Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 1959

Rev. Robert H. Shaw, Ph.D., rector-elect, Trinity Episcopal Church, Fredericksburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou high and mighty Ruler of the Universe, look with compassion upon the world which Thou hast made, and which men have disordered. Grant an end to tyranny and enslavement, to anxiety and fear. Show Thy mercy upon men; establish Thy truth among nations.

Bless, O God, this Nation, founded under Thy protection. Preserve it as a living witness to the value of each individual man, as a living influence for Thy will in Thy world.

Send Thy Holy Spirit, we beseech Thee, upon those who govern this Nation, and especially upon these, Thy servants, the Senate of the United States. Grant them love, to desire what is right; grant them wisdom, to know what is right; grant them courage, to do what is right; that in ordering the affairs of this country they may restore Thy order in the affairs of this world.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the same Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 4, 1959, was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT (EX. REPT. NO. 4)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of June 4, 1959,

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported favorably the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce, and submitted a report thereon, together with minority and individual views, which was printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon on Monday.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar, as in executive session.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

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

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

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider the nomination, on the Executive Calendar, of J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1960 (S. DOC. NO. 28)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1960, involving increases in the amount of $433,365 for the legislative branch, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present two resolutions which were recently approved by the Minnesota State Legislature, in support of a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps and a bill to equalize the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred to the committees considering these measures.

As the sponsor of the Youth Conservation Act of 1959, S. 812, and a cosponsor of S. 269, which would equalize retirement benefits, I am most pleased to invite the Senate's attention to these two resolutions in support of these bills.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION 7

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Military Pay Act of 1958 to equalize the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces of the United States

"Whereas there is now pending before the 86th Congress of the United States legislation, including S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services who receive their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949; and

"Whereas the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85–422, failed to provide for the computation of the retired pay of such members of the uniformed services, retired prior to June 1, 1958, on the basis of the newly established pay rates provided in said law, at the same time providing that the retired pay of those retired after that date be computed at the newly established higher rates; and

"Whereas there appears to be no basis for this gross discrimination against such retired personnel who, by reason of past meritorious services, should be equally entitled to benefits granted to retired personnel retired after the effective date of the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85–422; and

"Whereas a failure to maintain the same standard for the computation of retired pay of all members of the uniformed services of the United States, regardless of the date of their retirement, will cause defections from active service of carreer officers and thus prove detrimental to the national defense and security of the United States; and

"Whereas retired members of the uniformed services of the United States reside in every portion of our country, however, the State of Minnesota is privileged to have great numbers of such retired personnel who have served their country faithfully and with distinction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of Minnesota, That the Legislature of Minnesota respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation, similar to that proposed in S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703 of the 86th Congress, to provide that the retired pay of those retired before June 1, 1958, be computed on the same basis as the computation of the retired pay of such members retired after June 1, 1958; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"KARL RALVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"Approved April 24, 1959.
"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation creating a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and water, and of recreational areas

"Whereas an ever-increasing number of young people 16 to 22 years of age in our society are unable to find employment; and

"Whereas unemployed youth under 20 years of age in Minnesota numbered 14,000 in February 1959, according to Federal estimates reported by the Minnesota Department of Employment Security; and

"Whereas such growing unemployment results from the increasing mechanization and automation in agriculture, industry, and clerical and service activities, and is therefore no transitory problem; and

"Whereas many of these young people who are unemployed have special need to learn habits of work, responsibility, skills, and self-confidence; and

"Whereas idleness at this period of their lives will turn many of them into embittered and frustrated citizens, crippled vocationally and emotionally; and

"Whereas the protection of our natural resources in soil, water, forest, and wildlife is essential to the continued economic and spiritual health of our society, at the same time that conservation projects offer unlimited and noncompetitive work opportunities to our young people; and

"Whereas both youth unemployment and conservation needs are nationwide and require Federal attention: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact immediately legislation now before it to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of the joint resolution to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"KARL ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
Approved April 24, 1959.
"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 6319. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, to establish safeguards relative to the accumulation and final disposition of certain benefits in the case of incompetent veterans (Rept. No. 344).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 5915. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 345).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 6. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Sophronia Smiley Delaney and her sons (Rept. No. 346); and

S. 1941. A bill to extend section 17 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act for 2 years (Rept. No. 347).

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

S. 1521. A bill to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to a certain tract of land in Cumberland County, Tenn., conveyed to the State of Tennessee in 1938 (Rept. No. 348).

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

S. 1512. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 349); and

S. 1513. A bill to clarify the status of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives and their officers and employees with respect to certain laws applicable generally to the United States and its officers and employees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 350).

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

S. 864. A bill to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 351).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2121. A bill to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. BYRD of Virginia):

S. 2122. A bill to require semiannual reports by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the financial commitments and contingencies of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2123. A bill to amend sections 1461, 1462, 1463, and 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide mandatory prison sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing, or transporting obscene material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2125. A bill to provide that the tax imposed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act shall not apply with respect to service performed by individuals in connection with certain fishing and related activities; and

S. 2126. A bill to exclude from coverage under the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act service performed by individuals in connection with certain fishing and related activities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2127. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Szuba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2128. A bill for the relief of the West Virginia Pulp and Paper Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 129) favoring continued efforts by all nations to strengthen cooperation in health and research activi-

ties, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

THE PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION ACT OF 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Public Debt Reduction Act of 1959."

This bill is similar to Senate bill 1738, which I introduced in the last Congress. The bill would amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, which provides for a permanent ceiling on the total national debt of the United States, now established at $283 billion. The purpose of the bill is to lower, gradually and systematically, the ceiling on the national debt, by providing that at the beginning of each fiscal year it be reduced by a certain percentage of the preceding year's Federal revenue.

The percentages provided in this bill range from 2 to 5 percent. These are modest amounts, and would not disrupt existing Federal programs. However, if the bill were enacted into law, it would bring about a gradual reduction in the public debt of the United States, and would provide in any given year a fixed ceiling for Federal spending.

The percentages would operate on an escalator principle, and not until 1963 would the full impact of the bill be felt. In that and succeeding years the bill would call for a reduction of the debt by 5 percent of the net Federal revenue for the previous fiscal year. The budget for the fiscal year 1963 and thereafter could not exceed 95 percent of the previous year's revenue.

The bill provides two escape clauses when its debt-reducing effect would be suspended—one to be invoked in time of war, and the other to be invoked in a time of economic crisis when it might be considered in the best interests of the Nation to incur a budget deficit. Furthermore, in the event that Congress should pass any tax relief measure, the amount of the scheduled lowering of the public debt could be reduced, under this bill, for 2 fiscal years by the amount of the loss of revenue resulting from such tax relief.

The provisions of this bill are essentially the same as those of the similar bill I introduced in the last Congress. The bill I am introducing today contains two provisions which were not in my previous bill. The first of these would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept, on behalf of the United States, gifts of money or any other intangible personal property and any Government obligations, if made on the condition that such gifts be used to reduce the national debt. Under present law, the Secretary of the Treasury may not accept such conditional gifts. This provision would afford to the people of the United States an opportunity by their own direct action to reduce the national debt.

The second provision which was not in the bill which I introduced in the last Congress would require that the proceeds received by the Federal Government from the sale of any capital assets be applied to reduction of the national debt.

In order to make these two features effective, the bill requires that, in addition to the scheduled annual percentage reductions in the debt ceiling, such ceiling shall also be reduced by the amount of gifts received by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the amount of proceeds resulting from the sale of capital assets of the United States.

There are three basic goals which I hope this bill will achieve. The first is to reduce the size of the debt of the United States, which would, in turn, reduce the enormous sums of money which must be appropriated each year for payment of interest on the debt. The President's 1960 budget provides for $8.1 billion for this purpose. This is more than 10 percent of the 1960 budget. Second, I hope the bill will help to keep a control on Federal spending, by establishing a system for limiting the amount of expenditures in times of peace and prosperity. Third, the bill should serve as an effective measure to help combat inflation. President Eisenhower has made it a prime goal of national policy to curb inflation, which has plagued our economy since 1939. His efforts are beginning to show results. Enactment of this bill will help assure that the progress in controlling inflation which has been started under President Eisenhower will continue in the years to come.

It begins to appear that there is real hope for a budget surplus in the fiscal year 1960, for the U.S. economy seems to be booming toward ever-higher levels of prosperity as we draw away from last year's recission. If this session of Congress can produce a budget balanced along the lines recommended by the President, it now begins to appear that revenues will be large enough to produce a surplus. Already there has been some talk of the possibility of tax relief next year. Today I am not prepared to say whether tax relief would be a good idea next year. I know that I shall wish to balance that possibility against the opportunity to reduce the national debt.

If Congress enacts this bill, it will assure the necessity of weighing tax reduction against debt reduction, in the event of budget surpluses. Mr. President, certainly everyone favors reducing the national debt. This bill provides an opportunity for Congress to do something toward achieving that objective. I hope the Senate Finance Committee will give the bill prompt and favorable consideration, together with a number of other interesting proposals which have been made for reduction in the national debt.

Mr. President, this bill spells fiscal responsibility. It is a call for sound fiscal management on the part of both the Congress and the executive branch. It is an invitation to come firmly to grips with a bad habit which has marked most of the last quarter century of Federal Government fiscal behavior—namely, to leave until some undefined tomorrow payment of the cost of many Government services and activities which should be met today. I can think of nothing which would more effectively strengthen the confidence of the American people in the future fiscal integrity of their Government than for Congress to indicate that it means business on debt reduction. Such action would also assure all our friends in the free world that America means to keep her dollar hard, and thereby safeguard her economy, on which the economies of all other free nations so greatly depend for their strength and stability. It is not hard to remember that we must constantly maintain the military strength necessary in today's world, in order to assure the survival and growth of the United States and the rest of the free world. More effort seems required in order to recall the no less important necessity that we keep our economy strong. Enactment of this bill will guard us from the weakening influence of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, three articles which from different points of emphasis illuminate the importance of having Congress adopt an effective mechanism for controlling and reducing the national debt.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 26, 1959]

TREASURY'S ANDERSON: HIS PRODUCT UNPOPULAR

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson is a salesman with an unattractive product and fresh reminders of his market troubles come with disconcerting regularity.

Government securities are the Secretary's stock-in-trade. He wants investors to add larger quantities of governments to their portfolios but they have been taking a dim view of his entreaties.

The only growing market that Mr. Anderson can find is for short-term securities. Corporations have been buying short-term governments to invest their tax reserves and local governments have been buying them to invest their own tax collections.

Other customers are cutting back. That's true of savings bondholders, who consistently have been cashing more bonds than they have been buying. And it's true of the big institutional purchasers who have been searching out more lucrative investments than Government bonds.

It's doubly galling to Mr. Anderson and his Treasury advisers.

Government securities are being cold-shouldered at a time when the public debt—and the Treasury's needs for customers—have been rising. They are being cold-shouldered during a period when the total investments of institutions are growing by leaps and bounds.

The Treasury estimates that institutional investors chopped $1,500 million of Government securities from their portfolios during the last 6 years. The assets of the institutions climbed an incredible $100 billion over the same 6 years.

Life insurance companies and mutual savings banks cut their actual holdings of governments by $5,500 million. The proportion of their assets in governments dropped 50 percent.

Savings and loan associations and State and local government pension funds added to their holdings of governments. But their total assets rose even more quickly with the result that governments represented a

smaller proportion of their assets at the end of the period than at the beginning.

The latest bit of unhappy news concerns corporate pension-fund holdings of governments and it came to Mr. Anderson today from the Securities and Exchange Commission. It had a familiar ring, for it was the same story that a prosperous, profit-hungry economy has been telling the Secretary for a long, long time.

Corporate pension funds boosted their assets to $22,094 million at the end of 1956 from $19,319 million a year earlier. The funds simultaneously trimmed their holdings of Government securities to $1,985 million from a year ago total of $2,032 million.

Where did the funds put their increased assets? Holdings of corporate bonds rose to $11,731 million from $10,392 million. Holdings of common stock jumped to $6,042 million from $4,770 million.

