 30 of this year.

Mr. BONNER. The only question that I want to have answered is—whether it is the prerogative of your committee or the prerogative of the legislative committee to set the size of the Army.

Mr. MAHON. I would say it is the prerogative of the legislative committee to set the size of the Army, if we are going to set the size of the Army. What we are doing here is to provide the funds for an Army of 870,000.

Mr. BONNER. So if there is any dispute in this matter, then the legislative committee should hold hearings and determine the question; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOOD), there were—ayes 43, noes 131.

So the amendments were rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: Page 2, line 12, strike out "\$3,233,063,000" and insert "\$3,233,000,000, to be disbursed in such manner that the military personnel, Regular Army, shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 during fiscal year 1960."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered, instead of raising the bill and adding money, reduces the amount of the appropriation and is in the nature of a retrenchment. I take the position that it is, first, germane to the bill, obviously. And, secondly, it is obviously a retrenchment because it reduces the amount of the appropriation instead of adding to it, and it directs that the funds be used for the purpose of keeping the Army strength or making the Army strength at 900,000. The only question that would be in debate on the point of order made by my friend, the gentleman from Texas, would be as to the latter provi-

sion. Certainly, this amendment is germane. Secondly, I submit it is a retrenchment. I refer the chairman to rule XXI, paragraph 2. The Chair is aware, of course, that it says:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill, or amendment thereto, changing existing law be in order except such as, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures * * * by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that on the first two points I am flatly in point and I submit to you, sir, in the bill itself there is a provision under the general provisions thereof stating that the funds in this bill cannot be used for any other purpose than those declared in the bill, and no other funds can be used for that purpose.

I submit, sir, that this is a flat, and intended by me to be a flat, limitation upon the Department of Defense. It permits no discretion to be utilized so it can be abused. It is a flat limitation upon the expenditure of funds.

It is not trying to do indirectly what I cannot do directly. I submit, therefore, that this constitutes an exception to the so-called Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, all limitations on the size of military personnel have been suspended by Public Law 86-4, section 2, until 1963. Therefore there are no limitations—ceilings or floors—in effect during fiscal year 1960.

The amendment proposed would have the effect of establishing a floor as to the size of military force.

This amendment imposes additional duties on the executive branch since it would require them to maintain a specific number of troops, a requirement which does not exist at the present time. The amendment therefore is legislation on an appropriation bill.

This does make a reduction of \$63,000 in the amount carried in the bill but funds would have to be disbursed on the deficiency basis which will require the appropriation of additional funds for this same purpose during fiscal year 1960 which is the period covered by this bill. Therefore, this is not a retrenchment as provided by the Holman rule. The language itself does not show retrenchment on its face.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly in rebuttal?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, what I say will be a complete rebuttal. The only element the gentleman brings in is the question of the use of the funds. Certainly this affects the use of additional funds unless the Department of Defense came in for supplemental appropriations which would have to be by act of the President as an affirmative act.

The amendment is a limitation on the expenditure of funds in their discretion.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment to the pending bill which seeks in addition to reducing the amount by \$63,000 to add language directing that the appropriation be disbursed in such manner that the military branch of the Regular Army shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 for the fiscal year 1960.

While in the opinion of the Chair this amendment does in effect seek to retrench expenditures, it does by the language added impose upon the executive branch a mandatory duty of maintaining personnel at a figure greater than provided in the pending bill; and in the opinion of the Chair constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training), and expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members absent without leave, including payment of rewards of not to exceed \$25 in any one case, \$596,900,000, and, in addition, \$15,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Marine Corps stock fund.

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

Mr. Chairman, I sought this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. I should like to know where in the bill funds are provided for MATS, the Military Air Transport Service?

Mr. MAHON. The principal provision for MATS is in operation and maintenance under the Air Force, which is carried in a later section of the bill. However, wherever there is travel in the various sections of the bill there is money for MATS, because the Military Air Transport Service is under an industrial-type operation, and the various services which utilize MATS pay for these services.

Mr. GROSS. The funds are scattered all through the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And cannot be reached in one amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Not very well.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask this further question: Is MATS reimbursed for plane travel by Members of Congress?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. GROSS. I do not mean by Members of Congress; I mean reimbursed by the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. GROSS. Or by any committees of Congress?

Mr. MAHON. Whatever service MATS performs somebody has to pay for, and it is paid for from other appropriations, from these various funds.

Mr. GROSS. The reason I ask is because one of MATS four-motored jobs

was wheeled out last night to take a load of Members of Congress over to London to a meeting of the U.S. Committee for the Atlantic Congress. I am informed that the meeting is sponsored by a so-called nonprofit organization.

I have checked and I find no resolution has been passed by Congress, no legislative action of any kind taken by Congress to provide for this meeting in London. I called MATS this morning to find out who is going to reimburse, who is going to pay MATS for the use of this plane that went over last night to London carrying this bunch of junketeers.

MATS says it is not going to be reimbursed; that by some hocus-pocus this junket to London is called a defense meeting. I say again it has no sanction in Congress, and no funds have been provided by the Congress.

As I understand it from reading the hearings, these MATS planes are carpeted from wall to wall, they have a compartment in the front end which has special seats and accommodates 10 people. I understand that compartment is designed to take care of the VVIP's—the very, very important people. But at any rate this MATS plane which was wheeled out last night is one of the four jobs that fly back and forth across the Atlantic hauling junketeers, among others.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman forgets the beautiful blond Wafs who are on board.

Mr. GROSS. Is that something the gentleman inquired about during the hearings?

Mr. Chairman, with or without the blonds or brunets, it is high time that this matter be looked into. I find that this plane was ordered out by the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]; that is, he wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense requesting use of a plane for this junket. I say to you it is high time that Congress takes note of what is going on. It should not be within the authority of the chairman of any committee of the House of Representatives or of the other body to be able to order out a four-motored plane to go off on a junket that has not even been sanctioned by the Congress. I want you to know that I am going to pursue this thing to find out how MATS is paid for this trip and who is picking up the check for the so-called Atlantic Congress meeting in London.

Mr. MAHON. This is the first knowledge I had of this trip.

Mr. GROSS. There are others.

Mr. MAHON. I am not able to answer this particular question as to who pays for it, or if the State Department is calling upon MATS to perform the service.

Mr. GROSS. I said the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee had got this job done insofar as the plane is concerned.

Mr. MAHON. If it is a request of the Congress and it has something to do with the military budget, it may be taken

from the contingent funds of the Department of Defense. I do not have enough information at the moment. I shall be glad to cooperate with the gentleman in getting the facts.

I may say that while there are some abuses by Members of Congress in using military means of travel, the abuse by Members of Congress is infinitesimal when compared with the abuses of the military themselves in the unwarranted use of aircraft.

Mr. GROSS. That is like saying that because the military does something wrong, it is less worse if done by Congress, and I do not buy that at all.

Mr. MAHON. I am not defending the improper use of Department of Defense aircraft by Members of Congress or others. I regret I cannot give my friend a better answer at this moment.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, \$231,700,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving any and all points of order, I will be glad to have them read en bloc, but I would like to hear what they are and, therefore, reserve a point of order against both of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments, then the Chair will put the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Florida.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: Page 4, line 9, after the figure, strike out the period, add a semicolon, and the words "Provided, That the average strength of the Reserve personnel, Army, shall be maintained at not less than 300,000 during the fiscal year 1960."

Page 5, line 16, strike out the period, add a semicolon and the words, "Provided further, That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at not less than 400,000 during the fiscal year 1960."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida that the reported amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendments. I have no objection to their being considered en bloc, but I still reserve a point of order against them, either en bloc or singly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may make his point of order after the unanimous-consent request has been granted. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order so that I may discuss the reasons for my amendments?

Mr. FORD. Of course, I will accept the request of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, of course these amendments are subject to a point of order. We all recognize that fact. I trust, however, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who is a friend of the Guard and a friend of the Reserve, will not press his point of order, and here are some of the reasons why I trust he will not do so.

I would like to emphasize to the membership, Mr. Chairman, the fact that these amendments will not cost one additional red cent. All the money that is needed is in this bill to maintain the Guard at 400,000 and to maintain the Reserve at 300,000. Therefore, to make the language mandatory adds no cost to this bill. It does insure, however, that we will have a National Guard of 400,000 and a Reserve of 300,000. I submit that is a very important consideration in view of the fact that the Regular Army is being cut back year after year after year. We are now down to 870,000. We are now down to 14 divisions. If we want to insure that the Guard and the Reserve, which are the lowest cost military forces that we have, will be maintained in a position to step in and help the Regular Forces, this is the way to do it.

Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that last year the Department of Defense wanted to cut back the Guard as they do this year, wanted to cut back the Reserve as they do this year, wanted to cut back the Army as they have done. In the Congress mandatory language was written to make it prohibitive that the Guard and the Reserve be cut back. Money was carried in last year's bill for the maintenance of the strength of the Guard and the Reserve and the Army, but since there was no mandatory language, to protect the strength of the Army, the Army was cut by the Department of Defense while the Guard and the Reserve were maintained at the levels specified by Congress. So, if we want to be sure that the Guard and the Reserve will be maintained, that this money in the bill may not become simply a meaningless gesture, the only way we can do it is to write in the mandatory language I offer. I hope that the gentleman from Michigan or any other Member will not see fit to press for a point of order. The Guard and the Reserve are your people back home, and America has never won a war without them. Now let us give them a break.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the present Reserve program as it is constituted is not one which gives the United States the kind of security that we should demand of it in this period in our history. The fault is not with the Reserve officers and men who belong to the various units around the country. Rather it is the fault of the Regular armed-service officers in the Pentagon who refuse to assign

an important role to the Reserve arm of our military forces.

Last winter I had the pleasure to appear before a Reserve Air Force officers' group in Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. Chairman, these men are bored with their training. Their training is clearly silly and has no connection with the national defense. They are angry with their Government because their Government has not given these men serious tasks to perform even though these men are highly trained and skilled officers.

What were these men ordered to do? They were to study effective public speaking. What does that subject have to do with national defense? Who are we kidding in these programs? Ourselves? The Russians? I am afraid we are kidding ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, we live in fearful times. We talk and think national defense and national security. We spend billions for national defense. But I doubt if we really have an adequate defense. We are drifting. We are clinging to the habits of the past like desperate men, refusing to reexamine our basic defense system. We refuse to ask if we are not heading for mass destruction by building more and more weapons and missiles and hydrogen bombs without considering that mankind is at stake. This, I feel, is the basic question.

But even accepting the frame of reference that we are all operating in, I fear that we are throwing out millions without stopping to ask if we are utilizing our manpower in the ways that it can best be used. And a good example of this is our present Reserve programs where men come to meetings, sit around and study handbooks which have such chapters as the following in them:

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING MANUAL NK45-0001

- Chapter 1. Effective Speaking Essentials.
- Chapter 2. Speech Preparation.
- Chapter 3. Effective Speech Introduction and Conclusion.
- Chapter 4. Delivering the Talk—Platform Etiquette.
- Chapter 5. Expression in Conversation.
- Chapter 6. Conference Methods.
- Chapter 7. Effective Expression in Writing.
- Chapter 8. Preparation of Correspondence.
- Chapter 9. Preparation of Orders.

Day after day I receive mail from very serious military reservists who are extremely critical of our Reserve programs. I sincerely hope that the military leaders and Congress will look seriously into this program and see how we may improve our national defense posture by making the Reserve a significant part of our defense system.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. I believe there are ample precedents to sustain such a point of order.

May I say, however, that I join the gentleman from Florida and others on the subcommittee in increasing the appropriation for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, to raise the number on active duty in the guard from 360,000 to 400,000 and for the Army Reserve from 270,000 to 300,000.

I am in full accord with the desire for larger strength, but I do feel that it is

unwise to put this kind of language in an appropriation bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard further?

Mr. SIKES. No, Mr. Chairman. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law, \$24,300,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say that I think the RECORD should show that it is the sense of the particular subcommittee that worked on this bill and, in my opinion, it is the sense of Congress, that the Army National Guard should be continued at 400,000 and the Army Reserve at 300,000. We have provided funds for that purpose. It would not be appropriate in this bill to provide mandatory language, but I want the RECORD to show that it is the wish and the desire of Congress that the Guard and Reserve be maintained at this level. I am constrained to believe that the Department of Defense will follow the will of the Congress in this matter.

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

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the gentleman also indicate to the membership that if this fund is not expended for this purpose, it is the intent of the Congress that it shall not be diverted to other purposes?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Last year we appropriated money for a 900,000-man Army. Would it not equally have been the view of the chairman of this subcommittee that the Department of Defense should have used that money to provide a 900,000-man Army?

Mr. MAHON. I felt that the Army should have been maintained at 900,000, in view of the fact that Congress provided funds for an Army of 900,000, but the Army, nevertheless, has been reduced to 870,000.

I have been in touch with some of the people in the Pentagon who have to do with Reserve and National Guard matters, and I am of the opinion that as a compromise with respect to this issue of the strength of the various forces that the will of Congress will be carried out with respect to the National Guard and with respect to the Reserves.

It does seem to me, though, that if we are going to have mandatory strength levels, we ought to have hearings in the

Committee on Armed Services and we ought to come in here and vote on these matters and fix the policies and the strengths. We should not do it by amendments on an appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. In the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, the Department of Defense definitely gave us the impression that unless such floors as proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], were inserted this year, they would cut the Guard and the Reserve to the lower figures of 270,000 and 360,000.

Mr. MAHON. I hope that reconsideration will be given that position, and I am inclined to believe it will.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has done a good job in making available funds for the National Guard and Reserve units, but I am confident what the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] just said is true. Defense witnesses told us in committee, or just as good as told us, that they expected to cut back.

I would like to call attention of the Members of this House to the record, which speaks for itself. In case we get into a limited war, such as the Korean conflict, in my judgment we will be in worse shape or are in worse shape today than we were then, if they limit us on the weapons that can be used to fight the war. We were limited in the Korean conflict. Let us make no mistake about it.

I think the record should show that the Congress of the United States and the American people supported the Military Establishment in a policy of keeping us out of war or of winning a war if we had to get in one. It was the administration under President Truman that cut back the funds for airplanes and other weapons that Congress had appropriated, and, therefore, did not give us the strength that Congress called for. I recall that he called in then Mr. Eisenhower who was head of a university, as a civilian adviser to Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Louis Johnson, and upon the recommendations that he got, we were cut back. The record will speak for itself.

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

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important contribution to this debate. I would like to call attention to the fact that in the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee not one Army officer, after he had been freed from the requirement that he support the budget, said that the Reserve and the Guard should be cut. Every one of them said they should be maintained at present levels, regardless of the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense. And I assume that that is exactly what happened in the gentleman's committee.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is exactly so. Some time ago, they came before us to brief us—I believe in 1955—and I believe they asked for something like 600,000 National Guardsmen, as well as great numbers of active reservists. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the various secretaries, and others in the administration said, "If you do not do this, it will be necessary to reappraise the whole thing."

But do as you please about it, I do not think Congress can make the President of the United States spend the money on the National Guard or on the Reserves, either. We could not do it under President Truman, and I do not think we can do it under the Eisenhower administration. I want the record to speak for itself, so far as I am concerned. I think the American people should know that it was not the Congress of the United States that cut the military back prior to the Korean war. All we could hear in our committee at that time were the admirals and generals and secretaries saying, "If Congress will appropriate the money, we will be able to meet the situation." We had previously appropriated money which was never used.

I say to you, if they are going to limit us on the weapons that we can use, as they did when we sent the troops into Korea and Lebanon, we will find ourselves in a critical plight. They sent conventional war equipment in these places. We heard a lot about the use of atomic weapons prior to that time, but we heard nothing about their use around the time when they were firing on Matsu and in other sections of the world. I say that the testimony from Secretary McElroy, before our committee, on questioning by myself and others, shows that he admitted there is far more danger of being involved in a limited war than in a general war.

As far as I am concerned, we have the right kind of weapons today if Russia wanted to start a global war. Thank God, the President took a firm stand in the situation in Berlin in Western Europe. I think he did a wonderful job when he made his position clear. I am not afraid of actually winning with the weapons that we have and would use in case of a global war with Soviet Russia.

I have not taken the same position about rockets and missiles as some others have taken because I think they are talking about a few years from now. But, I say to you, I am concerned with our limited warfare capability. What I say today is only to point up in the Record that the administration should take the responsibility if they refuse to keep our National Guard and Reserves strong enough to meet the situation. It is the cheapest manpower that we can have to meet the situation. I just wanted the record to be definitely clear. So far as I am concerned, I hope the administration will not do as they have done time after time. We provided for a Reserve of 300,000, and a National Guard of 400,000 last year but neither the Guard nor the Army Reserves have been maintained at those strengths. The Army was reduced to 870,000 and

they are cutting back the Marine Corps from 188,000 to 175,000. Frankly, that does not suit me, in view of all this talk of what might happen in Berlin and elsewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deep appreciation to the fine explanation given this bill by members of the committee. The chairman, Mr. Mahon, concluded his remarks with the observation that he favored neither big wars nor small wars—he favored no wars. Certainly he speaks for every member of the House, and every responsible American, in this statement.

The pending bill represents one-half of all the money this Congress is likely to approve this session. In considering this measure, we are acting on our constitutional obligation to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

The Preamble of the Constitution clearly provides that the purpose of our Government is to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come in our national existence when we must reexamine the meaning of common defense. We now have in our arsenal weapons in the name of common defense which, if used, will prevent us, and prevent the world, from having any posterity who might enjoy the blessings of liberty. Certainly we must consider all of our duties as harmonious rather than as mutually inconsistent.

What does it mean, then, truly to provide for the common defense? If our Nation used its atomic arsenal, and our adversary did not retaliate, we would destroy not only our adversary but hundreds of millions of neutrals, and millions of our own people as well, from the effects of radioactivity. Similarly, if our adversary attacked us, and we did not retaliate, millions of neutrals as well as people in the attacking country would still be destroyed. This represents a practical reason, in addition to the overwhelming moral reasons, for ruling out any preventive or preemptive war. If our adversary were to retaliate, as many as half of the population of the United States might well be vaporized within 6 hours after the outbreak of hostilities, and another one-fourth might also be stricken by radioactivity.

In view of these circumstances, it is not surprising that the sober military judgment is that there is no defense against warfare which includes nuclear bombs. There is only the capacity for mutual extinction. To speak of preparation for such a war as common defense is to believe that neither side will ever resort to the use of the weapons with which each is provided. Yet it is the history of every arms race that it has ended in hostilities in which the arms are employed.

Mr. Chairman, this generation has a rendezvous with destiny. We must provide for the common defense, not merely

of our Nation, but, even more, of the right of human life to exist on earth. It is tragic that our Nation has been so gripped by fear of communism we have spent as much on military programs since the war as we spent on World War II.

Many of this generation seem to believe that the most significant event in history was the Communist manifesto and its aftermath. Other sober students of history would still insist that the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, and the U.S. Constitution have been more profound influences on world history. I am one who believes that the greatest event in history took place in Bethlehem over 1,900 years ago.

Under the law, before that time, it was said that justice consisted of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. There have been those who raised that law to a life for a life and a city for a city. In this budget, and what it represents as part of the great powers' arms race, we are preparing to raise that law to a civilization for a civilization.

And yet the man from Galilee gave us a new law that you overcome evil with good; that we should not give ourselves up to vengeance; indeed, that we should love our enemies. With this as our moral principle, let us take another look at the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, the total national defense and mutual security budget this year will require about \$260 per capita in the United States. The world's population today is something over two and a half billion persons. Each year we are spending about \$18 for every man, woman, and child on the face of the globe in preparing for man's destruction.

Yet the Congress appropriated last year only \$50,000 for the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament to work on alternatives to the arms race. The Communist offensive now is increasingly one of economic aid and penetration. For economic aid, for technical assistance, for all the refugee programs, educational exchange, atoms for peace, all our donations of agricultural surpluses to needy people abroad in about 80 countries, and for the Development Loan Fund, these appropriations amounted to little more than \$1.4 billion. That represents \$8 per U.S. citizen, or about 50 cents per capita globally.

For the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, and to encourage the growth of world law through the United Nations, our expenditures for the fiscal year 1958 were approximately 10 cents for each U.S. citizen.

When we add the specialized agencies for food, health, children, refugees, the United Nations Emergency Force, the grand total for the United Nations agencies and programs last year came to a \$120 million, or about 68 cents per each U.S. citizen; or about 4 cents for each person in the world.

The high cost of defense is the strongest argument against adequate schools, hospitals, and other essential services at home. Have we examined fully the other costs of this program in the waste of material, in the support of dictatorship and tyranny, and in other ways?

Are we concerned with the growing power of the military establishment over the national economy, over research and over the allocation of so many of our resources?

We are told this is a peace budget. Peace will be built, not by terror, but by the settlement of disputes by peaceful means—however difficult negotiation may be—by all-out support of the United Nations in establishing the rule of reason and the rule of law, and by earnest support of general disarmament. The hundreds of millions of hungry persons in Asia and Africa cannot eat our bayonets, do not want to be blanketed with fall-out from our bombs, but do want our sympathetic help in establishing healthy economies and in overcoming hunger, misery, illiteracy, disease and poverty without the totalitarian methods of communism.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in providing for the common defense we are operating too heavily from our fears and too little from our faith. This generation has it within its power to attack successfully men's ancient enemies—hunger, misery, illiteracy, disease, and poverty. If we could significantly reduce this military budget and apply only a third of the reduction to a global war on these enemies, I believe that we would by so doing more truly provide for our common defense.

An all-out assault on illiteracy, for example, would take but a small portion of our present military budget. Yet it would be the finest investment we could make in the cause of world peace and human freedom. Indeed, without such an all-out assault, our efforts at economic development will be faulty and inadequate.

If another portion of the reduction could be applied to improving the well-being of our own citizens, this would contribute to our common defense and to the peace of the world.

Several billions of dollars a year here at home would soon get rid of our slums, clean up our streams; eliminate air pollution and purify the very air we breathe; help develop decent housing for all our citizens, give us better highways and systems of mass transportation; and provide adequate park and recreational facilities for our people.

By devoting a portion to these purposes, the taxpayer would enjoy a higher standard of living at no increase in taxes. I submit that the remainder of any saving should be used to balance the budget, retire debt, and reduce personal taxes.

If the world saw the United States earnestly pursuing this course of action, and so changing its budget, in the years ahead, our prestige in the world would rise tremendously. The fears of war would be greatly abated. The hopes of the world would be given a tremendous lift.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude simply by quoting Adlai Stevenson at Urbana, Ill., on May 12, when he said:

What we seek is a world in which our children need not live under the atomic shadow. We need it as much as anyone else, we have more to lose than anyone else, and no exchange of benefit is involved. And if it

is the cost that is in question, I suggest that what we do to lift our neighbors' living standards is entitled to the same priority as what we do for our defense.

And in the same measure we should be neither sure nor proud. We are part of a human experiment that may founder. We have all set our hands to a science we cannot control. We all stand on the edge of the mysteries of outer space. We all live under judgment before an infinite Godhead. It behooves us, therefore, to express in all our dealings with the other peoples our sense of belonging to one endangering family, and sharing with it our part of hope and aspiration, our part of error and shame. Then perhaps our voice will be tolerable, our wealth forgiven, and men will sit down with us in amity to work for a better, safer world.

Mr. Chairman, it is with heavy heart that I must say to the House that I believe this appropriation measure represents 1 more year of neglect of the course of action I believe this Congress and this Nation must pursue in the interests of providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

We say we are buying time. Yet, as General Bradley has properly warned: "Time is running out—with the speed of a sputnik." The time for more constructive action is now.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes. He was promised time in general debate, but as things developed it was not available to him.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object. The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, \$54,000,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to respectfully direct questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] relative to a matter that he and his colleagues have taken up in committee on a number of occasions. I have endeavored to follow as much of it as I can in volume 1 of the hearings and I have been studying this subject, I might say, for quite some time inasmuch as it also affects my district. I am talking about the cancellation of the Regulus II missile. The gentleman from Texas spoke of this, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] just directed his attention to this.

I could refer directly to the testimony in the hearings but I think it better just to ask the question and then refer to the testimony if the answers are not adequate.

Mr. Chairman, then, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas this first question: In the committee hearings did it develop that there did seem to be a timelag or a time gap, rather, between

Polaris coming into being, coming into reality, and the use of Regulus II as a missile in being? In other words, creating a gap between the two.

Mr. MAHON. The evidence, I believe, will show that this Regulus II of the Navy is a surface-to-surface missile to be used aboard ship. In trying to get as much defense as possible from a limited amount of money, as could safely be done, the Secretary of Defense had various programs surveyed, and it was determined that the Regulus program could safely be eliminated, because the Polaris program of the Navy was moving forward so rapidly and the Polaris would be available much earlier than previously anticipated. It was felt that considerable money could be saved without any great hazard to national defense by canceling the Regulus, and that was done. The Regulus is a good missile, but it was stricken for reasons of economy, and under the circumstances I think it probably was the correct decision.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman refers to the chairman's answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is that there will be a definite gap between the operation of the Polaris and the operation of the Regulus already in being. The Regulus is a great missile. We are concerned about the Russian opposite number of the Regulus. The Russians have the opposite number of the Regulus to be fired from submarines. We are worried about it. It is a dangerous weapon, and we have nothing in its place against these short-range Regulus missiles. So if the gentleman is worried, keep on worrying; you should.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman. I think all of us are concerned to know what our position will be if we limit our use of operational missiles successfully tested.

My second question of the distinguished gentleman from Texas relates to the comparison or differences between these two missiles, as it is sought to replace one with the other. I understand that the Regulus is in being and that is proven; that the other is not yet operational. Do not these missiles fall in different categories and is not one supplemental to the other? I talked to the Chance-Vought people and they told me categorically that one missile would not replace the other but that they were complementary missiles each supplementing the other. The Regulus, unlike the Polaris, can be guided throughout its flight.

Mr. MAHON. To some extent I think Chance-Vought is right; there is considerable difference between the two missiles. They are more or less complementary. But in view of the great deterrent power of the Polaris missile as compared with the Regulus, and this is a question of opinion, all we could do was to accept the decision of the Secretary of Defense to cancel this missile. It is not possible for the Congress to decide what types of missiles should be utilized by the armed services.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate the gentleman's answer very much. May I ask the Chairman if he feels there was any difference of opinion, recognizing that there could be honest differences of opinion, of the people dealing with these weapons in the office of the Secretary of Defense and the Navy, respectively, and that the Navy wanted the Regulus II?

Mr. MAHON. Unquestionably the Navy people interested in Regulus wanted to concentrate on Regulus. This was a decision made by the Navy, feeling that they had to live within a reduced budget and that this was the best action they could take to carry out the missile program with the funds at their disposal.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, all of us are interested in maximum defense for the money spent. We also expect a well rounded defense program. For these reasons I am very concerned over the cancellation of the Regulus II missile. I have studied the hearings, that which has not been deleted for security reasons.

On page 94 and elsewhere in the hearings statements are made in which the Polaris has been cited as a better weapon as replacement for the Regulus II. It is to be expected, of course, that weapons become outmoded and replaced. Weapons do become obsolete. That is precisely the situation in the Regulus II situation but the vital objection or criticism which I make is that the Polaris is not ready to replace the Regulus II. The Regulus II has had 48 flight tests most highly successful and is much nearer readiness to protect us than is the Polaris which was intended to be ready in 1963, though now this date has been accelerated somewhat. On page 94 of the hearings the Polaris is cited as "virtually overtaken the Regulus II." Well, virtually is not good enough. By terminating Regulus II it seems to me we have created a gap of 2 years or more in this area of our defense program. Several references are made to the promise of ballistic missiles, as on page 220 of the hearings. "Regulus II and its overall weapons potential has similarly been overtaken by the 'promise' of ballistic missiles." Well, it's better to have a weapon in being than the promise of one to come.

Secondly, an air breathing missile like the Regulus II which can be guided throughout its flight can perform a fraction which the ballistic missile cannot. If there are indeed supplemental or different programs rather than similar programs how can Polaris replace the Regulus II? Certainly, unless this is explained and clearly understood, which the hearings do not explain, it seems too hasty a decision, this matter of canceling the Regulus II program.

Third, during my investigation of the Regulus II cancellation, and from studying these hearings, I am not able to learn whether economy in the defense budget, is or is not, a basic reason for this cancellation. Although it is mentioned on pages 581, 605, and 607, either it is an important factor or not. It is unthinkable to me that, while we spend money lavishly in welfare programs, we should cancel a deterrent weapon of the demonstrated success of the Regulus II.

Finally, I fail to see why the Navy, which has found the Regulus II to be a good weapon, should bow so readily to the wishes of the Secretary of Defense. The very fact that there can be honest differences of opinion, and there obviously were in this program between the Defense Department and the Navy, is reason enough for the Committee on Appropriations to have investigated the differing viewpoints more thoroughly.

A perplexing problem in our defense system obviously is the time lag between weapon research and the production model. In the case of the Regulus II and Polaris missile program it seems to me that the future hopes for Polaris caused us to cancel a successful present program. In defense we may not be permitted many mistakes. Even as we compliment the diligence of the Appropriations Committee, we are reminded of the ceaseless need for Congress to investigate and evaluate all factors of our overall defense program at all times. How tragic it would be if we indeed cancel worthwhile programs for future hopes in new weapons. In war we can use only those weapons that we have then in being. The Regulus II program was tested, in production, and ready to do its part in protecting our Nation. The Polaris lags behind and is a different type of system.

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

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law, \$234,961,000: *Provided*, That obligations may be incurred under this appropriation for the foregoing expenses for training of units designated for early deployment under mobilization plans or for antiaircraft defense of the United States and Hawaii without regard to section 107 of title 32, United States Code.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee have done a good and a thorough job in preparing this bill. However, I would like to make one point that I think is quite important. I believe very definitely if these committees had larger staffs and if those staffs were enabled to investigate better, even though it would cost more in a congressional appropriation bill, I am certain these committees could cut a good bit of waste out of bills such as this.

It seems to me quite definitely that all the talk that has gone before, this afternoon and yesterday, just confirms the fact that we know more or less of nothing; in other words, we do not know

very much about where we are going, we do not know very much about a military or defense program for this country. We have not gotten anywhere in developing a unified service that would promote economy. In fact, in my opinion, this Congress has fallen down on the job tremendously in solving this problem and in taking any truly constructive steps.

As we talk about strategy and things of that kind, it seems most clear to me that we are unable to depart from old ideas and we accept the new fetish of a military deterrent. I am certain that this country is going to have a very rude awakening. In the meantime we are spending and wasting our substance, and we are doing this for nothing.

I am as certain as I am standing here at this moment that for every \$3 we spend, if we would do it wisely and do it efficiently, we could do the same job for \$2.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we have about \$60 billion of obsolete equipment. Some obsolete equipment is to be expected, but there is no need for the tremendous amount of waste that has gone before. In fact, if my figures are correct, thinking here on my feet, this amount of money would run the State of Vermont from before the time of Christ until today.

Another thing, in all the debate that we have had we develop nothing but propaganda, a war spirit and a spirit of hate. We have no idea of working out a new solution, a new way. With the technological developments of the day we need a new way. These old military methods will not work, yet we do not have the courage to find a new way.

Another point that comes to my mind is that when people want to speak a little bit about a different thing they do not get the time to speak. We do not have here in this Congress the opportunity to debate the issues. I was rather ashamed as I sat around yesterday afternoon to note that there were about 26 Members on the floor of the House when we were discussing a bill which includes more than 50 percent of the total budget of the United States. What interest do we have in the welfare of the American people if only about 26 of us will sit here when such a subject is discussed and when half or more than half of these were members of the committee? What use is there in such a debate? There are many here who will probably laugh when I sit down, and many of them may say that what I got up and talked about does not amount to anything, but I do not think the Members of this Congress are doing their constitutional duty and fulfilling their oath of office when passing a bill in the way it is being passed.

I could go on and go through the whole bill and point out many things that are wrong, but I will not have time. I know I will get the gavel pretty quickly. A friend of mine got it not long before. So I think I will sit down, but I think it is about time this Congress does something constructive about the issue of war and peace, and not keep on voting billions of dollars and throwing

about one-third of those dollars down the drain.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

Operation and maintenance

Operation and Maintenance, Army

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, including administration; medical and dental care of personnel entitled thereto by law or regulation (including charges of private facilities for care of military personnel on duty or leave, except elective private treatment), and other measures necessary to protect the health of the Army; care of the dead; chaplains' activities; awards and medals; welfare and recreation; information and educational services for the Armed Forces; recruiting expenses; meals furnished under contract for selective service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; subsistence of prisoners at disciplinary barracks, and of civilian employees as authorized by law; expenses of apprehension and delivery of prisoners escaped from disciplinary barracks, including payment of rewards not exceeding \$25 in any one case, and expenses of confinement of such prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in a disciplinary barracks; military courts, boards, and commissions; authorized issues of articles for use of applicants for enlistment and persons in military custody; civilian clothing, not to exceed \$40 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from confinement in an Army or contract prison and to each soldier discharged for unsuitability, inaptitude, or otherwise than honorably, or sentenced by a civil court to confinement in a civil prison, or interned or discharged as an alien enemy; transportation services; communications services, including construction of communication systems; maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys and engineering planning; contracts for maintenance of reserve tools and facilities for 12 months beginning at any time during the current fiscal year; repair of facilities; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U.S.C. 4778), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; purchase of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles; tuition and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; field exercises and maneuvers, including payments in advance for rentals or options to rent land; expenses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and other units at educational institutions, as authorized by law; exchange fees, and losses in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents in accordance with law; expenses of inter-American cooperation, as authorized for the Navy by law (10 U.S.C. 7208) for Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed \$5,855,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; \$3,065,390,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains almost \$40 billion, and I hesitate a little bit to discuss a matter which could mean a saving of only \$10 million or \$20 million per year. But, I do have some questions in my mind that I should like to ask of the committee. Before doing so,

may I preface the questions with a brief statement? I obtained from the Department of Defense some information with respect to Defense Department passenger travel having to do with travel of military personnel within the confines of the United States. The figures they have submitted to me indicate that, for fiscal 1958, 1,250,000 military personnel traveled by one means of transportation or another in the United States. Of this amount 461,700 traveled by commercial air. Of that amount roughly 71 percent traveled by first class, 3 percent by coach, and 4 percent by charter plane. In passenger miles traveled, 54 percent of the military personnel traveled by airplane, 35 percent by first class, 7 percent by coach, and 11 percent by charter.

Now, it came to my attention a couple of months ago—and I have not checked this out, but I assume it to be true from the information I have obtained—that, for instance, on a jet flight across the Atlantic Ocean where they have two classes of passengers on the same plane, the rear section being the luxury class, the front section the economy class, the cost differential for a round trip is around \$425. It is not unusual, so I am told, to find that the luxury-class compartment is occupied chiefly by Government civilian and military personnel while the economy department is occupied by private business people.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Taxpayers.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Taxpayers, yes; and the same thing is true on flights across the country. A number of companies now have combined types of flight on the same plane, one, the first-class flight, occupied by passengers in the rear part of the plane and the fore part occupied by what they call coach flight passengers. And, it is not unusual to find the first-class compartment occupied by Government civilians and military personnel whereas the taxpayers, as the gentleman indicated, occupy the coach compartment or coach part of the plane. The cost differential on a round trip across the country is about \$100.

Now, I have traveled by coach both on combination flights and where the flights are entirely coach, and in my estimation they are all first class.

Now, I would like to ask the committee if it has given consideration to adopting or suggesting a policy to the military whereby we could possibly save from \$10 million to \$20 million in the military transportation cost in flights in this country alone simply by having the military personnel who are traveling from one assignment to another travel by coach wherever possible. When I say "coach," I am calling attention to the fact that these coach flights are designations only. They are actually first-class flights. Can the committee give me any information on this matter?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the inquiry we have consistently over the last 3 or 4 years, to my knowledge, condemned the various departments for excess of travel, too many changes of stations, not only within the continental limits of the United States but on a worldwide basis.