The pension funds are buying corporate bonds and common stock because they want a more generous return than they can obtain from Government securities. The corporates pay better. The common stock yields as much or more and provides a hedge against inflation to boot.

Corporate pension funds began to grow rapidly just under 10 years ago after the National Labor Relations Board ruled that pension benefits were a proper subject for collective bargaining. The SEC figures go back to 1951 and the changes since have been dramatic.

The funds have more than trebled in size. The December 31, 1958 total of $22,094 million compares with a December 31, 1951, volume of only $6,876 million.

The $11,731 million corporate-bond total contrasts with 1951 holdings of $3,125 million and the $6,042 million common stock portfolio stacks up against a meager 1951 volume of $812 million.

Government securities not only haven't shared in the expansion but they actually have lost ground. The $1,985 million of "governments" in pension fund hands last December 31 was $185 million smaller than the $2,170 million of "governments" that the funds had 7 years before.

Mr. Anderson is trying to decide whether he should ask Congress to boost the 4¼ percent statutory ceiling on Government bonds. The going rate is higher and the Treasury has been priced out of the market.

Paying more than 4¼ percent may not arouse additional investor enthusiasm. Corporate bonds and mortgages still will yield more than "governments." But it will allow the Treasury to sell some Government bonds to the segment of the market that likes to put part of its funds in Federal obligations.

Mr. Anderson can sharply increase the Treasury's sales only by raising the Treasury rate to yield that would actively bid money away from other investments.

The maneuver would drain money from home building, local government public works, corporate expansion and other private activities. Much as Mr. Anderson would like to sell more bonds, it's not a step that he's likely to take.

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1959]

THE OMINOUS DISTRUST OF THE DOLLAR

(As reprinted from the Whaley-Eaton American Letter by Reader's Digest)

The flight from Government bonds is more ominous than most Washington officials care to admit publicly. Several recent Treasury financing operations have failed badly. As a result, the Treasury is being forced to run faster and faster merely to keep up with its maturities. The fact is that the richest Nation in the world is now operating on a hand-to-mouth basis.

The effect of all this seems utterly lost on advocates of dynamic new spending programs to speed business expansion, eliminate unemployment.

The Treasury cannot spend more money than it gets through taxes and Government security issues. Yet professional and naive investors both now distrust the latter. This means recourse to financing through the banks, which increases the money supply and is directly inflationary.

The classic sources of savings upon which the Treasury must draw if it is to manage the public debt in orderly fashion are being diverted. Institutions and individuals alike are investing their funds elsewhere. This clearly reflects basic distrust of the Government's fiscal responsibility. As Federal Reserve Chairman William McC. Martin puts it, "Investors cannot be induced to purchase fixed-income securities if they fear a steady erosion in the purchasing power of the dollar." Yet this is precisely what they do fear.

Official Treasury figures tell the story. During the past 6 years the assets of insurance companies, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations and pension funds rose by about $100 billion, but not a penny of this additional money went into Government issues.

During this same period, private citizens had new savings on the order of $137 billion available for investment either through savings institutions or directly in securities and mortgages. None of this flow of capital went into Government obligations, on balance.

Refusal of the investing public to put new funds into Federal issues forces the Treasury to finance by devious means. For example, it sells tax anticipation notes to corporations at whatever price the market offers. This is, in effect, a method of collecting taxes before they are due. And it sells other short-term issues to banks, which treat them as cash, since they can be turned into dollars by rediscounting—thus creating more money.

Unless hopes for balancing the budget can be revived, the Treasury will have no alternative but to continue this course. That creates still further problems: (1) It will push up its interest cost even higher; (2) it will necessitate new offerings at more frequent intervals.

Restoration of faith in the dollar requires facing up to the Treasury's dilemma. But that is something Congress still seems unprepared to do. The testimony of Treasury officials has brought out clearly the need for fiscal sanity. But such pleas for a balanced budget mean comparatively little to a Congress which is being pressured from all sides to approve vital new Federal spending programs.

These pressures are direct, and every Member of Congress is subject to them. The sad truth is that they do not come solely, or even primarily, from labor-liberal groups. Conservatives are just as active in sponsoring spending programs when their own interests are involved.

Congress lacks any real machinery, moreover, with which to keep the budget under control. Its dual system of appropriating directly for some programs and authorizing agencies to borrow from the Treasury, with no time limit on either type of spending, skirts the whole problem. There is no close tie between the voting of expenditures and the voting of revenues to provide the necessary funds. This makes hold-the-line policy difficult under any conditions.

Spot checks of congressional mail fail to reveal any strong national demand for a balanced budget. Many people are writing, but most also want local needs considered.

Federal debt management problems not only arouse concern on the part of the Treasury officials but also affect the taxpayers' pocketbook. Interest cost on the money the Government has hired now runs to $8.1 billion yearly. This is second only to defense in the fiscal 1960 budget of $77 billion, and represents almost a 30-percent increase within the past 5 years alone.

The continuing shift in Treasury debt to shorter and shorter issues is creating other worries. With buyers backing away from issues having a longer term than a year, refunding operations become larger and more frequent. Financing exclusively in the 1-year area means that within 4 years 75 percent of the total debt wauld have to be refunded each year.

The upward trend of interest rates has, moreover, still some way to go. Not only does the Treasury face further maturities this half year which must be refunded; it will also have to raise some $6 billion to $7 billion of new money in the second half. If business recovery continues as expected, the Treasury will be competing with heavy business loan requirements.

Eisenhower's impossible position on spending versus economy is illustrated in his effort to boost rural electrical cooperative interest rates. He wants co-ops to pay the same rate (about 4 percent) that the Treasury must bear when it borrows in the open market—just enough to cover basic costs. Yet the President is stymied by the congressional farm bloc. Democratic leaders assured the cooperatives that the 2-percent rate will go untouched.

At the heart of the Treasury's problem is a simple fact, easily grasped by anyone. This is that governments, like individuals, cannot spend more than they take in without being hurt. In the case of governments, continuing deficit spending debases the currency. This is the essence of today's distrust of the dollar.

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 11, 1959]

INFLATION, DEBT, RED INK: HERE IS THE OFFICIAL VIEW

(Interview with Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury)

Question. Mr. Secretary, is the decline in the Government-bond market the result of a fear that inflation will further cheapen the value of the dollar?

Answer. I think you have to take into consideration a number of factors. In a period of strong business recovery, there are many opportunities for people to invest. A great many people are attracted to common stocks. Some see better business opportunities and put their money to work directly in a business operation. Businesses, seeking to expand and modernize, compete with the Treasury in borrowing savings with which to expand.

Greater difficulty in managing the Federal debt is simply one of the inevitable side effects of a rapidly expanding level of business activity.

Question. It has been said recently that the Treasury, in financing debt in a period of inflation, faces an almost impossible situation. What would you say to that?

Answer. It certainly is not an "impossible" situation. I would call it a rather difficult one. We have had similar difficulties in earlier periods of rising business activity. I think it's important to realize that we are making substantial progress in debt management in spite of the effect of a $13 billion budget deficit this year.

At the present time the amount of the public debt maturing in less than 1 year is $10 billion less than it was at the end of 1953. It's $2 billion less than in December 1957, before the present substantial budget deficit arose. The average length of the marketable debt is slightly greater than it was in December 1957.

And then we've taken several steps during the past year to restructure our short-term debt so that it creates much less market disturbance. This is being done through the staggering of maturities and through selling more of our securities at auction. In

this way, competitive market forces determine the price of the new issues which are sold.

Question. You have said that, when the Government borrows from banks, the effect is to increase the country's money supply. Why be concerned about that?

Answer. I think in answering this kind of question one has to speak in the context of the time in which one is living. Let us simply say that more money usually means more spending.

There are times in which more spending is just what the economy needs.

A year ago we were in a recession; more spending was desirable. But, when business is expanding rapidly, we tend to use more and more fully our productive resources—our manpower, materials, our machines, and equipment. And after a certain point we take up most of the slack in the economy.

Then, if spending increases when there is little or no slack in the economy, prices would rise. We might then be confronted with the immediate danger of restraining an inflationary spiral.

I believe it is important for us to say that we have not, in my judgment, reached that point; nevertheless it does not minimize our obligation to do the right things now, while reasonable price stability prevails.

We still have too much idle manpower but, as the economy grows and the level of business activity rises, this manpower will be more fully utilized. We still have some idle equipment and machinery but, here again, with rising levels of business, the slack will be taken up. Last month, for example, industrial output moved to an all-time peak; individuals' income rose sharply to a new record; unemployment declined sharply.

The hard, basic fact is that, if we are to be a responsible nation, we must constantly plan for the future. Winning a battle against inflation is much like winning a battle in a war—it requires the utmost in determination and in advance planning. And we must respond to the challenge of what may be the dangers in the future, so that we can maintain confidence.

Question. Would you say that inflation has now become so much of a danger that it is vital to balance the Government's budget and stop borrowing new money?

Answer. If, in a period when we are setting new highs in production, in earnings, in corporate profits, in the level of business activity that is measured by gross national product—if, under those circumstances, we cannot live within our means—then I think people can rightfully ask. "When can you do so?"

There are a number of things which should put us on guard. For one thing, we are rapidly taking up the slack in the economy. Moreover, even though consumer and average wholesale prices have been more or less stable for a year, the stability has reflected increasing industrial prices and the prices of various other things, offset essentially by declines in prices of food and farm products.

The important thing to remember is that, in combatting future inflation, the seeds of inflation can be sown in periods just like the present.

To sit placidly by as long as price indexes are reasonably stable, without preparing properly for the pressures which may be building up toward future inflation—without restraining those pressures that may later show up in increased prices—is in effect to close the barn door after the horse has gotten at least part of the way out.

Question. Is the alternative to a balanced budget more bank-created money?

Answer. The extent to which we do not have a balanced budget would, of course, require us to do increased borrowing. The extent to which we do increased borrowing would probably result in some expansion of bank deposits.

Question. Is growth in the money supply the real danger of deficit financing in the period ahead?

Answer. It is certainly one of the dangers.

I should like to say on this subject of balancing the budget, or living within our means, that we must never forget that we already have a debt of very great magnitude. Surely in a period of high and rising business activity we should have as a goal, as an aim of our country, not only to achieve a mere balance in the budget, but something of a surplus that can be used for debt retirement. For if this is not done, the alternative may well turn out to be greater reliance on money creation.

Question. Suppose business begins to expand more rapidly, and businesses become not buyers but sellers of Treasury securities. What will your situation be then, with money tightening?

Answer. The extent to which securities are not bought and held by individuals, corporate holders and other nonbank investors puts an additional pressure upon the Treasury to finance in the commercial banking system. To that extent, of course, there is the danger of increasing the money supply.

However, as long as corporate profits and tax liabilities continue to rise, their holdings of governments should remain high. With business activity expanding, the outlook for continuation of corporate demand for our securities is favorable.

Question. Now, Mr. Secretary, what can we do in this country to avoid resorting to excessive creation of money to finance the Government?

Answer. One of the things that we can do during periods of high levels of business activity is to not only live within our means, but actually to make some reduction of the national debt. This means that the Government should do all of those things that are required and as many of those things as prudent people would judge should be provided within the limits of our fiscal condition at any given time.

We can try to increase our productivity by carefully studying our productive capacities and by eliminating impediments to rising productivity.

We can and should give support and encouragement to sound monetary policies such as will prevent credit excesses from adding unduly to spending during a period of business expansion.

The role of Government in all of these areas is, of course, vital. In this connection, it should be noted that outstanding leaders of both parties in the Congress have an awareness of, and are working toward, sound policies. But more than sound policies in Government are required.

Sometimes it seems to be old fashioned, or a cliche, to say that business and labor—indeed, every single citizen of this country—must use restraint, judgment, and responsibility in his activities; but this is one of the burdens of democracy. And when you weigh the advantages of democracy and freedom, the ability to use man's full incentives and the genius of his productive capacity, against a totalitarian system of direct controls, it's a very small burden that we're asked to assume—simply to be responsible.

Question. Is the outflow of gold a complicating factor in your problem? Are you concerned about that outflow?

Answer. I do not believe that the outflow of gold has been a significant complicating factor in our efforts to finance the deficit.

The outflow of gold is related to our international payments position and also reflects the fact that some foreign countries which were building up their international reserves last year had increased earning in their balance of payments and chose to hold some of their reserves in gold. Gold serves its age-old functions—as a means of international settlement, and a national monetary reserve. To do this, it moves from country to country in accordance with the payments balance and the monetary policies of the major trading countries in the world.

I should point out that, during the time that gold was being added to the reserves of other countries, foreign holdings of bank deposits and short-term investment in this country—including short-term securities of the United States—increased.

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

The bill (S. 2121) to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS REPORTING ACT OF 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make regular reports of the financial obligations of the United States, including direct and guaranteed debt, indirect and contingent debt, contractual commitments, and authorized but uncommitted appropriations.

The direct and guaranteed debt of the United States, most of which is subject to the public-debt ceiling, is already now regularly reported at various times and in various forms by the Treasury Department. It appears in the Monthly Bulletin, in the monthly statement of receipts and expenditures, and in other ways.

However, there is no comprehensive, regular reporting of the Government's indirect and contingent debt, its forward contractual commitments, or its backlog of uncommitted appropriations. These categories of Federal obligations and spending have grown substantially over recent years. We need a convenient, regular, and comprehensive means of keeping informed about them. Such information is increasingly essential to sound fiscal management in the Federal Government.

Federal agencies and corporations have been authorized to issue their own obligations. Some are guaranteed by the U.S. Government, and others are not; but purchasers see both types as backed by the Government. For example, a variety of guarantees have been made on housing and other mortgages; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures the bank deposits of our people; GI life insurance insures the lives of our soldiers and veterans. Each of these programs and many others are reported to the Congress from time to time, but are never reported all at once, so that the Congress and the people may be fully aware of the impact they may have on our debt structure.

This bill calls for the reporting by the Secretary of the Treasury of the payments which the United States may be legally or morally obligated to make under all such programs. It calls for the reporting of the unused authority to make commitments under such programs. It calls for an estimate by the

Secretary of the Treasury of the financial risks inherent in such programs. The bill does not attempt a single definition of such risks, because there is so much variety among the programs. However, I would suggest that it might be reported in the form of estimated actuarial reserves. Any existing reserves would, of course, be reported, so that comparison would show the net risk.

There is another area in which recent growth has added to the obligations of the Government. The making of long-term contracts, when the United States has agreed to pay for goods or services over a period of up to 20 or more years, has increased sharply. Examples of this are the long-term leases whereby new post office or Federal office building construction is financed. In most cases these programs are an effort to avoid increasing the direct public debt of the United States, by encouraging private bodies to underwrite what the Government does not wish to pay for all at once. They are, perhaps, excellent programs; but since they replace the public debt, I believe they should be considered in the same context as the public debt. A third area in which the Congress is inadequately informed is the field of authorized and appropriated but uncommitted Government spending programs. From time to time, there is substantial delay in the actual commitment by the Executive of appropriated funds, thereby accumulating within the executive branch a volume of potential spending which could substantially affect the economy, as well as have a significant effect on the Federal balance sheet. It is my belief that this condition should be reported to the Congress at regular intervals at the same time as the direct debt, the indirect debt, and long-term contracts are reported, so that Congress and the taxpayers may see the full picture all at once.

The bill calls upon the Secretary of the Treasury to make such reports semiannually—at the end of the fiscal and calendar years. It provides that they be broken down by department and agency, so we may see the programs individually and as parts of a whole.

Such reports would provide Congress and the taxpayers with information which is vitally needed in convenient form. A part of it is now readily available in existing reports, but most of it can be obtained only by special request. Such requests have been made from time to time in the past by the chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who joins me in sponsoring this bill, and by other Members of Congress. The Treasury Department has been accommodating in fulfilling these requests. However, I do not believe it should be necessary that this information be specially requested from the Treasury Department.

Under present laws, we have easier access to information about the obligations of many private corporations than we have about the obligations of the Federal Government.

Corporations which want to raise money from the public must publicly disclose to the Securities and Exchange Commission all their contingent liabilities and future spending programs. The purpose of such disclosures is to inform investors of the risks they face, and to give them an informed and reliable basis for the decisions they must make in their private investments. Since all of us are necessarily investors in the Federal Government, we should be as readily informed about its obligations and future spending programs.

The reports called for by my bill will provide Congress with information which would be very helpful in providing for sound fiscal management of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the bill which I am introducing printed in the RECORD, and also a short study entitled "Providing the Congress with More Information on Authorizations and Commitments to Spend Beyond the Budget Year," which has been prepared at my request and direction by John C. Jackson, specialist in fiscal and financial economics in the Legislative Reference Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and study will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2122) to require semiannual reports by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the financial commitments and contingencies of the Government, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. BYRD of Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Obligations Reporting Act of 1959."

SEC. 2. Section 114 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) The reports required by this section to be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury shall include semiannual reports setting forth—

"(1) a summary statement of the outstanding public debt and guaranteed obligations of the United States showing the amount thereof which is subject to statutory limitation;

"(2) the aggregate amount of the contingent liabilities of the Government together with a statement showing the collateral pledged or other assets available (or to be realized) as security therefor, and an analysis of their significance in terms of past experience and probable risk;

"(3) the total amount of the Government's obligation under outstanding contracts for the purchase of property, goods, or services to be realized or delivered over a period of three or more years; and

"(4) the total amount of the outstanding contract authorization which has been granted to, but not committed by, the executive agencies.

"Such reports shall set forth the financial data required by clauses (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection in a concise form, with such explanatory material as the Secretary may determine to be necessary or desirable, and shall include total amounts for each category according to the executive agency involved and for all such agencies."

The study presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

PROVIDING THE CONGRESS WITH MORE INFORMATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS AND COMMITMENTS TO SPEND BEYOND THE BUDGET YEAR

(By John C. Jackson, specialist in fiscal and financial economics, Economics Division, Library of Congress)

Most of the Federal Government's expenditures pay for programs that continue beyond one budget year. Many of the programs and their component activities are of indefinite duration, others require varying numbers of years for completion. The manner in which the Congress has authorized expenditures often reflects the nature and duration of the program, and affects the ability of Congress to control expenditures in any fiscal year. A few examples will illustrate differences in the way expenditures are authorized. The interest on the public debt is paid under authority of a permanent appropriation. Major portions of the public roads program expenditures are from a trust fund to which gasoline and other taxes are contributed. Aircraft, missiles, and ships are paid for under authority of appropriations which contain no limitation as to the period of years over which the funds are to be available. The Export-Import Bank lends funds which it has obtained from Treasury investment in its capital stock, funds obtained by borrowing from the Treasury, and also lends the repayments and earnings from earlier loans. The Federal Housing Administration insures mortgages and meets claims by issuing debentures which are subsequently redeemed out of insurance revenue and the proceeds of the sale of the properties and mortgages. The appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of the Census is an annual appropriation, to be obligated during the fiscal year for which it is provided.

These activities or programs, like others undertaken by the Government, involve moral or statutory commitments of the Government to spend money in later fiscal years. The commitment to maintain a Bureau of the Census may be no less binding because it is financed on an annual basis than is the commitment to a missile program which will not require annual congressional action because one appropriation has authorized the full amount of money required for a program extending over several years.

The annual expenditures to meet commitments are difficult to control through present methods of authorizing obligations when a project requires more than 1 fiscal year to complete, or is financed through a revolving fund, or when insurance or guarantees are written. The Congress does not have complete control over the rate of progress on missile contracts or construction contracts, nor over the prices of farm produce subject to price support, nor over delinquency and default rates on insured mortgages.

The means of obtaining the money to make the authorized expenditures are prescribed by legislation, but the adequacy of the funds is not wholly within the control of the Congress. Income tax revenues, for example, vary with changes in economic conditions. Receipts of Government corporations from loan repayments and from sales of commodities, receipts that will be applicable to the corporation's uses and avoid budgetary expenditures, also fluctuate with economic conditions.

One of the results of imprecise control over expenditures and revenues is insecure control over the size of the public debt. If the Congress wishes to reduce the public debt in an orderly fashion, by definite amounts, it may consider methods of controlling expenditures more precisely.

A first step toward closer annual control over expenditures is to ascertain not only

the plans for expenditures during succeeding years but to ascertain how much the Government can spend on the basis of present authorizations, and how much it could be required to spend, willingly or unwillingly, because of present commitments for which appropriations have not been provided.

Information on these matters is presented in the text of the budget document, and in summary tables, for programs resulted in budgetary expenditures. (Some data also are presented for trust funds in the budget, and additional information appears in trustees' reports.) Some of the information is kept up to date through periodical publication; additional information is reported to the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, but is not published.

The total of authority to spend which can be used in the future is reported monthly in the Treasury Bulletin. The existence of this authority indicates only the current authorized upper limit on future expenditures. The upper limit can be changed, and its existence does not indicate either the amount that will be spent in a particular fiscal year, or eventually. In addition to the unspent balances, expenditures may be made from authorized programs for which no limit has been established, including some insurance and guarantee programs; or expenditures in excess of authorized limit may be required by commitments to guarantee and insure.

Unexpended balances of appropriations, of authorizations to expend from debt receipts, and of contract authorizations, are reported monthly in the Treasury Bulletin. One table shows for each of the departments, and for independent offices as a group, the development of the balances from the beginning of the fiscal year. Another table reports expenditures over a 6-year period according to a functional classification, and indicates the balances at the end of the most recent month. This table does not separate the forms of authorization which remain unexpended.

The tables referred to do not indicate how much of the authorizations have been obligated, whether spent or subsequently to be spent. Unobligated balances perhaps could be reported in these tables on the basis of information about obligations which is supplied monthly to the Bureau of the Budget on standard form 133, for its use in apportionment of authorized funds. (The Budget indicates that the unobligated balances at the end of this fiscal year will total about $27.5 billion, outside of the proposed authorization for the international financial agencies. Less than $8 billion of appropriations is expected to remain unobligated; nearly $16 billion will remain unobligated authorizations to expend from debt receipts, and $4 billion of that will be the FDIC and FSLIC authorizations which have not been touched in the past.)

In addition to information about unexpended balances, the Treasury Bulletin publishes for a number of governmental offices quarterly or semiannual statements of financial condition, income and expense, and source and application of funds and resulting budgetary expenditures. The offices include public enterprise revolving funds such as the Export-Import Bank and the Small Business Administration, and the Federal Housing Administration; intragovernmental revolving funds such as the GSA building management fund, other activities such as the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Commerce Department maritime activities. Bonneville Power Administration; and some deposit funds and trust revolving funds. The regulation (Department Circular No. 966, Treasury) reads:

"3. This regulation requires the submission of financial statements by corporate and noncorporate Government agencies of the following character:

"(a) All wholly owned and mixed ownership Government corporations specifically included in the Government Corporation Control Act and amendments thereto, or subsequently brought under the provisions of that act.

"(b) All other activities of the Government operating as revolving funds * * * for which business-type public enterprise or intragovernmental fund budgets are required by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(c) Other activities or agencies (1) which are of a business-type nature; or (2) whose operations, services, or functions are largely self-liquidating or primarily of a revenue producing nature; (3) or whose operations result in the accumulation of substantial inventories, investments or other recoverable assets. Agencies and other activities to report under this category will be designated by the Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury."

The tables which the Treasury Department prepares from these reports for publication in the Treasury Bulletin, do not include memorandum entries which would indicate the maximum spending or lending authority of the offices, nor how near the maximum has been approached. The tables include a great number of offices, but not all of the Government, and do not combine into aggregates that could be compared with the current monthly data on expenditures and unexpended balances. Perhaps a feasible addition to the tables would be a memorandum, prepared from information now reported to the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget, of the remaining unused authority of the offices included in the present tabulations.

The regulation which requires the reports referred to above also requires a semiannual report, information from which is now summarized in a mimeographed statement of long-range commitments and contingencies of the U.S. Government. The nature of the information required is best described in the language of the regulation, and of the standard form (223, Treasury Department).