I cannot say that specifically we have approached the problem that has been mentioned.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. As I understand the law, Government personnel, military or nonmilitary, are permitted to travel first class. Of course, it would be possible to change the laws and the regulations. It is not mandatory, if one wishes to travel second class, that he travel first class. Since they have the privilege of traveling first class, most people in the military and Government agencies do travel first class whereas many citizens otherwise ride the coach flights. Now, the legislative committee could consider changing the law with respect to that subject or we could put a prohibition, perhaps, in this bill, but I doubt that this would be the best procedure.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman. I trust the committee will give consideration to this point, because, as I have said, a coach flight today is a first-class flight so far as comfort and flight time is concerned. In addition to the possible savings of \$10 million to \$20 million annually on flights within the continental United States there can be substantial savings in transoceanic flights as well.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the Polaris system and its importance to our overall defense posture of the future.

The fleet ballistic missile, Polaris, occupies a place all of its own in our overall national program of developing long-range rocket powered weapons systems. Its purposes can be stated simply. That purpose is to provide us with a means for retaliating to major aggression massively, immediately, unpreventably from positions unknown to the aggressor, positions which cannot be identified and zeroed-in for destruction by missiles in advance of attack. Its military significance to us or to any potential enemy may prove to be decisive for with missiles ships deployed at sea we will hold in our hands the death warrant of any attacker no matter where, when, or how he might strike.

From a strategic standpoint the ocean areas from which Polaris missiles could reach major targets in the Communist bloc of nations totals some 30 million square miles of international waters. These seas provide a choice of launching positions nearly eight times the area of the United States, and about half again as large as the Sino-Soviet area itself. A fleet of Polaris missile ships deployed throughout this vast hiding place would be almost impossible to locate, especially as they are well concealed deep below the surface. Even a dozen or so such ships could carry

enough missiles to wipe out the great bulk of the major Communist military targets within an hour of the order to fire.

The first Polaris weapons system will combine into a unique partnership the two most significant developments in military hardware since aircraft became major elements in warfare. One of these, of course, is the ballistic missile which uses outer space for its trajectory. The other is a ship which can actually live in the ocean depths—the new type of nuclear powered submarine.

A ballistic missile is a huge electronically guided rocket powered "throwing arm," for which to date there is no known defense at present nor in the foreseeable future. Ballistic missiles can destroy the historic barriers of warfare namely oceans, mountains, deserts, distances, and even the weather.

The new type nuclear submarine is a great mechanical fish that can operate deep in the ocean depths longer than its crew can endure. It needs to refuel only about every 2 years. The nuclear submarine and Polaris are our best deterrent to aggressive action against us because we have no defense against ballistic missiles.

The Polaris itself is unable to defend us against ballistic missiles, but our only hope is to prevent an enemy from attacking. With the Polaris he knows that if he does attack he will be clobbered back in return by these hidden but tremendously powerful and illusive weapons.

If an enemy tried to destroy the Polaris system, he would have to shoot or deliver his warheads out over the oceans of the world and not on our homeland.

The Polaris system must become a vital link in our defense. It is scheduled to have its first operational submarine in 1960. It beautifully provides flexible deterrent striking power necessary to complement land-based deterrent weapons.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat again the need and advantages of Polaris. It is undetectable by radar, invulnerable to missile pinpointing, has coverage of all important military targets, has dispersal area of all the oceans.

It removes target from the U.S. soil; it is instantly ready. I am confident our engineers will hurry this program along at maximum speed. The free world needs this great deterrent weapon, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my criticism on Army policies which arbitrarily idle and reserve defense production facilities and prevent their use by job-creating private enterprise operations.

In my city of Cleveland, we have a heavy bomber plant built in World War II—which never did receive much use for bomber assembly. This is, however, one of the finest buildings of its type in America, 25 acres under roof, a hangar-type construction. It is ideally suited for aircraft or missile production.

Since 1951 General Motors used this plant to manufacture Army tanks and until recently the M-56 airborne anti-tank gun carrier. Production terminated last month on the antitank gun carrier, and the Army has declared its intention to shut the plant down and keep control of the structure on a reserve status. At the same time, the Army has released other similar facilities in various parts of the country.

The declared Army policy on this plant reflects a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward the facility. The basic design and structure of the plant is for aircraft or missile assembly and not for weapons production, generally characteristic of Army requirements. Release of the plant for private enterprise use would make it available for research or production which would contribute to the Nation's defense more usefully than an idle, deteriorating plant rapidly proceeding to obsolescence.

It is ridiculous to see this type of plant—one of the finest in America—idled, while new missile-making structures of similar type are popping up at public expense like mushrooms in the night all over southern California and Texas.

Cleveland needs the 5,000 jobs that would be created if this plant were put to proper use.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to my distinguished and very able colleague from Ohio, Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I think it is interesting, too, though this may not be exactly the appropriate place to raise this point, that the Army has behaved in a very secretive fashion with respect to the closing down, presumably for economy purposes, of various military installations around the country. Recently the Rossford Ordnance Depot in my district was closed down for what the Secretary of the Army has said will result in a \$5 million a year saving. A month ago or longer, I requested the cost figures upon which this decision was based. And do you think I have been able to get one single figure from the Department of the Army? Absolutely not. And it is not only that I have not been able to get these figures. They have been refused me by the Secretary of the Army. And yet the people of Toledo are supposed to swallow this move that will cause an increase in our unemployment from 7.2 to 7.9 percent. Sixteen hundred men and women in the Toledo area are going to be put out of work because of this Army order, and they are being asked simply to take the word of the Secretary of the Army that this is for economy purposes—to take his word while he hides the facts.

The fact of the matter is that all of the information that has come to me from independent audit teams and from high ordnance personnel, which has come voluntarily, has been to the effect that the move to transfer activity from Rossford to Erie Ordnance Depot is for a purpose quite contrary to what has been stated; that economy is not going to be served, that this is a fabulously uneconomic and inefficient move.

I want to call the attention of the House to this matter because we are being asked today to consider a \$40 billion military budget item. All I can say is that if this budget was arrived at by the same kind of methods and by the same procedures that I have experienced from the Department of the Army, it is going to be a little hard for me to recommend it or explain it to the people I represent.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], has read the record the subcommittee established on this point.

Mr. VANIK. I certainly have.

Mr. MINSHALL. But I should like to point out to him that I explored this entire situation with a great deal of thoroughness. I asked the Department of the Army to give me a complete report on this as to why the plant was being buttoned up. After receiving their report, I discussed it with them at some great length.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, during the committee hearings I asked the Department of the Army to give me a complete report on this as to why the plant was being buttoned up. After receiving their report, I discussed it with them at some great length. I explored this subject thoroughly. I am convinced, after having checked with the Army officials, and in view of the report that they gave me, that the buttoning up of this plant was not an economy measure no more than any facet of this defense budget is an economy measure. This defense budget is based primarily on getting the most for our defense dollar and giving the American public the maximum security for their defense dollar. I feel that the Department of the Army in mothballing this plant and having it on a standby basis is doing the proper thing. This is not the place to jeopardize our national defense just to try to make jobs. I am naturally in complete sympathy with any one out of a job but do not think we should make jobs by jeopardizing our national security.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I want to point out that the plant was never designed or constructed for the kind of use to which it has been put by the Army.

Mr. MINSHALL. Does the gentleman know what the plans of the Army are for this plant?

Mr. VANIK. This is a hangar type of plant designed for aircraft and aircraft missile manufacture. I think it should be used for that purpose. If the Army cannot use it, then some type of private enterprise ought to be permitted to make use of it. It is not at all suited to the heavy type of work that the Army has in its public announcements indicated would be the purpose for which it would desire to use this plant.

Mr. MINSHALL. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Ohio that the Army has given me every assurance that this plant will be used in the best interests of the public, and even though it is buttoned up temporarily, in all probability they will be using it in the very near future, but not solely to make jobs.

Mr. VANIK. I certainly hope the gentleman is correct and that the Army will soon make proper use of it. It is my experience that a great many plants are put on a standby basis to be held in reserve and never be used until they become completely obsolete. I hope the Army will not make that mistake in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, including aircraft and vessels; modification of aircraft; design and alteration of vessels; training and education of members of the Navy; administration; procurement of military personnel; purchase (not to exceed 1,117 for replacement only, including 10 at not to exceed \$2,900 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$40 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged for inaptitude, unsuitability, or otherwise than honorably; welfare and recreation; medals, awards, emblems and other insignia; transportation of things (including transportation of household effects of civilian employees); industrial mobilization; medical and dental care; care of the dead; lease of facilities; Latin American cooperation; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; military communications facilities on merchant vessels; dissemination of scientific information; administration of patents, trademarks, copyrights; losses in exchange and in accounts of disbursing officers, as authorized by law; annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian members of teaching services; tuition, allowances, and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; repair of facilities; departmental salaries; utility services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized by law (10 U.S.C. 7580), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Navy regulations to be used for welfare and recreational purposes; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for the enlisted men; cryptographic equipment; procurement and production of services, special clothing, supplies, and equipment; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves, as authorized by law; not to exceed \$12,325,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 7202 of title 10, United States Code, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; and support of the town of Olongapo, as authorized by law; \$2,599,320,000, of which \$975,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1960, and \$16,885,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Operating ex-

penses," Coast Guard, fiscal year 1960, for the operation of ocean stations.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 10, line 10, strike out "\$2,599,320,000" and insert "\$2,594,820,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is one of five amendments that in total would strike \$255 million from the budget. You can find the reference on page 18 of the committee report. This has to do with the additional moneys not recommended by the administration for antisubmarine warfare. I regret to say that under the parliamentary situation here I will not be able to discuss all five of these amendments together because, obviously, they cannot be discussed in 5 minutes. But, I join with the gentleman from Vermont who raised a question as to this method of considering a bill of this importance. This is said in no sense as a criticism of this committee. Yesterday, the committee took the entire time for debate. I tried to get time and apparently others did too who were not on the committee, but it is quite obvious that the committee did need the time in order to present this matter to us. As I say, it is not in criticism that I am bringing this out, but there are some of us who do study certain aspects of these appropriation bills and I think there are some of us who can contribute something to them. Certainly, this issue of \$255 million which the administration did not request deserves considerable exploration, particularly, I might state, from my own standpoint, inasmuch as this is a matter which deals with antisubmarine warfare, which I have been following very closely ever since spending 3½ years in the Navy during World War II in that activity.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not have much time to explain the first of the amendments and I want to get through that first so that the House might possibly understand certain aspects of it.

Mr. SIKES. I was hoping that if we could get the gentleman more time, we might consider all of these amendments en bloc.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what I would like to do.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for 10 additional minutes so that he can discuss all five of the amendments.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida. I do regret that we cannot do this now, and I will have to go over this fairly rapidly.

Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee on page 17 that has to do with antisubmarine warfare, I regret to say, does not correctly reflect the testimony

in the committee hearings on this subject. The committee hearings in the volume that has to do with this in part I on policy statements have five references to this, and if anyone is interested, they can be found on pages 35 and 36, page 69, page 546, page 614, and page 757. Now, far from the testimony being that the Soviet fleet is growing, the testimony is that it has been cut back. As a matter of fact, there has been misrepresentation as to what the Soviet submarine fleet really was in the beginning. Incidentally, I have tried to indicate this for some time.

There are two aspects to submarine warfare. Only one has to do with submarines; the other has to do with submarine bases, and I submit to anyone here that throughout all the extent of Soviet Russia you will not find one single, not one single year-around ice-free open sea harbor.

This comparison of the Soviet submarine menace with the German submarine menace of World War II is utter nonsense, because the German submarines did have bases. That is one of the issues involved.

When Secretary McElroy appeared before the committee, he this year points out for the first time this question of the limitation of bases, and maybe that came about as a result of my calling his attention to this serious question.

On page 69 Secretary McElroy states he has not been concerned too much about Soviet submarine capability because he does not visualize the type of war where you might utilize these submarines which presently have to do with a war of a limited type, limited warfare between Soviet Russia and the United States.

But aside from that, the point is that this is something that was placed in the budget not at the request of the administration; and the interesting thing, as I get into it is this: That the committee in its wisdom saw fit to take away an aircraft carrier. Whether that is justified or not I do not know, but having cut out the money for the carriers the committee, I suspect, said: "We ought to give the Navy this quarter of a billion dollars we are cutting out for the carriers, so we will give it to them in an area where there has been no justification, namely, for antisubmarine purposes."

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from Missouri who has just left the floor. I do not agree with him but I will to the death defend his right to say what he thinks is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think this is important. I think we should get into the meat of this matter and I am very much interested, I might state, in the hearings before the committee and the committee's explanation of the testimony that is in the hearings.

I want to refer, for example to page 614, to Admiral Burke's statement, or rather to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] in his questioning of Admiral Burke.

Mr. GROSS. Which volume of the hearings?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. This is No. 1.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Our calculation of what the Soviet Union would have by way of submarine strength was in error. In other words, they do not have as many as we thought they were going to have.

Admiral BURKE. That is correct, they do not, although what they did was retire their old ships, and we thought they might not.

In a previous statement by Admiral Burke on page 546 he confirms what I have said.

The colloquy runs as follows:

Mr. SKES. How significant do you consider the apparent cutback in Soviet submarine production?

Cutback, mind you.

I think it is very significant, sir, because they manufacture equipment on a mass production scale.

And he goes on further in that line. But the point is there has been apparently a stoppage of the construction of these submarines. The essential thing is this, Mr. Chairman, and a thing I wish the committee had interrogated the admirals about, and this is concerned with the antisubmarine problem.

The problem of the Soviet submarines is the problem of bases. Those who have listened to the Navy pleading for appropriations remember how they told us that it is not just ships alone that make the Navy, you have got to have bases; and we remember how they came up and justified the need for billions of dollars for naval bases. They can talk in eloquent terms about how they cannot sail ships and operate a Navy without bases when it comes to our own fleet; and they are absolutely right about it. But when it comes to appraising the force of the enemy they forget all about bases, and not anywhere in the testimony here is there any indication that this committee has inquired into that.

One thing Admiral Burke did say was that he thought the Russians would be silly if they built more than 450 submarines; and I say he is certainly right, and I doubt if they ever contemplated building that many.

So that is the basic issue involved here. I interrogated the chairman of the committee yesterday and the ranking minority member along these lines: Where you altered the administration's requests either by cutting off or by increasing the amounts in the light of new information which comes about because of developments after the budget has been frozen months before it is presented, did you take into consideration whether the Department of Defense had approved of these areas of increase or cutbacks. I was interested in the answer that the gentleman from Texas gave me to the effect that that could be ironed

out over on the other side of the Capitol in the other body.

I think the way to iron out this increase for antisubmarine activities is not to give the administration what they have not asked for. Do not include this extra quarter of a billion dollars for which there is no justification in these hearings. Eliminate it, and then if it is important let whoever thinks it is important try to put it in on the other side. That is the essence of that.

One final point: This has to do with the tremendous propaganda campaign that is going on and has gone on for many years. I call your attention to Look magazine of May 26, 1959, in which there is a real propaganda article, "The Way We Are Not Ready to Fight," "Our Flanks Are Completely Open to a Giant Soviet Submarine Fleet," "An Inadequate Force of Sub Hunters Is Stretched Thin Across the Atlantic," this article deals with the Soviet submarine threat. It contains inaccurate statements throughout. It is misinformation deliberately given for propaganda purposes. The article quotes several admirals. This was published on May 26, 1959, obviously in order to get the propaganda just in time for us to consider this matter on the floor of the House. This kind of propaganda every Member of the Congress should resent. Let us get to the facts of the thing. The committee has not the facts on the question of the dangers from submarines. According to the testimony of Admiral Burke, we have a very adequate antisubmarine force and we have a good balance in this area.

For that reason I urge the committee to adopt the amendment I have offered and the other amendments which I will offer later.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, made reference to the submarine menace. He pointed out that the threat had become much greater than it formerly had been. He said, "We need to improve our capability to combat submarines." He said, "Since World War II the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat them." He made those direct statements in his testimony before the committee. He also reminded us that Russia is operating about 450 submarines at this time. When World War II began the Germans were operating only 48 but the submarine almost proved decisive in that war.

Yet, in spite of that recent history, the gentleman is suggesting that we are doing too much about antisubmarine warfare. Admiral Burke told us that the

older Soviet submarines were being retired. There has been some lag in their production because of some significant reasons. I do not know whether it is on or off the record, but everybody I know of who is knowledgeable on this subject feels that the slow down has been brought about by their desire to construct nuclear-powered submarines.

The gentleman read from one of the six volumes of hearings in regard to antisubmarine warfare, but in volume II, beginning on page 196, we have for many, many pages testimony of the military experts who work very directly with the antisubmarine program, and who are responsible for its success. They came up from Norfolk and elsewhere to testify before us. When we called upon Navy officials to say whether or not additional funds were required in the Navy budget we were told that \$500 million worth of additional expenditures were really required if they were to do the job they would like to do for the United States. These additional funds included far more than is being recommended by the committee. In other words, these funds for the additional antisubmarine warfare programs were not in the budget that came to us, but it is not the fault of the Navy they were not because Admiral Burke and the Secretary of the Navy both supported the full program before the Secretary of Defense. The gentleman knows if we have a war of any duration it is important for the United States to maintain control of the seas and 450 submarines constitute the greatest menace that could possibly threaten us on the seas. It seems to me that Congress must be alert about this matter if we want adequate protection for the people and the industrial areas which might be destroyed by the submarines off our coasts. The gentleman should not oppose this action which has the support of the Navy and the need for which has been so thoroughly justified by the Navy.

I hope that the Committee will support the Committee on Appropriations in this matter. In the report the information as to how these funds will be spent is shown on page 18.

Among other things it provides for an additional nuclear submarine, and for an additional destroyer. Here is the place where we are lagging. Here is where our survival may be threatened. To consider for one moment striking this from the bill seems to me unthinkable and I hope the Committee will support the action taken.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. This was the unanimous action and the enthusiastic action of the full subcommittee, was it not?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing a good deal about submarine bases. I would like to draw attention to the fact, although I do not think it is necessary, because many Members have told me they felt it was very important to put back into this bill the money for the attack aircraft carriers. As you know, the carriers are mobile bases and they are vital to our national defense. If countries where we have airplane bases, airfields, should suddenly decide they do not want us there and put us out, we would be very dangerously weakened. That might happen in a number of instances. And, without these mobile bases, we would be terribly vulnerable. We remember the valuable service the Navy has performed with its great carriers. The performance at Lebanon showed that as an example.

I shall not try to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, because I believe we will secure the carriers later. I found many Members tremendously interested in the carriers. This bill was supposed to be a balanced service bill. Thus with the attack aircraft carriers deleted it is not a balanced defense service bill. It would be a horrible thing not to have the carriers. Thanks to each and all of you who have worked so hard on this bill, I know it has been a grueling task and one that tries the souls and hearts of men.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say in regard to the attack aircraft carrier—it is singular—that I thoroughly agree with the distinguished gentlewoman and that I intend to follow her leadership in this matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very grateful. The gentleman is extremely smart and very clever in getting what he wants.

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

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. We are truly a seapower Nation. We are bound to the sea by economics, by politics and by military strategy. We receive and ship materials of vital importance to the entire group of free world nations; we are allied and committed to many maritime nations throughout the world to whom we have pledged our strength and support. The nations of the world with whom we share the common bond of determination to resist Communist aggression would be isolated from us and from each other without the vast network of ocean shipping. Moreover, this isolation would occur at a time in history when consolidation of Western civilization's defensive strength is more critical than ever before. Our world strength, depends in part upon our seapower to hold this network together. But in a vastly larger sense, our world strength depends not only upon our seapower as it projects the Nation's power over the seas of the world, but as it has the mobile capability of projecting this Nation's power from

those seas onto any land area of the world where it is needed to stem the tide of Communist aggression and to keep the peace.

Thus our seapower is an important element of our world strength and our seapower depends upon our Navy. Recognizing this, we have wisely built a strong Navy, capable of guarding our shores and our shipping, and of equal importance, capable of striking effectively anywhere in the world where the need should arise. There is no luck or coincidence involved in the fact that our fleets have been ready to move the Nation's power for peace into any area where aggression has threatened. Rather, it has resulted from a unique U.S. comprehension of the concept of seapower, the creation of naval forces capable of implementing that concept, and the skill with which we have done it. We in the Congress have a solemn responsibility to understand what that seapower concept is, its vital role in the Nation's destiny and what balance of naval forces are required to perpetuate it. For if we in the Congress, failing in this understanding, fail thereby to provide the naval forces basic to seapower, we also fail in our obligation to provide for the common defense.

This understanding comes readily if we will but look to the vaunted British navy whose actions for almost three centuries gave rise to generation on generation of proud Britain's declarations that "Britannia Rules the Waves." This, in the literal sense, was true during the emergence and flowering of the British Empire. Britain controlled the sealanes of the world and was thus able to move her land forces where she pleased. Because there was no really effective shore-based resistance she was able to land those forces in many areas of the world and engage in the extensive colonization which created her empire.

But with all due respect to our good friends and allies, it can be said with historical hindsight that never, in all these hundreds of years, did the British ever understand or possess true seapower in the sense that she discovered the concepts, manufactured the hardware, and developed the know-how which would have enabled her effectively and efficiently to project her great national power on to land areas against resistance. This failure was evident during the wars with France, it was evident at Gallipoli, and it was evident in the 1957 Suez fiasco.

Britannia did, indeed, for hundreds of years rule the waves, but never did she gain real understanding of their full potentiality for transferring her power to the world's beaches. Thus she never basically utilized and exploited the sea to more than a fraction of the effectiveness she might have. Not, I hasten to add, because of any incompetence. Actually because conditions never really called upon her to do so. The unfortunate result in modern times has been that the Admiralty gave little or no attention to amphibious warfare as a means of projecting British power from sea to land and it relegated the aircraft carrier to a primary role of fleet protection rather than using it for spearhead-

ing powerful striking forces aimed at beachhead objectives.

Fortunately for the United States, a small group exists within our services primarily confronted with the specific problem of projecting this Nation's power from the sea to troubled spots ashore, namely, the U.S. Marine Corps. Fortunately again for this United States, this group is intertwined organizationally with the U.S. Navy. The two groups could, and did plan and work together between the two World Wars. Together, and often with cooperation of the U.S. Army, they expanded the narrow "rule the waves" concept of seapower to a wide and masterful concept of its effective utilization to carry the Nation's full military power anywhere on the oceans of the world and project it from sea to land at times and places of our own choosing. The magnificently successful amphibious campaigns of World War II resulted.

But these amphibious task forces were not merely men trained to hit the beach, or amphibious ships, or attack spearheading aircraft carriers. They were a carefully and precisely balanced combination of all. It must be recognized that without the task force air cover supplied from the carrier, the campaigns would have failed. Without the close air support supplies from these ships to the men on the beach, the campaigns would have failed. Not only in hot war, but in cold war as well, these carriers are a basic element of the Nation's vital seapower. Without aircraft carriers the Lebanon landings would certainly have failed. Without this same type of ship to balance and effectuate the projection of this Nation's power for peace at future trouble spots, we cannot expect the results we have obtained in the past. Without the aircraft carrier this Nation's mastery of seapower is incomplete, its basic power to resist the aggressions of communism is weakened, and thus its ability to deter those aggressions either in cold war or in hot war diminishes.

These are the considerations we should have in mind as we consider the fiscal fate of the Navy's aircraft carrier program and its relation to our strength to defend ourselves in a troubled world.

The arguments we all have heard the Navy use in support of its attack carrier make sense. The Navy has not suggested that the carrier is the sole item of value in our defense, and has not, to my knowledge advocated that the carrier replace any other major defense system. Our Department of Defense has planned a balanced military force, ready to meet either the threat of a nuclear war, or the threat of limited aggression. The Navy within its balanced fleet concept has designed the attack carrier for versatility, capable of accomplishing different kinds of missions. With the attack carrier our fleet can move as it did into Lebanon, as it does in the Formosan area and elsewhere to exert our influence, to limit the spread of fighting, and to serve notice of our intentions to support our national foreign policy. Not only does the carrier have the capability of using discriminate and discrete force, but it carries the big wallop, too. As a self-contained airbase, easily and quickly transported any-

where in the world, free from foreign diplomatic control, the carrier is able to add to the total nuclear punch that we promise in retaliation. I am convinced that no small part of the present nuclear stalemate exists because the Navy is not a preset target, and never will be. An enemy attack simply cannot surprise all of our forces at the same time: he would have to make a decision whether to try for a knock-out blow on our land installations or on our fleet. He could not win both. Our safety is assured to the extent that he continues to know that the United States with the help of a far-ranging fleet can launch such a force.

But the nuclear power of the Navy is not the most significant aspect of our seapower to my mind. I am impressed with the diplomatic way in which the Navy has always been able to show our influence and the speed with which it brings considerable airpower, seapower, and marine-power into focus on local situations.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if the striking power of our Air Force or of our Army were in question that I would feel equally strongly. We may arrive in time at a point when we can reduce our armed strength—we have not yet arrived there. We need to become aware of all of the capabilities of our major defense weapons. The attack carrier certainly stands out as one of the most important. The new carriers are far superior to the older ones in that they are safer for the pilots, they can handle the modern aircraft so necessary in this jet-age, and they are free from the failures that accompany overage. The testimony before the House subcommittee which emphasized the fact that our ships are approaching the point of being over-age is not surprising. The Navy has, for some years, had the understanding sympathy of the Congress toward this problem. The planned program of replacement of ships, and the modernization of others is necessary to good management. To keep our defense structure strong we must have the most modern aircraft carriers we can afford.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for a very profound statement on this subject and to say that I fully agree with him.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, the defense health of our Nation must be appraised over a space of time, not just at any one moment. In recent years, we have been subject to nuclearitis, sputnikitis, and, of course, chronic and increasingly severe, budgetitis. A quick check on our present pulse indicates that there are reasons to be somewhat concerned with our military posture. We have the views of the military specialists in attendance as well as those of the general practitioners. With a staff of diagnosticians, professional and amateur, vying for prominence, the resulting recommendations must be looked at very carefully to avoid more drastic treatment than the patient can stand.

My concern at the moment is with the status of our naval power. We hear our Navy friends talk about mobility, flexibility and versatility, and we read these words so often that their real meaning as a frame of reference for making judgments may be lost. These words are not, in my opinion, merely descriptive, for they refer to the basic concepts which underlie our naval planning—the philosophy established by the Congress and accepted by our citizens. This is a philosophy which rests upon our dedication not only to prepare for defense but to be ready to return any attack.

Our geographic position between two oceans requires that we develop and maintain a fleet which can move anywhere in these vast three dimensional battlefields to meet threats under, on, or above the surface of the sea, with the kind of force that is matched to the kind of threat presented. This is what is meant by mobility, flexibility, and versatility.

To be mobile the fleet must be able to move rapidly and it must be able to move with confidence. The fleet must have the speed, armament and air cover that cannot be bluffed. A fleet of ships with limited capability—and such limitations increase with years of service—cannot do the job. The term flexibility is probably one of the most significant in our thinking of military problems today: in this one word the Navy emphasizes that a balanced fleet must be ready to meet different kinds of problems, deal with different kinds of threats, and deliver different kinds of force.

Now what about this flexibility? Is the Navy flexible? Will it continue to be flexible? The growing strength of our submarine force is well known. The highly publicized exploits of our subs and their quiet, steady competence in accomplishing their mission has earned them strong support. There are those who have promoted conflict between the submarine concept and the carrier concept—let us hope that they have become aware of the consequences of an unbalanced fleet—one which, like the unbalanced Russian fleet, could only carry out restricted purposes.

There are those who confuse limited war with limited capability. The capability of our carriers to apply effective force should not be limited regardless of whether we anticipate limited war, or all-out general war. Our carriers should be as modern, as efficient, and as powerful as we can make them. There is no substantiation in history for the "sitting duck" criticism. There is no likelihood that future enemy capabilities to attack will be so superior to our capabilities to defend that such criticism will be valid. Opponents of the attack carrier hypothecate the total destruction of the duck with one nuclear bomb or submarine attack. Such destruction rests upon the assumption that the duck is placidly preening herself. A further assumption underlying some of the criticisms of the attack carrier is that the next war will be a general, all-out, nuclear war. Aside from the fact that our military and political leaders disclaim the imminence or

probability of such general war, common sense assures us that such wholesale destruction can hardly be called an instrument of national policy.

If we accept that we have reached and can maintain a point of mutual deterrence, then the existence of a strong balanced military force capable of dealing with limited wars becomes of primary importance. Each of our Armed Forces must maintain a balanced force, and this balance in the Navy rests to a large extent upon the flexibility of its fleet.

Can the Navy continue to maintain this flexibility? What does it take to insure flexibility to meet limited threats in a limited way as well as to be ready for general war?

First, we must dedicate ourselves to providing the defense we need. We must not be governed solely by the cost in dollars.

Second, we must dedicate ourselves to a concept of a balanced military force, ready to meet any kind of threat, ready to apply appropriate force in support of national policy.

Third, we must be ready to provide for a regular program of procurement of major defense items and to renew and to replace them in accordance with good management procedures.

Fourth, we must resist attempts to unbalance our military force. We cannot plan for our national defense health by following a popularity contest among spectacular developments in modern weaponry. Specifically, we cannot scuttle the regular augmentation of our carrier force, if we are to maintain balanced naval power.

Although I complete 20 years of commissioned service in the Naval Reserve this month, I am not a naval aviator and have not served more than brief training periods on aircraft carriers. Although I have always been proud of my naval service and perhaps sentimental about personal associations within the Navy, I have also been severely critical at times of various attributes of naval policy. I do not subscribe to the blank-check kind of support of the Navy's carrier construction program; the Congress should re-examine all long-range programs each year in the light of changing conditions. I have myself suggested that perhaps less costly carriers might be built as *Polaris* takes over the "big bang" responsibility of the Navy in an all-out nuclear war. However, I am convinced it is folly to neglect the less than all-out war capability of which the attack carrier task force is our most potent and flexible weapon system. To expect World War II ships, even though modified and modernized, to continue to perform reliably after 20 years of strenuous service is absurd; to expect these carriers to handle efficiently modern aircraft for which they were never designed is foolhardy; to demand naval fulfillment of present and prospective worldwide commitments with obsolete or obsolescent major vessels is to invite costly operational losses in peacetime and disastrous unreliability in time of combat.

These carriers take years to build. The Congress declined to appropriate to build one in the fiscal year 1959, and the

committee has deleted the one proposed for the fiscal year 1960. The ability of our Navy to do the job we have assigned it will be in serious jeopardy if we fail to restore funds for orderly replacement of World War II built ships which even today are obsolescent and which will soon be both obsolete and just plain worn out.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to venture the opinion that the committee has made a serious mistake in not supplying in the pending bill the needed funds for construction of an additional attack aircraft carrier which was included in the Navy Department's budget in the amount of \$260 million. The attack aircraft carrier is a vital and unique element of our military strength. Its role in coping with international situations has been clearly demonstrated during the Suez, Lebanon and Formosa difficulties.

The Navy is presently operating 14 attack aircraft carriers. Under normal circumstances, four to six of these carriers are deployed overseas in the Mediterranean and the Far Eastern waters of the Pacific. In times of international stress, the carriers deployed to these areas number from 10 to 12. The remaining at such times are engaged in intense training programs, and necessary shipyard overhauls.

Nine of the 14 active attack carriers are of the World War II *Essex* class and must be replaced as their inherent age and infirmity will preclude their utilization by 1966 as attack aircraft carriers. At present they are marginally suitable for the operation of our present high performance aircraft, and will be unable to effectively accommodate the type of aircraft required to keep pace with Russian technology in the field of manned aircraft.

There are now three *Forrestal* class attack aircraft carriers in the fleets, with an additional one scheduled to join the fleet this year. Three more are under construction, including the nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. One of these will be completed each year until 1962. As a *Forrestal* carrier joins the fleet, an overage *Essex* World War II class attack aircraft carrier, is retired from the attack carrier force.

To maintain the naval task forces now deployed overseas, the Navy must continue to replace the overage World War II *Essex* class carrier with modern carriers capable of accommodating the high performance aircraft of today and the foreseeable future. The Navy testified before the Appropriations Committee that if all attack carriers were of the *Forrestal* class, the improved safety factor would result in saving the lives of a dozen or more pilots and \$70 million each year. Furthermore, the *Forrestal* class carrier carries two times as much jet aircraft fuel, three to four times the number of nuclear and conventional bombs, and can deliver these bombs on the target at three to four times the rate of the *Essex* class.

Originally the Department of the Navy asked President Eisenhower's Bureau of

the Budget and his Secretary of Defense for an additional nuclear-powered *Forrestal* class attack carrier. The Administration compromised by allowing funds for a conventional *Forrestal* class attack carrier costing \$120 million less than the nuclear-powered carrier. During the course of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, I made efforts to have funds for the carrier included in the bill, and subsequently at the meeting of the full Committee on Appropriations I was prepared to offer an amendment to the pending bill which would have provided them. At about this time all of those who felt that funds for the carrier, either nuclear or conventional, should have been included in the bill agreed that the best strategy would be to forego the offering of an amendment in the full committee and to forego the offering of an amendment here on the House floor with the expectation that the funds will be included in this bill when it is considered by the other body. Relying upon the unanimous judgment of those concerned, I shall not this afternoon offer an amendment to include the carrier funds.

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

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

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman and others who have spoken on behalf of the carrier.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur wholeheartedly with the remarks of the gentleman from New York. During a period of several days last fall, it was my privilege to observe aircraft carrier operations at sea off the coast of Formosa with the 7th Fleet. I can assure you that the modern attack carrier striking force is a vital and necessary arm of our national security. The modern carrier can project the exact degree of force required with precise direction and intensity. It can gain and maintain control of the air in the area of operations, which is so vital in times like these when we are liable to have small, limited wars break out at any troubled spot in the world. It provides close air support for troops ashore. As events in the past have shown over and over again, the attack carrier is an optimum weapon system for deterrence of, or successful prosecution of, limited war.

I think two facts of paramount importance should be mentioned here. First and foremost, in the foreseeable future no system of weapons or armament can replace the aircraft carrier, deployed with its manned planes ready to go. Land-based aircraft must have bases from which to operate in order to project themselves. Missiles cannot replace manned aircraft because they cannot discriminate or select targets or actions required. Once a missile is on its way, it cannot be recalled.

Mr. Chairman, just this past week there occurred on the attack carrier *Essex* a tragic and unnecessary accident that could have been averted, possibly, if these planes had been operating from *Forrestal*-size carriers. In the forenoon of last Thursday 2 men were killed and

18 injured, with 3 burned seriously, when a plane crashed on the carrier deck. In times when high-speed heavy jet aircraft are operated on a day-to-day, night-to-night basis, for the safety of our men in the Navy and the crews that so valiantly serve them, we need larger and more modern aircraft carriers in our Navy.

I sincerely hope the other body, with their deliberate consideration of this item in the budget as proposed, will see fit to approve funds for the construction of a supercarrier.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, since the attack aircraft carrier is the heart of U.S. seapower, I sincerely trust that the House will make provision for a nuclear-powered *Forrestal* type of carrier in this bill. The budget presented by the President requests a carrier and the Navy wants it badly. Of course, both the Budget and the Navy have asked for a conventional type carrier. My impression is that a nuclear-powered vessel would be preferred by them but for budgetary problems.

Admiral Hayward in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee stated that we need a carrier, because if we do not have it in the years to come we shall not be able to meet our commitments. He said that our experience indicates that manned aircraft is here to stay, and that our ability to project our power across the sea is dependent upon the aircraft carrier.

Secretary McElroy stated at the hearings that the decision to request a carrier was made at the highest level of Government after a great deal of consideration not only by the Navy but in other parts of the executive branch. The administration feels this carrier is an integral part of our defense.

Secretary Gates told the committee that it would be a vital error of the United States to delay the construction of a carrier. He said that we are operating nine *Essex* carriers as attack carriers. They are World War II type and cannot handle modern airplanes.