The statement includes explanatory pages in which the Treasury insists that the commitments and contingent liabilities are not public debt. When or if they become obligations that are not met in full by the applicable receipts of the corporation, revolving fund, or other agency, they will become budgetary expenditures and then affect the public debt.

The commitments and contingencies are classified in the statement as loans guaranteed or insured; insurance in force; undisbursed commitments to make future loans, to purchase mortgages, to guarantee and insure loans; unpaid subscriptions; obligations on the credit of the United States; and Federal Reserve notes.

A number of programs are reported in part under more than one of these headings. For example, the urban renewal fund for loans and planning advances includes in its obligated balance (as reported in the Budget document), federally guaranteed private loans, and other undisbursed loan commitments. The first appears in one classification of the statement of long-range commitments, under loans guaranteed or insured by Government agencies; the second appears in another classification, undisbursed committmens to make future loans.

Possibly the statement could be arranged with agencies listed vertically in an item space, and the kind of commitment under headings spread horizontally, so that both the nature of current commitments and contingencies and the commitments and contingencies facing each fund or agency could be compiled readily.

The statement compares gross amount of contingency with public debt securities held against them. One purpose of the comparison is to discourage duplicate counting of obligations. The statement does not include information requested on the standard form about other collateral or realizable assets. Nor does it include estimated losses, also specified in the form.

Understanding of the nature of the commitments or contingenciess might be advanced if the relation of each to the obligations and the unobligated balance of the spending or borrowing authority of the agency were shown in the tabulation. Some of the commitments are charged as obligations against the borrowing authority of the agency, some are not; and whether or not they are obligations now is ascertainable only by examining the financial statements which appear in the budget document. Charges against borrowing authority, reducing unobligated balances, are made for the loan guarantees reported in the statement for CCC, public housing, informational media guarantees, Farmers Home Administration undisbursed loan commitments, college housing undisbursed loan obligations, public facility undisbursed loans, urban renewal undisbursed loan commitments and urban renewal federally guaranteed private loans. Not included in statements of financial condition nor in obligated balances of funds are farm tenant mortgage loans insured, FHA insured mortgages, maritime activities insured mortgages, Federal crop insurance, VA national service life insurance, and U.S. Government life insurance.

PENALTIES FOR MAILING, IMPORTING, OR TRANSPORTING OBSCENE MATERIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing stiffer penalties for willful and continuing violations of the Federal antiobscenity laws.

Unscrupulous racketeers are now doing a half-billion-dollar-a-year business in sending obscene magazines, books, records, and films to grownups and youth alike, all over the country. Our mails are used for this direct attack on the American family and American morals. In fact, our postal rates at times inadvertently serve to subsidize these filth dealers. The Post Office Department estimates that up to 1 million children will receive unsolicited pornographic literature this year. Youngsters need not have indicated any interest in this type of material to receive it in the mail. The racketeers plainly solicit any young person whose name they can obtain from any generally available mailing lists. At times it is sufficient for a young man to answer an advertisement for such an innocent item as a baseball bat, and he finds himself flooded with uninvited and obscene so-called literature.

The penalties under present laws, providing for fines up to $5,000 are inadequate. These illicit dealers, making thousands of dollars a year, regard fines as a mere cost of doing business. The bill I am introducing requires mandatory prison sentences for second and succeeding violators who transmit obscene matter through the mails, by express or truck, or who themselves take obscene matter interstate.

I desire to stress, however, that strengthening the Federal laws must be only one part of a broader program. The major portion of the battle against

this type of material must be carried out by State and local authorities, who must stamp out the base of operations of these dealers in filth. Furthermore, the attention of parents and the public at large must be drawn to this danger. Community support must be mobilized behind law enforcement, to help apprehend mailers of and dealers in pornography. But at the same time we must make certain that one of our most important public institutions, and a major means for national communications, is not misused by those who threaten the moral and social well-being of our youth.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2123) to amend sections 1461, 1462, 1463, and 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide mandatory prison sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing, or transporting obscene material, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to mailing obscene matter) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(except any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance)" immediately following "anything declared by this section to be nonmailable" in the eighth paragraph thereof; and

(2) by inserting immediately following such eighth paragraph the following new paragraph:

"Who knowingly uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, or knowingly takes any such thing from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or the disposition thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less that one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

SEC. 2. Section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to importation or transportation of obscene matter) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(except any matter, article, or thing covered by paragraph (a) or (b) of this section)" immediately following "any matter or thing" in the penultimate paragraph of such section; and

(2) by adding at the end of such section the following:

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any matter, article, or thing covered by paragraph (a) or (b) of this section—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of section 1463 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to mailing indecent matter on wrappers and envelopes) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, anything declared by this section to be nonmailable matter, or knowingly takes the same from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing of or aiding in the circulation or disposition of the same, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

SEC. 4. The first paragraph of section 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to transportation of obscene matter for sale or distribution) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription or other article capable of producing sound or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

INSTRUCTION AT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY OF TWO CITIZENS OF KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium. This week two fine young Belgians were graduated from the Naval Academy. These young men were admitted to the Academy under the authority of Public Law 318, of the 83d Congress. The same law authorized the admission of two Thai cadets to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The Thai cadets have also completed their full course of study. A new measure, Senate Joint Resolution 24, which was introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] earlier this session, will permit the replacement of two Thai students at West Point. The joint resolution which I am introducing makes provision for Belgium to have two more midshipmen at Annapolis. Belgium has a fine, budding, young Navy, but no naval academy.

I understand that King Baudouin of Belgium, who made such a fine impression on all of us by his address before the joint meeting of Congress last May 12, is very anxious to be able to replace at Annapolis the two outstanding young men from his country who have recently graduated.

I understand that both the State Department and the Defense Department are in favor of this proposal.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 106) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on May 28, 1959, I submitted an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1959. I did so on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], from Utah [Mr. MOSS], from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Subsequently while the amendment was on the table, and under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 28, 1959, there were added as additional cosponsors the names of the distinguished Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be added as cosponsors the names of the distinguished Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

I am most pleased, Mr. President, to be joined by such able and distinguished Members of this body in the cosponsorship of this amendment.

It is a simple amendment. It seeks only to bring the foreign aid programs under the same budgetary and accounting controls to which the domestic programs are subjected.

It is most difficult for me to understand the resistance on the part of the executive branch to such a proposal. The delegation by the Congress to an executive agency of its constitutional right to appropriate funds should not be permitted to continue.

It is highly significant that 20 Senators, more than 20 percent of the Members of this body, have joined in expressing their desire that appropriations for foreign aid be returned to the control of the Congress.

Is it not enough that so much of this program is presented yearly to the Congress under the cloak of secrecy? Must those who present the program also be vague and indefinite about the purposes for which the funds appropriated are to be used?

Is it not past time that the Congress recapture complete fiscal control of this program, on which over $70 billion have already been spent, and for which additional billions are being asked and will continue to be asked?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the names of the additional cosponsors of the amendment will be added, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

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

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

By Mr. HART:

Statement by Senator HART, presented to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on June 4, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN F. KILKENNY TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 2:30 p.m., Monday, June 15, 1959, in Room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of John F. Kilkenny, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon, vice Claude McColloch, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

THE STRAUSS NOMINATION—MR. ERPF

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 3, an editorial entitled "Now It's Mr. Erpf" was published in the Washington Evening Star. Inasmuch as other related material, from another newspaper in the city of Washington, has gone into the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with the Strauss nomination.

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

NOW IT'S MR. ERPF

The extent to which some people will go in their efforts to destroy a man is truly remarkable.

For months, Adm. Lewis Strauss, named by the President to be Secretary of Commerce, has been smeared up one side and down the other by his senatorial and journalistic enemies. When the committee hearings on his nomination ended, it looked as though the sniping was over—at least until the opening of Senate debate on the nomination. But not at all. Suddenly, out of the blue, there emerges the strange and supposedly sinister case of Armand G. Erpf. And the case of Mr. Erpf, we are told, proves once again that Mr. Strauss is devious, intellectually dishonest and unfit to be Secretary of Commerce.

This is vicious nonsense. On May 28, the Department of Commerce, undoubtedly with Mr. Strauss' approval, issued a press release which denied that Mr. Erpf, a New York financier, had been appointed to head up a Commerce Department transportation study. This release said Mr. Erpf "has not been selected, appointed, or otherwise chosen for any position in the Commerce Department and no arrangement with him has been made." This was the precise, literal truth. But suddenly it becomes devious and sinister. Why? Because Mr. Strauss hoped that Mr. Erpf would take on the assignment and, several months ago, sounded him out on the project. Was the May 28 press release an attempt by Mr. Strauss to cover his tracks in the Erpf matter? Of course not. And the record is the best proof.

On May 11, Mr. Strauss was before the Senate Commerce Committee in public session. Chairman MAGNUSON asked him whether he had selected the man who would head up the transportation study. Mr. Strauss replied that he had asked two or three men to help him last February or March, but that they shied away pending Senate action on his confirmation. Senator MAGNUSON again asked: But are we to understand that as of now you have not selected a person to head it? Then came the following exchange:

"Mr. STRAUSS. Yes; I have a man in mind I would like to head it. I don't know if he would.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is that Mr. Erpf?

"Mr. STRAUSS. Yes. E-r-p-f. And I haven't spoken with him in nearly 3 months."

This, then, is the record in the Erpf case—the case which now emerges as a sinister disclosure some 3 weeks after Mr. Strauss testified publicly about it.

Mr. Erpf, although an expert in the field, has withdrawn because he rightly feels that the adverse publicity has impaired his usefulness in any transportation study. Perhaps, because he has railroad interests, he should not have served in any event, although it should be noted that representatives of all segments of the transportation industry would have been represented on the study committee. Perhaps the critics would have been happier with a study headed up by some amiable nobody endowed with blissful ignorance of our transportation problems. But this now is beside the point.

The important thing is that the Senate is scheduled to begin debate on the Strauss nomination tomorrow, and we hope that Mr. Strauss, in line with the President's strong stand, will stay in there and fight this thing out to the end.

Of course, each Member of the Senate is entirely free to vote for or against confirmation. In our opinion, there is nothing in the record which justifies an adverse vote. But this is for the Senate to decide. All that an outsider can ask is that a record vote be taken—a vote in which each Senator will have to answer to his own conscience and to those people who expect the Senate to act with a sense of responsibility in a matter of this importance.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOVERY OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN—TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. JAMES M. WARNER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this year many towns in the State of Vermont are commemorating the 350th anniversary of the discovery of Lake Champlain by the French explorer, Samuel de Champlain.

Local festivities highlighting important historical events are being reenacted or otherwise memorialized all during the summer and autumn.

However, these activities are, by no means, limited merely to the Vermont of earliest colonial times.

For example, in Morristown, Vt., there was a Memorial Day exhibition in tribute to Brig. Gen. James M. Warner, the first colonel of the 11th Vermont Volunteers in which many Morristown men served during the Civil War.

General Warner was the first mounted man to break through breastworks at the Battle of Petersburg, Va., on April 2, 1865, in the assault which broke the Confederate line and turned the tide of the war.

There is also the story of his plea to the adjutant following his nearly fatal wound at Spottsylvania, to hold fast the regimental colors on May 18, 1864.

These are the same colors which are now on display at the State House in Montpelier.

Memorabilia closely associated with General Warner's wartime activities form a basic part of the exhibition which was on display in the local Peck's Pharmacy store window.

Some 12 years ago the Morristown Historical Society was formed. Since then, it has established a local historical museum in a fine old brick homestead which was built in the early 1800's by Jedediah Safford, the son of John Safford, who came to Morristown soon after its founding in 1790.

Of interest to visitors will be the original wallpaper designs reproduced by the silk screen process; original fireplaces, one with the bake-oven, crane and early fittings; a well-known collection of over 2,000 pitchers and Toby mugs; mementos of the first white settlers of the town; and relics from the revolution.

It is good to know that the example of the Morristown Historical Society is by no means exceptional. Instead, it is typical of the interest and devotion of American citizens in communities all over the land.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with these remarks a news report from the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press of May 26, 1959, relating to the same subject.