Admiral Burke said that we would not be able to support forces that we might have to commit to limited wars without new carriers. He said that without them we would not be able to project our military power to certain areas of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the new carrier should be nuclear powered. We should not build something that is outmoded at the start. Admiral Rickover has strongly supported the view that new carriers should be nuclear powered. It would, of course, cost \$120 million more to build, but it would most certainly be worth it. During the life of the carrier the Navy would probably save that amount of money in supply, and gain several times the value in effectiveness. There would be no refueling costs such as is the case with conventional vessels. The carrier could stay at sea for indefinite periods of time, and by reason

of its almost unlimited mobility would be a tremendously effective instrument in any kind of war.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the sums which the bill provides for research and development.

The studies and investigations conducted by the Committee on Science and Astronautics have indicated unmistakably that research and development will play a vital part in the future growth and security of the Nation. Advanced technology lies today at the very heart of our national defense. It also spurs economic growth and activity, which tomorrow will form the foundation of our security as well as our comfort and well-being. We therefore support a strong program of scientific research and development.

Effective research and development, even if adequately funded, needs continuity. In the past, on-again off-again support of research programs has led to waste and delay. We can no longer afford the luxury of erratic support to which we have too often been prone. Lead times are inescapable, and cannot be wholly redeemed even by crash programs or lavish later expenditures. Sound, efficiently managed programs should be continued at adequate levels, and not cut back or interrupted.

In this connection, it behooves us to think twice before we transfer a going program from one agency to another. I am not speaking now of new programs which may be started, for example, in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration rather than the armed services. But a sound program on which the armed services are doing a good job should not be transferred without compelling reasons.

The Appropriations Committee deserves our praise and gratitude for its fine report on this bill. It deserves our thanks for giving substantial support to research and development. If anything, the amounts provided for research and development should be even larger, as in future years they will surely be.

At present, as we all recognize, the spearhead of military technology is missile and space development. While progress must be made on a broad front, and no promising avenue should be left unexplored, research and engineering on military missiles, including their electronic and other associated equipment, demand the highest priority. This, at the moment, is the critical field on which our future and our hopes may well depend. It deserves our full support in all its phases.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the subcommittee and the full committee for its action in reference to research and development generally; research and development covering the Army, the Navy and the Air Force and ARPA, which is a new defense organization covering scientific research and development.

There are funds available to each department of the Department of Defense for this purpose. This represents really the first time, I think, that we have had

what you would call a real program of research and development. The program in these different departments runs to something like \$3.5 billion or \$4 billion. ARPA runs to something like \$445 million, and if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] would care to correct that figure, I should appreciate it.

Mr. SIKES. Four hundred and fifty-five million dollars.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It all represents a continuing program. This is the first time, as I say, that we are having a continuing program that will run from year to year.

Frankly, since I have been serving on the Committee on Science and Astronautics I have just begun to fully appreciate the economic value and the security value to the Nation of our program of research and development. I know of nothing that means more to the security of our Nation than for us to keep abreast of developments in scientific research and to see that they are properly and promptly applied to the defense operations of this Nation. In this respect, the committee has been liberal in taking care of the different departments, and I certainly think they are entitled to a word of commendation from us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS
For expenses, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps including equipment and facilities; procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; utility services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized by law, and buildings on military reservations authorized by Navy regulations to be used for welfare and recreational purposes; conduct of school-rooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment and welfare expenses for the enlisted men; not to exceed \$40 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged for inaptitude or unsuitability or otherwise than honorably; procurement and manufacture of military supplies, equipment and clothing; hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation of things; medals, awards, emblems and other insignia; losses in exchange and in accounts of disbursing officers, as authorized by law; and departmental salaries; \$171,350,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I compliment the members of this committee on the painstaking way in which they have done an arduous job, in bringing this bill to the House. I agree that there are probably problems presented in the minds, particularly of some of the new Members, concerning our procedure in handling the debate. But we seem to move along. What I have to say at this point may not apply to the committee's handling of this specific matter with the Air Force. It may apply to the Legislative Committee, but methinks it must be said at this time.

The pressing, legitimate, and unmet needs of our defense system today go well beyond what our revenues can presently support, what the administration has sought, or what the Congress is likely to

approve. We are constantly in the position of responding to requests in accordance with degrees of urgency, leaving many acknowledged gaps and deficiencies unfilled. Even so, as we are constantly reminded, the support of our present Military Establishment is a heavy burden upon the civilian economy.

This being the case, we should be doubly alert today against any use of defense funds for purposes that are unnecessary and uneconomical, that do not contribute in a positive way to the state of our defenses, and that are clearly and directly detrimental to the civilian economy from which those funds are drawn. When, for example, a branch of the Armed Forces proposes to create a military labor force for the express purpose of taking over work that is now being loyally and skillfully performed by private firms and civilian workers more efficiently and at lower cost, it is our duty as Members of Congress to blow the whistle and call a halt.

Specifically, the objections of Congress ought to be expressed in the strongest possible terms against the announced plans of the Air Force to supplant civilian contractors and civilian employees with enlisted personnel in the operation and maintenance of all SAGE plants that have been and will be established throughout the country. These plants are now being operated by skilled and experienced workmen who were led to believe that these jobs offered some degree of security and stability of employment. They were never told, nor was it the understanding when they were engaged, that these were short-term jobs and that after the plant had been placed in smooth working order, they would be dumped on the unemployment rolls in a small town with no other demand for their services, or for those more fortunate—kept on just long enough to help break in inexperienced Air Force enlisted men on their old jobs.

It should hardly be necessary to point out how much more difficult this Air Force plan will make it for contractors who will still be called upon to build and to undertake the initial operation of future SAGE plants to recruit the kind of reliable, skilled, and experienced men they will need to carry out their responsibility. It is equally obvious that the increase in civilian unemployment resulting from this loss of private employment opportunities will be harmful to the economy, both locally and nationally, and to relations between civilians and the military in the communities where these plants are located.

A survey conducted by the Air Force itself has found that the number of years of experience that civilians presently employed at these plants have for their jobs is exceedingly high. Constant turnover as men are transferred and enlistments expire, on the other hand, has consistently handicapped and made more expensive past efforts to train enlisted men for skilled occupations of this character or to give them any real interest or stake in such jobs.

From the standpoint of operating economy, any comparison of costs will expose the Air Force proposal as an ex-

ample of sheer, senseless, large-scale extravagance. At Grandview, Mo., the American Hydrotherm Co. operates a SAGE plant, by contract with the Air Force, with 48 employees at a cost to the Government of about \$264,000 per year. No case has been or can be made that this operation is not being conducted or maintained in keeping with the requirements of the program.

Effective July 1, 1959, the following system will go into effect:

American Hydrotherm will retain, for the time being, a contract covering 22 employees. Seven civil service employees will be used and 60 enlisted personnel have already been assigned. The annual cost of maintaining the enlisted personnel alone has been estimated at \$637,740. The total cost for all 89 of the contemplated personnel will be about \$771,940 per year. The difference in cost over the present system is \$507,940 a year.

Ultimately the contract with American Hydrotherm, according to present Air Force plans, will be completely canceled, so that this cost will be reduced by about \$80,000, but the net cost will still remain more than \$425,000 a year higher than under the present system. When it is realized that some 30 of these SAGE plants will eventually be established in different parts of the country, it can be seen that the result of applying the Air Force policy will be an added cost to the American taxpayer of \$15,000,000—spent in disregard of the most effective use of military manpower in a manner which needlessly deprives skilled and loyal American workmen of their livelihoods.

The one argument advanced by the Air Force is an old one, constantly invoked by the military whenever it has sought to extend its boundaries into civilian territory, to multiply its duty stations, and to enlarge its reservoir of potential assignments for personnel. It maintains that the iron discipline of military law, with absolute control over the lives of personnel, is necessary to assure continuous operations and to avoid the possibility that a work stoppage might occur during an emergency.

I believe that this argument is a totally unjustified slur upon the loyalty, responsibility and patriotism of American workers. If this attitude of the military is correct—that the only way to assure performance of duty when the safety of the Nation and of every family is threatened is a gun in the back—then we are in a very bad way, and we had all better be inducted into the Armed Forces right away. If there is no workable alternative to a possible breakdown of vital operations but militarization then we had better begin either to find one or to consent to a far more sweeping extension of the authority of the military over civilian life than any we have tolerated before in a free nation.

The character and complexity of modern weapons and modern warfare is such that, unless we conscript most of the population, there is no alternative but to rely upon civilian experience, civilian cooperation, and civilian devotion to duty in many vital industries, sciences,

and skills that are just as essential as a SAGE project to the support of the defense effort. We are doing so now in the production and testing of missiles and in the operation of missile bases, in the operation of atomic installations, and in a host of other areas of direct and vital importance to our national safety. It would not only be foolish and costly in the extreme, but impossible, to incorporate and to keep in the ranks of the military every job, skill or technical function that bears upon our military security.

So far as the continuous operation of SAGE installations as a part of the defense network is concerned, it should be enough, so long as civilian operation is otherwise satisfactory and economical, to be fully assured that the parties involved are completely aware of the responsibilities they bear and have developed reliable methods and procedures for the resolution of differences without work stoppages.

In this connection, I am advised that in all the period that SAGE plants have been in operation, not 1 minute of time has been lost by reason of strikes, work stoppages, slowdowns, or labor disputes of any kind, and that the labor agreements between the contractors and trade unions representing employees in these plants contain the most ironclad no-strike provisions to be found in the country. Methods and criteria for bargaining and reaching settlements on wages and other terms of employment, in the absence of the ultimate strike weapon, have been developed and employed successfully in areas such as the TVA and on atomic energy projects, and can certainly be applied with success in SAGE situations. I understand that the unions whose members are employed in SAGE facilities have expressed their complete willingness to cooperate with any steps or procedures necessary to assure that operations do not suffer from work stoppages or shortages of skilled manpower.

Cooperation of this kind has proved of very great value to the Nation in the past. It should not be spurned now, in favor of costly and unnecessary military regimentation.

I have very clearly in mind the present administration's many promises and strong declarations over the years, as to the need to get the Federal Government out of business and to turn over to private industry all of those functions which it could perform more efficiently. This is certainly one of those functions, and certainly no intrusion of Government into private enterprise is more dangerous or destructive of American values than an encroachment of the Military Establishment. Has the Commander in Chief no influence with the Air Force or were those promises for the birds? I now suggest that the Congress redeem them, if the President will not.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the position taken by the gentleman from California because it has come to my attention that

in the SAGE operations around Duluth about 30 experienced operating engineers have been given notice that their services will be terminated and that Air Force employees will take over, which I protest against.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman for this contribution.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the problem that has just been discussed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. I think it is something that is worthy of the attention of the Congress. I hope they will read the testimony given by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] and the statement which I am making in the RECORD.

When I heard of the proposal of the Air Force to replace civilians with enlisted personnel in the operation of SAGE plants I sent an inquiry to the Air Force in an effort to ascertain the facts. Like many other Members who did the same, I received a reply through the Office of the Air Force Legislative Liaison.

In this reply I was informed:

In the past it has been our practice to initially maintain and operate utility systems at SAGE installations by contract until such time as Government personnel could be properly trained to perform this service.

I had some difficulty with this sentence because it seemed to imply that the replacement of civilians with military personnel at these installations was an old established procedure that had been going on for some time with the knowledge of all concerned. Yet, if my information is correct, contract operation has been the standard operating procedure up to now, and the takeover by military personnel is something new that had not previously been done. Furthermore, if it was the intention of the Air Force all along to throw out the contractor and the civilian work force, and to put enlisted men in their jobs, knowledge of this intention was, it seems, pretty much the private property of the Air Force itself.

Apparently the contractors were not made aware of it when they took the jobs. At least, so I am informed, in organizing the work force they needed to man these installations, skilled workmen were, in many cases, persuaded to quit good stable jobs they held with private utilities and elsewhere and to give up years of seniority and other employment rights in order to meet the need for experienced men to operate the SAGE plants. They were offered steady jobs, not floaters' havens.

Now the Air Force proposes to dump them unceremoniously for the sake of more billets for the military. They gave up their former jobs and pioneered the SAGE projects just to pave the way for the troops. I doubt very much that any skilled experienced craftsman, holding the kind of job that would qualify him to help put a SAGE plant in good order, would care to go to work for a SAGE contractor if he were told what lay at the end of the road.

The Air Force's manner of doing business in this situation seems, on the face of it, to represent the rankest kind of

highhanded injustice—aside from the cost element, which is damning in itself.

The Air Force reply went on to say:

The Air Defense Command is currently conducting a study to determine the method of operation to be used for the SAGE sites. This study will cover all factors involved in these operations, including a comparison of the costs of contract operation versus Government operation.

Any final decision in this matter which may result in a change in the present plans to operate these installations with Government personnel will be made only after this study has been completed and the results thoroughly evaluated.

In other words, after making the decision to replace civilian contractors and employees with enlisted personnel, effective July 1 of this year, the Air Force is going to make a long and careful study, extending into the indefinite future, to determine whether that decision was a wise one. Would it be too much for the Congress to ask that this study be undertaken before a radical change in the method of operating these facilities is made, rather than after? Without further belaboring the obvious absurdity of the Air Force's approach to this matter, let me simply express the devout hope that this is not the way that all military decisions are now being made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

For necessary expenses in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games, 1960, as authorized by section 1 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (Public Law 85-365), \$400,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 19, line 5, after "\$400,000" insert "provided that funds in this paragraph shall not be available for support of any international game or events in which participation is denied any of the free countries of the world."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, and reserve the point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to prohibit the use of the \$400,000 which this bill makes available for Army support personnel to carry on the winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley if any free nation of the world is prohibited from taking part in these winter Olympic games.

The International Olympics Committee recently decided to expel the athletes of the Republic of China from participation in Olympic activities. It seems to me this decision of the International Olympics Committee is purely an act of political discrimination. It does not seem to me that the U.S. taxpayers' dollars should be used for support of the winter Olympic games if representatives of the Republic of China, by the action of the International Olympics Committee, are barred from participation in these games.

This amendment is fair and just. It is necessary for the International Olympics Committee to give further consideration to their action in barring repre-

sentatives of Nationalist China from taking part in the Olympic activities.

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

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BECKER. Is a point of order going to be made against the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been reserved.

Mr. BECKER. If a point of order is to be made against the amendment I wish it could be disposed of at the present time, for if it is sustained I have an amendment I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has informed the Chair that he will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to heartily endorse the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have an amendment at the desk which would do the same thing by striking out those lines on page 19.

I think it is about time that we in the Congress of the United States expressed our feelings not only to the people of our Nation but the people of the world and let them know that we support our allies and our friends now and at all times.

Mr. Chairman, I was indeed very pleased to read in the newspapers that since the Olympics Committee made the decision barring Chinese nationalists from participation that our own State Department has made a public statement condemning the action of the International Olympics Committee. I believe this is quite a step in the right direction, and I am pleased that our State Department has made known our feelings on behalf of the U.S. Government. We, the taxpayers of the United States, do not intend that our money and our name, our country and our land be used to purge a friend, and a very good friend of the United States, Nationalist China.

Why, at this particular time, the Olympics Committee should see fit, on the demand of Soviet Russia, Red Russia, to purge a sporting outfit, an outfit to be sent to the Olympic games, to purge a friendly nation, is difficult to understand.

Let me take you back to the forming of the United Nations and remind you that it was Red Russia that forced the governments of the world participating in that United Nations formative assembly to bow before her demands for the elimination of opening each session of the U.N. with prayers calling upon divine wisdom to guide the United Nations in their actions. That very surrender cost us a great deal of prestige in the eyes of the world.

I believe this is the time for the Congress to say we will not appropriate \$1 for this purpose under this purge at this time.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, certainly.

Mr. MAHON. I cannot speak for the full committee, but I believe that we are in agreement that this amendment is probably acceptable, and there is no serious objection that I know of to the amendment.

Mr. BECKER. My respect continually increases for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. On behalf of the minority members of the subcommittee we likewise agree that this amendment is acceptable.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the attitude of my colleagues on my side of the aisle.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I raised the question originally as to whether these funds would go for support of the Olympics in which the Nationalist Chinese were barred. I have been assured they would not be barred from participation, and, therefore, I do not offer the amendment I had at the desk which would have eliminated the funds.

I support the gentleman's desire that we express in appropriate words our feelings. We all remember the slogan "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." We certainly do not want to put ourselves now in the position of appropriating \$38 billions for defense and \$400,000 or some other amount for tribute.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. DORN of New York. In all fairness I think the attention of the House should be called to a telegram I have just received from Robert L. King, executive director, organizing committee, Eighth Olympic winter games. It reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 3, 1959.

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Recent action of International Olympic Committee does not make Red China member of that body. They cannot and will not participate in VIII Olympic winter games. The organizing committee invited Nationalist China, and they accepted prior to I.O.C. action. The organizing committee will stand behind this invitation and accept entries of Nationalist China competitors at Squaw Valley. Therefore, this I.O.C. action has no actual effect whatsoever on our conduct of the Squaw Valley games.

ROBERT L. KING,

Executive Director, Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games.

I join in support of this amendment because it is in keeping with the resolution I introduced heretofore that it would be the sense of this body that if Taiwan, that is, the Republic of China, Nationalist China, were excluded from participation in the Olympic games that the United States would withdraw from the Olympic games.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee and one who shares some concern in this matter, I want to join with my colleagues in support of the pending amendment. I am confident that it can be said that the action we are taking in adopting this amendment will meet with the wholehearted approval of the State Department of the United States. I understand that the State Department is very much incensed with the action taken by the International Olympics Committee, and I believe this move certainly will have an important place in correcting this discrimination and this injustice.

I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the support of this amendment. I would like to recall to the gentleman from New York an occasion in this very Chamber when our former colleague from New York, Mr. Reed, made a great speech in which he said that the Olympic game participants used to go through conflicting armies without challenge. There was absolute freedom from politics.

I hope the pending amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. I assume that America has a representative on the International Olympic Games Committee. Is that true?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe that to be so.

Mr. POFF. Can the gentleman supply us with the name of the American representative on that Committee?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I cannot offhand. I think a gentleman by the name of Brundage is serving on this Committee.

Mr. POFF. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the American representative on this Committee also voted to exclude Nationalist China?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not familiar with the procedure that is followed in the International Olympic Committee.

The Department of State did make clear that this action, whatever the method employed by the Committee, was regarded as a clear act of political discrimination.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. To answer the gentleman from Virginia, it is my understanding that the vote was 33 to 19 and at the time there was the very disgraceful situation of the United States delegate voting with the Soviet Union.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in support of this amendment. I also want to pay sincere tribute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the gentleman from New York [Mr.

BECKER], and all those who have brought this disgraceful affair to our attention. They have rendered a real service to their fellow Americans. Acquiescence in the action of the International Olympics Committee would be interpreted in many quarters as a retreat from America's consistent policy in opposition to diplomatic recognition of Red China and as a repudiation of Nationalist China. Rather, the Congress, by adopting this amendment, will repudiate the vote of the American representative on the International Olympics Committee which was in no wise representative of America's foreign policy.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD with regard to the Olympic games controversy.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some questions. It seems to me that we are not acting on the basis of good information here. If someone knows what actually happened there, I will be glad to yield. Can the gentleman from New York answer? I understand that what this Committee did was to decide it was a misnomer to call the government of Chiang Kai-shek China, and that if the government of Chiang Kai-shek wants to come back purporting to represent Formosa that would be all right. It seems to be a matter of nomenclature. What was the issue?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The question was brought up at the meeting by the Soviet Union. As the gentleman knows, Communist China is not a member of the International Committee. So the Soviet Union speaking for Communist China proposed to the assembled international delegation, which was incomplete, there were at least 22 members not present at the time, in effect that Chiang's China be thrown out; and if Chiang's China is not thrown out, we and all of our satellites will not participate. And they carried on with a further threat and said, "We will establish our own Olympic games."

Mr. PORTER. Would the gentleman confirm that if Chiang's China wants to come back, using a more accurate but still erroneous name, the Government of Formosa, then they would be allowed to be admitted?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman from Oregon is discussing this matter on a question of semantics. The question was that it was the Republic of China that was being thrown out, and the Republic of China stood on its rights, recognized by the United States and, as far as I know, everyone else, but the Communist Chinese insisted that they should be called the Republic of China and participate as the Republic of China.

Mr. PORTER. But the point is that apparently it is just a matter of nomen-

clature who has a right to call itself China.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No; the gentleman from Oregon and I disagree. I do not think that it is a question of nomenclature. It is a question of real high moral principles.

Mr. PORTER. I am not against high moral principles, of course.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am sure the gentleman is not.

Mr. PORTER. What are you doing?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. All we are doing is saying that no free nation shall be barred from participating in the Olympics.

Mr. PORTER. That is, any free nation?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is it your understanding that a free nation was barred by the action of the Olympic Committee?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Absolutely correct, by the action of the Olympic Committee.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 19, strike out all of lines 1 through 5.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in the argument over the amendment just offered, I think we are losing sight of the fact that this is nearly another half a million dollars in Federal funds to be appropriated to the winter Olympic games in Squaw Valley, Calif. I would like to ask either the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking minority member of the subcommittee how much money is here being appropriated or has been appropriated to the winter Olympic games in California?

Mr. FORD. The appropriation totals \$400,000. There was a request for an additional \$500,000, as I recall, based on additional costs that have materialized in recent months. This had to be authorized. I understand that authorization bill has been approved by the House but has not as yet been approved in its final form by the Congress as a whole. Because that additional authorization is not law, we did not approve the request for the additional \$500,000.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, let me call the gentleman's attention to the hearings on page 986:

Mr. LAIRD. We are also building a pavilion out there with Federal tax dollars.

Mr. KING. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. What is the total cost of that?

Mr. KING. \$3,500,000. The total Federal contribution to the Olympic games will wind up \$3,500,000 plus the \$900,000 of military support for a total of \$4,400,000. That will be the final total.

Now, is that correct? Does this \$400,000 put the total up to \$4,400,000, or what is the story?

Mr. FORD. There were funds made available originally for construction. That is the more sizable amount. The \$400,000 in the bill here is for what we call military support for the winter games. They did request an additional \$500,000 for that purpose, but that is not authorized by law.

Mr. GROSS. Does this \$400,000 put it up to \$4,400,000? I am not clear on that point.

Mr. FORD. It puts it up to \$3,900,000.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is how much more to come?

Mr. FORD. There is an additional authorization of \$500,000 more.

Mr. GROSS. On top of the \$400,000 in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. No.

Mr. GROSS. So there is another \$900,000, including this?

Mr. FORD. There would be \$900,000 in military support plus the \$3.5 million for construction, and if all is approved it would be a total of \$4.4 million for both construction and military support.

Mr. GROSS. And that is not the end of it, because Mr. King testified before the gentleman's committee and said: "I may have to come back for more," did he not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say that I do not think there will be any more requests because of the fact that California has put \$7½ million into the project as against the Government's \$4.4 million.

Mr. GROSS. That is what Mr. King said when he came before the committee before that. He said, "I won't be back, this is it." But then he said here before the committee:

In answer to your statement, I believe I made the statement to Mr. SHEPPARD's query that so far as I knew, this was all that was going to be asked, and I even think that I embarrassed myself at this point by stating at that time that if there was to be any additional request, somebody else would have to come back—

Then he goes on to say, in effect: "Here I am again, looking for another handout from the Federal Government." Here we have all the taxpayers, including those in Iowa, underwriting a big part of the cost of the Winter Olympic Games out in Squaw Valley, Calif.

I am not for this appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is not the first time the Federal Government has participated in an appropriation for a purpose of this character as I understand it. Furthermore, I would like to suggest, as a matter of timing, that if they do come back for more, that would have to be in a supplemental, not a regular appropriation and we could stop it then if it should be stopped.

Mr. GROSS. It does not make a bit of difference whether it comes in a supplemental or in a deficiency or in a regular appropriation. It still comes out of the taxpayers' pockets, and I am opposed to this proposed \$400,000 appropriation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make two comments. The first is that while I share the interest of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] from the standpoint of economy, my concern in this particular issue today relates to the financing of the Olympic activities in which the Nationalist Chinese would be barred by the Communist blackmail activity and the surrender to blackmail that occurred just this last weekend. It is for that reason I have adhered strictly to that issue.

Now that the gentleman from Oregon has seen fit to suggest that the action that was taken was proper, I should like to observe simply this, that if this Congress accedes to that intolerable position, we will have receded completely from the position which this House has taken repeatedly in opposing any proposals for the recognition of or the seating in the United Nations of Red China.

I want to commend the State Department for its emphatic protest against this action by the Olympics committee. I want to point out that in 1957 the United States, I think with some questionable wisdom, acceded to the request of the Chinese Communists to participate in the Olympics. But the Communists are not satisfied with that. Their interest is political and ideological, and the only thing that will satisfy them is to drive the free Chinese, the representatives of a friendly power, recognized by this Government, out of the Olympics. And there is nothing that the gentleman from Oregon can say that can alter that fact.

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has made a very fine statement, and I think we all subscribe to it. I would like to point to the fact that there was some confusion about the contents of the amendment when it was first offered. Many of us had not had the opportunity to see it, but I would like to point further to the fact that when the amendment was explained and understood, its adoption was unanimous, and I think that shows clearly the strong feeling of the House in the matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I have been in no way critical of any statements made in connection with this or the position of the committee whatsoever beyond the one fact of the attempt of the gentleman from Oregon to defend the action that was taken under Communist blackmail.

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PORTER. Tomorrow afternoon, when there will be more time and I will not be holding up so many Members, I intend to make a speech about China, and I hope the gentleman will be present.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I shall make it a point to be present, I assure the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

Procurement

Procurement of Equipment and Missiles,
Army

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, ammunition, equipment, vehicles, vessels, and aircraft for the Army and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; purchase of not to exceed one thousand three hundred and fifty-nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only (including twenty at not to exceed \$2,900 each); expenses which in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army are necessary in providing facilities for production of equipment and supplies for national defense purposes, including construction, and the furnishing of Government-owned facilities and equipment at privately owned plants; and ammunition for military salutes at institutions to which issue of weapons for salutes is authorized; \$1,232,300,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is the intent of the committee to undertake to finish the bill tonight and have a rollcall vote on the final passage. As I understand the situation, if the consideration of the bill went over until tomorrow, a rollcall vote on tomorrow would have to be postponed until next week. So I hope that we can move along as rapidly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, and modernization of aircraft, missiles, and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such lands, and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; \$1,969,394,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 20, line 16, strike out "\$1,969,394,000" and insert "\$1,930,394,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the five amendments which relate to the extra money amounting to \$255 million, which was put in the budget for antisubmarine purposes and not requested by the administration. I am not going to offer the other amendments inasmuch as the House has shown its desire in this matter unless by some chance in these brief 5 minutes, I might still persuade the House that this thing is a very serious matter and needs correction. I regret to say that the chairman would not yield to me when he was quoting certain parts of the hearings. I simply wanted him to give me the citations because I still make the statement that the report of the committee on page 17 is not in ac-

cordance with the hearings at all. It actually misrepresents the case.

Under the privilege of extending my remarks I want to answer a point made by the chairman immediately following my remarks. He now refers to part 6 of the hearings and the testimony of Admiral Hayward appearing on page 299. I trust the House will read that testimony, particularly the information the Admiral supplied for the record. Here it is.

During the last year many well qualified industrial concerns have made a large number of interesting proposals to do all types of work in all phases of antisubmarine warfare research and development.

Because of stringent funding limitations, only a small percentage of these proposals have been followed up with a contract. Only those proposals which the Navy felt were sure to produce an increase in ASW effectiveness were funded. This means that many new ideas which were of a high risk nature have been left unfunded for lack of funds. It is entirely possible that one of these new ideas could hold the secret to a real successful improvement in antisubmarine warfare. The \$100 million additional requirement for ASW R.D.T. & E. contains an appreciable sum which will be used to explore new or novel ideas with the hope of increasing our capability to detect, classify, and kill the enemy submarine.

I think this clearly shows that the judgment by Admiral Hayward's superiors in cutting back on these funds was entirely in reason. Why did the committee disregard the considered judgment of the Navy heads and the Department of Defense?

It actually misstates the case. I regret to say I believe the distinguished chairman has not reviewed the testimony in regard to this matter. I want to refer to page 216 of volume 2 of the following testimony. Admiral Weakley was appearing before the committee and the chairman was interrogating him on this matter of research and development money that was needed:

Admiral WEAKLEY. We went after a figure in antisubmarine warfare research and development of \$246,330,000. This is for antisubmarine warfare R.D.T. & E.

The figure that is now in your budget is \$174,692,000 for antisubmarine warfare, R.D.T. & E.

Mr. MAHON. That is research, development, test, and evaluation?

Admiral WEAKLEY. That is the new budget line which has taken the place of the old R. & D. budget line.

Mr. MAHON. You felt that would be fully adequate?

Admiral WEAKLEY. We felt it was adequate and about what we could fund.

That is what the testimony was.

Also, I want to call attention to a very interesting exchange on page 214 where the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], began interrogating the witness, mind you, a member of our committee that is supposed to find out the justification for these items.

I may say that I intend to take the floor at a later time under a special order and point out the inaccuracies of this committee's report. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] on page 214, starting this out, says:

Admiral, I was shocked to see that there is not a more dramatic program for anti-

submarine warfare. Maybe this is as good as we can have.

Therefore I say it is very obvious that the chairman of the committee is the one who wanted to put more money in, not the witness, who testified that this sum was adequate.

One other point from the hearings dealing with the subject matter of whether or not there is a growing submarine threat. I refer to page 222 of the hearings:

Mr. MAHON. We have been told that the Soviet Union has drastically reduced its rate of production of submarines. What do you make of that?

However, the point I am getting at is the limitation of bases from which submarines might operate. I challenge anyone to point out a single question the committee directed to any witness as to what submarine bases Soviet Russia might have. We all know, or should know, that bases are a limiting factor in submarine warfare.

I again point to this article in Look magazine which quotes these same admirals who, of course, are pumping for their funds. It is a pure propaganda sheet, and this committee instead of protecting the House and bringing us factual information almost repeats in its report the propaganda which is carried in this magazine. And the report is at variance with what limited information there is in the hearings.

The administration has not asked for this money. This money has been put in, I maintain, because the committee having deleted the aircraft carrier fund felt that to make up for it they should give the Navy more money to use in research and development, a quarter of a billion dollars which had not been requested and which the record will show, if we really had a record, was not needed. Certainly this record does not justify putting a quarter of a billion dollars into this item.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is not practical to undertake to run through the various volumes of the hearings and seek out testimony at this time. It is not possible for members of the committee to remember what testimony was printed and made a part of the record and what was not printed. About one-third of the testimony is not in the record but is locked in the vaults downstairs and is available, because we have taken the secret testimony in order that we may have it available when we mark up the bill.

I have not had an opportunity to review all this testimony during this discussion, but I do have page 299 before me, volume 6. The witness testifying is Admiral Hayward. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] was acting chairman of the committee at this time.

I call attention to the following statement by Admiral Hayward:

Admiral HAYWARD. As you may remember, last year Congress gave us \$48 million additional for ASW research and development. However, I felt personally that we did not have sufficient money in the research and development phases, and we need an additional \$100 million for 1960.

He said they need \$100 million additional for 1960 for research and development in the field of antisubmarine warfare. We gave them, as shown in the report, \$45 million in addition to the estimates for antisubmarine warfare research and development.

The people who worked on this bill and listened to the testimony will remember that when the vote came on the amendment to provide more funds for programs of antisubmarine warfare, the motion I believe was unanimously approved. The gentleman from Michigan may be able to state whether or not it was unanimous. I do not know.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, if the committee will observe page 537, "Part I, Policy Statements," it will see that Admiral Burke indicated that he needed about \$500 million in three categories: First, new ships; second, aircraft; and, third, research. He divided those into three generic classifications further into, first, antisubmarine warships—1 guided missile destroyer (DDG), 1 attack submarine (SSN), 1 guided missile frigate (DLG); second, aircraft, 12 all-weather fighters (FAH-1), 24 early warning aircraft (WF-2), 18 carrier ASW aircraft (S2F3), 20 ASW helicopters (HSS); third, ASW research and development; fourth, modernization and maintenance and operation funds; and, fifth, Polaris—1 Polaris submarine (SSBN).

This testimony came when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] was in charge of the committee. I had asked the admiral earlier what he would do if the subcommittee gave him the money for a new nuclear carrier, and he said that in the light of the fact that his fleet was superannuated to the tune of 82 percent, being ships of World War II vintage, he could not in good conscience spend the money on a new nuclear carrier, but he would break it up in the previously itemized fashion which would cost \$507 million. The testimony is replete that Russia has 450 operational submarines. If the gentleman from Missouri is going to research the point of the need for antisubmarine warfare funds he will do a wonderful service, to the whole House and to the country, but it was the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that the submarine threat did exist, and I submit the money is necessary in light of all the facts disclosed by both the secret record and the record that is printed.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. It will be recalled that Congress accelerated the Polaris program, which is to be one of the brightest hopes for deterring war in the arsenal of this country. Congress will remember that the Constitution says it is up to the

Congress, and Congress is authorized, to raise military forces and support them. Why should not Congress try to direct, insofar as it reasonably can, an effort to solve a problem that has to do with the very survival of the country?

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I disapprove the elimination of funds for the carrier, and as an alternative I support this effort for an increase in our antisubmarine warfare capability. I believe this amendment, which includes \$255 million spread out in three or four appropriations was unanimous in the subcommittee.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF ORDNANCE AND AMMUNITION,
NAVY

For expenses necessary for the production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition, including missiles (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; and procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; \$627,369,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two, and the first one I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee is whether or not he made the statement a moment ago that if a vote was not had on this bill tonight it would have to go over until next week?

Mr. MAHON. I conferred with the leadership and was told they would be glad if we could finish this bill this evening, that a vote on tomorrow would be passed over until next week.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. MAHON. I am not able to give that information.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why we cannot vote on this bill on tomorrow.

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], that I have said we hoped to finish this bill by 6 o'clock and have a roll call. I stated that probably a roll call which might be ordered tomorrow in the event we do not finish tonight would be passed over to next week.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts I wonder what big event is going on tomorrow that would preclude the House from voting on this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course we are anxious to dispose of this bill today.

The question of what might happen tomorrow or the day after has nothing to do with the hope of disposing of the bill today.

Mr. GROSS. Then we could have a vote on this bill tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If it goes over, but I doubt it very much. What might happen tomorrow or on Friday has nothing to do with the desire to get rid of the bill today.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not know what world-shaking event would preclude a vote tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not going to be here all night. We are pretty close to the end now. There are important matters coming up and we would like to dispose of this bill today, because if the bill is not disposed of today the program I had intended for tomorrow will not come up. Now, if we could get this bill out of the way, I could bring a bill up tomorrow that I have in mind.

Mr. GROSS. Well, will there be a vote on that bill tomorrow, may I ask the gentleman? I am not trying to usurp the functions of the leadership on the minority side. I am just trying to get some information.

Mr. McCORMACK. Am I using the gentleman's time?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but I have a motion that I can use if I have to. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want any statement I make about tomorrow or the next day to be imputed by the gentleman today to have an application to the bill pending.

Mr. GROSS. Whatever that means I do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, with that understanding, I might say that the leadership on both sides—because of circumstances that they think are justifiable and, if the occasion should arise, with the permission of the House—have agreed that if any roll call should come up tomorrow or Friday, that it go over until next Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am afraid I will have to object to any unanimous consent request for that purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, knowing the fairness of the gentleman, I do not want him to commit himself now but wait until that situation arises.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I wonder if there is any money in this bill to construct any ordnance depots, in view of the fact that Army is supposed to be abandoning one of the finest, if not the finest, ordnance depot in the United States, the San Jacinto depot in Texas.

Mr. MAHON. There is no money in this bill to build ordnance depots. Such a program would be carried in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will give some attention to that, because I am very much interested in the San Jacinto ordnance proposition.

I notice in the bill \$54,380,000 for what is called extraordinary expenses, and most of that money is spent on the accounting of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretaries of the various branches of the armed services. I can understand that some money is necessary for that

purpose, but I am wondering if this subcommittee is really riding herd on these people to find how this money is being spent. I do not suppose the average, common, garden variety Member of Congress can find out, but I hope the committee will ride herd on these items under the title of extraordinary expenses.

Mr. MAHON. The vast majority of this money is spent for highly classified purposes, and we would do a great disservice to the country with any statement made with respect to those expenditures, but we are doing our best to ride herd on these people and safeguard public funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft, and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land without regard to section 9774 of title 10, United States Code, for the foregoing purposes, and such land, and interests therein may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; reserve plant and equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation of things; \$4,165,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year there may be merged with this appropriation such amounts of the unobligated balances of appropriations previously granted for "Aircraft, missiles, and related procurement," and "Procurement other than aircraft and missiles," as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary for the accomplishment of the programs for which this appropriation is made.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLEY: On page 22, line 23, delete "\$4,165,700,000" and substitute "\$4,175,700,000."

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is at bottom an appeal to you members of the Committee of the Whole. It is an appeal that I make as an elected Representative of many thousands of unemployed persons in the Sixth District of Maryland and the many more thousands who are dependent upon these unemployed persons. As I pointed out yesterday in my remarks to the Committee, appearing on pages 9608 and 9609 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, these unemployed persons are highly skilled, many of them professional employees and many semiskilled employees. They are employees laid off by the Fairchild Co. in Hagerstown, Md., within the past 17 months. In my investigation to determine the basic reasons for this great economic setback to the proud, progressive and truly outstanding American community of Hagerstown in Washington County, I have found these facts to be true:

The great and growing surge of unemployment in Hagerstown has been caused by the layoffs by the Fairchild Aircraft Co. It is the same Fairchild

Co. of Air Force flying boxcar, the C-119, fame, and the builder of the C-123. But these proven craft no longer are being built. The Air Force last December canceled a \$50 million contract for the Goose decoy guided missile which would have been produced by Fairchild. In addition, the J-83 engine for the Goose missile was canceled. These cancellations have cost Fairchild not only considerable current income production and profit, but amount to approximately \$200 million loss in future business. But my complaint is not with these inevitable developments in the swift technological change that is characteristic of the missile age. My complaint centers upon the nonglamorous, more prosaic part of the aircraft spectrum. It has to do with support aircraft. More particularly is has to do with the current need and future demand for the F-27 twin prop jet transport produced by Fairchild.

Last August, in 1958, the Air Force officials requested approval of procurement of the F-27 from the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. Because of the lateness of the hour of the request, the F-27 was not included in last year's budget. In January of 1959, before the House Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas is chairman, the request was made for approval of the F-27 for limited air attaché or embassy use. This request was turned down by the subcommittee. In my subsequent conversations with the members of the subcommittee, by letter and by personal visit, I pointed out the many broader and greater needs for the F-27 by the Air Force. I will itemize these needs a little later. Suffice it to say that the Air Force has seen this aircraft and has approved the aircraft and has demanded the aircraft.

I can inform the Members of the Committee without any fear of contradiction, that Gen. Curtis LeMay has requested this aircraft, that Gen. Thomas White, Chief of the Air Force, has requested this aircraft, that the Air Force weapons board has approved the F-27 and has requested through channels requisitions of the aircraft. Moreover, an Air Force committee, studying the future needs of support aircraft to replace the C-47, the old DC-3, has recommended the purchase of 150 of the F-27 over a period of time. Yet, in the face of this expert appraisal and recommendation of the top Air Force Defense official, the civilian spokesman for the Department did not come before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and request the F-27 for the 1960 fiscal year.

Let me remind you that last December the Air Force cancelled the Goose missile. The Air Force has terminated production of the C-123. Fairchild Company as a result of these actions has had to lay off close to 3,000 of its employees within the last 17 months. The company lost considerable money in 1958, and will lose increasing amounts in 1959. In fact, unless there is a military requisition effective within a few months to come, the whole F-27 production program of Fairchild will come to an end.

For this reason, I have presented this amendment to the Committee of the Whole House. Since the top spokesman for the Air Force, for no reason, to my mind, failed to request this necessary aircraft vehicle, I, as the elected Representative of the many thousands of unemployed persons and the last person who can register an appeal with you members of the Committee of the Whole House, you who are the last refuge for my constituents, make this appeal for support of my amendment. For in our governmental system, it has been necessary for me to wait until this very moment to have the authority and opportunity to make a request of the Committee of the Whole House for appropriations for these needed aircraft vehicles.

By approving my amendment these will be the immediate effects of the action taken by the Committee of the Whole House:

First. A proven aircraft producer, namely Fairchild, of Hagerstown, Md., will be saved from imminent economic disaster, and I am not overstating the case.

Second. A proven aircraft, namely the F-27, the logical economical replacement for the old DC-3's will be provided the Air Force.

Third. Employment conditions will immediately improve in Hagerstown and in Washington County for the Fairchild Company can recall many hundreds if not thousands of those now in the bread lines in Hagerstown and the policy of the Congress to aid a surplus labor area will be implemented.

Fourth. A source of spare parts for the F-27's presently in operation by feeder aircraft throughout the country will be continued in operation.

My amendment will make it possible for the Air Force to order 10 F-27's during fiscal 1960. The additional funds requested will be earmarked for the procurement of this particular aircraft.

Fairchild Co. needs this military order to maintain its F-27 production line in operation. Likewise, the Air Force needs this F-27 to replace the DC-3. These are demonstrable needs but because of bureaucratic bungling the needs have not been presented, until these last few moments. I have felt that it is my constitutional duty to present the needs to the members of the Committee of the Whole House. And in between the needs of the company to produce and the need for the Air Force to acquire the F-27, are the 3,000 unemployed persons anxiously waiting to get back to the production line. By this Committee's approval of my amendment the first and most important step back to the production line for these thousands of unemployed will have been taken. My amendment is not asking for a grant. My amendment is not asking for a loan. My amendment is merely asking the members of the Committee of the Whole House to provide for a genuine, economically sound quid pro quo. The Air Force will get needed proven support aircraft—the company will get desperately needed requisitions to continue production of the F-27. But more importantly, and over-

riding every other consideration, thousands of unemployed persons with their many more thousand dependents, will once again have the chance to exercise their high skills and earn a living.

By approving my amendment, the members of the Committee of the Whole House, the last refuge for thousands of my constituents, will have once again and forcefully condemned bureaucratic bungling. The members of the Committee of the Whole House, in the practical circumstances I have presented to you today, by approving my amendment, will have given meat, substance, and marrow to the oft declared policy of providing contracts for labor surplus areas.

I respectfully request the members of the Whole House to approve my amendment and I wish to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and all members of that subcommittee for their courtesy and consideration that they have shown me in this very important and crucial matter to thousands of my unemployed constituents.

MILITARY USES OF THE F-27

First. The F-27 is a natural replacement for the DC-3-C-47—which the Air Force uses as a general work horse all over the world. The DC-3's are anywhere from 12 to 18 years old. They are getting expensive to maintain; the spare parts problem grows more acute with time; and they are wholly unsuited to a member of Air Force missions today.

Second. The Air Force could use the F-27 in the photographic and charting service in the low and medium altitudes. The F-27 is the best airplane in the world for this use because of its high wing configuration. The commanding general of the charting service at Orlando, Fla., has requested the F-27 in the most glowing terms.

Third. There is the Medical Air Evacuation Mission, particularly in Europe, South and Central America. Because the Air Force is responsible for the medical care of not only its own personnel, but State Department personnel and overseas Government agency employees, some 1,200 people are transported each month by the Medical Air Evacuation Service, ranging from Burma to Iceland. These people are carried from bases or places of employment to military hospitals, and so forth. The capacity of the F-27 for either ambulatory or litter patients or both, greatly exceeds that of the C-47-DC-3. With its jet engines and vibrationless performance it can do the medical mission better than any airplane presently flying.

Fourth. There is a navigational training mission. The F-27 is particularly suited for the work carried on at the Air Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo. Because of its superior high altitude and hot temperature performance, the F-27 is ideally suited for student navigational training work. There are navigational training jobs at a number of airbases in the United States where present aircraft should be replaced by a more modern aircraft.

Fifth. The Caribbean Air Command based in Panama has a daily flight requirement of supplying high priority

equipment, mail, and personnel to some 20 military missions maintained by our Government in Latin, Central, and South America. This work is now being accomplished by old DC-3's. The DC-3's are also being used to furnish high priority cargo and personnel service to a number of remote radar facilities.

Sixth. The Air Attaché Mission, particularly for countries close to or behind the Iron Curtain, is now carried on by old DC-3's.

In general, because of its greater range, larger payload, and additional speed, an A-27 has two and one-half times the productivity or usefulness of the C-47. It costs 56 cents a ton-mile to operate a C-47 today. It costs 22 cents a ton-mile to operate the F-27. Thus the F-27 does two and one-half times more work than the C-47 at only 39 percent of the ton-mile cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] on the work he does constantly for his constituents.

Perhaps, because the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] has inherited some of the Midwestern aggressiveness and sincerity of his parents, he serves his people in Maryland better.

I can say that in this case, however, he serves the country, too.

I only want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I support my distinguished friend from Maryland in his significant amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks and to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous consent requests of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I should like to say that I agree with what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] said about our colleague from Maryland, JOHN FOLEY, that he is sincerely trying to do a good job for his people.

Certainly, he is here today making an earnest plea for several thousand unemployed people in his district as well as their families.

Mr. Chairman, there are some points that I would like to emphasize following what my colleague has told you about this situation.

First, a proven aircraft producer, namely Fairchild of Hagerstown, Md., will be saved from imminent economic

disaster, and I am not overstating the case.

Secondly, a proven aircraft, namely the F-27, a logical economical replacement for the old DC-3, will be provided the Air Force.

The gentleman pointed out several other facts in support of his amendment, but I suggest the strongest point that he has to make is the saving of one of our pioneer aircraft producers from possible disaster. The gentleman is making a plea and so am I for several thousand workers, and also for the modernization of our Air Force, and to do away with a lot of the obsolete DC-3's that are now being operated all around the world, with many of them that have been held over since World War II and replacing them with modern jet airplanes that will be capable of doing a much better job and at much less cost, in other words, at about 39 percent of the cost of operating the old DC-3's. The Air Force itself has made a plea for this. I do not know why the Air Force did not come before the committee, but as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] pointed out, General LeMay and General White, I believe were in favor of the F-27. The F-27 has proven its worth and its capabilities. I am certain it would help to modernize our Air Force and replace a lot of planes which are now obsolete.

The F-27 has also proven its worth in air medical evacuation. Some of the officers who are in charge of this have said that they would like very much to have this plane.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the Air Force requested funds for certain cargo planes which were eliminated by the committee, and which represent a reduction of \$50 million. Certain other administrative type of planes were also eliminated from the budget. The plane in question is one manufactured by Fairchild at Hagerstown. It was not presented to us as a budgetary item at all for 1960. It was discussed somewhat with regard to the program for fiscal year 1959. I have the greatest sympathy and the greatest interest in the people involved here, but, Mr. Chairman, there have been many cancellations of programs throughout the Nation and many people have lost their jobs. Of course, such a thing is always regrettable, but the object of our defense program is to provide the best possible defense for the country with the maximum utilization of the funds available. If we use these funds primarily to aid communities with unemployment problems, we will get ourselves very far afield from our main objectives. I want to say in behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] that he has done a diligent and a good job in presenting this very serious problem to the Committee and to the Congress. I do not blame him for offering the amendment. I wish I could support it, but it would be contrary to the principles that this Congress must follow in

making defense appropriations. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I must recommend that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOLEY) there were—ayes 25, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land without regard to section 9774 of title 10, United States Code, for the foregoing purposes, and such land, and interests therein may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; reserve plant and equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation of things; \$2,448,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year there may be merged with this appropriation such amounts of unobligated balances of appropriations previously granted for "Aircraft, missiles, and related procurement, Air Force", and "Procurement other than aircraft and missiles, Air Force", as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary for the accomplishment of the programs for which this appropriation is made.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MINSHALL: On page 23, line 21, strike out "\$2,448,300,000" and insert "\$2,248,300,000."

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day during general debate, I discussed at some length my argument against Bomarc. I also took the liberty of addressing a letter to the Members of Congress last night which I assume many of you saw on your desks this morning, in which I outlined, at least, some of my arguments against Bomarc.

I should like to state very briefly, just what my amendment does. This amendment does but one thing: By reducing the appropriation by some \$200 million it will take out the funds that are appropriated for the Bomarc program only.

I am leaving in the bill what you might call rope with which they can hang themselves, \$84.6 millions for test and evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Defense Department concept of defense in depth. As you all know, around our cities and around our important areas in this country we have Nike-Hercules. That covers an area of about 80 miles surrounding those particular installations. Beyond that we would have Bomarc B, which is designed to reach out another 400 miles. Then we have the manned interceptors that would also cover this range and farther out beyond that.

If we could spend that money today and be assured of attaining the concept of defense in depth, including the Bomarc, I would be 100 percent in favor of it and would not be offering this amendment. But fact is, of course, that no funds voted today would do any such thing.

For 9 long years the Air Force has been tinkering around with the Bomarc program, and to date they have spent a total of \$1,900 million for a program that has yet to be proven.

Bomarc B, which is the only thing we are talking about here today, has still to be fully tested; and according to the Air Force's own estimate will not be operational for at least another 2 years and will only have a minimum capability until 1964. Who in this House is going to say that the only threat against our country in 1964 would be manned aircraft? Manned aircraft is the only weapon against which Bomarc is effective, not the ICBM upon which the Russians are basing their entire offensive threat according to our best intelligence estimates. Bomarc is useless against the ICBM.

In summarizing my remarks today in general debate I said that Bomarc is a \$2 billion failure. Call it, if you will, a \$2 billion boondoggle. They have not produced as yet a single operational weapon, yet they want to carry on this program which if continued will cost another \$3 billion or \$4 billion. And this, of course, does not include \$7½ billion for SAGE, the semiautomatic ground environment electric computer system upon which the Bomarc system is entirely dependent.

Bomarc B was developed from Bomarc A. Bomarc A has been completely abandoned except for five squadrons which are going to be put in position next year. Bomarc B shows some change in the propulsion and guidance systems, and an increase in power. Bomarc B, as I have just said, is useless against the ICBM; which will be our threat in the next few years. After 9 long years and nearly \$2 billion we are still not receiving 1 cent's worth of defense, not 1 cent's worth of protection from the Bomarc system, yet this program if carried out will cost \$3 to \$4 billion more not including SAGE.

The most important thing in my opinion is the fact that the Bomarc will be obsolescent before it is operational, and it will be at least 2 years before Bomarc will become operational even if Bomarc is on schedule.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a very great appreciation for the gentleman from Ohio and the work he has done on our committee. He has been a valuable member of the committee. He has been diligent in his work, and I compliment him very sincerely.

I do not support his amendment; in fact, I recommend very strongly that his amendment be defeated. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we are now talking about the defense of America. We are talking about the defense of the cities and towns of this

Nation and the people who live in them, the millions of people who would be exposed to attack by Russian bombers. They are the people for whom protection must be provided by the Congress in this bill. That is why I do not want to take a chance on \$200 million or any other sum which might deny the people the protection that you and I want them to have.

In addition I am talking about the protection of our military bases, the bases from which retaliatory efforts must spring if we are attacked.

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress cannot really decide on the wisdom or lack of wisdom of this step. It is something that must be determined by those who have the technical knowledge, the advanced scientific knowhow which will permit them to decide properly on such an important step.

I call your attention to the fact that not a single scientist, not a single top ranking official from the fields of research and development testified that this program should be discontinued. I call your attention to the fact that the Secretary of Defense himself stated very positively that this program should be carried forward, that there is need for this weapon and a place for it.

I realize that the Nike program is a very good weapon, and I am proud that our committee made no cut in the Nike program, but that program does not possess the range which Bomarc offers. Bomarc, according to reliable data, will reach out into an area 400 miles from our own borders and to a height of 85,000 to 90,000 feet in the atmosphere.

Mr. Chairman, we simply have no other weapon available now or foreseeable which in the years immediately ahead will do the job for which Bomarc B is intended. Bomarc A is not under discussion, nor is it affected by this amendment.

I call your attention to the fact Bomarc A becomes operational in September 1959, this year. I call your attention to the fact that Bomarc B will become operational in March 1961, and that one installation a month will become functional beginning on that date. Bomarc B does have the capability to shoot down supersonic aircraft, it does carry an atomic warhead, it does have the potentiality to knock down entire formations of hostile aircraft.

There is not a miserable record of failure in connection with either Bomarc A or Bomarc B. More than 50 percent of the tests that have been conducted were successful, and for any new weapon a record of 50 percent is a very good one.

Until 1970 there is no evidence that manned aircraft will cease to be operational. We must maintain the best defenses we can against manned aircraft while they remain a threat to America's security. This has been a slow weapon to come into focus and into production. I recognize that it has been disappointingly slow, but this is a complex weapon. Frequently we have found that once a breakthrough is achieved, progress is thenceforth rapid. This was true of Thor, Atlas, and other weapons—all of them were disappointingly slow at one time.

If we do not spend this \$200 million we lose ability to procure this missile during the coming fiscal year and thereby take the risk of setting back the defenses of our cities and bases a full year. That is what we are being asked to do here.

We saved a billion dollars in this bill by cutting down on the number of manned interceptors we would have to buy if we did not buy the Bomarc B. Bomarc B is not an addition to our defenses, it is a replacement.

We may never have a need for this weapon. I hope we do not. But I want to be sure we do not fail to have all reasonable protection available for our people if it should be needed.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]. I rise in support of the position taken by the Committee on Appropriations. The reason is this: I believe there is an aircraft threat by the Soviet Union, a manned aircraft threat, that exists today and one that will exist at least until the late 1960's. This can be said for this reason, that the Furnas Committee report states—and if you have a chance to look at the people on the Furnas Committee, I think you will be impressed—that they are confident that intelligence estimates available to the panel have led to the conclusion that there will be a manned bomber threat at least until 1970. And, as long as we have that manned bomber threat, we have to face it with a mix of air defense weapons.

This graph shows in outline our plan for our air defense program. That area in brown will be defended by manned aircraft. At the present time they are F-101's and F-106's. We have some research and development money in this budget for a new manned aircraft, the F-108, that would have a longer range, greater speed, and greater altitude. But, that is only in research and development at the present time. This area which is shown in red is the range that will be covered by Bomarc A but more specifically by Bomarc B. This is a range out to approximately 400 miles.

These dots on the graph are the proposed sites for Bomarc A and Bomarc B. Those on the east coast, five of them, are Bomarc A sites. The first will be operational in September of 1959. The remainder will be coming along on a schedule of one each 3 or 4 months thereafter. The 16 Bomarc B sites will go into operation, the first one, in March 1961. They will become operational at the rate of one each month thereafter. They will all be operational by 1964 at a time when we still have a very substantial manned aircraft threat.

Now, if you knock out this \$200 million for Bomarc B, you might as well wipe out all of the area defended by the red except that on the east coast which will be defended by Bomarc A. If you approve this amendment to take \$200 million out of the bill, you can wipe off all of the protection you will get from Bomarc B, and Bomarc B is the only weapon

which gives you this vitally important protection or will give it to you starting in 1961.

I disapprove of the action taken by the Senate Committee on Armed Services where they have made a deep slash in the Nike programs. I believe in the Nike program. The Nike sites will protect our major population areas. I hope that the Congress will take remedial action to straighten out the situation caused by this action taken by the Senate subcommittee. Our action, if we approve this amendment, will be as wrong as the action taken by the Senate committee.

This amendment is the meat ax approach. I do not think any of us in this body are competent to decide on a very technical matter such as this. We have a responsibility to provide adequate funds for a good air defense program, and if we leave this money in the budget, a total of \$284 million for Bomarc, then the Secretary of Defense can make an intelligent decision as to which weapons, and in what mix, should be in our defense of depth. The Secretary of Defense has indicated in a communication dated May 11, 1959, "I have indicated above, and as I have indicated in my testimony, our concept of defense in depth leaves a place for both types of missile systems."

This was a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Military Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is defeated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to this controversy over the Bomarc and the question of our defense missiles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, yesterday on the floor of the House, I was amazed when one of my distinguished colleagues, who is an avowed supporter of the Air Force Bomarc program, said that the Bomarc B target seeker will be used on the Army's Hawk missile, which is a low-to-medium altitude field-type missile.

The reason for my amazement was that I know the Bomarc B has no perfected target seeker at this time. Numerous approaches have been made to the problem, but as yet there have been no proven successes. The Bomarc B target seeker which my distinguished colleague has apparently been led to believe is successful is undoubtedly one which is under development by Westinghouse. The technical principle involved in this device is entirely different from the one which is used in the Hawk.

Now, let me digress for a moment and emphasize that the Hawk missile used by the Army, and whose target seeker was first developed in 1952 by Raytheon, is a highly effective, operational system this day, and has been in operation for a considerable period of time. Whereas, the Bomarc B seeker is in the same state of development now as was the early

model of the Hawk seeker in 1952. That was 7 years ago.

Yet we hear that the Air Force Bomarc B seeker is indeed the best device possible for the use of the Army's Hawk. That suggestion, that the Bomarc B seeker be used in the highly efficient Hawk is just about as silly as the idea of a football coach at a junior high school offering one of his bench-warming eighth grade touchball players to the coach of the Cleveland Browns pro football team for use as the mainstay of that ragged group of men. It is just plain ridiculous.

I read one of the many voluminous press releases, which are ground out with regularity, that the Bomarc B was test-fired on May 27. We were told here on the floor of the House yesterday that this test firing was, and I quote, "entirely successful." I know that this test was far from successful—unless success means that it got off the launcher and then plunked down to earth again not far away.

I am tired of the Air Force making these highly ridiculous claims through their press agents, and their continuing efforts first to degrade and then later to capture the fine developments which the Army and the Navy have achieved in the missile field.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the floor of the House is hardly the place to make a technical decision so vital to the internal defense of our Nation.

Economy may be a desirable thing; we may welcome a balanced budget, but the greenbacks saved in this manner will not be useful in warding off an enemy air attack on our homeland—they will not shoot down a single plane.

I support the position of the committee in this matter. I feel we would be very unwise to make a technical decision here this afternoon as to the relative merits of the Nike-Zeus and the Bomarc missile. In my own layman's judgment I believe we would be wise to follow good military advice and until far more is known about this matter we should give adequate support to both of these air defense programs.

Both programs have much to recommend them. Until all the answers are available I feel it is the better part of wisdom, in the interest of the preservation of millions of American lives, to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

Much has been said pro and con regarding the general conclusions of the Furnas report. I should like to quote from the summary of that report:

The panel considers the Bomarc IM-99B an important element of continental air defense against the air-breathing threat. Because we are now facing this threat, it is of paramount importance that our defensive posture be improved as rapidly as possible. Hence, it is recommended that a limited, though vigorously expedited IM-99B program be pursued at this time. Deployment should be limited to locations on the perimeter of the area to be defended, as outlined in section 6 of this report. Deployment at sites in the interior is not recommended.

That, Mr. Chairman, comes from an able panel who knew what they were talking about.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] stated that at the proper time he intends to introduce an amendment to strike out \$200 million which is earmarked for the Bomarc missile.

I have some interest in this matter, Mr. Chairman, because the Boeing Co. which makes the Bomarc is located in a neighboring congressional district of mine and I am somewhat familiar with the controversy that has existed as between the Bomarc and the Nike-Hercules. Basically, of course, this is a conflict as between the military services. It is a fight between the Air Force and the Army, each of which desires to fill a certain mission in our overall defense picture.

As to the Nike-Hercules, I believe it is an excellent defensive missile. I have visited the Nike sites in my district and have been briefed on the capability of this particular weapon. I say nothing of a derogatory nature about it.

Of course, I was disappointed when the committee struck out certain funds requested by the Defense Department and recommended by the President for the Bomarc B. I would have liked to see the \$447 million that was in the budget included in the bill. However, when the committee reduced this to \$284 million I considered that it was doing what it thought proper and I was prepared to support the committee.

Now I have heard many statements about the lack of capability of the Bomarc. However, let me refer to the testimony of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], on this subject. He pointed out that Bomarc A last December intercepted a jet fighter traveling at 500 miles per hour at a range of 145 miles at an altitude of approximately 30,000 feet. I do not think that the record of tests from Bomarc A is anything except a good one. Furthermore, I believe the Bomarc B with its increased range of 400 miles and the increased capacity as to altitude certainly deserves support on this merit.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the committee in all respects and in particular hope that any attempt to reduce the appropriation for the Bomarc B will be defeated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, in a minute and a half I am not going to be able to say very much. I think I shall confine my remarks to commenting on the fantastic propaganda campaign which has been carried on against the Bomarc missile. I know that most of the members of this committee are not aware

of the incredible lengths to which the adherents of the Nike defense system have gone in their attempt to discredit the Bomarc. I think some of the methods used have been quite questionable; extremely questionable.

Of course, this is Army inspired. The Nike is an Army weapon, and if the Nike should be stricken out, the Army will be out of the missile business. So I can understand it.

Let me say that I am not one who proposes that the Nike should be eliminated. I think we need both of these weapons.

Mr. Chairman, this morning the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] was at his histrionic best.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I wish to record my vehement objection to this amendment. Rather than cut any more funds from the Bomarc program, I believe that this Committee has an obligation to restore those already deleted by the Appropriations Committee and to take a serious look at this whole Nike-Hercules-Bomarc controversy.

Never in all of my experience as a Congressman have I witnessed such a volume of claims and counterclaims as that surrounding the vital subject of the defense of the United States. And this, ladies and gentlemen, is the basic issue—what is the best defense system for the United States?

In order to answer that question, let us start by looking at the threat. The basic threat that exists today is Soviet bombers and known air-to-surface missiles. In addition, we know that the Russians are developing nuclear bombers and high-energy fuel bombers with supersonic speeds. This, then, is the airborne threat that Russia has today or will have in the coming years. We also know that Russia is busily engaged in developing and implementing production of a ballistic threat, or the intercontinental ballistic missile. Eventually, as the ICBM is improved in accuracy, range, and the technology required to make it a reliable weapon, it will replace the airborne threat. However, for today and a number of years to come, the airborne threat is still the most accurate and cheapest way to deliver a nuclear bomb.

Now, the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc are aimed at taking care of this airborne threat. They are not intended to tackle the ICBM's. So let us now examine just how these two weapons will accomplish their jobs. First of all, I am sure you will agree that we have to keep any nuclear explosion sufficiently far away so that its effects will not cause marked destruction of either property or life, either by action of the enemy or by our own action in destroying the carrier of such nuclear weapon. In order to do this, we have to effect the kill of the oncoming weapon warhead by destroying it before it reaches the target zone. The problem is further complicated by the fact that new weapons of the air-to-surface missile type are being developed which can be launched from bombers a number of hundreds of miles away. This means that in order to be sure that we get and kill the attack before it can hurt us we should kill the carrier before it releases its missile. This is the concept of any defense

weapon. If it does not do this job, it is not protecting the target area.

To understand this better, let us take a look at two targets—one a city and the other a SAC base. Both are protected by Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Bomarcs. The Bomarc uses the eyes of existing radars in early warning airplanes, picket ships, Texas towers and land-based radars. All of these provide the early detection that enables Bomarc to carry the battle as far out as possible. In contrast, the Nike-Hercules and Hawk depend on radars adjacent to their particular sites and therefore cannot take full advantage of the early warning airplanes, picket ships, and Texas tower type of radars. This brings up the first difference between the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc. The Bomarc, tying in with SAGE, uses farflung existing radar systems for early detection and control. The Nike-Hercules and Hawk depend upon individual radars, which, because they are located next to a battery, are very limited in line-of-sight, plus the fact that they can control only the weapon of that particular battery, and do not have the depth of early warning and control gained by an entire integrated radar network.

Secondly, we have the difference in range. Roughly, the range of the Nike-Hercules is 86 nautical miles and the altitude approximately 100,000 feet. The Hawk, which is designed to compensate for the lack of low-altitude capability on the part of the Nike-Hercules, has a maximum range of approximately 21 miles at its top altitude of 50,000 feet and approximately 12 miles at sea level. These two systems must go together to provide point defense from sea level to high altitude.

On the other hand, the high-altitude range of the Bomarc is more than 400 nautical miles, while its low-altitude capability is approximately 300 miles. This means that from the center point a Bomarc missile could go 400 miles at high altitudes in any direction and at low altitude approximately 300 miles in any direction. It gives protection from sea level to high altitude without adding any other missile.

Thirdly, we have the difference in manpower. To operate a Nike-Hercules battalion takes approximately 460 men. To operate a Hawk battalion requires approximately 400 men. To man a Bomarc base requires approximately 140 men.

Fourthly, we have the difference in cost. The average cost of a Nike battalion, based upon the number of battalions required to protect 62 targets in the United States, is \$67.5 million per battalion. The Hawk, based on the same ground rules, costs approximately \$70 million. The Bomarc costs approximately \$82.5 million for this same coverage. While the cost of the Bomarc is individually higher than either the Nike-Hercules or the Hawk, you must remember that the Nike-Hercules and the Hawk have to be combined to give you the same protection as the Bomarc. Therefore, the total figure for coverage by the Nike-Hercules and the Hawk is close to \$135 million, while the Bomarc will give you this same coverage for \$82.5 million.

In summary, I believe that the Bomarc weapon system will provide the best and cheapest air defense. We need a defense system to meet the manned-bomber threat which exists through 1970. The way to meet this threat effectively is to have a remote battle, one that keeps the destruction of the enemy and the blast effects of our own missiles away from our shores. It is also desirable to store air-defense-missile warheads away from our populated areas by remote deployment. And, finally, the Bomarc system provides the most economical way to achieve effective air defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

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

Mr. Chairman, like most Members of Congress, I am not a military expert. Therefore, on many items in this bill I must rely on the advice of members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee which year after year gives consideration to military matters.

I must oppose the amendment to strike from this bill the sum of \$200 million for Bomarc missiles. The Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and a majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee recommend funds for continued construction of Bomarc missiles.

If there is any question with respect to the effectiveness of the Bomarc we should resolve that question at this time in favor of the defense of our Nation. Let us not gamble with the security of our Nation by eliminating a missile which the Defense Department says we need.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the interservice competition is largely back of this amendment. I feel that I am not competent to pass on the merits of the two missiles. I am going to support the committee. I think it is very unfortunate that we on this floor should be in the position of having to try to settle a highly technical matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to argue or discuss the merits of this issue but to ask questions of either the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking minority member. Has any member of the subcommittee observed a successful firing of the Bomarc?

Mr. MAHON. The Bomarc has been tested for a number of years. It goes operational in units in September. I personally have not been present at any of the firings, but some of the other members perhaps have.

Mr. FORD. I have not seen a firing myself, but the record indicates that out of 54 firings against targets they have had 37 successful launchings, I think.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. I would like to say that the Bomarc B, which is the only weapon we are considering here today, has never been fully tested. They fired it on May 27, the night before the subcommittee met, and then grossly exaggerated what it did.

Mr. FLYNT. That was going to be substantially my next question. Have there been any successful firings of any significance of the Bomarc prior to the 27th of May?

Mr. FORD. I can say this, that that test was the first Bomarc B launching.

Mr. SIKES. There has to be a first of everything.

Mr. FORD. This was on a schedule that was set 12 months ago.

Mr. SIKES. There have been many successful firings of the Bomarc A. There has to be a first for everything, and this is the first of the Bomarc B.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question, which is not clear to me. Just what is the \$200 million that your amendment seeks to take out to be used for?

Mr. MINSHALL. The \$200 million, may I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, would be used solely for procurement.

Mr. BOW. That is for procurement of a missile that has not had but one unsuccessful test; is that correct?

Mr. MINSHALL. It was tested once and that was a very qualified success. I cannot repeat it here because the results are classified, but I can say the report which was published in the public press was highly exaggerated, and I saw the official results.

Mr. BOW. I understand the gentleman's amendment leaves the \$84 million in for the Bomarc B for further development; is that correct?

Mr. MINSHALL. Yes; for further testing and evaluation. It will in no way affect the testing and evaluation of this weapon. We are leaving that money in there, but we do not think we should spend \$200 million more for procurement and send more good money after bad.

Mr. BOW. To what extent will this delay the missile program?

Mr. MINSHALL. In my opinion and in the opinion of many military experts, it will not delay the Bomarc program one iota.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. It will delay the procurement of the Bomarc B for 1 full year thereby setting back the defenses of our cities and towns and bases 1 full year.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman believe that the Bomarc B will be successful or will we be providing money for a missile that has not yet been proven to be successful and which may not be successful.

Mr. SIKES. I have every reason to believe it should be successful. If it is not successful, the money does not have to be spent, but it would be held.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen of the committee are very fine and sincere men; thus I regret I must make the following statement.

I rise in defense of the amendment to exclude the moneys for the Bomarc program. Mr. Chairman, the Bomarc program is completely obsolete, and it appears that the proponents of this Bomarc program are thinking in terms of spending approximately \$12 billion by 1962 to make a weapon operational which was obsolete at its inception. According to the best estimates which I have been able to gather, it will take \$7½ billion additional funds—I said billion, Mr. Chairman—to finish the research and development program on the SAGE system, the central control system for Bomarc, and it will take more than \$3 billion additional in research and development funds in the Bomarc program.

It is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that this \$12 billion—if we must spend it—could very well be put into advanced research on defense weapons against the ICBM which travels above Mach 5. This is, and has been, a tragic waste of taxpayer's money.

What are some of the secrets of this weapon heretofore not generally made public?

From my research, I have discovered that there has been only one engagement by a Bomarc weapon against a supersonic target, and that one was unsuccessful. The Bomarc B is on the planning boards only. The Bomarc program was started in 1949 against a projected target 1955 style, so that today in 1959 we are talking about spending about \$12 billion, Mr. Chairman, for a weapon which was planned to meet its peak of efficiency in 1955, and 4 years later is still not operational. The 400-mile range is free flying, not on target. An engineer's dream. Not 400 miles and intercept.

What are the weaknesses of this weapons system? The first point that we have to make immediately is its limited altitude range, the ultimate range of which is slightly in excess of 60,000 feet. By the best estimates 40,000 feet is the maximum effective range, and again it is not operational today. This is only projected thinking. The ramjet engine which it has obviously indicates that it has to have air to breathe, and this is the reason for its limited altitude. Compare this to the rocket engine of the Hercules complex which has a maximum altitude of somewhere around 150,000 or more feet.

Further, it is a slow-speed weapon which is indicated by the fact that it has not made a supersonic kill as yet. About 2.7 Mach.

Another weakness of this system it appears to me is the recognition of the guidance and centralized control system needed for the Bomarc. It becomes completely inoperable if the SAGE system is knocked out. This can be a very

dangerous thing to have a country depending upon this weapon for defense, even if we project ourselves to the time when it will be operational if we must rely on a guidance and computing system which can be made useless so easily.

Contrast the Nike-Herc system with Missile Master Guidance System which has its own operational centralized control system. Each battalion in the Nike-Herc system has its own target-acquiring control and target-tracking control. This is completely the opposite to the SAGE system which has a centralized control for the entire system in the Bomarc program.

The proponents of the Bomarc system seem to sell it on the strength of its great range, but I would like to ask, with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, "What good is range, if when it gets there it can't hit the target?" It is like sending a boy to a dry well for a drink of water—only in this case, the defense of our country is what is at stake.

And, as it stands, the SAGE system tests have shown that it cannot support the Bomarc at extreme range. It does not have enough definitive warning at this great distance, and again we are talking about a theoretical maximum distance of 400 miles, and we are still talking about a ramjet engine which limits its speed and its altitude.

Now, what about the cost of maintaining a Bomarc B squadron? According to the best estimates the Bomarc B squadron with 60 missiles will cost about \$2 million. For contrast purposes only, the Nike-Herc battalions of 84 missiles each will cost about \$70,000. Or, in other words, we can have 30 Nike-Herc battalions for the same cost as 1 Bomarc squadron. Common sense dictates my thinking as to which I would prefer to have.

In other words we can put out 2,400 Nike-Hercs for the price of 60 Bomarc. Let us scatter these out wider. A proven system operational today.