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

MORRISTOWN HISTORICAL GROUP HONORS LEADER OF VERMONT CIVIL WAR REGIMENT

MORRISVILLE.—The Memorial Day exhibit of the Morristown Historical Society this year, appearing in the Main Street window of Peck's Pharmacy, is in tribute to Brig. Gen. James M. Warner, first colonel of the 11th Vermont Volunteers, in which many Morristown men served during the Civil War. Morristown's GAR post, formed in 1868 as the fourth in Vermont, is named for him.

General Warner, a native of Middlebury, was 25 years old and a 1st lieutenant in the U.S. Infantry at Fort Wyse, Colo., when Gov. Holbrook asked him to lead the new Vermont Volunteer Regiment.

His 1861 lieutenant's commission in the Army, issued following his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and signed in a firm hand with full signature, "Abraham Lincoln," is among the items in the exhibit.

Another memento is a scabbard of a gold-mounted dress sword presented to General Warner by officers of the Vermont Regiment. These and other items are loaned by his grandson, Paris Fletcher, of Worcester, Mass., an interested friend of the local historical society.

The exhibit includes a large portrait presented by General Warner to the GAR post here in 1869 and a copy of the resolution of thanks adopted by the post and signed "A. A. Niles, D. J. Safford, E. D. Darling, and Frank Kenfield, committee."

The James M. Warner Women's Relief Corps loans its charter. A group photograph of GAR members, a steel engraving portrait of General Warner in uniform as it appears in the book, "Vermont in the Civil War," a summary of his military career and other documents make up the memorial.

"General Warner is described in "Vermont in the Civil War" as "brave, modest, soldierly in the Civil War" as "brave, modest, soldierly, and equal to every position in which he was placed."

He wounded while directing an assault at the Battle of Spottsylvania on May 18, 1864.

Settling at Albany, N.Y., after the war, with his wife, the former Matilda Allen, he established a successful commercial house and served as U.S. postmaster for 4 years. His death occurred suddenly in 1897 at the age of 61.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, tomorrow will be June 6, 1959—the 15th anniversary of D-day.

Fifteen years ago tomorrow, on a sulky, stormy day, just at the break of dawn, allied paratroops dropped on Contentin peninsula, Normandy, France. Ninety minutes later the first assault troops—made up of American, British, Canadian, French, and Polish soldiers—began to crack the Normandy beaches named Sword, Juno, Gold, Utah, and Omaha.

The Normandy invasion was one of the greatest military achievements of all time, Mr. President. There, on that day, the battle of Europe against Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany essentially was won. Five thousand ships, 9,000 planes, and Allied troops numbering 150,000 men, including 24 U.S. divisions, did battle during D-day. There were more than 10,000 Allied casualties and more than 2,000 men killed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles commemorating D-day, one from the June 8 issue of Time magazine and one from the May 31 issue of This Week magazine, be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I feel that it is appropriate for us, and rewarding to us to commemorate this attack, this victory, this performance, this day, Mr. President, for two paramount reasons.

First of all, we commend to our memory the courage and the capability displayed on the 6th of June because that day rises high in our spirits as a great moment of American and free world history, and because of the dignity and generosity of the men and boys who died there serving the cause of a better, happier, more peaceful world for all of us.

Secondly, I am proud in the remembrance of D-day to honor the service of one individual who led our cause then, and who leads it now in the all-compelling issues of war and peace. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mr. President, who had commanded the Allied forces against the Axis in North Africa, and who was to become NATO leader, Army Chief of Staff, and finally Commander in Chief, was in charge of the entire D-day operation. As Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces, he was the final strategist, he calculated the precarious chances, he equated the factors of danger and triumph, he made the momentous decision to "go ahead."

In a sense, D-day was the beginning of the painful reconstruction, regrouping, and rededication of the years of the postwar period. In a sense, Mr. President, the Normandy invasion marked the start of a NATO which now guards Europe. Here, on June 6, 1944, in the first success of the continental victory over fascism, were the first beginnings of the new struggle against communism. Then and now, Mr. President, Dwight D. Eisenhower leads us.

On that victorious day in France in 1944 were sown the seeds of confidence in the judgment and leadership of General Eisenhower which so emphatically bloomed in the 1952 and 1956 U.S. elections. And today, President Eisenhower continues to hold the overwhelming support and trust of the American people as he works, for the future, with the intricate factors of power and principle. We offer our prayers and support to him, Mr. President, as he leads America and the free world in our shared efforts to meet the complex and delicate challenges of waging the peace.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Time magazine, June 8, 1959]

D-DAY IN EUROPE: THE FORGE OF VICTORY

June 6, 1944 was a dour, windswept day on the English Channel—and the decisive moment of World War II was hard at hand. The combined Chiefs of Staff of the United States and Britain had issued a directive to Supreme Commander Dwight D. Eisenhower: "You will enter the continent of Europe and * * * undertake operations aimed at the heart of Germany and the destruction of her armed forces." Eisenhower looked at the lowering sky and made his fateful decision to go ahead. Now to the captive peoples of Western Europe came his voice of hope: "The hour of your liberation is approaching." This, 15 years ago this week, was D-day. The results of that day's work are known wherever man draws breath. Almost forgotten is how precariously the power and the glory hung in the balance.

To undertake history's greatest amphibious invasion, the Allied Powers had assembled 150,000 men, 1,500 tanks, 5,000 ships, and 9,000 planes. The German enemy was reeling: his cities had been bombed, he had lost North Africa and been thrown back to the seven hills of Rome. Wounded he was—but still deadly dangerous, with 60 divisions, including his crack Panzers, to defend Western Europe. Adolf Hitler correctly divined Normandy as the probable Allied Schwerpunkt, concentrated his armored reserves behind seven infantry divisions in the target area and, closer to Germany, maintained strength in the Pas de Calais area. Hitler's most mobile general, Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, well knew that Allied air superiority (5,000 fighters on the channel front to a mere 119 for the battered Luftwaffe) would rule out any battle of maneuver, Rommel strengthened the coast defenses and prepared to fight it out on that line. Said he: "The war will be won or lost on the beaches. The first 24 hours will be decisive."

The Allies therefore faced a momentous strategic equation. Once the beachhead into Europe was established, they could land 100 divisions and pound on to Germany with almost 2–1 superiority. But on D-day itself the Allies would have to land nine divisions to fight 10 German divisions in bristling, fixed positions—and the Allied spearheads would be even more heavily outnumbered. "We shall have to send the soldiers into this party seeing red," said the Allied ground forces commander, Bernard Law Montgomery. "Nothing must stop them. Nothing."

Nothing did stop them—in places. In the battle's first hours, between 0015 and 0900, the Allies won three quick successes. On the left flank the British 6th Airborne Division achieved complete tactical surprise, wiped out German positions east of the Orne River. On the right flank the U.S. 82d and 101st Airborne Divisions, although badly scattered in the airdrop, outfought 3 German divisions, suffering 2,500 casualties. Shielded by this U.S. airborne success, the U.S. 4th Infantry Division swept ashore soon after the first light on Utah Beach, swamped the defenses at a cost of only 197 casualties. It was D-day's first major breakthrough.

INCH BY INCH

But it was on the four beaches between the Orne and the Vire that the man-to-man battle was fought in most savage fury. On Sword, Juno, and Gold Beaches, British and Canadian troops hurled in an astonishing force of specialized armor—mine-clearing tanks, pillbox-blasting tanks, ditch-filling tanks, flamethrowing tanks—but the German 716th Infantry Division in fortified seaside hotels and summer villas, fought back viciously, inflicting 4,000 casualties.

Onto the U.S. forces' Omaha Beach, a concave sweep of sand 300 yards deep beneath fortified bluffs, the U.S. 1st and 29th Divisions sent in a spearhead of 1,450 men. They ran head on into most of the German 352d Division—undamaged by the inaccurate air bombardment—and were soon shelled, mortared, mined, machinegunned. But even as the German commander at Omaha announced victory and began diverting his reserves against the British, U.S. Col. George A. Taylor ordered an advance: "Now let's get the hell out of here." Inch by inch, behind accurate naval gunfire, backed up by waves of reinforcement, the U.S. infantrymen pushed back the German defenders.

MILE BY MILE

All day and night the Allies poured reinforcements onto the hard-won strips of Europe—36,250 in the Utah sector, 34,250 at Omaha, 83,115 on the British-Canadian beaches and airborne area. The German infantry began to crumble. Still desperately fighting, the Britsh punched out gains of 6 miles, the Canadians 8. The U.S. 1st and 29th Divisions battled into fortified villages behind Omaha, dug in. In the Utah sector the seaborne forces linked up with the airborne, pressed inland. The battle neared its moment of truth—the expected counterattack of Rommel's blazing Panzers. But that moment never came.

What happened was a breakdown in the German command. Rommel, believing the weather too foul for an invasion, was away in Germany on D-day. The 21st Panzer Division, instead of counterattacking, was fed into a piecemeal defense of Caen. The 12th SS Panzer and the Panzer Lehr Divisions were held in the rear from 0400 to 1600 by command from Hitler himself. Smothered by Allied air attack, they did not get into action until D-plus-one, D-plus-two, and D-plus-three.

THE BREAKTHROUGH

By that time, the battle was won. Along a 30-mile front, the forces of freedom had secured their beachhead on Hitler's Festung Europa. The price was dear: 10,724 casualties, including 2,132 dead.

There was deadly fighting yet to come and stirring history yet to be made. Montgomery drew the German armored strength onto the Second British Army and First Canadian Army at Caen, while the First U.S. Army broke out at St. Lô. Hitler and Rommel held back the German Fifteenth Army near Calais, waiting for a second invasion that never came. George Patton, with his ivory-handled pistols, led the Third U.S. Army from Avranches to Le Mans to Orléans to Verdun to Metz in the most spectacular armored advance of the war. There was the unforgettable moment when Paris was liberated. But those moments essentially had been made possible by the United States, British, and Canadian troops who, on that single day 15 years ago, stormed the beaches named Sword, Juno, Gold, Utah, and Omaha.

[From This Week magazine, May 31, 1959]

EISENHOWER'S TOUGHEST DECISION

(By Stewart Beach)

Do you remember D-day? Even if you weren't one of the thousands of soldiers who crossed the channel that unforgettable day, you may have been there in spirit, turning on a radio early the morning of June 6, 1944, hearing the terse message: "Under the command of General Eisenhower, Allied naval forces, supported by strong air forces, began landing Allied armies this morning on the coast of France."

That was all. But for the moment, it was enough. The invasion had begun. But why was it timed for June 6? Why that day rather than another? Few remember, if they ever knew, the factors which dictated the choice of D-day, or the precarious chance on which its success hung. I was in the fortunate position of knowing some of the chief actors in the drama, and I have gotten the story of what happened from them. It began this way:

Fifteen years ago this week events were moving rapidly toward the flaming climax of the greatest suspense story of modern times. The Germans knew, as everyone knew, that the Allies were about to launch a vast assault against the coast of France. But where the forces would storm ashore and the date of D-day—these were the two great secrets of that spring of 1944.

In May endless convoys of trucks loaded with men in battle dress began moving down the English roads to the channel coast. The men could guess that this was the invasion—but they didn't know. Only when they were penned into barbed-wire enclosures near the ports would they be told. They would wait there, for no one came out once he knew the secret. The entire south coast of England was an enormous military camp, off-limits to the public.

THE SECOND ENEMY

Now the ships began marshaling—more than 5,000 of them. Many anchored in the harbors; the landing ships nosed up against the macadamed "hards," surfaced strips along the water's edge, where their bows opened wide and their ramps went down to receive the troops and tanks that would rush the beaches.

But the supreme commander and the other officers who shared the secret knew there was one enemy that could wreck their plan—the weather. And the plan itself was based on three phases of the weather which relentlessly governed the timing of D-day. An invasion across the treacherous English Channel was hazardous enough in itself. But unless they had fair weather on the days when three factors coincided, the commanders agreed that the enterprise would have to be postponed. Here is what they wanted:

1. Tide low but rising. Out near the low water mark on the Normandy coast the Germans had strung mined defenses. Lanes would have to be blown, and this could be done only when the tide was out. But they wanted it rising so landing craft could get well inshore after obstacles were cleared.