Not the Bomarc which the great DAN FLOOD so eloquently said, "Hasn't even shot down a starling." One of the gentlemen suggested yesterday that the Bomarc B was using the same seeker in its nose as the Hawk. I believe the Hawk is using a rather seeker. Westinghouse is building the Bomarc seeker and hopes to test it this fall. It terrifies me when I think what will happen when we rely on the too automatic dream world created by the supporters of Boeing Aircraft Corp. and the Bomarc program. Remember, obsolete today, but not in sight until 1964.

I sincerely hope the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is agreed to.

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

Mr. WOLF. I must yield to my colleague since he has been so very kind to me, but, as the gentleman knows, our time is very, very limited.

Mr. SIKES. The SAGE program is not intended primarily for Bomarc. It uses the SAGE program thereby avoiding the expense of a separate guidance program for Bomarc. The SAGE program is part of the warning network and interceptor control system of the Nation and is not intended primarily

for Bomarc. It is considered a necessary facility whether or not we have the Bomarc program.

Mr. WOLF. May I ask the gentleman from Florida in return what would the SAGE program do if it is proven that the Bomarc is worthless? What would its service be then?

Mr. SIKES. It would do exactly what it is intended to do, regardless of whether Bomarc continues in the defense system. SAGE is part of the warning network of the Nation and has an important function in the guidance of our aircraft.

Mr. WOLF. Is it as expensive a program without the Bomarc involved?

Mr. SIKES. It would be at a comparatively lower operating cost but there would be no major difference in the installation costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I must rise to take vigorous issue with this radical and dangerous proposal to strike out the procurement funds for the Bomarc missile.

First, this action would dramatically undercut the U.S. defense posture at a critical time, just at this very time Secretary McElroy and Secretary Herter are both in Europe and our negotiations with the Communists over Berlin must be backed by a display of our military determination.

The Bomarc missile has been studied and restudied by military committees, and the development and procurement of the missile has been consistently recommended. The Weapons System Evaluation Group, currently headed by an admiral, recommended that the Bomarc be stepped up. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and Secretary McElroy have also supported the green light on Bomarc development.

Thus to strike out procurement funds now would be premature. Furthermore, I understand Secretary McElroy has promised Congress within about a week and a half a complete overall air defense plan.

Second, it should be made clear that the Bomarc is not a duplication of the Nike system, but is, to the contrary, a distinct complement to the Nike system, with abilities that the Nike system does not have. Let me explain. The Nike includes three series; the Ajax, which replaces antiaircraft defenses for point defense; the Hercules, which is also for point defense and has a range of approximately 75-85 miles. This, of course, is a last-ditch effort, and far too close for comfort. We must have weapons which will down enemy aircraft long before they get within 75 miles of a city.

The Nike-Zeus is designed to destroy intercontinental ballistic missiles. It will be good for long ranges and go very high. On the other hand the Bomarc is designed for air-breathing vehicles. The A which has a liquid fuel booster and then cruises with ramjet power has a range of 200 miles. The B which has a solid fuel booster and then cruises with ramjet engine has a range of 400 miles. While cruising these can be maneuvered, which the Nike missile cannot. The B

therefore will be able to destroy enemy aircraft at a much greater distance from the target than the Nike, Ajax, or Hercules could do, and the Nike-Zeus would not be suitable at all for antiaircraft.

Some of my colleagues who favor striking the Bomarc procurement funds apparently believe that there is no need for us to defend ourselves against aircraft because of the coming missile age. However, this is fallacious for two reasons. The first is that the groups which have access to all of the American intelligence about the Russian military potential and plans, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Weapons System Evaluation Group, know best the nature of the threat to the United States and they strongly endorse the Bomarc missile as a necessary part of our defense structure. The second is because we would be inviting Soviet air attack by planes if we do not prepare a defense against aircraft.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. I yield.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one more point, if I can. I thank the gentleman from Montana for yielding to me. Some of the discussion here today has referred to the cost of these two programs. You can set up a battalion of Nike-Hercs which is 84 missiles for \$70,000 approximately and a squadron of Bomarc when they are operational, which they are not today, of 60 for about \$2 million. Now you can have 2,400 missiles, Nike-Herc missiles, for the price of 60 Bomarc. Suppose you were to scatter these out over this area. You are going to cover more with these 2,400 Nike-Herc missiles. You cannot take it out in the Atlantic but you have the Polaris out there that we are providing money for. I think these are some of the things that should be thought about here very carefully. As I say, we are not talking about \$200 million here about the Bomarc but \$12 billion. It is a boondoggle and has been a boondoggle from the start. In 1949 when they started this program for a missile which was supposed to be operational against a target date of 1955 and it is not today in 1959 operational. Again I remind you that it will be 1964 before it will be fully operational and on site and I fear then we will be worrying about an ICBM which will travel at 2 times the speed of the Bomarc. This, of course, will eliminate the Bomarc as a defensive weapon against the ICBM.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense asked the Congress to put both feet of the Department of Defense to the fire as regards this country's air defense system. In my opinion the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense started to put the feet of the Defense Department to the fire but they only went half way. I would like to read to you from page 16 of this committee report, which supports my position. It states:

The committee would be willing to appropriate the full budget estimate and more if it had full confidence in the proposed Bo-

marc missile—if it had the assurance that the system would actually work. The contractor for this missile has already received over a period of years commitments in excess of \$1,100 million. Before further commitments and expenditures pile up, a new hard look should be given to the proposed Bomarc and the whole air defense problem.

In this particular case our subcommittee was unanimous in providing all of the money necessary for research and testing; but certainly by giving half the money requested to set up a production line I think we are taking one foot of the Defense Department away from the fire. The Minshall amendment makes the Department of Defense face up to this air defense problem and come to the Congress before this bill is enacted into law with a firm decision.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the figures in regard to the Bomarc program will be found in the discussion yesterday in the House. This issue was discussed for several hours. The committee report which begins on page 14 under the heading "Air Defense" covers the situation. The gentleman from Wisconsin has quoted from this section of the report.

We did strike out \$162.7 million of budgeted funds for the Bomarc missile in order to compel a decision.

Secretary McElroy has sent word to the Congress that a decision will be forthcoming with respect to air defense within the next 10 days.

It seems to me that under the circumstances the committee action is as good a compromise, as to how this matter should be handled, as could be obtained.

This is not a new missile. The Bomarc B is a follow-on to Bomarc A. This missile has been in production in one form or another, or under research and development, for about 8 years, and the major and the important technological questions have already been solved.

We are trying to telescope time in the Bomarc program in order to give us some degree of air defense. We did that last year with the Polaris missile; we are doing it in this bill with the Atlas and other missiles. It is simply a matter of trying to gain time from the beginning of research to the production of an operational missile.

I hope the Committee will vote down the Minshall amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired, all time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MINSHALL) there were—ayes 51, noes 178.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS, MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The appropriation to the Department of Defense for "Construction of ships, Military

Sea Transportation Service," shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1959.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANTANGELO: On page 25, after line 17, add new section, as follows:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 301. None of the funds contained in this Title may be used to enter into a contract with any person, organization, company or concern which provides compensation to a retired or inactive military or naval general officer who has been an active member of the military forces of the United States within 5 years of the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is subject to a point of order. I have not seen a copy of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making a point of order? If so, will he state it?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I will reserve a point of order.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to eliminate influence by retired military officers above the rank of colonel and to reduce the cost of our defense program. It will permit those who grant procurement contracts to let them without offending their former bosses or colleagues.

It has become rather general practice for high-ranking military officers to accept important positions in defense industry after their retirement from active military service. We have approved the budget request of 715 million for retired pay of military personnel. Retired officers receive substantial retirement benefits. In some cases such officials take positions with companies which have large contracts for the furnishing of war materiel to the Defense Department.

There can be little doubt that this is a very unhealthy situation and should be changed immediately. It can have a very definite effect on contracting policies and procedures within the Defense Department. It can result in unnecessary expenditures and waste.

Persons within the Department who may be looking forward to possible employment within a certain organization after retirement can display partiality and favoritism without ever realizing it. Further, prominent military figures in retirement can have a great influence over their former subordinates who are still in the Department. Contact at social and professional gatherings between active and retired officers can provide a perfectly natural setting for influence and favoritism.

Past history before the Renegotiation Board indicates that defense contractors have made excessive profits. Last year, procurement contractors voluntarily or involuntarily disgorged \$112 million. During the past 10 years since the creation of the Renegotiation Board our Government has recovered or recouped over a billion and a half in excess profits. From the nature of things, excess profits are concomitants to negotiated con-

tracts and letter contracts, they follow when bids are noncompetitive. In our haste to be efficient, we have become shamefully prodigal.

Of the President's \$77-billion budget for 1960, \$45,805 million goes to national security programs. Of the \$45,805 million, \$13,938 million is allocated to procurement, the purchase of aircraft, missiles, ships, and other military equipment. A great bulk of this \$13,978 goes to contractors producing planes or missiles. About 10 companies received the bulk of negotiated contracts. Page 68 of hearings which deal with procurement discloses what defense contractors received in 1958:

ADVERTISED VERSUS NEGOTIATED PROCUREMENT
(Extent of single source procurement, fiscal year 1958)

The total value of Air Force single source procurement on negotiated contracts during fiscal year 1958 was \$9,221,542,000 (AF-N27 report). This was made up of \$4,668,134,000 of amendatory actions pursuant to the terms of existing negotiated contracts and \$4,553,408,000 of new procurements negotiated with a single source. Of the total of the single source procurement, \$6,672,791,430 or 72.3 percent was effected with 10 contractors. Those 10 contractors are our major source of aircraft, missiles, installed systems, and ground radar. The 10 contractors and the value of the procurement placed with each is as follows:

Boeing: Bomarc, B-52, KC-135, Minuteman	\$2,209,793,957
Douglas: C-133, Thor, Genie	386,735,577
General Dynamics: B-58, X-15, F-106, Atlas	1,268,395,457
General Electric: ASG-14 fire control, J-79 and J-58 engines, guidance systems, nose cones, FPS-6 ground radar	654,795,742
Hughes: ASQ-25, MG-13, MA-1 fire control systems, Falcon	385,381,034
Lockheed: F-104, C-130, system 417L, reconnaissance missile	557,982,372
Martin: Titan, Mace	166,916,863
McDonnell: F-101	260,574,882
North American: B-70, F-100, F-108, propulsion units for Thor, Atlas, Jupiter, guidance systems, Hound Dog	501,607,864
Republic: F-105	280,607,682
Total	6,672,791,430

What has been the development of these defense contractors?

Let us take three companies. Boeing from 1952 to 1958 was able to increase its capital investment on the basis of profits made almost entirely from Government contracts from \$34 million to \$145 million. In 1958, Boeing made \$29 million profits after taxes. Who are their public relations men, who are the retired officers on their payroll?

Douglas Aircraft in 1953 had a private capital investment of \$53 million. In 1957, Douglas had a private capital investment of \$111 million and made a profit of \$30,665,000 after taxes. Who are their public relations men—who are the retired military or naval personnel on their payroll?

Lockheed in 1953 had a private capital investment of \$57 million. Today it has a private capital investment of \$129 million. In 1958, after taxes, they made

a profit of \$18,556,000. Who are their public relations men, who are the retired military or naval officers on their payroll?

The committee report on page 42 clearly indicates that policy decisions by the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not taken and infers that their indecision is influenced by industrial contractors. The committee report demonstrates their concern about the influence of retired personnel on procurement of contracts by defense contractors. Why this indecision which is so costly? I do not hazard a reason but I can surmise.

Why do these industrial contractors engage or hire retired military or naval officers at inordinate salaries? Is it because of their technical knowledge or is it because of their relationship with their former colleagues or former subordinates who are at the levers of control? This amendment seeks to minimize that influence by denying funds to a defense contractor who engages a retired general officer within 5 years from date of retirement solely for purposes of capturing contracts.

Further, it seems that most of these contracts are going to companies who have their plants out West. Eastern contractors are losing their work and the loss of contracts is depressing areas in the East, in New York and Maryland. This amendment will give all companies an equal chance without interference by retired officer personnel.

My proposal is similar to legislation which makes it illegal for an Internal Revenue agent to handle private tax cases during a period of 3 years after leaving that organization.

I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order. I agree that there are abuses indicated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. I think those abuses should be corrected. But, I think at this point, this is the wrong way to do it, and for that reason I make the point of order. In my opinion, this amendment or this limitation places additional burdens on the executive branch of the Government which are not now required by law, and therefore it is legislation on an appropriation bill; therefore subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SANTANGELO. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is not legislation upon an appropriation bill. This is a limitation of expenditures and restrictions as to the way they shall spend these funds, and it is in no wise legislation. I submit it does not violate the parliamentary rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order on the basis presented by the gentleman from Michigan that this would impose additional duties upon the Department of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] offered an amendment in

the nature of an addition to the pending bill by adding a new section, the language of which was reported with the amendment: None of the funds contained in this title may be used to enter into a contract with any person, organization, company, or concern which provides compensation to a retired or inactive military or naval general officer who has been an active member of the military forces of the United States within 5 years of the date of enactment of this act, to which amendment the gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

It is obvious that the intent of this amendment is to impose a limitation on the expenditure of the funds here appropriated, and while the point might be made that imposing limitations will impose additional burdens, it is nevertheless the opinion of the Chair clearly a limitation on expenditures, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is with some reluctance that I oppose this amendment offered by my friend and colleague from New York, because I believe there are certain cases to which he has referred in which this has been a serious problem. But, I think there are two points that ought to be borne in mind by the House. In the first place, we are denying to our defense industries, if this amendment goes into effect, the services and assistance of the very people who have had the most experience in the fields of weapons and related matters to which the Government looks to such contractors. If this amendment were to go through in this extreme form, we would actually be jeopardizing our own national defense. We would be throwing out the baby with the bath. Secondly, this House not too long ago adopted the so-called "hump" bill for the Navy, and we are expected soon to be presented with a similar piece of legislation for the Air Force, under which valuable officers in the higher ranks will be forced to retire before their time with a lesser return in retirement pay. If this amendment were to be adopted, therefore, we would be foreclosing to these loyal officers, many with families still to educate, the chance of entering certain fields of gainful employment after their forced retirement, particularly those fields where they are best qualified and best able to serve. How can we force loyal officers to retire, and then deny them a chance to find a living in those very civilian fields which are most likely to be open to them?

Mr. Chairman, this, I think, would work a serious injustice to these officers

and would impair our national defense. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point a portion of page 42 of the report on this bill in which the Department of Defense is called upon to supply the names of military personnel working for defense contractors:

The committee is seriously concerned over problems which arise as a result of the acceptance by retired senior officers of employment in responsible executive positions with defense contractors. The problem has been discussed within the committee over a period of years. Hearings before the House Armed Services Committee in previous years have been consulted. The committee is advised that further hearings before the House Armed Services Committee are scheduled for the near future. As a prelude to further analysis of this problem, the Office of the Secretary of Defense is requested to supply the committee, prior to the 1961 appropriation hearings, with a list of retired officers of or above the rank of colonel, or the equivalent, employed by persons or firms having contracts with the Department of Defense or any of its agencies.

The Office of the Secretary should also be prepared to discuss its lack of a Defense-wide policy in this matter, as well as its interpretation of the force and effect of section 281 of title 18, United States Code.

Representatives of this committee have been in touch with members of the Committee on Armed Services, particularly the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], who is about to start a series of hearings on this issue looking toward necessary legislation in this field. This matter was explored by the Committee on Armed Services of the House a few years ago. Hundreds of pages of testimony were taken.

This issue is not as plain, simple, or uncomplicated as it may appear on the surface. It seems to me that this is quite drastic action to be taking here on this appropriation bill without the benefit of adequate testimony.

I realize that this amendment has considerable appeal, and I realize that my able friend from New York is seeking to do a good service. But I am sure he would not want to take steps that he might later find to be undesirable and injurious to the cause of national defense. So I hope that this amendment will be voted down, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] and those associated with him on the committee will be able to come up with legislation dealing with this very delicate and difficult problem.

There is an area here for something to be done. I believe that the interest which has been shown in this matter and the action here on the floor today will tend to bring into focus the issue and help to bring about some sort of decision on the issue.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. Recently I had the opportunity to talk with a colonel who is considered to be one of the outstand-

ing nuclear men in our Armed Forces. He was telling me about a great personal problem that he had. He had been educated at West Point at the expense of the Government, then sent to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and then to California Institute of Technology. He is indeed a great expert in his field.

He told me that he had over 20 years in service and was entitled to retirement at the present time. He said, "I have a family of four youngsters all going to high school at the present time, about ready to go to college. I have the opportunity to retire and to go to work for one of the larger companies at a salary twice what I am now receiving. To whom do I owe the obligation? Do I owe it to the country who gave me my education, who sent me to MIT and to Cal. Tech., and for whom I have worked through the years? Or do I owe the obligation to my family, to take my pension and go out into newer fields where I can double my salary?"

I think there is a tremendous amount of merit in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It is high time, some provision was made to prevent the industries doing business with the Government from pirating the brains of our Armed Forces.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I cannot yield further. I want the Members of the House to vote their own convictions on this difficult matter. My question is, Is this too hasty and is this too severe under all the circumstances without any hearings or further consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 130, noes 131.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SANTANGELO and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time so that I might ask the chairman of this Appropriations Subcommittee for an answer to the following question: I am reading from a letter that was transmitted from Chief of Transportation of the Army to the commanding officer of Military Sea Transport. Military Sea Transport has the responsibility of transporting our troops and supplies to troops. This letter states:

Air transportation as the primary mode of transportation to and from overseas for Army passenger movements in peacetime is under active consideration.

For discontinuance, it is planned, commencing with the month of October 1959, to decrease surface movement by approximately 10 percent and increase air movements by this amount. Similar transfers

will be made in succeeding months and all surface movements phased to the irreducible minimum.

I want to ask the chairman of this committee: Have funds been put into this bill to transport the Army personnel, and the dependents of the Army, by air in lieu of available transportation by MST and private modes of transportation on the high seas?

Mr. MAHON. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], one of the senior members of the committee, for his comment in regard to the problem.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, this is the question: If this is the intent I think the Merchant Marine Committee should be told about it, because it is our responsibility to keep a certain amount of ships available for the national defense in the case of an emergency, and I am wondering whether you plan a program to move the entire Army in a case of emergency by air. If you do, that is one thing; but if you are going to cut out this peacetime movement, then how in the world do you expect private industry and MST to be available at the time of emergency when you need them for great movements of national defense forces?

Mr. SIKES. May I say to the gentleman that there is money in the bill, of course, as the gentleman realizes, for the transportation of personnel as we have carried it heretofore. We have not attempted to specify to the services what mode of transportation they should use; we have left it generally to the services to attempt to find the most economical mode of transportation.

The gentleman may have noted on page 25 of the bill that \$1 billion is appropriated to the Department of Defense for the construction of ships for military sea transportation, sea transport service. He probably is interested in that item also.

Mr. BONNER. I am going to ask about that later, but I think this question should be answered either by somebody on this committee if you have taken charge of the Army in its movements and its regulation, or at least it should be answered by the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In the testimony it shows that the MATS operation for fiscal 1960 planned to spend exactly the same amount for passenger ton miles in fiscal 1960 that they are spending in fiscal 1959; and they also indicate the same for commercial aircraft. In other words, there is not going to be any build-up in fiscal 1960 either on commercial aircraft or on MATS over what they are doing in fiscal 1959.

Mr. BONNER. I am glad that the gentleman has made this contribution. However, may I say that this letter is signed by Maj. Gen. F. S. Besson, Jr., Chief of Transportation for the Army. He says he is going to keep all transportation to a minimum conventional sea service and put it all in the air. That is the reason I asked the question.

I would like to say there is nothing whatever in the report about this section of military sea transport and I

thought that had some connection with this.

Mr. Chairman, the letter I referred to above is as follows:

APRIL 27, 1959.

To: Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Department of Army policy on use of air transportation for passengers.

1. Air transportation as the primary mode of transportation to and from overseas for Army passenger movements in peacetime is under active consideration. Under this plan, all military personnel and their dependents will be furnished air transportation except in cases where air transportation is not suitable or available, or is medically contraindicated or when dependents refuse to travel by air.

2. It is planned, commencing with the month of October 1959, to decrease surface movements by approximately 10 percent and increase air movements by this amount. Similar transfers will be made in succeeding months and all surface movements phased to the irreducible minimum by July 1, 1960. Revised estimates of requirements reflecting these adjustments will be furnished in the near future.

3. In order to plan for the orderly transition from a surface and air to a maximum air passenger movement program, a meeting will be held in the Office, Chief of Transportation, room G-824, building T-7, at 1330 hours May 1, 1959.

4. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the various implications adoption of this plan will have on your operations.

5. It is requested that the names of representatives of your organization who will attend this meeting be furnished Lieutenant Colonel Harding, extension 50600, as soon as possible.

F. S. BESSON, Jr.,

Major General, United States Army,
Chief of Transportation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word so that the gentleman from North Carolina may continue his line of questioning. Does the gentleman want to ask me something about the section on the construction of ships?

Mr. BONNER. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. There is nothing in the report about it.

Mr. BONNER. No; there is nothing in the report.

Mr. SIKES. I will be glad to explain the action of the committee. The gentleman is discussing an item which appears on page 25 of the bill, which says:

The appropriation to the Department of Defense for "Construction of ships, Military Sea Transportation Service," shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1959.

May I say that this item was in an appropriation. The gentleman is an expert in this matter, and the program provided for the construction of commercial ships and high-speed tankers which could not be satisfied from existing sources. As indicated by the Department of Defense, no further program of this type is contemplated and the remaining money would, therefore, revert to the Treasury. That may possibly have some connection with the matter the gentleman brought up insofar as this committee is concerned. While there is no reference made in the report, this committee is concerned with items of expense for transportation and would be seriously concerned with the adoption by the Department of Defense of any

mobile transportation more costly than is now being used. I am glad the gentleman calls this to the attention of the committee, and I am sure the committee will inquire if the result would produce higher costs.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman. The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, \$150,000,000, and in addition not to exceed \$150,000,000 to be used upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such funds can be wisely, profitably, and practically used in the interest of national defense and to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the current fiscal year as the Secretary of Defense may designate: *Provided*, That any appropriations transferred shall not exceed 7 per centum of the appropriation from which transferred.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for its statement on page 48 in regard to the disposition of surplus property. The point I want to drive home is the amount of surplus involved. The testimony indicated that \$26.7 billion worth of material is presently awaiting disposition. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], myself, and others, have been very much interested in this problem of procurement, and this is a demonstration at the other end of the line of the surplus that is generated. I have tried to point out in the past 2 or 3 years that we are generating surplus at the rate of about \$7 billion or \$8 billion a year that we dispose of, getting about 8 cents on the dollar. So, if anyone thinks there is not considerable room for improvement in our procurement practices, just think of this \$26.7 billion of property that is ready to be disposed of at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the remainder of the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEUGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 392, nays 3, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—393

- | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abbutt | Cederberg | Green, Pa. |
| Abernethy | Celler | Griffin |
| Addonizio | Chelf | Griffiths |
| Albert | Chiperfield | Gross |
| Alexander | Church | Gubser |
| Alford | Clark | Hagen |
| Alger | Coffin | Haley |
| Allen | Cohelan | Hall |
| Andersen, Minn. | Collier | Halleck |
| Anderson, Mont. | Colmer | Halpern |
| Andrews | Conte | Hardy |
| Anfuso | Cook | Hargis |
| Arends | Cooley | Harris |
| Ashley | Corbett | Healey |
| Ashmore | Cramer | Hébert |
| Aspinall | Cunningham | Hechler |
| Auchincloss | Curtin | Henderson |
| Avery | Curtis, Mass. | Herlong |
| Ayres | Curtis, Mo. | Hess |
| Bailey | Daddario | Hiestand |
| Baker | Dague | Hoeven |
| Baldwin | Daniels | Hoffman, Ill. |
| Barden | Davis, Ga. | Hoffman, Mich. |
| Baring | Davis, Tenn. | Hogan |
| Barr | Dawson | Holifield |
| Barrett | Delaney | Holland |
| Barry | Dent | Holt |
| Bass, N.H. | Derounian | Holtzman |
| Bass, Tenn. | Derwinski | Horan |
| Bates | Dingell | Hosmer |
| Becker | Dixon | Huddleston |
| Beckworth | Dollinger | Hull |
| Belcher | Donohue | Ikard |
| Bennett, Fla. | Dooley | Irwin |
| Bennett, Mich. | Dorn, N.Y. | Jarman |
| Bentley | Dorn, S.C. | Jennings |
| Berry | Dowdy | Jensen |
| Betts | Downing | Johnson |
| Blatnik | Doyle | Johnson, Calif. |
| Blitch | Dulski | Johnson, Md. |
| Boland | Dwyer | Johnson, Wis. |
| Bolton | Elliott | Jonas |
| Bonner | Everett | Jones, Ala. |
| Bow | Fallon | Jones, Mo. |
| Boykin | Farbsteln | Judd |
| Boyle | Fascell | Karsten |
| Brademas | Feighan | Karth |
| Bray | Fenton | Kasem |
| Breeding | Fino | Kastenmeier |
| Brewster | Fisher | Kearns |
| Brock | Flood | Kee |
| Brooks, La. | Flynn | Keith |
| Brooks, Tex. | Flynt | Kelly |
| Broomfield | Fogarty | Keogh |
| Brown, Ga. | Foley | Kilburn |
| Brown, Mo. | Forand | Kilday |
| Brown, Ohio | Ford | Kilgore |
| Broyhill | Fountain | King, Calif. |
| Budge | Frazier | King, Utah |
| Burdick | Frelinghuysen | Kirwan |
| Burke, Ky. | Friedel | Kitchin |
| Burke, Mass. | Fulton | Kowalski |
| Burleson | Gallagher | Lafore |
| Bush | Garmatz | Laird |
| Byrne, Pa. | Gary | Landrum |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Gathings | Lane |
| Cahill | Gavin | Langen |
| Cannon | George | Lankford |
| Carnahan | Gialmo | Latta |
| Carter | Glenn | Lennon |
| Casey | Goodell | Lesinski |
| | Granahan | Levering |
| | Grant | Libonati |
| | Gray | Lindsay |

- | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Lipscomb | Osmers | Siler |
| Loser | Ostertag | Simpson, Ill. |
| McCormack | Passman | Sisk |
| McCulloch | Patman | Slack |
| McDonough | Pelly | Smith, Calif. |
| McDowell | Perkins | Smith, Iowa |
| McGinley | Pfost | Smith, Kans. |
| McGovern | Philbin | Smith, Miss. |
| McIntire | Pilcher | Smith, Va. |
| McMillan | Pirnie | Spence |
| McSween | Poage | Springer |
| Macdonald | Poff | Staggers |
| Machrowicz | Porter | Steed |
| Mack, Ill. | Preston | Stratton |
| Mack, Wash. | Price | Stubblefield |
| Madden | Prokop | Sullivan |
| Magnuson | Pucinski | Taber |
| Mahon | Quie | Taylor |
| Maillard | Quigley | Teague, Calif. |
| Marshall | Rabaut | Teague, Tex. |
| Martin | Rains | Teller |
| Matthews | Randall | Thomas |
| Meador | Ray | Thompson, Tex. |
| Merrow | Reece, Tenn. | Thompson, Wyo. |
| Metcalf | Rees, Kans. | Thornberry |
| Michel | Reuss | Toll |
| Miller, Clem | Rhodes, Ariz. | Tollefson |
| Miller, | Rhodes, Pa. | Trimble |
| George P. | Riehlman | Tuck |
| Miller, N.Y. | Riley | Udall |
| Milliken | Rivers, Alaska | Ullman |
| Mills | Rivers, S.C. | Utt |
| Minshall | Roberts | Vanik |
| Mitchell | Robison | Van Felt |
| Moeller | Rodino | Van Zandt |
| Monagan | Rogers, Colo. | Vinson |
| Montoya | Rogers, Fla. | Wainwright |
| Moore | Rogers, Mass. | Walter |
| Moorhead | Rogers, Tex. | Wampler |
| Morgan | Rooney | Watts |
| Morris, N. Mex. | Roosevelt | Weaver |
| Morris, Okla. | Rostenkowski | Weiss |
| Moss | Roush | Westland |
| Moulder | Rutherford | Whitener |
| Mumma | St. George | Whitten |
| Murphy | Santangelo | Widnall |
| Murray | Saund | Wier |
| Natcher | Saylor | Willis |
| Nelsen | Schenck | Wilson |
| Nix | Scherer | Winstead |
| Norblad | Schwengel | Wolf |
| Norrell | Scott | Wright |
| O'Brien, Ill. | Selden | Yates |
| O'Brien, N.Y. | Shelley | Young |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Sheppard | Younger |
| O'Hara, Mich. | Shipley | Zablocki |
| O'Neill | Short | Zelenko |
| Oliver | Sikes | |

NAYS—3

Harmon Johnson, Colo. Meyer

NOT VOTING—39

- | | | |
|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Adair | Durham | May |
| Baumhart | Edmondson | Morrison |
| Boggs | Evins | Multer |
| Bolling | Forrester | O'Konski |
| Bowles | Green, Ore. | Pillion |
| Buckley | Harrison | Powell |
| Canfield | Hays | Simpson, Pa. |
| Chamberlain | Hemphill | Thompson, La. |
| Chenoweth | Jackson | Thompson, N.J. |
| Coad | Kluczynski | Wallhauser |
| Denton | Knox | Wharton |
| Devine | McFall | Williams |
| Diggs | Mason | Withdraw |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Buckley with Mr. Adair.
- Mr. Boggs with Mr. Wallhauser.
- Mr. Morrison with Mr. Withdraw.
- Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Jackson.
- Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Devine.
- Mr. Coad with Mr. Baumhart.
- Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Chamberlain.
- Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Wharton.
- Mr. Durham with Mr. Canfield.
- Mr. Multer with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
- Mr. Forrester with Mr. Mason.
- Mr. Williams with Mr. Knox.
- Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Chenoweth.
- Mr. Harrison with Mr. Pillion.
- Mr. Denton with Mr. O'Konski.
- Mr. Powell with Mrs. May.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include pertinent excerpts; and I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

WEST VIRGINIA IS GETTING SHORT CHANGED

Mr. HECHLER. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed a bill carrying billions of dollars for the national defense and security of our country.

It was with some misgivings that I voted for this bill, realizing as I do that West Virginia will be far down near the bottom of the list in military installations, personnel, and expenditures resulting from this appropriation.

There have been some Members of the House who have chided me in a friendly way about my campaign to reduce this outrageous discrimination against West Virginia. Some of my colleagues have kidded me by saying I was interested in some kind of pork barrel for West Virginia. All I can say is that we are reaching the bottom of another kind of barrel in many communities of my State.

We are not asking for pork-barrel handouts; all we are asking for in West Virginia is an even break when it comes to locating defense installations and defense contracts.

But what has happened in the five States bordering West Virginia? Ohio, with 4 times the population of West Virginia, has over 30 times as many active-duty military personnel, 40 times as many civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and 16 times as many active military installations.

Pennsylvania, which is 5 times as large in population as West Virginia, has over 25 times as many active-duty military personnel, 60 times as many civilian employees in the Department of Defense, and 30 times as many active major military installations.

Virginia, with 50 percent more population than West Virginia, has 140 times as many active-duty military personnel, 70 times as many civilian employees in the Department of Defense, and 37 times as many active major military installations.

The same facts in relative degrees hold true for the other two bordering States of Maryland and Kentucky.

I listened today, Mr. Speaker, to the debates on this military appropriation bill. I heard some of my colleagues state that in their view the national defense was an issue which should be approached from a national standpoint, and that it was inimical to the interests of our national security to consider the claims of States and areas.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is all very fine doctrine in the abstract. But I also submit that when there are flagrant discriminations against a single State, as in the case of West Virginia, it is high time for someone to blow the whistle and put a stop to this discrimination. For the strength of our national defense, Mr. Speaker, is tied in with the strength of the Nation. If one area or State in the Nation is neglected, overlooked, underprivileged, and deprived of virtually everything which other States and areas receive, the whole Nation will eventually and inevitably suffer.

West Virginians are a proud people, Mr. Speaker. We can take it. We are used to standing on our own feet. Our State motto is "Montani Semper Liberi"—"Mountaineers Are Always Free". But you cannot push us around this way much longer and expect the Nation's defense to grow stronger.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he can advise us what the program will be for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow we will consider the water pollution bill.

On Friday, we will take up the public works appropriation bill, and I would like to meet Friday at 11 o'clock.

Any rollcall on tomorrow or Friday with the exception of a rollcall on a rule will go over until Tuesday of next week. That will apply also to Monday of next week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Friday at 11 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why I made the request now while my friend was present, so he could ask about it if he wished to.

Mr. GROSS. I ask why we should meet at 11 o'clock Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The public works bill I expect will be debated considerably and we want to dispose of it that day.

Suppose we let my request go until tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

MICROFILMING OF THE JAMES MADISON PAPERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 281) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, au-

thorized to transmit to the Papers of James Madison, a research project sponsored by the University of Chicago and the University of Virginia, at Chicago, Ill., microfilm or photostatic copies of certain James Madison documents in the files of the House of Representatives, as described in the 46th page list deposited with the Clerk, the cost of such photostatic copies to be paid by the Papers of James Madison.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask how long this loan is for?

Mr. YATES. It is not a loan. This is a research project undertaken by the Universities of Chicago and Virginia. This resolution is necessary to authorize the Clerk to permit the universities to take microfilms of these papers within his possession for delivery to the universities at the expense of the universities. The papers will still be in the Clerk's possession. This merely permits them to be microfilmed.

Mr. FULTON. My only thought was that if it were a loan the period of the loan should be specified; there should be a time limit.

Mr. YATES. It is not a loan.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the resolution offered by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will greatly facilitate the undertaking of the University of Chicago and the University of Virginia, sponsors of the project, in collecting and publishing the papers of James Madison, the fourth President of the United States. It is a project that properly has stirred wide interest not only among scholars but in all circles where information of the undertaking has become known.

James Madison, who kept the minutes of the Constitutional Convention, who served as a Congressman from Virginia 1789-97, was Secretary of State, 1801-09, and President of the United States, 1809-17, is one of the great figures in American history. The publication of all his writings and utterances on the many complexing issues of the years of conception and early development of our Republic, including the period of the War of 1812, will be an important contribution to scholarship and our understanding of our national history.

The editors of the Papers of James Madison are Dr. William T. Hutchinson, of the University of Chicago, and Dr. William M. E. Rachal, of the University of Virginia. On May 27, 1959, Dr. Hutchinson wrote me:

There is, I believe, a standing rule of the House, requiring it to give clearance to anyone who wishes to make copies of its records in the National Archives. With the consent of Mr. Roberts, the Clerk of the House, and the cooperation of Dr. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, Mr. Robert Scribner of our editorial staff searched through the records of the House from 1789 to 1817 for items by or to Madison. Because of his outstanding prominence during those

years, as a Congressman from Virginia 1789-97, Secretary of State, 1801-09, and President, 1809-17, the resulting list was a long one.

We sent a copy of this list to Mr. Roberts requesting that we be favored with permission to photocopy the papers with a view to editing and publishing them in a comprehensive edition (probably about 22 volumes) of the Papers of James Madison, to be published by the University of Chicago Press. Clearly this edition will be far from "comprehensive" if it omits Madison's many writings in the House records. We are informed by Dr. Grover that Mr. Roberts to clear so many papers for microfilming will require permission by the passage of a special resolution by the House.

I trust that you will agree that we are responsible scholars, solely interested in providing as complete an edition as possible of the writings of one of America's ablest political thinkers and statesmen.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and I are most appreciative of the fine cooperation of the distinguished majority leader and the promptness with which he has acted in order to avoid any delay in the compilation of the papers of James Madison. Our appreciation for their parts in a fine cooperative effort in a matter of historic significance is expressed to the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, to Mr. Roberts and Dr. Grover.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in my remarks during debate on the national defense appropriation bill I may be permitted to include a letter from Maj. Gen. F. S. Besson, Chief of Transportation, U.S. Army, to the Chief of the Military Sea Transport Service, advising that the Army contemplated using airplanes in lieu of ocean vessels for transportation of military personnel and their dependents.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW

Mr. WALTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 31, the U.S. Information Agency announced that 49 paintings and works of sculpture had been selected for showing at the American National Exhibition in Moscow this summer. The art collection has already been crated and was scheduled to be shipped to the Soviet Union on the steamship *Finnsailer*, which I understand is now on the high seas.

The 6-week American National Exhibition at which these works will be shown will be opened in Moscow's Sokolniki Park on July 25 by Vice President Nixon. It is billed by the USIA as containing "cultural, scientific, and technological exhibits designed to further Soviet understanding of life in America."

The USIA press announcement concerning the art collection lists the names of the 67 artists whose works will be displayed at the exhibition. In the 3 or 4 days which have transpired since the press announcement was distributed by USIA, I have requested the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities to furnish me with information in the committee files on the artists whose work has been shipped to Moscow. I wish to emphasize that the information which I shall now reveal is not the result of any field investigation or even of an exhaustive check of all possible sources of information, but is the result of a routine check of committee files made on 67 people in the course of a few days' time.

This routine check, may I state, is a service which the Committee on Un-American Activities regularly renders to any executive agency of the Government which requests it.

Of the 67 artists whose works have been chosen for exhibition in Moscow, 34—a fraction more than 50 percent—have records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes. Of these 34 there are 12 whose records appear to be relatively inconsequential because they involve connections with only one or two Communist fronts or causes, and include no affiliation for a period of 10 years or more.

This leaves 22, or one-third of the 67 artists, with significant records of affiliation with the Communist movement in this country. The routine check against the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities indicates that these 22 artists have a minimum of 465 connections with Communist fronts and causes.

One of these artists, Max Weber, has been publicly identified as a Communist Party member. The affiliations of some of the others, however, are so extensive and of such a nature that they raise serious questions as to where their loyalty actually lies.

Three of them have been connected with Communist Party schools.

Six of them have publicly urged participation in the Communist Party's May Day parades.

Five of them have publicly recommended the election of known Communists to public office.

Three of them have contributed articles to, or openly supported, the Communist Daily Worker or its west coast counterpart, The People's World.

Eight of these artists have been members of the Communist John Reed Clubs.

Two of them have had their paintings offered as prizes for Daily Worker subscriptions.

Four of them defended Stalin's bloody Moscow purge trials of the late 1930's.

Four have contributed their art work to the Communist magazine The Liberator.

Two have similarly served Fight, the publication of the Communist front, the American League Against War and Fascism and, later, of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Three have done the same for Soviet Russia Today, another Communist magazine.

Two of them have been owners of the Communist publication, the Masses.

Sixteen have contributed their art work to the Communist magazine New Masses.

Thirteen have similarly served its successors, Masses and Mainstream.

Three have contributed art material to the Communist publication Jewish Life.

Twenty-six of these 67 artists have contributed their paintings to art exhibitions staged by Communist fronts: 12 to the China Aid Council, 5 to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, 1 to People's Drama—a Communist Party theatrical agency—and 8 to the Communist-line weekly newspaper, The National Guardian.

Eleven of these artists signed the call to the American Artists Congress of 1936, one of the major art fronts set up by the Communist Party in this country.

Three of these artists have publicly defended V. J. Jerome, Communist Party cultural commissar, for delivering his speech, "Grasp the Weapon of Culture," at the 1950 convention of the U.S. Communist Party. This speech was one of the overt acts on which Jerome was subsequently indicted—and convicted—for conspiring to overthrow the Government of these United States by force and violence.

Just a short time ago two of these artists signed a public statement calling on the United States to completely reverse its foreign policy, particularly in regard to Formosa and Labanon. This statement was, in effect, a call for United States surrender to Moscow.

Now, I should like to tell you a few things about some of these artists as individuals. First, let us consider the case of Jack Levine, who, the routine check made by our committee indicates, has been affiliated with at least 21 Communist fronts and causes. Levine's work, "Welcome Home," is being sent to Moscow to portray and impress the people of the Soviet Union with American culture.

A recent issue of the Communist Worker described this painting as a picture of a stuffed-shirt American general. Jack Levine himself has described this painting in the following words:

And no matter how commanding and impressive a general, he will be chewing. His wife, however smart and fashionably turned out, will be chewing. Everybody in the general's party will be chewing, as a gesture of kinship with the lower orders of mankind. What is more absurd than an august gathering abstractedly chewing their cud's * * * my thesis, that armies are a continuation of class snobbery.

So that there will be no doubt about Levine and the style and purpose of his art, I quote from a review of an exhibit of his works which was published in the

Communist newspaper, *The Worker*, on April 10, 1955:

Jack Levine is an artist of social satire and social caricature. He paints dead souls in living bodies with devastating power and insight. He paints the men and women who would stifle humanity, starve mankind, brutalize the world for their own parasitic, selfish, greedy ends. He divests these people of their outer garments of wealth, position, and respectability and exposes the sham that covers the leering evil, the greed, the corrosion of upper-class immorality and self-indulgence.

One cannot look at these canvases without experiencing the impact of their terrific power. The painting, *The Trial*, has deep political significance today as witchhunts and hysteria have made a mockery of courtroom justice.

Throughout the exhibition it is more clear what Jack Levine hates. He says himself, "Those I love I simply leave out. A painter should do what he does best."

It is obvious from Levine's own words that he hates the U.S. general he has portrayed in "Welcome Home."

The *Worker* review of Levine's exhibit also stated:

One of the functions which art is expected to perform is to intensify man's emotions and sharpen his insights. Jack Levine has done this in a merciless exposure of corroding evil dressed in riches and respectability. He has created unforgettable faces expressive of corruption that grows and decays, of hypocritical souls wielding power today.

This statement makes it clear that not only does Levine hate American generals but that, in his artwork, he follows the dictates of the world Communist conspiracy. Addressing the 21st congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on January 27 of this year, Nikita Khrushchev made the following statement:

It is the duty of * * * painters to raise still higher the content and artistic level of their work, to continue as energetic assistants of the party and the state in the Communist education of the working people.

Writing in the Communist *New Masses* magazine in 1946—the magazine to which 16 of these artists have contributed—U.S. Communist Party Chairman William Z. Foster, said:

There must be a clear understanding that art is a weapon in the class struggle. Not only is art a weapon, but a very potent one as well. Moreover, rising revolutionary social classes instinctively realize the importance of art as a social weapon and have always forged their own art and used it to challenge that of the existing ruling class.

It is clear from these statements that neither Khrushchev nor Foster has any complaints as far as the work of Jack Levine is concerned. He uses his art as a weapon to arouse hatred of our free society and people considered representative of it.

His picture of the gum-chewing, "stuffed shirt" American general will help the Kremlin convince its enslaved people that its vicious propaganda about American military leaders is true, and is supported even by the American people.

Another artist whose work the USIA has chosen to exhibit in Moscow is Ben

Shahn, who has been affiliated with over two dozen Communist fronts and causes. Shahn has been repeatedly described in the Communist press as a "people's artist." Shahn is one of the artists in this group who recently signed a statement calling on the United States to reverse our policy of resisting Communist aggression.

A *Daily Worker* review of his paintings a number of years ago contained the following statement:

Shahn has always considered art as a medium for the communication of ideas and his ideas have always been progressive. (When used in the Communist press, "progressive" means Communist or pro-Communist). He is one of our finest artists and one of our best social painters.

The Communist newspaper's use of the word "our" in referring to Shahn is significant.

The *People's World*, west coast Communist Party newspaper, in April of 1955, described some of Shahn's paintings in a Los Angeles exhibit as follows:

His brilliant caustic social paintings * * * an acid portrait of a policeman, a sympathetic drawing of a miner * * * drawn by an artist who takes sides and expresses his viewpoint in a powerful style.

The same Communist newspaper in a 1948 review of an exhibition of Shahn's works made the following comment:

It is interesting to note, also, that posters such as "We Want Peace, Register, Vote," "For All These Rights We've Just Begun To Fight," and others are fine, qualitative examples of the work to the artist. * * * Here, simply and definitely, is an artist of the people.

During the 1948 election campaign Shahn put his talents to the use of the Communist-controlled Progressive Party by painting a campaign poster which mocked President Truman and his Republican opponent, former Governor Dewey of New York.

Still another artist chosen for the Moscow exhibit is Max Weber, the one who has been identified as a Communist Party member by Louis Budenz, former managing editor of the *Daily Worker* and member of the Communist Party national committee.

Weber has been connected with some 70 Communist fronts and causes. The Communist magazine *Masses and Mainstream*, issue of April 1949, contained an article on Weber praising him as follows:

Weber grew up an artist in the atmosphere of quest and revolt * * * Weber sought an answer to the anarchy of capitalist society in the controlled order of formal manipulation.

Through the depression years of the thirties, Weber took an active and leading part in the struggles of artists. And at this time his work * * * reflects the social scene through the inclusion of new thematic material in such paintings as "At the Mill," "The Bulldozer," and "Refugees."

His passionate social awareness makes him constantly affirm his alliance with those who have begun to break through.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote certain appraisals made by art critics of the work of Max Weber. These appraisals are taken from a publication

copyrighted by the Whitney Museum of American Art in 1949:

Their ugliness is appalling.

No one is going to believe that nature alone ever made anybody as bad an artist as all this. Such grotesquerie could only be acquired by long and perverse practice.

Here are travesties of the human form, here are forms that have no justification in nature, but that seem for all the world like the emanation of someone not in his right mind, such as one might expect from the inmate of a lunatic asylum. * * * It is difficult to write of these atrocities with moderation, for they are positively an insult to ordinary intelligence.

A brutal, vulgar and unnecessary display of art license.

Philip Evergood, another artist whose work will be displayed in the exhibit, has been connected with over 75 Communist fronts and causes, has contributed articles to the Communist *Daily Worker* and has been a staff writer for the west coast Communist Party newspaper, the *People's World*.

Evergood is one of the many artists in this group who sponsored or took an active part in the notorious Communist initiated Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held in New York City in March 1949, and frequently referred to as the Waldorf conference.

Evergood was a panel speaker at this conference. His subject was "The Artist as Interpreter of His Age." Addressing the numerous Communists and fellow travelers who took part in this gathering, he said:

The tools of the artist may vary, his philosophy may change, but the substance of his art, if it is to live, is always the reflection of his time. Today the artist is living in the most complex of societies. How can today's artist cope with and express the chaotic state of the world in which he lives? The artist must enter the struggle for peace like the people who are for peace and the continued growth of their kind, because to quote Paul Robeson, "The people are engaged in a mighty creative battle for progress."

The worm-rotted shells whose stench of putrefaction permeates our contemporary mental atmosphere will disintegrate and disappear like the nightmare they are.

Entering the struggle for peace himself, Evergood did a charcoal drawing of a "Dove of Peace" for an art exhibition staged in 1951 by the New York branch of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the Communist Party's cultural front. It was at this time that Moscow's Stockholm peace appeal was being circulated throughout this country and the Communist artist Picasso's peace dove had become the symbol of the Kremlin's hypocritical peace drive.

The art exhibition the USIA is sending to Moscow is supposed to portray—and help the enslaved people of the Soviet Union appreciate—the art and culture of the United States. The theory behind the exhibit is that it is an exhibition of the art of freemen. It appears that we are sending the so-called art of men who have prostituted whatever talents they possess to the foulest conspiracy in the history of man. I ask you, "can anyone claim—and the USIA claim—that these men really represent American culture?"

It is repulsive to me that a U.S. Government agency should glorify so-called artists who stand for nothing that this country represents and for everything it is opposed to, men who stand for, promote, and defend Communist slavery, mass murder, and destruction of freedom; men who, by their actions and statements over the course of many years, have proclaimed themselves the enemies of the United States.

I also wish to state my objection to what is implied by the backgrounds of the artists the USIA has selected to represent this country in Moscow; namely, that of all the painters and sculptors in the United States, one-third of them are either Communists, conscious and deliberate fellow travelers, or dupes of the Communist conspiracy.

I am cognizant, Mr. Speaker, of the "liberal" line proclaiming the intrinsic esthetic value of "art for art's sake," irrespective of the background or design of the artist and that somehow by displaying in Moscow, at U.S. taxpayer's expense, the art work of American Communists and Communist-fronters, Khrushchev and his gang of international outlaws will cease being Communists dedicated to world revolution. In my judgment, this is plain poppycock.

How long is it going to be, Mr. Speaker, before it is recognized that the Communist conspiracy is at total war with the free world? It is a war of intrigue, subversion and force. It is above all, a war in which the Communist conspiracy is irrevocably dedicated. If our method of fighting communism is to display in Moscow art works of American Communists and Communist fronters our cause is lost.

I cannot believe that the overwhelming majority of the patriotic American citizens will stomach this nonsense.

ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. ADDONIZIO. 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, about 5 weeks ago, on April 25 a man was taken from a jail cell in the dead of night and murdered without trial. This did not happen in Communist Russia, nor among the head-hunters of Borneo. It happened here, in the United States, the most powerful bastion of human dignity and of the rule of law. The perpetrators of this crime have not been apprehended, and there is strong evidence to suggest that they will go unpunished. The Federal Government is powerless to prosecute, and the government of Mississippi is moving with little determination and even less diligence toward a perfunctory grand jury inquiry. Yet the crime at issue is heinous, and its effect reaches far beyond the unperturbed county of Pearl River, Miss.

The 15 or 20 masked criminals who took the life of Mack Charles Parker are guilty of more than murder. They have spat in the face of decency and moral-

ity, and they have ridden roughshod over the standards that are essential to the survival of freedom and democracy in this country. In spirit, they are the direct descendants of all the hate-poisoned murderers of history, from Jenghiz Khan's barbaric hordes to Hitler's evil hoodlums. By their crime, the killers of Parker have flown in the face of every basic tenet of the American creed.

This is a very serious matter. It is a source of deep shame to every thinking American, and it seriously undermines our international stance as leading champions of freedom and democracy. Yet, the authorities in Mississippi seem to think that the case requires no more than the cavalier treatment that has traditionally been accorded such crimes in that State. Governor Coleman has announced that the case will be presented to the grand jury in Pearl River County during the next regular session in November. In other words, there will be no action until more than half a year after the date of the murder. The likelihood of effective action at that late date is infinitesimal. The Federal Government, meanwhile, is excluded from the case because no Federal law was violated.

For some time past, the Congress has been urged to pass antilynching legislation. Many bills to that effect have been drawn, but so far they have always failed on enactment in the face of southern assurances that lynching was on the wane and that the States had the matter well under control. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the time has come to brush such assurances aside and to pass a bill containing an antilynching clause. One unpunished lynching in 10 years—nay, in a century—is one too many. For the sake of our national conscience and our national interest, we cannot afford to tolerate such unspeakable barbarism in our Nation.

Let us enact such a law now, before another Mack Charles Parker case shocks the Nation and the world.

GONE-EMPLOYMENT IS THE REAL MENACE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, we have had heartening news recently about national economic trends, and I know that all of us are happy to see a marked upturn from the 1958 recession levels. Throughout this session many of us have been very seriously concerned with the problem of unemployment, and we have given evidence of that concern by the introduction of a variety of measures aimed at both stimulating employment and easing the plight of the unemployed. The improvement in business activity during recent weeks has reduced the total number of unemployed, and I am sure that all of us are thankful for that. However, it has not had any effect on long-term chronic unemployment, which is the most stubborn opponent to full prosperity for our country.

I have no desire to minimize our improved economic picture, but I feel it is my duty to rise and bring to your attention a very real need which faces us today.

The Secretary of Labor issued a study recently which analyzed the employment situation in terms of total unemployment and of the gains in the number of employed during the spring of 1959. Almost all of the criteria of measurement were on the plus side. In this report, however, there is a most significant statement which, to my mind offers a major challenge to the wisdom and ingenuity of this Congress.

Secretary Mitchell's report stated that there had been a decline in the number of unemployed during the past year to a total of 3,600,000, a figure which constitutes 5.3 percent of the total labor force. He acknowledged, however, that there were "1.4 million persons unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, and of these, 700,000 had been without jobs for more than 26 weeks." These 700,000 men and women are the long-term chronic unemployed who represent a particular problem which is developing along with the growth of our national economy—a problem for which we must find a solution.

If you study the area of location of these 700,000 workers who have been unemployed for more than 26 weeks, a year or more, or even 2 years, they are the workers whose present circumstances are responsible for the existence of what we have been discussing in this session as depressed areas.

There have been four changes in our economy since the end of World War II, during which there have been increases and declines in the general economy. After each dip the economy has recovered, but each recovery has left behind an addition to the total number of men and women whose means of livelihood has disappeared under the impact of technological advance. Most of the attention directed toward this development has been focused on mining and a few other industries in which the impact has been felt most heavily. Yet the trend is such, and the indications on the horizon are such, that we must recognize the inevitability of the growth of pools of chronic unemployment in all areas and industries over a period of years.

Obviously, we must continuously strive for top operational efficiency in our business industry. Not to do this would mean that we would one day rank as the No. 2 industrial power in the world. We all know what that would mean. It would simply mean that we would lose our leadership among the free nations of the world, and soon thereafter we would lose our very national existence. We must, therefore, learn to live and grow with the growth of automation and mechanization developments and techniques. It seems to me that whenever there is a downturn in the business cycle, there is a tendency to give some thought to this matter. When business revives to a degree, we tell ourselves that the unemployed, or at least those who want to work, will all find jobs without any further thought being given to the situation.

I note the beginnings of such thinking again both among business spokesmen and among some of my colleagues. I say to you that this is a very dangerous position to take. I say it not in criticism so much as in the belief that most of us have never analyzed the true scope of the problem in the light of our national requirements, and I believe we have failed to do so because the problem has never been labeled, identified, and segregated from its surrounding background. We must put the problem under the microscope and study it. We must also give it a specific identification, and talk of it specifically when we discuss the chronically unemployed.

The men and women who are without jobs for periods of time ranging up to 26 or 30 weeks, and who receive some assistance through unemployment compensation and similar benefits while unemployed, are simply unemployed employables. Their situation is temporary; even if they are out of work for as much as 6 months, they are still unemployed employables because their jobs will again be open to them as soon as a temporary economic setback is reversed by an upward business trend. We have considered many measures to deal with unemployment of this kind; some of these measures are more effective than others, but on the whole our efforts in recent years have combined to produce a fairly effective array of protection devices for workers in that position. The great majority of these unemployed employables who were without work as a result of the 1958 recession are now being called back to work. Most of the States are again able to report that their unemployed totals are declining to prerecession levels. It is not of these workers that I would speak with you today.

I wish to call your special and particular attention to the circumstances in which the 700,000 previously mentioned chronically unemployed find themselves. They will not be called back to work. They cannot do so because the jobs to which they previously owed a source of livelihood no longer exist at all. The jobs are gone. They are gone forever. They have vanished under the pressure of technological advance. We must learn to segregate this body of the unemployed from the larger group that comprises the majority of all national unemployment. As a device to assist you in identifying this group of workers I offer for your approval a new word to be added to the language—a word which shall be used to describe the condition in which these men and women find themselves.

That word is "gone-employment."

When we talk about the chronically unemployed displaced by mechanization or new automation methods or techniques we are talking about gone-employment. It is gone forever, and these persons can never hope to obtain employment again in the capacities in which they previously earned a livelihood.

I know that many of my colleagues, almost a hundred in fact, have been disturbed during recent years over the growth of persistent pools of unemployment in their districts. I have watched

the progress of legislation in the session by means of which efforts have been made to better the situation. One of the most far-reaching such efforts was embodied in the area redevelopment bill which passed the Senate and was referred for action by this House. Both the last Congress and this one have made approaches to the problem through depressed areas or area redevelopment legislation. Today, however, in the light of the more favorable news about employment generally, there appears to be far less enthusiasm for efforts to deal with the problems of the chronically unemployed through this or similar legislation.

What I wish to call to your attention with greatest emphasis, however, is the fact that whatever measures are enacted by this Congress for immediate relief of the unemployed in depressed areas will not strike at the core of the problem. Even if we should place on the books an area redevelopment measure, and should stimulate public works programs and housing and airport construction, and the development of flood control and similar engineering projects, and should add to the prevailing unemployment compensation benefits and appropriate money to broaden and increase the agricultural surplus commodities program we would still be working in the dark.

By this time I believe most of us realize that the long-term chronically unemployed—the gone-employed—are the victims of technological advance. We have seen the growing effects of mechanization and automation develop in many industries and in many parts of the country. What we need to approach the problem intelligently is a roadmap or guide to our planning and spending.

In other words, while we approach the problem at the national level and encourage activity at the State and community level, we must also institute measures to support our activities by obtaining definitive findings at the theoretical level. We are dealing here with an economic disease and it must be handled like a campaign against any other disease. I am reminded of the national effort to conquer poliomyelitis. For many years we contributed dimes and dollars to fight poliomyelitis. The money was spent to buy crutches and braces for the children who were suffering from the effects of this disease. Millions of dollars were spent over a period of years to this purpose, and it was a good purpose, but we knew at the time that it was not getting at the root of the trouble. Meanwhile, there were those with special knowledge who approached the problem in the laboratories, at the theoretical level, and in due course they produced a vaccine which dramatically reduced the ravages of polio.

In the same manner a background of theoretical experiment and scientific inquiry is badly needed if we are to ever hope to lay down an effective method of dealing with gone-employment.

It is fruitless to believe that we can in any manner halt or mitigate the effects of technological advance in industry.

In fact, the international competition today requires that our national policy contemplate the encouragement of continuously growing efficiency among our productive forces. In the same manner that we could not expect polio to simply die out, we cannot expect the undesirable effects of mechanization and automation to disappear either.

I am proposing, then, that we deliberately search for a theoretical basis for correctives. We know the problem will be with us for a generation or more; how serious it will be depends upon how wisely we plan to meet it now. We can spend money for any number of possible solutions, but we will never know whether or not we are spending the money wisely, and whether or not we may expect a favorable final result.

To obtain a basis upon which future Congresses may take action in this area of need, I propose the authorization of a study of long-term chronic unemployment, such study to be made by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. My suggestions are contained in a House joint resolution which I am introducing today. The resolution calls for an exhaustive inquiry into the recent economic history of areas and communities so affected, and into the trends of their industrial growth and decline, in an effort to segregate and identify as a basis for corrective action whatever factors may be applied as yardsticks of measurement in dealing with the economic decline of areas and communities in the future.

The study would be confined to those areas generally considered to be depressed areas within the meaning of the terms of the various area redevelopment measures under consideration. It would be pursued over a period of 3 years with a progress report to be filed at the end of the first and second years and a final report with recommendations to be filed in June 1962. I might say at this time that there have been suggestions for studies of unemployment recently and that this House has been reluctant to take action because of the political implications of such short-term studies and the fact that we are again approaching a presidential election year. This resolution is written in such a manner as to avoid all partisanship and all political implications for the forthcoming 1960 election. Its adoption will reflect credit on both parties and will signify to the people whose livelihood has been destroyed by technology that this Congress is aware of their problems and is undertaking to assign the best qualified economists in the United States to the search for a solution.

If we do not move in this area at once, we will soon be lulled to sleep by the increasingly pleasant statistics regarding gross national product and personal income. In recent weeks I have heard comments from fellow Members who represent districts in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Kentucky, and several other States voicing distress over the tendency to sweep the chronic unemployment problem under the rug simply because the general national economic outlook is improving. I believe the only way we can obtain a commitment to a

solution of this problem is to authorize a specific study of this nature and thereby demonstrate that we have a strong interest in the subject, even though certain specific measures before the Congress designed to deal with various particular aspects of the problem may finally fail of passage.

A few days ago the White House Conference on Refugees suggested that we open our gates to hundreds of thousands of refugees from overseas, and a State Department official suggested that we boost American aid to foreign refugees to about \$65 million per year. Many public statements were made to the effect that we have a responsibility to do something about the rehabilitation and resettlement of some 2,500,000 refugees in Europe and the Near East. I remind you also that it is proposed to appropriate \$700 million for the Development Loan Fund to rehabilitate and develop certain overseas areas.

This resolution would call for an expenditure of only \$150,000 per year for 3 years, and it is designed to save us money in the long run. If the amount—\$150,000—appears high, you might remember that this constitutes only one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the amount of money we proposed to spend to correct similar problems overseas. I realize that we have been advised by some self-appointed experts to the effect that it is not necessary to study the problem; it is only necessary to appropriate and spend money. I disagree with this position. I do agree that short-range, politically motivated inquiries are without value.

The trend toward growing gone-employment in those areas and industries first affected by the rapid technological advance has been growing and increasing ever since the end of World War II, and we will not obtain the answers during the course of a 60-day or 90-day inquiry. We may not obtain all of the answers for a decade or more. But we must start at once before the problem gets completely out of control. I remind you that under the terms of the National Defense Education Act we are supplying funds to intensify the development of engineers and technicians, so that their talents may be sharpened to the utmost and added to the working tools of our economy. In other words, we are subsidizing an increase in the rapidity of the cycle of technological advance. I believe this is necessary and desirable. But we must also prepare our economy to ward off the ill effects which we know will develop coincident with increased technology.

I do not propose this study as a substitute for any of the measures now pending before the Congress which would apply short-term relief to the depressed areas of today. The people in those areas must have immediate and practical relief. But, while we take steps to aid them today, we must support a strong inquiry into the origins of the situation in which they find themselves, so that their sons and daughters may look forward in full confidence that the despair of their unemployed fathers will not fall to their own lot.

I realize that there are many among my colleagues whose districts do not face this situation, and whose people are today enjoying the full economic and social benefits of an expanding economy in a prosperous Nation. To them I say that you above all should join in support of this resolution because your people will have the most to lose. Do not think for a minute that any city or State or industry is immune to the economic and social ravages that can be created by the rapid installation of automatic machinery and automation techniques. Give a moment's pause to this statistic, and think of its implications: Between 1947 and 1957, when industrial production was rising 40 percent, the number of production workers in industry increased only 1 percent.

We must be informed about this trend, so we may legislate wisely and inform our constituents, and to that end I ask support for this resolution.

HOW TO BECOME A MAJOR GENERAL

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, these remarks could have been made under a point of personal privilege, but I do not want to take the time of the House, or any more of my own time, to dispose of this matter.

I spent most of World War II as a second lieutenant. Now I am a major in the Air Force Reserve. That is the only military rank I hold. I am not a major general in the revolutionary army of national liberation of Santo Domingo. I never have been and I never will be.

Many Members of Congress and journalists received copies of a legal sized multigraphed, single-spaced newsletter called "Special Memorandum From: Universal Research and Consultants, Inc." who are identified on the letterhead as being consulting geopoliticians, foreign negotiations, operations research.

The May 26, 1959, issue contained four paragraphs about me. Here is the first paragraph:

The Dominican Republic Herald recently confirmed an announcement made early in May by Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER that he had been appointed a major general in the revolutionary army of national liberation of Santo Domingo. Such an announcement by an American Congressman is indeed a shocking one. The revolutionary army of national liberation is no honorary society or chowder and marching club but an active revolutionary force dedicated to a physical invasion of the Dominican Republic and the overthrow of its Government. For a Congressman of the United States to publicly announce his acceptance of a commission in a revolutionary army is by no means compatible with his duties to his constituents in Oregon, nor is it compatible with the interests of the Nation.

This item was the first notice I had of any such appointment. I never announced any such thing or anything re-

motely similar. This is made from whole cloth. And as for one of Trujillo's newspapers confirming any such item, well, it is not likely they would favor me or care about the truth.

My administrative assistant, Jack Billings, spoke with the editor of the newsletter and was told he read the item in the Dominican Republic Herald for whom, incidentally, I understand the editor writes a column.

My action has been to refer the newsletter to attorneys to advise me as to the grounds therein for a libel suit. I don't mind being cussed and vilified but outright misrepresentation as gross as this tends to annoy me. Moreover I know that some of my colleagues have seen it and it may be that one or more of them will believe that it is true.

To set the record as straight as I can I am inserting these remarks. Of course I am against Trujillo and against any other tyrant, whether he rules Formosa, mainland China, the Soviet Union, Spain, or any other country. I rejoice when a tyrant's power is challenged and overthrown, but I never have alined myself with any particular revolutionary group. I feel a kinship and a sympathy for persons who fight tyranny. I will continue to urge my Government to give the formal handclasp to dictators and the warm embrace to democratic leaders. I will continue to stand up for the principles of freedom and human rights on which this Nation was established.

But I will not be a major general or even a private or a marshal in any particular revolutionary army of another nation. Of course, no one has asked me to be, no doubt with good reason. It is generous of Trujillo to bestow such rank on me and certainly broadly tolerant of Special Memorandum to accept the word of Trujillo's newspaper.

Special Memorandum has come on rough days. Not long ago it was paid by Batista and by Pérez Jiménez to be a foreign agent for their illustrious cut-throat governments, and also by some purportedly anti-Communist league with a high-sounding name. Now these clients are gone, but perhaps the editor seeks to sign up Rafael Trujillo before it is too late for both himself and Trujillo.

Many strange animals roam the corridors and infest the cocktail parties of this Capital City of the United States. The strangest and slimiest snakes of all, in my opinion, are those creatures who take blood money from tyrants to do their prostitute journalism and other chores in this citadel of democracy and the free world.

THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S PLAN FOR PEACE: REGIONAL AND WORLD CONFERENCES OF LAWYERS

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 the American Bar Association completed the study it undertook at the request of the International Cooperation Administration. The study's recommendations are of key importance in the long, hard and frequently frustrating fight to establish the rule of law in the world.

Yet, I understand, ICA may refuse to allocate the funds, even in the amount promised in a letter from former ICA Director James Smith. It may be that an attempt to amend the Mutual Security Act should be made when it reaches the House floor so as to earmark the necessary funds.

The report affirms that "it is feasible to conduct a series of conferences, culminating in a world conference, of lawyers from the United States and other nations, to consider and recommend specific measures for the achievement of world peace through law."

The regional conferences would be held possibly in Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Accra, and Vienna, the world conference possibly in Stockholm. Each regional conference would run for 5 days, and the world conference for 3 weeks.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES

The report states:

The general objectives of each of the conferences would be to further the basic goal of world peace through the rule of law and to make international law and international courts a more powerful force in international relations, thereby reducing international tensions.

The details may be found in the report, the complete text of which I am appending to these remarks.

The men who prepared this report, with the help of many other lawyers, are idealists, yes, in a sense but not starry eyed. They know that the only route to survival is the rule of law. The American Bar Association committee's chairman, a former president of the American Bar Association, is Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D.C., whose work for the rule of law in the world has been widely, justly and highly praised.

His committee members are outstanding lawyers from all over the United States, including among others such distinguished lawyers as Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School; Arthur H. Dean, of New York; and former American Bar Association president, Robert G. Storey, Sr., of Austin, Tex.

When law replaces weapons,

The report concludes—

in the control of the fate of humanity, the mission of lawyers will have been completed. In a world ruled by law man can walk in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

REPORT TO THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The American Bar Association has completed the study which it undertook at the request of the International Cooperation Administration and has reached the conclusion that it is feasible to conduct a series of conferences, culminating in a world conference, of lawyers from the United States and other nations, to consider and recommend specific measures for the achievement of world peace through law.

OUTLINE OF PLAN

According to the plan submitted herewith, lawyers from the four continents (the Americas being considered as a single continent) would meet first in international regional conferences at cities to be decided upon, possibly Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Accra, and Vienna, and eventually in a world conference at a city to be decided upon, possibly Stockholm.

Each of the international regional conferences would run for 5 days, and the world conference for 3 weeks.

The general objectives of each of the conferences would be to further the basic goal of world peace through the rule of law and to make international law and international courts a more powerful force in international relations, thereby reducing international tensions.

The agenda for the conferences would be determined by committees, provided for in the plan, upon consideration of topics which would include:

(1) Means of increasing use of the International Court of Justice, including:

(a) Exercise of the Court's existing authority to sit outside The Hague and to form chambers of three or more judges for hearing and final decision of particular cases or classes of cases;

(b) Achievement of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court by all nations without crippling reservations;

(c) Inclusion in future international agreements of a provision that disputes over their interpretation will be subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court;

(d) Improvement in the practice, procedure, and administration of the Court.

(2) Establishment of regional courts of international law, outside the judicial system of the United Nations, by bilateral and multilateral treaties.

(3) Extension of the jurisdiction of international courts, by amendment of the statute of the International Court of Justice and by bilateral and multilateral treaties, to disputes between governments and individuals and between private parties, either generally or with specific reference to disputes growing out of contracts between governments and individuals or out of international business transactions.

(4) Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for arbitration of disputes between governments and disputes growing out of concession contracts and international business transactions between governments and individuals and between private parties.

(5) Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for international cooperation in promoting the economic advancement of all nations, including the improvement of the legal framework for such advancement and the removal of the legal uncertainties and fears which now block such advancement.

(6) Consideration of means to strengthen the United Nations both by Charter changes and by increased use of existing United Nations machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes under the rule of law.

(7) Establishment or improvement of agencies and procedures for clarification of uncertainties of existing international law and for adaptation of existing rules of international law to changing conditions with a view to furthering the growth of a body of international law acceptable to all nations by drawing upon all legal systems of the world.

(8) Consideration of methods for compilation, reporting, and analysis of legal decisions and other developments in the international field.

It is believed that a series of conferences prepared for and conducted in the manner suggested in the accompanying plan would result in the marshaling of the resources of

the legal profession of all the participating nations for the achievement of world peace through law and for the education of the world opinion which is essential to that end.

EVOLUTION OF THE PLAN

The accompanying plan was prepared, under the direction of the board of governors of the association, by a special committee on world peace through law. The names of the members of that committee appear at the end of this report. As stated in an interim report of February 23, 1959, to the house of delegates, a copy of which is submitted herewith, the committee decided at its first meeting, 6 days after the signing of the contract with the International Cooperation Administration, to seek the cooperation of lawyers, professors of international law, and associations of lawyers in this country and abroad and the cooperation of legal organizations such as the International Bar Association, the Inter-American Bar Association, and the International Law Association, to study the efforts of the United Nations and other official agencies in the field of world law; to arrange a number of regional conferences of leading lawyers in the United States for discussion of tentative ideas, suggestions, plans, and proposals; and to employ a staff to assist the committee in its work. It decided also that its staff should give special attention at the beginning of its work to the compilation and analysis of ideas and information as to how the proposed conference might advance the use of the rule of law in world affairs, promote the use of the judicial concept in the settlement of disputes between nations, extend international judicial institutions to disputes of individuals growing out of international transactions, and increase the sense of responsibility and the influence of members of the legal profession in the field of international relations.

Presidents of 1,400 State and local bar associations in the United States and 182 professors of international law were requested to send the committee comments, suggestions, and ideas as to what a world conference on the rule of law should do and can do.

Similar letters, accompanied by a partial list of topics which had been suggested for discussion at the proposed conference, were sent to 1,300 members of the section of international and comparative law, 2,400 members of the American Society of International Law, and the presidents of 74 bar associations in foreign countries.

The responses to the above-mentioned letters were almost uniformly favorable to the idea of the proposed conference. Many of them contained extremely helpful suggestions as to the questions to be discussed and as to the practical arrangements required for successful conduct of the conference. These communications provided substantial evidence that lawyers assembled from many nations may be able to achieve concrete advancement of carefully stated programs for the establishment of international relations on the basis of respect for law and the observance of its orderly procedures.

Equally encouraging indications were received from specially qualified persons whose views were sought in private conversations and at conventions and conferences of lawyers in the United States and abroad.

On March 28 and 29, 1959, the first of five regional conferences in the United States was held at Boston, Mass., for the purpose of consultation on what lawyers assembled from many nations could do toward the achievement and maintenance of world peace. Similar conferences were held at Charlotte, N.C., on April 10 and 11; Chicago, Ill., on April 17 and 18; San Francisco, Calif., on April 24 and 25; and Dallas, Tex., on April 28 and 29. The participants in each of these conferences included the presidents of State bar associations in the several regions

(comprising from 7 to 11 States) and four or more leading lawyers of each State invited by these presidents or by the committee. The participants in each of the conferences were provided, in advance of the conference, with working papers, prepared by the committee's staff, with the assistance of experts in the fields of international law, which contained the background information required for intelligent discussion of the questions raised in the conferences. Copies of the working papers prepared for these conferences are submitted herewith.