2. Approach at dawn. Navy and Air Force wanted an hour of daylight to saturate the shore defenses. Therefore, the tide should be right an hour after dawn.

3. Light for airborne troops. Three divisions of airborne troops were to be dropped behind the beaches at 2 a.m. They needed darkness for the flight, but a late-rising moon to light the Normandy objectives.

By May 17, when he could be sure that all the pieces of the elaborate invasion machinery would fall into place, Eisenhower could pick a date. The three great essentials would coincide, according to the almanac, in early June—June 5, 6, and 7.

Now the state of the weather—fair or foul—was the big question mark which would face General Eisenhower when the time came for him to make his decision. Weekly practice sessions had been started in April when the meteorologists predicted the weather 24 hours ahead. Questions were asked, as they would be on the fateful morning. Then General Eisenhower would announce his practice decision.

As May wore on the weather was beautiful. The generals—Eisenhower, Montgomery, and Bradley—visited the troops in the invasion force, making pep talks, as Montgomery called them. Confidence was high throughout that magnificent spring.

Then it happened. As May turned into June, the weather began to worsen. The commanders' meetings with the meteorologists were now held twice daily at Southwick House, the Portsmouth HQ, at 9:30 in the evening and 4 in the morning. And now the 4 o'clock meeting on June 4 was the crucial one.

At the meeting the meteorologists' predictions held no hope. Heavy clouds, gales, and high seas were ruling the channel. Naval gunfire would be ineffective, the dawn aerial bombardment of the Normandy defenses almost impossible. Smaller craft might capsize in the turbulent surf. The supreme commander made his decision: D-day was postponed, until June 6.

Twenty-four hours later, in the early hours of Monday, June 5, a wind of almost hurricane proportions was blowing in General Eisenhower's camp when he left for the 4 o'clock meeting. It was a formidable and complicated decision he must make. Many of the ships based in northern ports had already been at sea 2 days. To postpone for another day would cause almost insurmountable problems of refueling. To delay for another 2 weeks, when dawn and tide would be right again, would raise the agonizing problem of what to do with the troops in the meantime. Secrecy would almost certainly be lost if they were let out of the barbed-wire enclosures.

WARMTH INSIDE, CHILL WITHOUT

At Southwick House, he went into the comfortable library where a fire glowed on the hearth and there was coffee to take off the chill, tea for the British. There were some 15 or 20 officers assembled there—the commanders with their chiefs of staff, Air Chief Marshal Tedder, the deputy supreme commander; Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, General Eisenhower's chief of staff; Maj. Gen. Harold R. Bull, SHAEF G–3. There were also those most important men, the meteorologists, headed by Group Capt. J. M. Stagg and his deputy, Col. Donald Norton Yates, today a major general commanding the Atlantic missile range at Cape Canaveral.

The weather was dreadful outside Southwick House, and the meteorologists confirmed that the storms they had predicted were lashing the Normandy coast, with high waves thrown up on the beaches.

But, they said, reports from Iceland, Greenland, and ships at sea indicated that on the morning of June 6 a relatively good period of weather would begin; it might last as long as 36 hours. Then bad weather would set in again.

IT WAS HIS CHOICE, ALONE

So there it was, a hope followed by the threat of disaster. General Eisenhower was faced with a choice and a chance. If he got a force on shore, could it be maintained in the face of bad weather ahead? Without the rigidly planned buildup of men and equipment on the beaches, the Germans might push the entire enterprise into the sea. On the other hand, the problems of postponement were agonizing.

As Supreme Commander, the decision was his alone. It was a moment when history was made. A wrong decision could wreck the greatest amphibious force ever assembled anywhere; a right one would carry it to decisive victory. His opponent was not Hitler now. It was the enemy he had always known he might have to face—the weather.

The room was still, with an almost unbearable tension. Then General Eisenhower rose to his feet.

He said, "We'll go."

That was Eisenhower's toughest decision. It was one that couldn't be put aside, and that had to be made by Eisenhower alone. That it was the right decision was brilliantly proved by the Allied sweep through France. That's something we can all still be thankful for this D-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I commend the very able minority leader on the very fine and beautiful statement he has just made with regard to the coming anniversary of D-day and with regard to those who contributed so much in order that so many could continue to enjoy freedom in the world.

Very shortly I shall address myself to an anniversary involving one of the great statesmen of this Nation who was one of the real architects of the victory which was ours.

I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Members may be notified; and I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNDERSTANDING: THE ONE SURE ROAD TO PEACE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my home State of South Dakota was privileged earlier this week to hear an outstanding address by Mr. George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. Allen's excellent speech is a valuable contribution in not only explaining the role of the USIA in promoting cultural exchange, but in telling how important and vital it is to world peace that we make every effort to achieve understanding of each other among the peoples of the world. Mr. George Allen was awarded an honorary degree by Huron College of Huron, S. Dak., on June 1.

As coauthor of the Smith-Mundt Act, I am deeply appreciative of the kind

comments Mr. Allen has made with respect to the accomplishments which have been made through programs resulting from this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Allen's address made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

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

UNDERSTANDING: THE ONE SURE ROAD TO PEACE

(Address by George V. Allen, Director, U.S. Information Agency)

It is not by chance that graduating exercises are commonly called commencement. The traditional sheepskin is, indeed, your introduction to a new life, to be lived in stirring times.

Personally, I am optimistic about the future, but not so blind as to deny that today the future presents many serious problems. Certainly the most serious of these is how to achieve peace with justice.

During the past 30 years I have lived in a number of countries and visited and traveled in many more. The most interesting, and often the most valuable, part of living or traveling in different countries is to talk to people, to find out what they are thinking, what they want. And I have always found that their first thought, their deepest desire, was for peace—for a real and lasting peace, not just another uneasy interlude between wars. People want a chance to develop their lives, to give their children an education, and to look to a future free from the constant anxiety and dread of international conflict.

Since this desire is so deep and wide, I have asked myself, I have asked others, why, then, do we not have permanent peace? Why is war still the nightmare that haunts the world's dreams? Why must we, even during periods between hot wars, constantly be faced with a cold war conflict?

One of the chief reasons, it seems to me, lies in the almost universal failure of different national groups to understand each other. Xenophobia, the fear and distrust of strangers, one of man's strongest emotions since the dawn of time, still control men's thinking. We not only dislike, we even hate people whose eyes are strangely made, as the song writer put it. We have a tendency, perhaps an instinctive one, to distrust people whose skin is a different shade or whose language or religion or customs are different from our own.

And yet time and again we have seen it demonstrated that once this tendency is overcome, men are able to recognize their common humanity. The first step is for people of different nationalities to learn more about each other. I do not contend that all people will automatically like each other better merely because they know each other better. A newspaper columnist, during a recent political campaign, described one of the candidates as a man you have to know well to dislike thoroughly. But knowledge is the first step toward understanding. If you understand a foreigner's motives, you are likely to be tolerant of his way of life even when you do not agree with it.

In the past, the chief barrier to international understanding has been the problem of communications. During recent years, however, tremendous strides have been made toward solving that problem, at least in the technical field. Today, one man standing before a microphone can communicate simultaneously with every nation of the entire world. Last summer the USIA broadcast the proceedings of a special session of the United Nations, live, from the floor of the U.N. Assembly room in New York to every corner of the globe, in the five official languages of the U.N. We concentrated all of our 76 transmitters in the United States and overseas for this purpose, during the crucial 3 days of the session. This was undoubtedly the largest concentration of international broadcasting attempted up to the present time.

Last Christmas, a short 6 months ago, a human voice came down to earth from outer space for the first time in man's history. President Eisenhower's message of peace and good will toward all men was broadcast from an earth satellite which orbited the globe every 90 minutes.

The transmission lasted only a few days, and the message was brief, but it was eminently appropriate, for it ushered in a great new era of communications with a plea for peace and good will. Within a few years, both television and radio networks will use orbiting satellites regularly to relay messages to all the world. Two of these such satellites, orbiting in cadence with the daily revolution of the earth, but at different places in outer space, will relay broadcasts to every spot on the surface of the earth simultaneously.

These new tools of communication make it possible for us, if we use them wisely—if we use them to build friendship rather than hatred—to make great progress toward international understanding.

The barrier of language will still exist, and will be a more difficult one to overcome than the scientific problem of transmitting sounds. A universal language is still far off. Even here, however, progress is being made. The eagerness of people throughout the world to learn English is astonishing. And we Americans are at last waking up to the need at least for our people who work overseas to speak the language of the people with whom we live.

International understanding may be no longer merely a dream. It could become a reality, at least to a sufficient degree to enable the governments of the world to form an international organization strong enough to keep the peace. I am convinced that this will come about, and that conviction is the basis of my optimism for the future.

It seems to me that the United States has a distinct and special contribution to make toward the progressive advance of such understanding. It could be our most important single contribution toward human welfare.

This young Nation has demonstrated that the people of many faiths, of many races, can learn to live in peace with each other. To be sure, we have not resolved all our internal differences completely, but we have made extraordinary progress. We can serve as a model, not of perfection, but of determination to do the job. I think we have a responsibility to do just this.

In the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, of which my good friend and your senior Senator, KARL MUNDT, was one of the sponsors, the U.S. Government recognized this responsibility. The act itself states that its purpose is to promote "a better understanding of the United States in other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries." To the wisdom and statesmanship of those words I think the future will bear witness.

Your Senator, then Representative MUNDT, and Senator Alexander Smith, of New Jersey, were sent to Europe in the summer of 1947 on an investigation. They learned that a very incorrect image of the United States was in the minds of most people abroad, and that Americans did not always have a true picture of the aims and aspirations of foreigners. They came home resolved to take the action that resulted in the legislation just mentioned.

Then, as now, the need was to give other people as true a picture of America as we possibly could. It was not proposed that we try to picture the United States as having achieved perfection, but Congress made it clear that those of us engaged in this field should try to give people everywhere a sense of what we Americans know we are—a strong and alert democratic nation dedicated to man's best capabilities.

Fortunately for the United States, a large proportion of mankind today shares our aspirations for peace and a better world. Interest in America, too, is almost universal. People everywhere want to know what we are and what we do. They want to come and see us, and if they can't do that, they want to read, hear, and talk about our country.

All this, of course, gives your Government's oversea information program a strong foundation on which to work. With books, magazines, releases for the local press, films, radio and TV programs, our officers overseas try to supply the information these people want. Using all the tools of communication available, we try to keep the channels open for a flow of information and ideas in both directions.

Cultural exchange with foreign peoples is proving one of our most effective approaches. As a high ranking Indian Government official remarked at the opening of an American water-color exhibit in New Delhi, "Politics divide, slogans irritate, but art unites."

The heart of our operation overseas is, in fact, our U.S. cultural centers, 158 of them in 80 countries. In addition, the USIA cooperates in the operation of 93 binational centers, the majority in Latin America but an increasing number in Europe and Asia. These centers range in size from modest little units managed part time by one American with the aid of a local staff to such great establishments as Amerika Haus in West Berlin, which is visited daily by some 5,000 persons, a fourth or more from East Germany. We are told that the Soviet determination to get the Western Powers out of Berlin is chiefly directed at the USIA Amerika Haus and RIAS, our radio station in that city. The Soviets call them festering sores. We call them havens of democracy and freedom.

A newspaperman from Calcutta had a rather pertinent comment recently on the U.S. Government's oversea informational and cultural programs. C. K. Bhattacharyya told us that our materials help build "relationships which endure although political relationships may deteriorate."

I am particularly proud of this positive and constructive side of the USIA program. Unfortunately, we are forced at present to carry on concurrently certain quarrelsome activities—to correct misstatements about the United States and to combat misrepresentation by international communism. We would have enough to do merely to overcome simple ignorance about the United States, but when we must strive to offset willful falsehoods, our task is compounded. The Communist bloc is waging the greatest international propaganda campaign in history, to propagandize the non-Communist world and to degrade the United States. In addition, they spend a great deal of time and effort, through jamming operations and otherwise, to prevent their own people from learning about the outside world.

We try not to be propagandists in the bad sense of the word, but the Communist campaign of misrepresentation has to be countered, and we are doing it, with lashing attacks where needed. However, it isn't the most appealing part of our effort. To build a true structure, not destroy false images, is more in keeping with the American character.