The potentialities of the program under study by the committee were recognized by one of the most eminent clergymen in the United States, Cardinal Cushing, in the following statement at the beginning of the Boston conference:

"The work on which you have ventured may well be the most significant of our time. For it can set the pattern for the future of the world, and it may indeed decide whether or not this civilization of ours will survive at all."

Equally enthusiastic comments were made by lawyers participating in this and subsequent conferences.

The consensus of the participants in the five regional conferences, with specific reference to the feasibility of conferences of lawyers on a continental or global scale, may be fairly summarized as follows:

1. A world conference of lawyers should be held. To make it a true world conference, lawyers from behind the Iron Curtain should be invited.
2. The groundwork for the world conference should be laid by international regional conferences in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Europe.
3. The conferences will serve a very useful purpose whether or not Iron Curtain lawyers and their governments are willing or able to seek to extend the rule of law. It is important meanwhile for the other countries of the world to gain experience in the settlement of international disputes by judicial means and to build up a record of accomplishment in the settlement of such disputes among themselves.
4. The world conference and the international regional conferences which precede it should concentrate chiefly on the improvement of existing international institutions and the creation of the new international institutions that will be required if the rule of law is to achieve internationally the degree of order and stability that it has achieved nationally.
5. As a first step in this direction, the conferences should consider the means of getting more international disputes into the existing International Court of Justice and into new circuit or regional courts of international law. They might appropriately urge the International Court of Justice to exercise the authority which it now has to sit outside The Hague and to establish chambers of three or more members of the Court for hearing and decision of particular cases or classes of cases. Sitting in New York and elsewhere throughout the world, the Court would be more accessible to the parties, and proceedings would be much less expensive. Regional courts of international law could be established by agreements without amendment of the Charter of the United Nations or the Statute of the International Court of Justice.
6. The world conference and the international regional conferences should give special consideration to ways and means of extending the jurisdiction of international courts to disputes between governments and individuals growing out of international business transactions.
7. The world conference and the international regional conferences should also consider the means of expanding and improving procedures for arbitration of disputes growing out of international business transac-

tions and the means of encouraging greater use of legal rules in international commercial arbitration.

8. The conferences now contemplated should not attempt agreement on substantive rules of international law. Restatements of present rules and drafts of new rules of international law should be left to existing official and unofficial groups of experts. If further world conferences are recommended, committees may be created to review progress in various fields of substantive law and make recommendations to further that progress or to initiate new work on old or new problems.

9. The mere fact of holding international regional conferences and eventually a world conference of lawyers on the rule of law among nations would have tremendous import. Lawyers have never before worked together on this subject on a multinational or global scale. The prospect of worthwhile accomplishments has stirred all prospective participants in such conferences.

10. Participants at the conferences would be jurists, practicing lawyers and teachers of law.

11. The conferences should consider establishment of a permanent clearinghouse of ideas, programs, and experience pertinent to the extension of world peace through the rule of law. In this connection they should consider the possibility of proclamations of a World Law Day and a World Law Year to stimulate and coordinate the efforts of lawyers.

12. The U.S. reservation, which presently limits our acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, was discussed extensively. The consensus was that the unilateral determination clause of this reservation should be eliminated. Under this clause the United States and other nations having similar clauses sit as judges of the World Court's jurisdiction in each case filed against them. They decide whether the case involves an international or a domestic issue even though the United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from exercising jurisdiction over domestic issues. As one of the greatest users of the rule of law nationally, the United States must prove that we trust the rule of law internationally. Such leadership on our part is essential.

13. A tremendous grassroots educational program is essential in the United States as well as in other countries. This program should spotlight that it is essential to exercise sovereignty for survival, to build law into the legal vacuum which now exists internationally.

14. World government is impractical and impossible in today's world. This program is directed toward increasing the use of the rule of law in courts and building new law in the world community. This is a practical and meaningful forward step toward a peaceful world.

15. This effort to create a lawful world should be largely financed by private money. It should be a lawyer-to-lawyer-to-people program. As lawyers explain the potential use of law in the world community, the idea should attract tremendous support among laymen.

16. We should do all we can to strengthen the United Nations by urging increased application of, and adherence to, the rule of law in the deliberations and actions of all of its organs and agencies, as well as by urging amendments to the Charter to further the ideal of world peace through law.

17. The objectives of this program cannot be accomplished within a short time. A long-range continuous effort must be planned for by the legal profession of the nations of the world.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The views summarized above are the views of practicing lawyers, not experts in international law, throughout the United States. They are in many instances different from the views that were held by participants in

the regional conferences in advance of those conferences. There are doubtless many lawyers in this country, as well as in other countries, who are not fully aware of the imperative necessity for the establishment of the rule of law among nations. Conferences similar to the five regional conferences that have been held in the United States will probably be indispensable in other countries in preparation for effective participation of lawyers of those countries in international regional conferences. A further conference of lawyers of the United States, including those who participated in our regional conferences, would also be desirable before the beginning of the international conferences.

It is realized that not every tension-producing dispute is susceptible of judicial determination. There are political and diplomatic questions and problems which are not justiciable; the program envisioned herein is not to be understood as suggesting that they are. The function of the rule of law is to keep the peace while necessary and desirable changes can be worked out through other means. In a fully developed world civilization all disputes should be settled by means other than force.

The special committee on world peace through law began its study from the premise that, as law has achieved order and stability within nations, it could, if given the opportunity, do the same among nations. With full realization that the unprecedented dangers of today create overwhelming public support for any idea which will prevent war, it has sought to develop plans and programs by which the rule of law can bring about the same order, stability and peace internationally which it has already created nationally.

On the basis of the study made by the special committee, it is believed that the rule of law can justifiably be raised as a new standard of decency in international relations. Years and decades of hard labor are ahead of us before this goal can be realized. The absence of law in the world community is indeed the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. To fill that gap, or legal vacuum, is no easy task. The path to success is strewn with many pitfalls and immense difficulties.

Lawyers throughout the world are confronted by a task that they must do. No other group or profession has assumed, or will or should assume, a responsibility equal to ours in translating the idea of world rule of law into reality. Lawyers in centuries of effort have created the legal rules and institutions and procedures which now exist; lawyers of this and other nations are the logical group to do this new work of creating a lawful world.

People everywhere are hoping and searching for some way to avoid the holocaust of missile-atomic war. They know that history teaches that every arms race since the world began has exploded into war by design or accident. They watch the current ever-accelerating arms buildup and fear that war is as certain as tomorrow's sunrise unless a great leap forward is made in the sphere of law. World peace through law offers the greatest potential of all the ideas yet advanced to avoid self-destruction by mankind. The law's proved capacity in achieving and maintaining order and stability within nations augurs well for its success if used between nations.

Lawyers at our regional meetings have signified their willingness to lead the way in a great effort to inform and unite the people of the world in support of this great idea. Through conferences such as those provided for in the accompanying plan, lawyers throughout the world can develop a program to push forward the idea of the rule of law among nations from general concept to proposals for concrete action which will bring the idea closer to reality.

When law replaces weapons in the control of the fate of humanity, this mission of

lawyers will have been completed. In a world ruled by law man can walk in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles S. Rhyne, Chairman; Homer G. Angelo, Arthur H. Dean, Erwin N. Griswold, Arthur Larson, Philip H. Lewis, Howard C. Petersen, Herman Phleger, Robert H. Reno, Robert G. Storey, Sr., Lyman M. Tondel, Jr., Loyd Wright.

MAY 18, 1959.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR CONFERENCES OF LAWYERS OF MANY NATIONS

OBJECTIVES OF THE CONFERENCES

- (1) To marshal the resources of the legal profession of all countries for the achievement of world peace through law and for the education of world opinion to gain essential public support.
- (2) To consider and recommend action on matters within the special competence of the legal profession.

AGENDA

See pages 2 and 3 supra.

PREPARATIONS FOR REGIONAL CONFERENCES

(1) The president of the American Bar Association communicates with the president of the national bar association, or its nearest equivalent, in each of the countries which were represented at the Geneva conference on the law of the sea. He summarizes the results of the American Bar Association study of the feasibility of conducting a conference of lawyers from many nations and suggests the desirability of the establishment of a special committee of lawyers on world peace through law in each of the said countries to cooperate with the American Bar Association special committee in organizing a conference of lawyers in each of the regions specified below and in organizing an eventual conference of lawyers from all the aforesaid countries. He offers further information, technical assistance in promoting the interest of lawyers and financial assistance in connection with arrangements for the regional conferences and the eventual world conference. Subject to the possibility of reallocations for convenience of travel, the regions referred to would be (1) the Americas; (2) Asia; (3) Africa; and (4) Europe.

(2) The formal communications to presidents of national bar associations are supplemented by informal approaches. Some of the aforesaid countries are visited by members of the American Bar Association special committee and its staff. Information and technical assistance are supplied as requested. Within an estimated period of 3 months, correspondence and personal meetings result in the establishment, in each of the regions, of a planning committee, one member of which is designated by the president of each of the participating national bar associations.

(3) The conference planning committee for each region meets at an agreed place and time to work out detailed arrangements for a regional conference. These details include time, place and duration of conference, number of delegates from each country, rules of procedure including limitation of discussion to the agreed-upon agenda, conference rooms, local staff, working languages, simultaneous translations, reporting and social functions.

(4) Provision is made at the same meeting for preparation and advance circulation of working papers (in the working languages) on the topics placed on the agenda. Qualified experts in each of the countries in the pertinent region will be employed. The text of the working papers will be approved by a subcommittee of the planning committee representative of the principal legal systems which exist in the region. The staff of the American Bar Association special committee

is augmented to such extent and for such period as may be necessary.

(5) It is anticipated that travel expenses of two lawyer delegates to and from each of the conferences and the subsistence of two lawyer delegates at each of those conferences, for a period of 5 days, will be paid from funds at the disposal of the American Bar Association.

CONDUCT OF REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Subject to determination by the respective planning committees, it is anticipated that:

(1) Each of the regional conferences will last 5 days.

(2) All sessions of each conference will be plenary, with simultaneous translations into the working languages, and fully reported. The working languages will be English and Spanish for the Americas; English and French for Asia and Africa; English, French and Russian for Europe.

(3) At the first plenary session rules of procedure, previously drafted, will be considered and adopted, and necessary committees (steering, drafting, etc.) will be appointed. Special committees may be appointed subsequently to study and report on matters referred to them.

(4) Committees will be small. Their sessions will be informal, provided with interpreters but not with simultaneous translation, reported summarily by assigned members of the conference staff.

(5) Each of the regional conferences will publish a report of its proceedings and recommendations.

(6) Each of the regional conferences will elect three members of a world conference planning committee. The chairman of the American Bar Association special committee on world peace through law will be a member ex officio of the world conference planning committee.

PREPARATIONS FOR WORLD CONFERENCE

(1) The world conference planning committee is convened at Washington. Travel expenses and subsistence of foreign members are paid from funds at the disposal of American Bar Association. The chairman summarizes the results of the regional conferences and submits for consideration proposals of arrangements for the world conference.

(2) After agreement on the arrangements, the president of the American Bar Association invites the president of the bar association, or nearest equivalent, of each of the foreign countries that participated in the regional conferences to designate the authorized number of delegates to the world conference and states that the travel and subsistence expenses of two of these delegates will be paid from funds at the disposal of American Bar Association. If so instructed by the world conference planning committee, he issues similar invitations to presidents of national bar associations of countries which were represented at the Geneva conference but not in any of the regional conferences and to presidents of national bar associations of countries which have subsequently become members of the United Nations.

(3) Working papers are prepared by an augmented staff of the American Bar Association special committee, under substantially the same conditions as indicated above, and circulated in advance in the working languages of the world conference.

(4) The greater part of the staff of the American Bar Association special committee is transferred to the seat of the conference 1 month before the opening date. The staff is responsible for carrying out before that date the instructions of the world conference planning committee with respect to physical arrangements for the conference.

CONDUCT OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE

Subject to determination by the planning committee, substantially as outlined under

conduct of regional conferences except as follows:

(1) Duration 3 weeks.

(2) Simultaneous translations into English, French, Spanish, and Russian.

(3) Published report to be transmitted by each delegation to its own government and disseminated to all members of participating bar associations.

(4) A continuing committee of the conference to be established to keep participants informed of pertinent developments.

(5) Arrangements to be made for a proper followup on all of the plans and programs developed at the conference.

BUDGET ESTIMATE

Meetings of planning committees:	
(a) In South America.....	\$13,000
(b) In Asia.....	12,000
(c) In Africa.....	6,000
(d) In Europe.....	7,000
(e) In Washington, D.C., for world conference.....	13,000
Total.....	51,000
Nationwide U.S. conference:	
(a) Preparatory expenses.....	2,500
(b) Expenses of conference.....	2,500
Total.....	5,000
Regional conferences:	
(a) In South America.....	42,300
(b) In Asia.....	49,500
(c) In Africa.....	27,000
(d) In Europe.....	30,000
Total.....	148,800
World conference.....	300,000
American Bar Association staff (2 years):	
(a) Salaries of lawyers, translators and secretaries.....	100,000
(b) Staff travel in field.....	15,000
(c) Fees to consultants.....	5,000
Total.....	120,000
Office expenses of American Bar Association staff (2 years):	
(a) Office rental.....	6,000
(b) Stationery, postage, etc.....	10,000
(c) Outside printing and mimeographing, including final report.....	25,000
Total.....	41,000
Total.....	665,800
Miscellaneous (5 percent of total).....	33,290
Total.....	699,090

NOTES

(1) Expenses of meetings of planning committees, the international regional conferences and the eventual world conference are based on figures available with respect to travel to and from the cities mentioned in the report and with respect to maintenance and facilities in those cities.

(2) The estimates include travel and maintenance for two delegates from each of 22 nations for the Western Hemisphere conference; 25 for the Asian conference; 11 for the African conference; 34 for the European conference; and 89 for the world conference.

(3) It is assumed, for budgetary purposes, that all conference halls, meeting rooms, offices, office furniture and equipment will be rented at normal rental prices.

(4) Actual costs may be considerably below the estimates if different sites are selected, or if the number of participating nations is less than that assumed, or if conference halls, etc.; are provided free of charge for some or all of the conferences.

(5) A detailed memorandum on the bases of the estimates is attached.

BASES FOR ESTIMATED BUDGET

Regional Planning Committee Meeting

Travel expenses are estimated on the basis of air transportation, tourist class, round trip; per diem maintenance in accordance with U.S. Government schedules.

If the site selected in South America is Rio de Janeiro, travel expenses will be approximately \$12,000; maintenance expenses approximately \$1,000.

If the site selected in Asia is New Delhi, travel expenses will be approximately \$11,000; maintenance expenses approximately \$1,000.

If the site selected in Africa is Accra, Ghana, travel expenses will be approximately \$5,000; maintenance expenses approximately \$1,000.

If the site selected in Europe is Vienna, travel expenses will be approximately \$6,000; maintenance expenses approximately \$1,000.

World Conference Planning Committee

On the basis indicated above, if this committee meets in Washington, D.C., travel expenses will be approximately \$12,000; maintenance expenses (for a 4-day session) approximately \$1,000.

Nationwide U.S. Conference

Delegates would travel to and from this conference at their own expense and there would be no maintenance allowance. Preparatory documents and other similar expenses would amount to approximately \$2,500, and expenses of reporting and facilities at the conference site would amount to approximately \$2,500.

Regional Conferences

Air travel and maintenance expenses are estimated on the basis indicated above. Rental prices for conference halls, meeting rooms, offices, office furniture, equipment and facilities are estimated, for the most part, on the basis of data obtained from the Office of International Conferences of the Department of State. Service costs are estimated on the basis of data from the same source, supplemented by data from service companies.

Regional Conference in South America

If this conference is held in Rio de Janeiro, the approximate expenses will be as follows:

(a) Room for plenary session.....	\$1,300
(b) Committee meeting rooms.....	700
(c) Offices.....	600
(d) Office furniture, equipment and supplies.....	3,200
(e) Communication services.....	1,000
(f) Interpreting services (wireless receiver sets and equipment.....)	1,500
(g) Transportation (hire of vehicles).....	700
(h) Four interpreters.....	1,000
(i) One typist recruited locally.....	100
(j) Two messengers recruited locally.....	200
(k) Two registration clerks recruited locally.....	200
(l) Two tape recorder operators recruited locally.....	200
(m) Transportation of staff personnel from Washington, D.C. to Rio and return.....	3,700
(n) Per diem expenses for personnel in (m) above.....	1,000
(o) Travel of delegates.....	23,600
(p) Per diem for delegates.....	3,300
Total.....	42,300

If the conference is held in Mexico City, the savings in travel expenses will reduce the total cost of the conference to approximately \$13,400.

If the conference is held in Lima, the savings in travel expenses would reduce the total cost of the conference to approximately \$36,400.

Regional Conference in Asia

If the conference is held in New Delhi, the expenses of the conference will be approximately as follows:

(a) Items corresponding to (a) through (l) in Rio de Janeiro schedule.....	\$13,200
(b) Items corresponding to (m) and (n) in above schedule.....	11,600
(c) Items corresponding to (o) and (p) in above schedule.....	24,700
Total.....	49,500

If the conference is held in Bangkok, the savings in travel expenses will reduce the total cost of the conference to approximately \$45,800.

Regional Conference in Africa

If the conference is held in Accra the expenses of the conference will be approximately as follows:

(a) Items corresponding to (a) through (l) in Rio de Janeiro schedule.....	\$11,800
(b) Items corresponding to (m) and (n) in above schedule.....	4,300
(c) Items corresponding to (o) and (p) in above schedule.....	10,900
Total.....	27,000

Regional Conference in Europe

If the Conference is held in Vienna the expenses of the Conference will be approximately as follows:

(a) Items corresponding to (a) through (l) in Rio de Janeiro schedule.....	\$11,000
(b) Items corresponding to (m) and (n) in above schedule.....	3,900
(c) Items corresponding to (o) and (p) in above schedule.....	15,100
Total.....	30,000

World Conference

If the World Conference is held at the Hague, the expenses of the Conference will be as follows:

(a) Rental of meeting rooms, offices, office equipment supplies and other facilities.....	\$68,000
(b) Interpreting services.....	8,000
(c) Communication services.....	3,400
(d) Transportation (hire of vehicles).....	5,000
(e) Cost of contract personnel.....	39,000
(f) Travel of staff personnel.....	7,100
(g) Maintenance of staff personnel.....	3,400
(h) Travel of delegates.....	105,200
(i) Maintenance of delegates.....	44,900
(j) Reproduction of documents.....	18,000
Total.....	300,000

ABA Staff salaries

Three attorneys paid at the annual rate of \$20,000, \$7,500, and \$6,500, respectively.

Two secretaries paid at the rate of \$5,000 per year each.

Translators employed as needed, \$6,000 per year.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
STUDIES OF AUTOMATION

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am often gratified at the widespread recognition and high level use which is made of some of the materials which come into existence, often essentially as by-products of the legislative process and

legislative watchfulness of matters involving the national interest. In 1955 a Joint Economic Committee Subcommittee of which I was chairman made a careful and objective study of the impact of "Automation and Technological Change" on employment levels and our standard of living. Other members of the subcommittee at that time were Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Senator Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Representative Augustine B. Kelley, of Pennsylvania; and Representative Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan. Through similar subcommittees in later Congresses, we have kept in close touch with the problem by regular supplemental hearings and continuing study.

At our pioneering congressional hearing on this intensely important subject we heard the testimony of a carefully selected and varied group of experts from industry and research. The widespread interest and regard for the statements and answers of these witnesses is attested by the fact that printed transcripts of hearings of the committee have long been out of print. It has been necessary to reprint the committee's report—Senate Report No. 1308, 84th Congress—several times to satisfy the public interest in the subject.

Both the hearings and the report have, moreover, been widely quoted and cited both here and abroad. For example, the findings of the Committee have been translated into German and published in the Zeitschrift für angewandte Konjunkturforschung—Journal for Applied Business-Cycle Research. It was widely referred to in the 1957 report of the Director-General of the International Labor Office—Geneva—entitled "Automation and Other Technological Developments." Similar reference has been made in the report of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research—United Kingdom—published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office in 1956. Innumerable domestic publications, such as a pamphlet by Almarin Phillips entitled "Automation—Its Impact on Economic Growth and Stability," make frequent quotes from the testimony of experts in the Joint Committee's hearings.

Just recently there has been published a book, "Automation and Society," edited by Howard Boone Jacobson and Joseph S. Rowcek of the University of Bridgeport in which 11 out of 32 chapters do honor to the Joint Economic Committee's hearings by quoting, with slight editing, the statements of the expert witnesses whose testimony is reported in the committee's hearings.

I am prompted on this occasion to remind Members of Congress that credit for such obviously respected work is of course not always given. While materials developed in congressional hearings are quite properly in the public domain, I am sorry that the authors in the present instance neglected to acknowledge and remind their readers of the debt owed to the Joint Economic Committee and particularly to the debt which the committee owes to those public-spirited citizens, industrialists and union officials who have prepared statements at the committee's request. The respect paid to the Joint Economic Committee's pioneering study in this field by

generous quotation, even though unacknowledged, is testimony of its objectivity, its selection of expert witnesses, and the lasting contribution which such hearings have made to our knowledge of this rapidly developing subject.

ELECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

(At the request of Mr. HALLECK, as follows:)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for June 3, through June 5 on account of official business away from Washington, D.C.

Mr. SAYLOR, on June 4 and 5, 1959, on account of official business.

Mr. CANFIELD, for an indefinite period, on account of physicians order for recuperative rest.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK:)

Mr. HAYS on account of official business.

Mr. DENTON, on account of official business.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, on account of official business.

Mr. HEMPHILL, on account of official business.

Mr. COAD, on account of official business.

Mr. MOELLER, on account of official business.

Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of death in family.

Mr. KEARNS, for 1 week, beginning June 8, on account of attending the I.L.O. meeting at Geneva, Switzerland.

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. SLACK, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. ROBISON), for 30 minutes, on June 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROBISON) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. DOOLEY.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MULTER
Mr. HERLONG
Mr. WOLF

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 758. An act for the relief of Viktor Neimanis;

S. 1197. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended;

S. 1217. An act to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation;

S. 1228. An act to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1242. An act to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 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:

1061. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1062. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1063. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1064. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the workmen's compensation provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3030. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan

Police force" so as to provide retirement compensation for the present director of said band after 10 or more years of service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6378. A bill to authorize the American Society of International Law to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6662. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act in order to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of such Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 949. An act for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, to provide that under certain conditions officers of the executive branch of the Federal Government appointed by the President shall be exempt from such act; with amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2368. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7523. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7524. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H.R. 7525. A bill to amend section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 7526. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of pension or compensation to veterans concurrently with reserve retired pay under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 7527. A bill to validate the payment of family separation allowances to members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 7528. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7529. A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 7530. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 7531. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7532. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7533. A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7534. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by providing for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure the coherent development of all official international cultural activities of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 7535. A bill to provide that surplus personal property of the United States may be donated to the States for the promotion of fish and wildlife management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 7536. A bill to provide for assistance to the Klamath County School District, Oregon, in the construction of a high school building on the Klamath Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H.R. 7537. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 7538. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7539. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7540. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7541. A bill to allow small business corporations which had less than 90 days after the enactment of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 in which to make an election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 an additional 30 days in which to make such election; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLON:

H.R. 7542. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that foremen

shall in certain cases be considered as employees for purposes of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7543. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land for expansion of the Grafton National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 7544. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 7545. A bill to provide for the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 7546. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in order to provide assistance to the States for certain workshops, rehabilitation facilities, and rehabilitation evaluation services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 7547. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARMON:

H.R. 7548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 410. Joint resolution providing for a White House Conference on Human Public Relations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to provide for a special research inquiry into the causes of chronic unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 412. Joint resolution authorizing the National Geographic Society to erect a memorial on public grounds in the State of Virginia to honor Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 280. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to a presently contemplated conference of heads of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant Federal loans to needy students for graduate studies and provides for repayment over 20 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 18 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the Youth Conservation Act of 1959 and expressing the appreciation of the Legislature of the State of Nevada to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK for sponsoring such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prepare ade-

quate State water rights legislation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the Pittman Act, and to amend the Desert Land Act by eliminating the exception of the State of Nevada from the provision that no person shall be entitled to make entry on desert lands unless he be a resident of the State in which the land is located; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to aid the mining industry in Nevada and other sections of the United States either by imposing tariffs or by other reasonable and effective methods so that the United States may become more prosperous and be assured of a constant supply of minerals necessary for an effective defense program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to pass legislation proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to request the Government department administering social security benefits to liberalize the requirements for such benefits, or to enact suitable legislation effecting this end; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 7550. A bill for the relief of Vartanouch Kalfayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7551. A bill for the relief of Hubert O. Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7552. A bill for the relief of Willie Lemuel Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7553. A bill for the relief of Hrant H. Shoushanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7554. A bill for the relief of Kit Fong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 282. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 3958) with accompanying papers to the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

204. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a redress of grievance and requesting that the officers of the House of Representatives be directed by the House to disclose to the public those transactions concerning the disbursement of public funds for payrolls, salaries, expenses, and such other purposes as are a matter of record; to the Committee on House Administration.

205. Also, petition of Jesse Glenn, Chicago, Ill., requesting support for a civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the

Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1958 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

- A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) \$128. E. (9) \$352.02.
- A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,770.90. E. (9) \$1,770.90.
- A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$3,033.10.
- A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,531.42. E. (9) \$1,531.42.
- A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$9,968.50. E. (9) \$9,968.50.
- A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$11,847.60. E. (9) \$10,547.60.
- A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$9,916.90. E. (9) \$23,831.76.
- A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$144.25. E. (9) \$4,895.66.
- A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$4,178.85.
- A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$15,205.74. E. (9) \$3,391.58.
- A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Ash, Bauersfeld & Burton, 1921 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- B. Edwin W. Pauley, 717 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) \$9.13.
- A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
- B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- A. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., Ltd., 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$150.35.
- A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. Clearly, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,225.
- A. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Auto Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,792.29. E. (9) \$8.70.
- A. Bennett Associates, Inc., 6 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
- B. National Wool Textile Export Corp., Commerce House, Bradford 1, Yorkshire, England.
D. (6) \$11,250. E. (9) \$1,998.93.
- A. Carl H. Berglund, 1219 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
- A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$0.75.
- A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,667.57.
- A. C. B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,111.01.
- A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
- B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. Blue Cross Commission, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- A. John J. Boland, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
- B. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$15,000. E. (9) \$67.88.
- A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
- B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
- A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse, 253, Mulheim-Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) \$137.
- A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) \$247.
- A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$537.50.
- A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Brown & Lund, Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$82.96.
- A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$21.77.
- A. Lyman L. Bryan, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$40.
- A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street, SE., Washington, D.C.
- B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$219. E. (9) \$219.
- A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
- B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
- A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$100.
- A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
- B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
- A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
- B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
- A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
- A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. Leo E. Connor, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- B. Lexington School for the Deaf, 904 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Eugene P. Conser, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$875.
- A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
- B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$3,250.

- A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$72. E. (9) \$127.
- A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
- A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
 D. (6) \$109,330.51. E. (9) \$575.
- A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
 B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
 B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.
- A. John F. Deeds, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert J. Demichelis, 640 Central Avenue, Deerfield, Ill.
 B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,762.50. E. (9) \$223.33.
- A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,031.25. E. (9) \$49.73.
- A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,125.
- A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$91.93. E. (9) \$8.66.
- A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$548. E. (9) \$10.
- A. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$10.
- A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
 B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Maurice H. Fouracre, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Teachers College, Columbia University, 120th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
 B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
- A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$535.90.
- A. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$1,096.26.
- A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
 B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. William B. Henderson, 1013 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Parcel Post Association, 1013 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,903. E. (9) \$1,853.
- A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
 B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
- A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,649.99. E. (9) \$1,120.65.
- A. Harold K. Howe, 207 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 207 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,400.
- A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
 B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
- A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
 E. (9) \$160.75.
- A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
 B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
 E. (9) \$1,585.64.
- A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$56.
- A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N.J.
 D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$1,158.75.
- A. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,749.98. E. (9) \$271.92.
- A. Hugo E. Johnson, 1400 Hanna Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
 B. American Iron Ore Association, 1400 Hanna Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
- A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,873.
- A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 E. (9) \$675.33.
- A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. Franklin E. Kenner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
 B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,807.66. E. (9) \$111.91.
- A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,052.
- A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. A. H. Bull Steamship Co., 115 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
- A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$548. E. (9) \$10.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
 B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$450.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$450.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$55.

A. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. Consolidated Edison Co. of N.Y., Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$92.61.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Chicago Mercantile Exchange, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$42.23.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Porter Brothers Corp., Post Office Box 667, Boise, Idaho.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$53.02.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
 B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$2,134.33. E. (9) \$215.85.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$497.09.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$390. E. (9) \$161.71.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$258.70.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$425.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$5,775. E. (9) \$114.60.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,802.

A. Marks & Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,500.

A. The Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$2,725.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$66.48.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$4,324.99. E. (9) \$200.75.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Moot, Sprague, Marcy & Gulick, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
 B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$38.31. E. (9) \$2,500.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Alexandria, Va.
 B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$173.03.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
 B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$287.70. E. (9) \$501.70.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$12,063.94. E. (9) \$13,950.59.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$52,041.50. E. (9) \$9,717.15.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$10,177.98. E. (9) \$1,856.35.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$15,210.48.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$850.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
 D. (6) \$388.55. E. (9) \$230.25.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$9,383.85.

A. National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$402,096.95. E. (9) \$3,222.11.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$24,190. E. (9) \$22,325.71.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 E. (9) \$170.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$42,499.36. E. (9) \$2,267.94.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$6,266.92. E. (9) \$1,104.66.

A. National Rural Electric Co-op. Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$415.34.

A. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,655.87. E. (9) \$9,034.46.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,719.54. E. (9) \$1,616.89.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
 D. (6) \$551.95. E. (9) \$1,625.10.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$2,684.48.

A. George S. Newcomer, 900 First National Bank Building, Baltimore, Md.
 B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

- A. Joseph A. Noone, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$834.93. E. (9) \$569.97.
- A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
- A. Charles A. Parker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- A. The Patent Office Society, Box 685, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$225.
- A. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$213.
- A. Mrs. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,278.83. E. (9) \$200.98.
- A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) \$3,346.14. E. (9) \$1,226.25.
- A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
- A. Piper & Marbury, 900 First National Bank Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) \$9.52.
- A. Ralph D. Pittman, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. George B. Soto, 1801 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$10.
- A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,268.
- A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
- A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
E. (9) \$13.47.
- A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$104.26.
- A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$195.40.
- A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$6,909.68.
- A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$575.
- A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$4,982.67. E. (9) \$3,519.70.
- A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
- A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles.
D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Ira Saks, 1008 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. James D. Secrest, 1721 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, 1721 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$33.10.
- A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ivanhoe Trading Co., Inc., 274 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$3.60.
- A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$54.41.
- A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$836.76.
- A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$6,059.11.
- A. M. Frederik Smith, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,455.04.
- A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) \$669.49. E. (9) \$295.91.
- A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$486.40.
- A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$183.45.
- A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$17,331. E. (9) \$15,766.85.
- A. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
- A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$9.
- A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Compagnie Immobiliere Marc Rainaut et Compagnie.
- A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Walter H. Duisberg, 231 South Dwight Place, Englewood, N.J.
- A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ronson Corp., 1 Ronson Road, Woodbridge, N.J.
- A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. S. A. Orcl, Geneva, Switzerland.
- A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,638.60.
- A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Transportation Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,135.50. E. (9) \$4,517.88.
- A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,350.07.
- A. The United States Trotting Association, 1349 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Philco Corp., Tloga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$176.07.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,241.53. E. (9) \$2,241.53.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$50.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.

B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,568.87. E. (9) \$571.34.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.

D. (6) \$20. E. (9) \$20.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$53.17.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.

B. Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$55.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

THURSDAY

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

HOUSE

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (1) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
- (2) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
 - (1) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (2) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

- 1. State name, address, and nature of business.
- 2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—Reports by Agents or Employees. An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

- (b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
- (c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

- 1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.
- 2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.
- 3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes anything of value. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.**—(1) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of \$500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.**—(1) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of \$500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to \$500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. \$-----Dues and assessments
2. \$-----Gifts of money or anything of value
3. \$-----Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. \$-----Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. \$-----Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. \$-----TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. \$-----Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. \$-----TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. \$-----TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. \$-----Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. \$-----Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. \$-----"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of \$500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": -----
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total \$500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	Name and Address of Contributor (“Period” from Jan. 1 through -----, 19-----)
\$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
\$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
\$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. \$-----Public relations and advertising services
2. \$-----Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. \$-----Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. \$-----Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. \$-----Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. \$-----Telephone and telegraph
7. \$-----Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. \$-----All other expenditures
9. \$-----TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. \$-----Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. \$-----TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditures' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. \$-----TOTAL now owed to person filing.
13. \$-----Lent to others during this Quarter
14. \$-----Repayment received during this Quarter

15. **Recipients of Expenditures of \$10 or More**
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose
\$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
\$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at \$800.00 per month.
\$4,150.00	TOTAL

- A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$51.80.
- A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,417.45. E. (9) \$20.25.
- A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,897. E. (9) \$8,131.54.
- A. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,482.68. E. (9) \$5,482.68.
- A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$11,170.35. E. (9) \$11,170.35.
- A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
- A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.
- A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$21.28.
- A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
- A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) \$2,210. E. (9) \$6.50.
- A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,818.28.
- A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$7,249.69.
- A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$6,869.86. E. (9) \$6,869.86.
- A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$23,898. E. (9) \$23,898.
- A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL-CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$34,514.59.
- A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$189,931. E. (9) \$7,636.76.
- A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$12,670.48. E. (9) \$10,720.48.
- A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$20,000. E. (9) \$11,362.81.
- A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$5,340.65.
- A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$76,419.88. E. (9) \$1,523.51.
- A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$770,500.91. E. (9) \$5,659.90.
- A. American Optometric Association (development fund-legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$4,072.62. E. (9) \$2,470.45.
- A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$572.55. E. (9) \$572.55.
- A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,087.04. E. (9) \$1,640.32.
- A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$22,669. E. (9) \$8,937.
- A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$87,661.19. E. (9) \$4,476.97.
- A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,649.76. E. (9) \$5,649.76.
- A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 206 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,602.35. E. (9) \$23,656.09.
- A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$3,625. E. (9) \$38.14.
- A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Battery March Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$32.98.
- A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$15,803.53.
- A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10,290.06. E. (9) \$15,881.52.
- A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$650.37.
- A. American Warehousemen's Association Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,059.04.
- A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,545. E. (9) \$1,705.22.
- A. Buist M. Anderson, care of Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
E. (9) \$135.
- A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., care of Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) \$336. E. (9) \$770.95.
- A. Robert Antheine, 1065 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Pension Fund of Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 113 University Place, New York, N.Y. and Inter Local Pension Fund, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 204 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$102.69.
- A. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The American Tariff League, Inc.
- A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$35. E. (9) \$1,223.11.
- A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) \$221.13. E. (9) \$901.80.
- A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
- A. George E. Arnstein, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$1,169.95.
- A. Lester Asher, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois State Conference of Building & Construction Trades, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$2,687.54.
- A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$19,643.73. E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
E. (9) \$3,333.36.
- A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$25,867.06. E. (9) \$25,867.06.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y..

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,218.65. E. (9) \$2,218.65.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,040. E. (9) \$1,040.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$250.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.

B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$125.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$389.54.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.

B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,806.84. E. (9) \$352.78.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$102.75.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$365.75.

A. J. H. Ballew, 1105 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$2,400.

A. Roy A. Ballinger, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hartman Barber, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$2,301.96. E. (9) \$703.02.