Our cultural exchanges with foreign countries is positive, and of growing importance. The USIA, I should hasten to add, is not the only U.S. Government effort in the cultural exchange field. Fifteen Government departments and agencies were represented at a recent State Department meeting to discuss the coordination of the various official international cultural and educational programs of the United States. This may sound like duplication, but I do not believe the danger of duplication is very great. The Department of Agriculture, or Labor, or Commerce, or the Library of Congress, or the Smithsonian Institution, is each interested in developing cultural contacts with foreign officials or groups in its particular field. In my view, the more groups working at the problem, the better.

There are also very many and important private programs which are doing outstanding work. Some of these programs are entirely nongovernmental. In others, the Government either cooperates or stands by to assist when asked. We do both, cooperate and assist, in such programs as the affiliations between American colleges and similar institutions abroad. These colleges exchange books, magazines, records, films and even students. Some 38 American colleges and universities are at present affiliated with institutions overseas.

American cities and towns affiliate with cities and towns abroad. I should like to see both types of affiliations vastly expanded.

I was pleased to note in some of the literature which your President sent me that Huron College frequently has welcomed foreign students. Perhaps you may have felt that the number of such students was too small to be of significance. I think even a small number is significant. The importance of the individual is a tenet of the democratic faith, and one foreigner who returns from Huron College to his homeland to tell about America is very important. If he leaves with you a wider understanding of his country and his people, that, too, is equally important. It is mutual understanding which the world needs.

I am deeply honored that Huron College has seen fit to confer on me the honorary degree of doctor of social science. Since international relations is one of the social sciences, I accept your distinction not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of my associates at USIA. That it was bestowed by Huron College makes it even more important since, as I have told you, the program with which I am now connected is, in considerable part, the brain child of Senator KARL MUNDT.

The legislation that bears his name launched the United State on one of the noblest ventures of its history—a venture based on the concept that honest and straightforward presentation of facts is the best basis for international understanding. It is a venture with which I am proud to be connected.

DANISH AND SWEDISH CONSTITUTION DAYS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is appropriate today for the Senate and for Americans to recognize the Constitution Days of two of the great democracies of the world, which are being observed this weekend.

Today marks the anniversary of the adoption of the Danish constitution on June 5, 1849. Under this document, Denmark became a constitutional monarchy, ruled by the Rigstag, or parliament. The constitution was drawn up in 1848 under King Frederick VII, and later revised in 1915.

Sunday will be the anniversary of the adoption of Sweden's liberal constitution on June 6, 1809. This constitution came as the result of a reform movement which overthrew a despotic ruler and placed King Charles XIII on the throne. Since that time, Sweden has enjoyed an era of progressive liberalization in government and industrial development.

Both Denmark and Sweden today are model democracies which enjoy advanced standards of living and high levels of education. These two constitutional monarchies offer fine examples for all the world of the fruits which progressive democratic government and liberal public welfare standards can produce for a nation. I might add, Mr. President, that our own country can benefit greatly from the experience of these two countries in developing and enacting the liberal welfare programs which have so greatly enriched the lives of their citizens.

In the free world's struggle against Communist imperialism, there is no better example to show to now uncommitted and underdeveloped nations than the economic, social, and political progress that these two nations have produced under liberal democratic government. America salutes Denmark and Sweden on their Constitution Days.

THE "VOICE OF FIRESTONE"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am quite certain that the television and radio listeners of the Nation were hit with a rather heavy impact on June 1 when they learned that the "Voice of Firestone" would no longer be seen over the television or heard over the radio. I have received a number of letters on this subject from citizens of Ohio expressing their regret that the Firestone hour of music will no longer be their entertainment.

The Firestone Co. wanted very much to continue to sponsor this top-quality program, but regrettably it was refused prime evening time by the three television networks because the "Voice of Firestone" supposedly did not have a satisfactory audience rating, as measured by present Madison Avenue advertising standards.

I have written a letter to the Federal Communications Commission expressing my disappointment about the action which has been taken by the three principal television networks. I should like to state to my colleagues today that it is rather regrettable that in the programing of entertainment on the television networks their prime objective seems to be satisfactory financial results to the various companies.

I believe a grave mistake was made. My hope is that something will be done to prevent its recurrence in the future. I think there may come a time when possibly legislation will be enacted declaring that the airways belong to the public, and that the gigantic national television networks will have imposed upon them a civic responsibility greater than they are now willing voluntarily to carry.

Huge are the profits they make in the sale of their stations. Huge are the profits which are being made through the operations of their stations. Yet when the public is to be considered on the one hand, and fiscal profits on the other, the recognition is of the fiscal profits, and not the public.

I call this subject to the attention of my colleagues especially because the sponsor principally involved is the Firestone Co. of Ohio.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

THE EIGHTH WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it was with great distress that I observed that the Olympics committee recently decided not to recommend that Nationalist China be invited to participate in the Olympics. I think a tragic mistake was made. The promoters of the International Olympics extended an invitation to Red China, and recognized it as the government of the Chinese people. At the same time, they requested that Taiwan enter as Taiwan and not as Nationalist China. I bring this subject to the floor today because in February 1960, at Squaw Valley, there will be held the eighth winter Olympics. The organizing committee for the eighth winter Olympics has already extended invitations to various prospective participating nations. Its invitation went to Nationalist China. It did not go to Red China.

I understand that discussions of the subject are now under way, but that the organizing committee for the eighth winter Olympics has decided to continue the extension of its invitation to Nationalist China on Formosa, and not to Red China.

It is my sincere hope that the organizing committee will stand fast. I understand that through the Congress we have provided $4 million to sponsor the Squaw Valley Winter Olympics, and it would be a tragedy if we should decide to invite Red China to the winter Olympics and to require Nationalist China to apply under the national designation of Taiwan.

I call upon the organizing committee for the eighth winter Olympics, and especially the American representatives, to stand fast and continue their invitation to Nationalist China, and not Red China.

IMPROVEMENT IN THE EMPLOYMENT PICTURE—INFLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we have all noted with gratification the improvement in the employment picture during the spring months and we all hope for continued improvement until the recession is laid completely to rest.

However, we must never overlook the fact that severe local unemployment existed before the recession began and will exist indefinitely into the future unless action is taken. Those of us who supported the area redevelopment bill, which the Senate passed earlier this year, sought to provide such help.

In order that Members of Congress may be reminded of the continuing labor

surplus problem and of the large number of communities still suffering from substantial unemployment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a tabulation showing major and smaller areas of substantial labor surplus, as of May 1959. This tabulation is taken from the May 1959 publication Area Labor Market Trends, of the Bureau of Employment Security.

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

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS, MAY 1959

MAJOR AREAS

Alabama: Birmingham, Mobile.
Connecticut: Bridgeport, New Britain, Waterbury.
Illinois: Joliet.
Indiana: Evansville, Fort Wayne, South Bend, Terre Haute.
Kentucky: Louisville.
Maine: Portland.
Maryland: Baltimore.
Massachusetts: Brockton, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield-Holyoke, Worcester.
Michigan: Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Muskegon-Muskegon Heights.
Minnesota: Duluth-Superior.
New Jersey: Atlantic City, Newark, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Trenton.
New York: Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Buffalo, New York, Utica-Rome.
North Carolina: Asheville, Durham.
Ohio: Toledo.
Pennsylvania: Allentown - Bethelehem - Easton, Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, York.
Puerto Rico: Mayaguez, Ponce, San Juan.
Rhode Island: Providence.
Tennessee: Chattanooga, Knoxville.
Texas: Beaumont-Port Arthur, Corpus Christi.
Virginia: Roanoke.
Washington: Spokane, Tacoma.
West Virginia: Charleston, Huntington-Ashland, Wheeling-Steubenville.

SMALLER AREAS [1]

Alabama: Alexander City, Anniston, Florence-Sheffield, Gadsden, Jasper, Talladega.
Alaska: Anchorage.
Arkansas: Fort Smith.
Connecticut: Ansonia, Bristol, Danbury, Danielson, Meriden, Middletown, Norwich, Thompsonville, Torrington, Willimantic.
Illinois: Canton, Centralia, Harrisburg, Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Litchfield, Mount Carmel-Olney, Mount Vernon.
Indiana: Anderson, Columbus, Connersville, Michigan City-La Porte, Muncie, New Castle, Vincennes.
Iowa: Ottumwa.
Kansas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons, Pittsburg.
Kentucky: Corbin, Hazard, Hopkinsville, Madisonville, Middlesboro-Harlan, Morehead-Grayson, Owensboro, Paducah, Paintsville-Prestonsburg, Pikeville-Williamson.
Louisiana: Alexandria, Opelousas.
Maine: Biddeford-Sandford, Lewiston.
Maryland: Cumberland, Frederick, Hagerstown, Westminster.
Massachusetts: Greenfield, Haverhill, Milford, Newburyport, North Adams, Pittsfield, Southbridge-Webster, Ware.
Michigan: Adrian, Allegan, Bay City, Escanaba, Iron Mountain, Jackson, Marquette, Monroe, Owosso, Port Huron, Sturgis.
Mississippi: Biloxi-Gulfport, Greenville.
Missouri: Cape Girardeau, Flat River, Joplin, Washington.
Montana: Butte, Kalispell.
New Jersey: Bridgeton, Long Branch, Morristown-Dover.
New York: Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Corning-Hornell, Elmira, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Kingston, Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, Olean-Salamanca, Oneida, Plattsburgh, Wellsville.
North Carolina: Fayetteville, Henderson, Kinston, Lumberton, Mount Airy, Rockingham-Hamlet, Rocky Mount, Rutherfordton-Forest City, Shelby-Kings Mountain, Waynesville, Wilson.
Ohio: Ashtabula-Conneaut, Athens-Logan-Nelsonville, Batavia-Georgetown-West Union, Cambridge, East Liverpool-Salem, Findlay-Tiffin-Fostoria, Marietta, Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Springfield, Zanesville.
Oklahoma: Ardmore, McAlester, Okmulgee-Henryetta.
Pennsylvania: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Bradford, Butler, Chambersburg-Waynesboro, Clearfield-Du Bois, Indiana, Kittanning-Ford City, Lewistown, Lock Haven, Meadville, New Castle, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pottsville, St. Marys, Sayre-Athens-Towanda, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville, Williamsport.
Rhode Island: Newport.
Tennessee: Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport, Columbia, La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.
Texas: Laredo, Texarkana.
Vermont: Burlington, Springfield.
Virginia: Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Radford-Pulaski, Richlands-Bluefield.
Washington: Aberdeen, Anacortes, Bellingham, Bremerton, Everett, Olympia, Port Angeles.
West Virginia: Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, Fairmount, Logan, Martinsburg, Morgantown, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, Welch.
Wisconsin: Beloit, Eau Claire-Chippewa Falls, La Crosse, Oshkosh.

[1] These areas are not part of the regular area labor market reporting and area classification program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

Mr. CLARK. Not all of these communities would be eligible for assistance under the area redevelopment bill because they have not been labor surplus areas for the length of time required for eligibility. However, some of the cities on this list have been in the substantial unemployment category almost continuously since the end of World War II. It is for areas of chronic unemployment such as these that the area redevelopment bill is designed. Not only the States affected, but the whole Nation, has a stake in the restoration of a healthy economy in these communities.

I point out that my own State of Pennsylvania unhappily has the largest number of surplus areas, and I believe it now has the greatest amount of chronic, consistent unemployment of any State in the Union. This causes me to advert to a recent editorial entitled "Ingredients of Inflation," published in the New York Times, which took the Joint Economic Committee to task for its prognosis of several months ago. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

INGREDIENTS OF INFLATION

An increasing number of developments on the economic front of late have combined to suggest that, while it is only about 2 months since the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Economic Report appeared, its central conclusion, if not perhaps completely refuted, has at least been brought into serious question.

This conclusion was that for 1959, since there was obviously no evidence of inflation on the horizon, we should pursue public policies such as a budget deficit and cheap money until we have achieved full recovery from the recession. In other words, we should forget about a balanced budget and give highest priorities to the attainment of maximum employment and production.