A. Arthur E. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$670. E. (9) \$70.36.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,225.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,600.

A. E. F. Behrens, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$12.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Bert Bell, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) \$980.45.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$30. E. (9) \$0.75.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,146.06.

A. Andrew J. Blemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,630. E. (9) \$593.08.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, The Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) \$238.10.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Massachusetts Indemnity and Life Insurance Co., 654 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. A. H. Bishop, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$30.75.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$550.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Confederated Unions of America, Raymond Building, Baton Rouge, La.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of Independent Oil Unions, Post Office Box 1449, Ponca City, Okla.
D. (6) \$450.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,471.10.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,715. E. (9) \$103.85.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$14.69.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,926. E. (9) \$369.80.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,040.

- A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$293.75.
- A. G. Stewart Boswell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$450.
- A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$175.56. E. (9) \$510.50.
- A. Charles B. Bowling, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$180.
- A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Aircraft Industries Association, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$200.
- A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$620.55.
- A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 D. (6) \$7,541.21. E. (9) \$7,541.21.
- A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$575. E. (9) \$46.60.
- A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. J. D. Brown, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$386.
- A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,425. E. (9) \$1,405.15.
- A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$20.20.
- A. F. Raymond Brush, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$21.25. E. (9) \$21.25.
- A. Mr. Lyman L. Bryan, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$60.
- A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$31.
- A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
 B. Florida Inland Navigation District Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
 D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$191.06.
- A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
 B. The Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
 D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$233.35.
- A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum Street, Butte, Mont.
 B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
 E. (9) \$475.
- A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$482.44.
- A. David Burpee, Doylestown, Pa.
 E. (9) \$214.36.
- A. J. Edward Burroughs, Jr., Suite 701, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Unilac, Inc., and its subsidiary, Nestle's Products (Export), Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.
- A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,624.99.
- A. Hollis W. Burt, Room 1212, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$41.25.
- A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$704.16. E. (9) \$21.83.
- A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
 B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
- A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
 D. (6) \$760.20. E. (9) \$46.
- A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$393.73.
- A. Campaign for the 48 States, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.
- A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$28.13.
- A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,884.62. E. (9) \$288.46.
- A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$500.
- A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$269.
- A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
- A. Henderson B. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$815.
- A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
 E. (9) \$31.74.
- A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,280. E. (9) \$307.78.

- A. Jay H. Cerf, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,300. E. (9) \$698.41.
- A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. M. Golodetz and Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,500.
- A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S. A. De C. V. Balderas 36—Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.
D. (6) \$6,875.
- A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. Enoch D. Chase, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$21.85.
- A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$3,710.53. E. (9) \$5,514.94.
- A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$125.71.
- A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.
- A. Herman Clott, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 941 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,540.50. E. (9) \$1,136.39.
- A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,800.
- A. W. H. Coburn, 315 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Western Forest Industries Association, 526 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$649.65.
- A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$659.90.
- A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$10,000. E. (9) \$328.81.
- A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sand Products Corp., 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) \$15.15.
- A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.
E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,025. E. (9) \$492.91.
- A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,606. E. (9) \$1,250.
- A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$6,359.23.
- A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Julien D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$35.95.
- A. Contracting Plasterers' & Lathers' International Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.
- A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Advanced Life Underwriters, 708 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$188.46.
- A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$366.39.
- A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$20.
- A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,147.50. E. (9) \$1,856.46.
- A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
- A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.
- A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T.H.
E. (9) \$0.50.
- A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Savings Banks' Committee on Taxation, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Deposit Guarantee Fund, 1303 Fifth Third Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) \$2,275. E. (9) \$29.90.
- A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$370.25.
- A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$996. E. (9) \$996.
- A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$5.80.
- A. William A. Cromartie, North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Swift & Co. Employees Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$1,474.20.
- A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
- A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
- A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,926. E. (9) \$523.28.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) \$750.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. Vincenzo Buttaro, 64 Nelson Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., and Miss Domenica Buttaro, via Zuccarine 76, Mola di Bari, Province of Bari, Italy.

E. (9) \$40.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$629.17. E. (9) \$18.17.

A. Joan E. David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$103,004.42. E. (9) \$1,712.17.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Swift & Co., Employees Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$1,474.20.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Consumers Life Council, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Deeds, 311 Western Union Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$36.27.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. T. Devany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$107.61.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,718.15. E. (9) \$93.15.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,013.30. E. (9) \$213.30.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) \$1,750.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$17,556.98. E. (9) \$21,032.66.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$20,577.34.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington D.C.

D. (6) \$141.25. E. (9) \$26.30.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,625.01.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$127.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) \$500.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,468.44. E. (9) \$84.75.

A. Ben DuBois.

B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$255. E. (9) \$17.97.

A. Stephen F. Dunn, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William E. Dunn, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$6.95.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$10.20. E. (9) \$105.96.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$15.

A. Harold Edwards, 2400 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Health Federation, 2454 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$700.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,092.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$61.78.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$10,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$8.35.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$219.70.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,437.50.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,600.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,100. E. (9) \$36.55.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,510. E. (9) \$11.60.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$204.20.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$8,700. E. (9) \$5,901.66.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$96,115.83. E. (9) \$22,816.87.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$150.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) \$6,099.96.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Coal Shipping, Inc., 17 State Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bangor and Aroostook Railroad, 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$125.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,300. E. (9) \$25.52.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$203.05.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.

E. (9) \$2,116.95.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,388.78.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

D. (6) \$15,867. E. (9) \$6,495.33.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

E. (9) \$1,583.35.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

B. Florida Railroad Association, Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

B. The Florida Savings and Loan League, Post Office Box 2246, Orlando, Fla.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,400. E. (9) \$5,517.69.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) \$372.78. E. (9) \$372.78.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$737.50. E. (9) \$40.85.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$97.95.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,200.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Craft Road, Greensboro, N.C.

D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$475.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,100. E. (9) \$625.35.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,100. E. (9) \$642.20.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retail Drug-gists.
D. (6) \$3,900. E. (9) \$1,124.

A. W. E. Fravel, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) \$1,750.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$28,193.23. E. (9) \$9,078.39.

A. O. L. Frost, Jr., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Garrett Fuller, 1210 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Ore.

D. (6) \$652.50. E. (9) \$18.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

- A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$411.55.
- A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$111.37.
- A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200.
- A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,059.80. E. (9) \$297.99.
- A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$118.
- A. Lief Gilstad, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Henry W. Goodall, 209 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) \$2,333.33.
- A. John A. Gosnell, Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500.
- A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$375.
- A. Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,863.03. E. (9) \$6,131.33.
- A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. James L. Grahl, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$100.
- A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$46.99.
- A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318-418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) \$15,547.20. E. (9) \$13,485.35.
- A. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$45. E. (9) \$10.23.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,875.
- A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$2.05.
- A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.
D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$36.25.
- A. Thomas J. Gullfohl, 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. General Finance Corp., 1301 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
- A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,753.80. E. (9) \$201.89.
- A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,560. E. (9) \$435.45.
- A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$137.18.
- A. Harlan V. Hadley, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$261.90.
- A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$747.22. E. (9) \$16.71.
- A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$523.51.
- A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,374.96. E. (9) \$184.85.
- A. Harold F. Hammond, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$523.33.
- A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,250.
- A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,108.34. E. (9) \$30.83.
- A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$200.
- A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 301 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$2,573.70.
- A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$533.98.
- A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$539. E. (9) \$289.83.

A. Glynn C. Hawthorne, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,185.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$151.30.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$857.87.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$17.40.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$333.15.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$550.

A. Chas. H. Heitzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

D. (6) \$930. E. (9) \$211.35.

A. Willon A. Henderson, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2,175.69. E. (9) \$1,050.69.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$322.93. E. (9) \$322.93.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$39.77.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.

E. (9) \$98.76.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station E, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$78.25.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$218.75.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,325.05. E. (9) \$75.05.

A. L. S. Hitchner, Associations Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$25. E. (9) \$3.

A. George C. Holdrege, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) \$4,875.

A. Edward D. Hollander, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Tallet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Stanley G. Holmes, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$930.79.

A. Richard C. Holmquist, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$100.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$2,200.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$318.75.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$103,004.42. E. (9) \$1,712.17.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. J. Cline House, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,499.89.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N.Y.

B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$370.80.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Industrial Council, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$298.75.

A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$1,079.85.

A. Illinois State Conference of Building and Construction Trades, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$2,687.54.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$153,301.04.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 151 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$15,883.77. E. (9) \$15,883.77.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$537.50.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$3,353.75.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$3.50.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$1,105. E. (9) \$1,382.68.

A. Chester W. Jackson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,126.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$182.

A. Andrew Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$375.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,817.51. E. (9) \$52.65.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrielles Et Commerciales, S.A., Peter Merianstr 19, Basel, Switzerland.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.
E. (9) \$232.91.

A. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,749.98. E. (9) \$359.23.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,589.76. E. (9) \$425.79.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) \$231. E. (9) \$467.36.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$31.90.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$189.91.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 547 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) \$8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,780. E. (9) \$253.22.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) \$1,418.97.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. George J. Kelly, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$54.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$37.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$256.70.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$202.18.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, P. O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$576.22. E. (9) \$1,380.22.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$343.20.

A. Thomas J. Keyes, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,186.54. E. (9) \$4.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 O Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,628. E. (9) \$1,280.64.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$221.25.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) \$3,038.45. E. (9) \$228.55.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$299.25. E. (9) \$5.53.

A. James F. King, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Ludlow King, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. King and Noble, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$880.89. E. (9) \$880.89.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,350.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$720. E. (9) \$720.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 N. Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$36.47.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,807.66. E. (9) \$39.72.

A. Clarence C. Klocksinn, 3049 N. Hackett Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$300.

- A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,040.
- A. Burt L. Knowles, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$34.50.
- A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$15.
- A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 830 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$15.
- A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$2,313.25.
- A. Mrs. Catherine G. Kuhne, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$5,609.52. E. (9) \$4,470.05.
- A. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
 D. (6) \$749.96.
- A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
 D. (6) \$999.96.
- A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 808 Trans-American Life Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
 D. (6) \$1,275.
- A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$150.
- A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
 B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$450.
- A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$450.
- A. Alan Latman, 210 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,249.98. E. (9) \$153.
- A. John L. Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$40.
- A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$411.25. E. (9) \$1.20.
- A. Warren Lawrence, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 E. (9) \$75.
- A. Elton J. Layton, 4730 Arlington Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
 B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$100.
- A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$593.75. E. (9) \$7.
- A. H. Harold Leavey, 2020 L Street, Sacramento, Calif.
 B. California-Western States Life Insurance Co., 2020 L Street, Sacramento, Calif.
 D. (6) \$1,094.50. E. (9) \$1,158.42.
- A. Robert F. Lederer, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$13.33. E. (9) \$13.33.
- A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,083.33. E. (9) \$3,523.66.
- A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$154. E. (9) \$8.20.
- A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$4,999.98. E. (9) \$3,277.99.
- A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 D. (6) \$202.05. E. (9) \$202.05.
- A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$13,278.42. E. (9) \$13,278.42.
- A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 D. (6) \$3,125. E. (9) \$137.03.
- A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
 D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$133.30.
- A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Charles B. Lipsen, 215 DeSales Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Retail Clerks International Association, DeSales Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$675. E. (9) \$125.59.
- A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$1,015.53.
- A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. General Acceptance Corp., 1105 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
- A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
 D. (6) \$330. E. (9) \$152.44.
- A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,499.90. E. (9) \$15.
- A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$100.
- A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$136.72.
- A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
 B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$750.
- A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
- A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,000.
- A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Medical Corp., 415-423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western National Life Insurance Co. of Texas, 210 East 10th Street, Amarillo, Tex.
D. (6) \$200.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$687.94.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milton F. Lurch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,108.33. E. (9) \$29.69.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) \$1,050.

A. LeRoy E. Lyons, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$2,785.66. E. (9) \$1,469.35.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$650.37.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$20.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,005.60. E. (9) \$58.40.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$290. E. (9) \$406.60.

A. Robert E. McCormick, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Angus McDonald.

B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,739.52. E. (9) \$186.78.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. D. McElvain, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$320.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.

B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) \$781.26. E. (9) \$1,262.17.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth, Sterling, Kans.

B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$999.99. E. (9) \$250.

A. Edward F. McGinnis, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Taxpayers, U.S.A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$225.

A. William F. McKenna, 535 Lincoln Building, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$111.10. E. (9) \$131.11.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,885.20. E. (9) \$136.45.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,223.25. E. (9) \$33.95.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$23.70.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., % Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) \$2,460. E. (9) \$10.45.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$0.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,750.01. E. (9) \$1,043.51.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Confectioners' Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maclay Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James B. Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$2,462.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South Seventh East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., P.O. Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$945.08.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Gracie Terrace, New York, N.Y.

B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. John H. Mahoney, 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$250.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,040. E. (9) \$1,359.03.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$255.37.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,625. E. (9) \$2,475.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,790.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$4,200. E. (9) \$1,070.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) \$2,666.64. E. (9) \$417.97.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$273.76. E. (9) \$40.31.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, A919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$181.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,926. E. (9) \$528.25.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) \$355.69.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,222.41. E. (9) \$466.84.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50.25.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$4.75.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M.D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$58.52.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$356.25. E. (9) \$24.49.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$1,980.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 9th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$80.38.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.

E. (9) \$393.82.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$46.

A. G. R. Milburn, Grass Range, Mont.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

D. (6) \$2,654. E. (9) \$1,044.57.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,350. E. (9) \$1,086.33.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Blue Cross Association, Inc., 55 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$26.45.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,400. E. (9) \$29.17.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D.C.

B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston.
D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) \$2,553. E. (9) \$256.50.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,824. E. (9) \$1,076.35.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Siator M. Miller, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, T.H.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr.; Robert K. Eifer, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$20.60.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$78.75.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) \$2,500.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Alexandria, Va.

B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of St. Thomas and St. Croix, V.I.
D. (6) \$652.85. E. (9) \$348.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Giles Morrow, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,625. E. (9) \$212.30.

A. H. S. Mosebrook, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

- A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$4,056. E. (9) \$417.45.
- A. William J. Mougey, % General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
- A. Bernard R. Nullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) \$2,600.
- A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$748.
- A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
- A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.
- A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association, Corp., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) \$111.08. E. (9) \$261.70.
- A. Paul A. Nagle, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,125. E. (9) \$2,125.
- A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) \$13,750. E. (9) \$12.50.
- A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$59,563.65. E. (9) \$12,216.17.
- A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$7,269.04.
- A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.
- A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$1,234.24.
- A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$979.37. E. (9) \$979.37.
- A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$478.50.
- A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$13,550.74. E. (9) \$1,738.95.
- A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$15,450. E. (9) \$6,332.03.
- A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$350.
- A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) \$3,053.58. E. (9) \$232.05.
- A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oregon.
D. (6) \$1,023.67. E. (9) \$1,023.67.
- A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$9,383.85.
- A. National Bureau for Lathing & Plastering, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$204,389.23. E. (9) \$2,802.79.
- A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
- A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,550. E. (9) \$3,192.19.
- A. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,996. E. (9) \$1,684.74.
- A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) \$1,000.
- A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.
- A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) \$5,240.03. E. (9) \$5,240.03.
- A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$183.25. E. (9) \$600.75.
- A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) \$168.
- A. National Council of Naval Air Stations, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,834.23. E. (9) \$2,134.82.
- A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of First Class Mailers, 210 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,511.13. E. (9) \$1,673.62.
- A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Airlines Association, 1328 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,956.25. E. (9) \$1,970.
- A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$585. E. (9) \$585.
- A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$710.69. E. (9) \$692.17.
- A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$9,732.81. E. (9) \$9,732.81.
- A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$111,854.01. E. (9) \$12,077.32.
- A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$183,168.31. E. (9) \$15,802.94.
- A. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$10,476.
- A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$22,450.59. E. (9) \$18,912.60.
- A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$32. E. (9) \$32.
- A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,794.26. E. (9) \$1,598.48.
- A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$287,437.77. E. (9) \$1,570.25.
- A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$2,573.70.
- A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$689.93. E. (9) \$752.98.
- A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,168.65. E. (9) \$5,168.65.
- A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$779.97.
- A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$9,375.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$7,020.05. E. (9) \$7,020.05.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$8,641. E. (9) \$12,104.34.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,939.70. E. (9) \$1,126.80.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$4,125. E. (9) \$5,240.71.

A. National River & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$26,455. E. (9) \$13,726.43.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$421.71.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$819.28. E. (9) \$819.28.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$4,596.48.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$251,551.60. E. (9) \$4,896.50.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$30. E. (9) \$30.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,800.35. E. (9) \$2,420.59.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) \$13,008. E. (9) \$3,084.61.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$11,700. E. (9) \$16,327.14.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$4,368.73.

A. Joseph L. Nellis, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Consumer Organizations, Inc., 9424 Dayton Way, Beverly Hills, Calif.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$142.99.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$6.10.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$323.

A. Paul Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$20.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$4,434.41.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Henry G. Nolda, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,692.34.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 603 Associations Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$3.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$577.50. E. (9) \$61.09.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$253.65.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$133.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, 207 Northern Building, Green Bay, Wis.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$600.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$27,770.17.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Connor, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$600.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$1,500.

A. Hurley F. Offenbacher, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL-CIO.
D. (6) \$1,160.52. E. (9) \$39.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) \$539.64.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$21.66. E. (9) \$1.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Oliver, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$2,490.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Limestone Inst., Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$10.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$375. E. (9) \$106.60.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,347.08. E. (9) \$1,040.93.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$164.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$454.54.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,365.39. E. (9) \$11.90.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$1,625.01.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

E. (9) \$194.42.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) \$3,625.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$212.50. E. (9) \$4.45.

A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$25.39.

A. Edwin B. Patterson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$958.98. E. (9) \$28.03.

A. James G. Patton.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$1,170.17.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$20,000.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Saturday Review, Inc., 25 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$6,500.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$278.41.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

E. (9) \$64.55.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) \$5,200. E. (9) \$624.65.

A. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Mrs. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,784.22. E. (9) \$965.63.

A. Hugh Peterson.

B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Hugh Peterson.

B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$316.95.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$21.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.

B. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$10.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$73.12. E. (9) \$89.50.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

D. (6) \$73.12. E. (9) \$89.50.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$70.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$40.91.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

E. (9) \$278.36.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.

B. George B. Soto, 1801 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.

D. (6) \$106,478.69. E. (9) \$525.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$827.94.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. The Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$216.25.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$9.10.

A. Walter I. Pozen, 1519 26th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,499.99.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) \$2.26.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Detroit Bakery Employers' Council, 2901 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.

E. (9) \$409.58.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,031.25. E. (9) \$438.31.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

E. (9) \$140.80.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Instituto Cubano de Establizacion del Azucar, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Cancer Society, New York City, Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, New York City, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, New York City, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York City, National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis, Minn., Association of American Medical Colleges, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) \$12,583.33. E. (9) \$5,693.64.

A. Alex Radin, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$317.24.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$31.25. E. (9) \$1.50.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$425. E. (9) \$83.75.

A. Joseph H. Ream, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, Suite 506, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.

B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$1,926.67.

A. J. B. Reeves, Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.

A. K. M. Regan, Post Office Box 172, Midland, Tex.

B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) \$9,444.22. E. (9) \$4,424.22.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,999.98. E. (9) \$53.55.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$123.67.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$1,312.50. E. (9) \$725.39.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) \$612.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$7,067.08.

A. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers' Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$96,110.60.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,625. E. (9) \$8,798.52.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$575. E. (9) \$7.70.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bill Richards, Orleans, Nebr.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. James P. Richards, 1536 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$175. E. (9) \$31.95.

A. James W. Richards, 4510 Trent Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$180.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edward McGee Rider, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. Siert F. Rieplma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

D. (6) \$1,356.04. E. (9) \$136.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor, and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,926. E. (9) \$501.30.

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Riley, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hugo J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$806.19.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Washington, D.C.

B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$318.71.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$290.55.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corporation, 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$82.13.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$950. E. (9) \$44.30.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$7.85.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) \$4,333.50.

A. Henry F. Rood, 1301 South Harrison Street, Fort Wayne, Ind.

B. Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., 1301 South Harrison Street, Fort Wayne, Ind.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 316 A Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,300.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$6,095.85. E. (9) \$2,352.33.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 738 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) \$590.52. E. (9) \$523.27.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$618.75. E. (9) \$115.27.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$241.70.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,999.88.

A. Ira Saks, 1008 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$69.47.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Boston and Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) \$140. E. (9) \$205.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harrison Sasser, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,950.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) \$1,350.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) \$19.26.

A. Harold H. Schroeder, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$1,100.

A. John L. Schroeder, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. V. L. Schultz, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) \$1,982.61.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) \$450.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 582 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

E. (9) \$136.30.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$102.81. E. (9) \$1,122.85.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$57.16. E. (9) \$17.35.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$53.75.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$625. E. (9) \$34.98.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$893.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C. and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,250.06. E. (9) \$546.66.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$7.80.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) \$3,250. E. (9) \$263.73.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$625.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,441.90. E. (9) \$884.15.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) \$3,011.60.

A. Stephen Slipper, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,187.50. E. (9) \$19.80.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$606.12. E. (9) \$115.64.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) \$254.85.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$275. E. (9) \$85.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) \$3,850.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) \$4,257.

A. Wallace M. Smith, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$1,750. E. (9) \$1,070.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$183.33.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,362.98. E. (9) \$0.80.

A. J. D. Snyder, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$825.

A. J. R. Snyder, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$2. E. (9) \$71.26.

- A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,074.65.
- A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$48,111.50. E. (9) \$24,437.26.
- A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$460.05.
- A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
- A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,800. E. (9) \$4,431.41.
- A. Howard M. Sterling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$150.
- A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest station, Washington, D.C.
- A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$240. E. (9) \$20.
- A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. B. H. Steuerwald, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$750.
- A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. N. R. Caine & Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.
- A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) \$255.
- A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$74.99.
- A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,583.33.
- A. Erskine Stewart, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,208.33.
- A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local 1, AFSCME, 333 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$125.
- A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$300.
- A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) \$1,250.
- A. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
- A. Francis W. Stover, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) \$1,750.02.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,615.38.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,250.
- A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,250.
- A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adhesive Manufacturing Association of America, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
- A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Reservation, Browning, Mont.
- A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.
- A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.
- A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.
- A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.
- A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.
- A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md., and 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
- A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$143.12.
- A. William L. Sturdevant, Jr., 8300 Burdette Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,300.
- A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$200.
- A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$905.59.
- A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$843.75. E. (9) \$1,096.13.
- A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
- A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Walter H. Duisberg, 231 South Dwight Place, Englewood, N.J.
- A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ronson Corp., 1 Ronson Road, Woodbridge, N.J.
- A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
- A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
- A. Tyre Taylor, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$532.85.
- A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$38.87.
- A. Temporary Committee on Taxation of Mutual Life Insurance Companies, 7140 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$42,450. E. (9) \$40,752.37.
- A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$6,481.03.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$158.66.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., 2929 16th Street SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Trans-World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
 B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$2,082.50.

A. Thomas C. Thompson, Jr., 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$47.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$4,005. E. (9) \$154.97.

A. Arthur R. Thurston, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.
 B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,750.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
 B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
 D. (6) \$295. E. (9) \$571.55.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$537.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$2,418.75. E. (9) \$196.55.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
 B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$129.65.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
 B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,620.83. E. (9) \$74.47.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,093.75. E. (9) \$47.25.

A. Stanley R. Tupper, 154 State Street, Augusta, Maine.
 B. Boston & Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$143.21.

A. Harold J. Turner, Portland, Ore.
 B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Ore.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. California Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
 D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$31.10.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, I.O.M.M. & P., Post Office Box 601, Canal Zone.

A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$800.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
 E. (9) \$1,138.83.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$1,299.93.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$239.02.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$31,984.89.

A. The United States Trotting Association, 1349 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$370. E. (9) \$140.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl M. Walker, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$106.70.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$482.13. E. (9) \$6.15.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$478. E. (9) \$20.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Government Employees' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,042.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$100.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$4,645.50. E. (9) \$4,919.59.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
 B. Southern Pacific Co., 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$178.75. E. (9) \$3,338.89.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
 B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
 E. (9) \$836.01.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 E. (9) \$282.90.

A. Robert Watson, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$1,413.60.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
 B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
 D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
 E. (9) \$231.60.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. The Atlantic Refining Co., Inc., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$265.89.
- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$192.35.
- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$422.27.
- A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Philco Corporation, Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
- A. William H. Webb, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,824.12. E. (9) \$509.97.
- A. Donald D. Webster, Room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Committee on Conference Studies, Room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$1,132.81.
- A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12059 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
 D. (6) \$3,803.64.
- A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$116.99.
- A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
 E. (9) \$621.
- A. Joseph T. West, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.
 D. (6) \$1,185.
- A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 E. (9) \$12,137.13.
- A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
- A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$37.50. E. (9) \$105.51.
- A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
- A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
 D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$50.
- A. Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
 E. (9) \$25.85.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
 E. (9) \$9.14.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
 E. (9) \$256.01.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Belleview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.
 E. (9) \$2.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Quinalt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.
 E. (9) \$2.46.
- A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
 E. (9) \$40.03.
- A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
 B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.
- A. Franz O. Willenbacher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$3,000.
- A. Harold M. Williams, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$325.
- A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$3,700. E. (9) \$623.85.
- A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$2,568.87. E. (9) \$411.85.
- A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
 B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
 D. (6) \$18. E. (9) \$18.
- A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
 B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,507.89. E. (9) \$1.
- A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
- A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
 B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
 D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$538.83.
- A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.
 B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
 B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
 D. (6) \$4,375.
- A. Frank G. Wollney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
 B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Wood, King & Dawson, attorneys at law, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
 B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
- A. Russell J. Woodman, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,779.17.
- A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
- A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
- A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
 D. (6) \$1,050. E. (9) \$125.18.
- A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
 E. (9) \$140.
- A. Edmund A. Zabel, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
 D. (6) \$1,699.98. E. (9) \$200.05.
- A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
- A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="4" style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">QUARTER</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">P</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">1st</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">2d</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">3d</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">4th</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center; padding: 2px;">(Mark one square only)</td> </tr> </table>	QUARTER				P	1st	2d	3d	4th	(Mark one square only)				
QUARTER																
P	1st	2d	3d	4th												
(Mark one square only)																
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT																

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
 - (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
- (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—Reports by Agents or Employees. An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) if a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated,

place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of these publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 61 West 87th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Anthoine, 1065 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Pension Fund of Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 113 University Place, New York, N.Y.; Interlocal Pension Fund, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 204 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. David O. Appleton, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., Inc., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. M. Baldrige, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy A. Ballinger, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barnes Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoades, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. Albert M. Greenfield.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 4664 Reservoir Road NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, the Hill Building, Washington, D.C.

A. BNG Industries, Inc., 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniel L. Boland, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roger E. Brooks, 923 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. F. Raymond Brush, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurseymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Newman D. Buck, Mount Pleasant, S.C.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation District, League City, Tex.

A. Harold Burke, 140 Front Street, New York, N.Y.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Edward Burroughs, Jr., Suite 701, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Unilac, Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Camara Minera De Mexico, Gante, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S. A. De C. V., Balderas, Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. A. H. Chesser, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest W. Clausen, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Henry J. Clay, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Howe Sound Co., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. W. H. Coburn, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Forest Industries Association, 526 Henry Building, Portland, Ore.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Sand Products Corp., 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Herbert S. Colton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Burl Johnson & Association, Box 1115, Fairchild AFB, Spokane, Wash.

A. Robert B. Craig, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fairbanks, Morse & Co., 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bakers Association and National Trade Association.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Swift & Co. Employee Benefit Association, 41st and Exchange Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Laurence A. Crosby, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Curan, 5605 61st Place, Riverdale, Md.

B. International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Swift & Co. Employee Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corporation 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John F. Deeds, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. John H. Trigg, Post Office Box 5629, Roswell, N. Mex. and Ralph S. Trigg, Box 1312 Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. Phillip M. DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Porter Brothers Corp., Post Office Box 667, Boise, Idaho.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Douglas, Obeare & Campbell, 822 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Anne Archbold, 3905 Reservoir Road, Washington, D.C.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 1710 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.

A. K. H. Easley, Waco, Tex.

B. Amicable Life Insurance Co., Waco, Tex.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Electronics Small Business Council, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Electronics Small Business Council, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George Estok, Bridgeport, Conn.

B. Electronics Small Business Council, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Estate of Mr. R. B. von Courten, 60 State Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Louis Fisher, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Aaron L. Ford, 609 Plaza Building, Jackson, Miss.

B. Joseph Abrams, 33 Great Neck Road, Great Neck, N.Y.

A. Clark Foreman, Post Office Box 1275, Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Francisco, 68 Narragansett Avenue, Ossining, N.Y.

B. International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. I. J. Cromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.

A. Alfred N. Guertin, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Walter Guld, 261 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

B. New England Manufacturing Confectioners' Association, 261 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Thomas J. Gullfoil, 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo.

B. General Finance Corp., 1301 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David Hartfield, Jr., 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray F. Hesch, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

A. Lewis E. Hoffman, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. John H. Trigg, Post Office Box 5629, Roswell, N. Mex., and Ralph S. Trigg, Post Office Box 1312, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Stanley G. Holmes, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Room 206, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders' Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. DeWitt S. Hyde, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Laundry & Dry Cleaners' Association of the District of Columbia, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clifford J. Hynning, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Movers' Conference of America, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Logopedics, 2400 Jardine Drive, Wichita, Kans.

A. International Chiropractors' Association, 741 Brady Street, Davenport, Iowa.

A. Andrew F. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Phillip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank S. Ketcham, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Movers' Conference of America, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. A. Key, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Robert F. Klepinger, Rust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Peninsula Retired Officers Club, Moffett Field, Calif.

A. William L. Kohler, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Laboratory Apparatus & Optical Instrument Sections, Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Laboratory Apparatus & Optical Instrument Sections, Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Elton J. Layton, 4730 Arlington Boulevard, Arlington, Va.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. General Acceptance Corp., 1105 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Ray B. Lucas, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western National Life Insurance Co. of Texas, 210 East 10th Street, Amarillo, Tex.

A. John W. MacKay, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julia L. Maletta.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, N.Y.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Chambers of Commerce of St. Thomas and St. Croix, V.I.

A. James R. Morris, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Electronics Small Business Council, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Naval Air Stations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Philippine War Damage Claimants Association, 46 Escolta, Manila, Philippines.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. H. Painter, United Fidelity Life Insurance Co., Dallas, Tex.

B. United Fidelity Life Insurance Co., Dallas, Tex.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.

B. C. C. Woodward, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

A. Walter I. Pogen, 1519 26th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Promotion Associates, Inc., 120 North Pitt Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Instituto Cubano de Establizacion del Azucar, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Institute of Logopedics, 2400 Jardine Drive, Wichita, Kans.

A. James P. Richards, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sand Products Corp., 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N.J.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold H. Schroeder, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John L. Schroeder, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. V. L. Schultz, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. C. E. Schwab, Box 29, Kellogg, Idaho.

B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, Room 1102, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. P. L. Shackelford, 4545 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. David R. Shelton, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Joseph Abrams, 33 Great Neck Road, Great Neck, N.Y.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. David Silvergleid, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1033 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. Ernest H. Staubitz, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D.C.

B. Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, Grand Island, Nebr.

A. Steadman, Collier and Shannon, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States Life Insurance Company in the City of New York, 84 William Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Laboratory Apparatus and Optical Instrument Sections of the Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. GPO Press Division Employees Union, Post Office Box 1644, Washington, D.C.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Fluorspar Importers & Producers Institute, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph C. Swidler, 415 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Power Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Donald S. Thomas, Post Office Box 858, Austin, Tex.

B. Texas Life Convention, 4310 Dunlavy, Houston, Tex.

A. Thomas L. Thomas, Rockville, Md.

B. Electronics Small Business Council, 1100 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George O. Tiffany, Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

B. Unlac, Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

A. Phillip Tocker, 3335 Herring Avenue, Waco, Tex.

A. Joseph A. Todd, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. California Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Walker, 702 North Owen Street, Alexandria, Va.

B. Society of American Florists, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

A. David W. Wallace, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Alleghany Corporation, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Lion Manufacturing Co., 2640 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Manufacturing Co., 3401 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Vera M. Waltman.

B. National Consumers League, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Watson, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson, and Quinn O'Connell, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Atlantic Refining Co., Inc., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Butte, Mont.

B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Belleview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.

A. Frederick L. Williford, 511 Edmonston Drive, Rockville, Md.

B. Society of American Florists, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

A. C. C. Woodward, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Improving the Rural Life of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that recently I introduced proposed legislation to establish a Country Life Commission. The purpose of the measure would be to take a long-range look at problems and challenges in agriculture, and come up with some sound solutions on the problems we face today.

Fortunately, the Agriculture Committee in the House of Representatives has seen fit to hold hearings on similar proposals pending before that body.

I have respectfully urged that similar action be taken as early as possible in the Senate.

In view of the fact that we have been unsuccessful in resolving our farm problems—as evidenced by the discussions currently now going on in the Senate—a long-range, objective look at the agricultural scene, I believe, is definitely merited.

As always, I am of course delighted to see individuals and groups, on their own initiative, attempting also to deal with challenges in a particular field.

I am especially referring to the activities of the American Country Life Association, which has as its objective the encouragement and promotion of more satisfactory and wholesome rural life in America.

The annual conference of this association is scheduled for July 13 and 14, 1959. The theme of this conference is, "Making the Most of Human Resources Through Community Development."

Among the specific topics to be discussed at the meetings are:

Economic adjustments in rural life and agriculture;

The rural community as a unit for rural development;

Rural educational institutions and agencies responsible for development.

Recently, I received from Roy C. Buck, president of the American Country Life Association, a statement of the purposes and objectives of that organization. Believing that this represents a thoughtful, constructive approach to dealing with the problems now in agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Record.

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

The purpose:

To study and promote discussion of the problems and objectives in country life.

To clarify and integrate the objectives and efforts of various agencies and organizations that work with rural people.

To facilitate means of the attainment of these objectives.

To sponsor meetings for discussion and media for analysis of problems, trends, and influences affecting the pattern of American country living.

To evaluate the special contributions of country people to American citizenship and freedom.

To aid in rural improvement.

and be prepared to make every sacrifice, to safeguard the way of life bequeathed to us by the noble defenders of the country we honor today.

Military strength alone, though essential and vital, will not meet this challenge. Economic prosperity, though imperative, will not of itself preserve this Nation.

Only the indomitable will and fierce determination of free Americans to live by the spiritual tenets of religion and patriotism that have nurtured and built our national greatness can stem the surging tides of revolution and moral deterioration that are beating upon our shores, threatening to destroy our institutions and invading our very homes.

It is for all of us, regardless of class, creed, or station, as never before, to cease petty bickering, bury inconsequential differences, renounce selfishness and greed and rally as a united people resolved and dedicated to defend the peerless edifice of American liberty, if we hope to preserve freedom and spiritual values in a world where tyrannical, powerful forces are marching to enslave mankind. Victory will be ours, if we emulate the inspiring example of those who gave their all that American freedom might live.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, speaking at Memorial Day exercises at Westminster, Mass., I hailed the unforgettable contributions of American heroes in every generation, who, by their devotion and sacrifice, preserved the Nation.

I said in part:

All of us living in this period of great stress and great threat to our precious liberties must give something more than lip-service to perpetuate the ideals and principles for which these heroes fought and died.

We have special and urgent responsibilities, not only to exercise vigilance, but to work unceasingly to guard and defend the Nation and the Government from the great perils of the hour.

If we would adequately protect the freedoms we cherish, we must exert every effort,

The Soviet Cosmic Rocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, by now those who believe the Soviet lunik or mechta was a hoax have had their say. The officials who are equally convinced it performed approximately as advertised have also been heard. There have been opportunities before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics for rebuttal and counterrebuttal. Short of a full disclosure by the Soviet Union, little more is likely to be gained by pursuing the subject.

The committee, of which I am a member, will write its report in due course. Personally I suspect that the editors of True magazine which carried Lloyd Mallan's articles wish they had done more independent checking of the material