When the congressional committee was preparing its report the most recent available figure on unemployment was that of January, which placed it at 4,724,000. Reflecting the recovery to new alltime highs in industrial production and the gross national product, this figure had been slashed by April to 3,627,000. Since the average number of unemployed in the boom years 1955–57 was 2,900,000, this means the total of the recession-induced jobless had already fallen to 727,000, and this at a time when we have put behind us the worst 4 months of the year in terms of unemployment expectancy.

If we look for evidence that the danger of inflation is not to be dismissed as lightly as the committee dismissed it, our first thought, of course, would be the stock market, which has soared so high and so fast that officials and members of the exchange have expressed their apprehensions concerning its speculative temper.

But the desire to turn a quick profit is equally evident in such seemingly unrelated news stories as that of the Florida land boom and the spectacular prices recently bid for paintings by established artists in the leading art auctions. In another, but equally obvious, form, we see it in the unwillingness of investors holding maturing Government obligations to accept in exchange a new short-term security that in anything like a normal atmosphere could be regarded as exceptionally attractive.

Again, the committee observed that the country's money supply had increased by an average of only 1½ percent since the end of 1954. By the generally accepted definition of the money supply—currency, plus demand deposits adjusted—the latter has risen during the past 12 months from $135 billion to $140.4 billion, an increase of $5.4 billion, or 4 percent. This reflects an increasingly vigorous demand for business credit, which on being used is likely to put to a very practical test the committee's thesis that the possibility of a reemergence of prime inflation this year can safely be ruled out.

In short, the person who is genuinely on the alert for possible signals of inflation doesn't wait until it shows up in that laggard series, the Consumer Price Index. And not even the legislator dedicated to the concept of inflation as a way of life, perhaps, would deny that such news items as these are strangely reminiscent of some of the more infallible symptoms of inflation in the making that he vaguely recalls from the past.

Mr. CLARK. In my judgment, this editorial is entirely wrong, both in its emphasis on inflation as being our primary national problem, and also in its criticism of the Joint Economic Committee. The New York Times and the financial journals of Wall Street have become so obsessed with the problems of inflation that they are unable to view in perspective the somewhat more important problem of continued national economic growth, in order to put an end to unemployment and to realize for our children a first-class America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an

able article by Richard L. Strout, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, published in the May 13, 1959, edition of that newspaper. The article is entitled "Inflation's Mist Fogs Boom."

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

INFLATION'S MIST FOGS BOOM

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—American business is good and getting better: the big concern is inflation.

The paradox of this situation is that nearly all business indices are heading up except the cost of living—this index that measures inflation has remained nearly stationary for almost a year, the longest period of price equilibrium in recent statistical history.

These is every prospect that the United States is in, or is about to enter, a boom, and that this will last a year or so.

It is hard to see what can stop it. Following a 2-year recession there is now an enormous backlog of consumer and capital goods demand. It is true that unemployment is still abnormal, but this is rapidly dropping.

NINETEEN HUNDRED SIXTY VOTE FACTOR

The boom should ease many domestic problems. It should also aid the Republicans in the 1960 Presidential campaign. They can take credit for expected prosperity.

Through all this rosy prospect there remains, however, the fear of inflation. Advertisements warn against it daily. Apparently the apprehension is not based on any current runaway prices because actually the sensitive cost of living index is standing still.

(This index is the average of conflicting forces: the cost of many things is rising, particularly of services, but for the present this is balanced off by the decline of consumer food prices. Stability is being purchased at the expense of the farmers.)

Is the current fear of inflation due to a bad American record in holding the price line as compared to other countries? The answer here has to be no.

The United States by this criterion has a record to be proud of. Every American knows that prices have gone up. But competent economists show that relatively the American price rise is less—and in most cases far less—than in most other Western nations.

RATE OF RISE LOW

Britain, for example, does not seem worried about inflation. Yet the 10-year rise of British wholesale prices, 1948–57, was 55 percent, that in the United States only 13 percent. The same thing is true of consumer prices. The 10-year American rise of 17 percent is visible to everybody, but compared to other countries it is close to the bottom of the list.

Well then, the observer asks, how does the present movement of U.S. prices compare with those in the past?

What the public rarely understands is that inflation has been operating a long time. One analysis shows that over the period (1897–1958) the compound rate of price increase in the United States has averaged 2⅓ percent a year. Some years it was less, some (usually war years) more.

So-called creeping inflation has existed for a long time. In the United States, at least, it has never become galloping inflation. If the average rise is 2⅓ percent a year then the current period of almost a year with no rise at all is amazing.

DEFICIT AT PEAK

There are several new factors in the current situation which help account for the national sensitivity over inflation—a sensitivity hardly found today in any other big country.

1. The power of labor and management to maintain wages and prices appears to be at an alltime high. In the 1957–58 recession old-fashioned economic precepts indicated a drop in wages (from unemployment) and of prices (from reduced consumption). On the contrary, both went up. This implies a power to control the economy which society must view with concern.

2. Budget deficits: The United States is operating at a deficit, the biggest in peacetime history. President Eisenhower has balanced his budget only twice in 6 years. Red ink in the budget tends to be inflationary. But why is there this enormous current deficit?—primarily because of a slowing down of national economic growth. This results in a fall off of Federal revenues. The budget goes into the red.

Many observers would be happier if the Nation showed as much concern over the alarming decline in the rate of increase in gross national product, a disaster which has really occurred, as it does over the fear of inflation, a mere possibility of the future.

SCARE TECHNIQUE?

3. Politics: The political factor cannot be ignored. Nobody can deny that fuel for inflation now lies around. But it is easy to use the scare to cry inflation against almost any bills—some of them worthy, such as defense, foreign aid, and education. There are signs that some interested parties are promoting an inflation scare for their own ends.

Where a proper concern over inflation becomes hysteria it becomes dangerous. Some observers ask if that point has been reached.

The Government is finding it hard to market its long-term bonds in large part because of nationwide inflation fears. Simultaneously the huge stock market boom threatens to get out of hand (also stoked, in part, by investors seeking a hedge against inflation).

Again, one reason for gold going abroad may be exaggerated foreign fears of inflation.

Finally, exaggerated emphasis on inflation distracts attention from the problem of retarded U.S. economic growth.

Soviet output recently has been at three or four times the rate of the United States; a situation not necessarily serious at the moment but which Allen W. Dulles, Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, says would spell economic suicide if indefinitely continued.

Mr. CLARK. Our friends of doom and gloom on the other side of the aisle point constantly to the dangers of inflation, but hardly ever do they say anything about the necessity for continued economic growth. I point out again that twice as many babies were born in the United States in 1956 as in 1936. I point out that the national per capita income has grown hardly at all during the Eisenhower administration, in fact by less than one-half of 1 percent. I point out that the primary economic problem is economic growth, not the combating of inflation. Of course, we must combat inflation, too, but I point out that the cries of doom and gloom which arise from our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing positive harm in our efforts to stabilize our price system. One of the features of these cries is the stressing of the fact that we are losing gold in this country.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have an article published in the May 31, 1959, issue of the New York Times printed at this point in my remarks. It is entitled "Exports Gloom Held Too Thick."

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

EXPORTS GLOOM HELD TOO THICK—BALANCING FACTORS INDICATE THE U.S. PICTURE ISN'T AS DARK AS IT'S PAINTED

(By Brendan M. Jones)

Continuing business concern with the decline in U.S. exports suggests the need for a corresponding emphasis on factors tending to put the issue in more rational perspective.

The decline began about 2 years ago. After reaching an exceptionally high level of $19,455 million in 1957, commercial exports dropped last year to $16,315 million. This decrease of more than $3 billion still was not as large as, or very different from, three previous year-to-year declines that occurred in relatively recent times.

The record set in 1957 climaxed 2 successive years of exceptional export gains, above $2 billion that year and $3 billion the year before. A good part of this exceptional rise was due to boom conditions in Europe and some other areas.

DECLINE BEGAN IN 1957

The decline of export trade, which showed up most markedly in last year's total, actually began in the latter half of 1957. Although this was the year in which exports soared to a new peak, most of the increase was concentrated in the first half. It was produced primarily by the unusual demands for fuel and other commodities caused by the Suez Canal stoppage.

A particularly worrisome aspect of the export trend is the fact that the decline has persisted into 1959. While last year there had been no real expectation that volume would come anywhere near the high level of 1957, more optimistic traders had looked for an upturn by the spring of this year. So far there has been no sign of such an upturn, but figures for April reported last week show a comparatively small decline.

While it now seems likely that the looked-for upturn will be later than expected, there are these factors serving to give perspective to the overall export picture:

The decrease in exports has not been peculiar to the United States. Beginning in 1957 and continuing last year, most large trading nations experienced a downward trend.

For the United States, the 1957 boom and subsequent decline of exports has been concentrated in mineral and agricultural products. Products mainly affected in these two categories include petroleum, coal, fertilizers, cotton, grains, and various other agricultural items such as soybeans, peanuts, and citrus.

A main influence on the general world decline of export trade was a sharp drop in commodity prices, which only lately have begun to recover. The effect on primary materials-producing countries has been the drastic curtailment of their buying power. This development was similar to the commodity slump following the Korean war, which had a like effect on United States trade.

The recent commodity-price drop exerted a contracting effect on exports of most large trading nations thorugh part of 1957 and nearly all of 1958. While many other nations have already begun to experience an upturn in their exports, the full impact of the commodity slump has only just hit United States exports.

This is indicated by the fact that in the first quarter of this year the dip in United States exports came mainly from a decline of 19 percent in sales to Latin America.

In sum, the decline of exports for this country has been from a peak reached thorugh unusual circumstances, followed by severe curtailment of buying power in major markets. Added to this is the fact

that through 1957 and 1958 this country's exports of agricultural produce, much of it surplus, ran at exceptionally high rates that could not be expected to continue indefinitely.

Concern over the export situation has been heightened by the heavy outflow of gold from this country. This movement has caused much questioning concerning whether inflation has priced American products out of the market. It also has raised the general question of decreased value of the dollar in world markets.

While the effects of inflation and the heavy outward movement of gold are not to be shrugged off lightly, the fact is that foreign countries jointly now hold more dollars than a year ago. In addition, it must be recognized that a large part of the outflow of gold, especially last year, was a reversal of a heavy inward flow of the preceding year.

Because of the exceptional requirements in fuel and other materials caused by the Suez situation, West European nations particularly drew heavily on gold reserves for financing. Practically all of these expenditures added to the United States reserves and about half of the heavy outflow last year represented a rebuilding of other nations' diminished reserves.

Through this recent period West European nations showed remarkable recovery from the effects of the Suez crisis and were able last December to underwrite a freer convertibility of their currencies. That this also is a token of their stronger competitive capacity in world export markets is obvious.

While most of these nations have made exceptional progress economically in recent years, they have had to apply greater discipline in checking inflation. Their dependence on world trade is such that protecting the value of their currencies has been paramount. Success of their efforts has now brought a basis for revival of freer competition in world markets and removal of import restrictions as was demonstrated by Britain last week.

Anxiety over the decline of American exports and diminished value of the dollar seems to have been stimulated partly by the recent recession and wage-cost pressures. A furor over decreased value of the dollar has a certain propaganda effectiveness not only domestically but also in other countries where there is interest in seeing gold prices increased.

From a different perspective it is possibly helpful to recall that United States exports slumped $4 billion in the 1944–45 period; and by nearly $2 billion in 1947–48 and 1951–53. They later recovered to go on to new records.

Mr. CLARK. I hope very much that the country at large will soon recover its senses and, despite the propaganda from the White House and Wall Street come to the conclusion that we must have prices stable and constant economic growth, as well as and that we are not going to get that economic growth unless the policies of the Eisenhower administration and of the Federal Reserve Board are changed.

AMENDMENT OF BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 5, 1959, p. 10013, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to address one inquiry to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The conference report adopts the date of June 30, 1960, instead of the date in the bill as passed by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it removes the date which was inserted and adopts the House version, and also the so-called Aiken amendment which the Senate added, which specifies the amount.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have just completed action on the conference report on S. 1094, the Bretton Woods Agreement Act. I wish to commend the Committee on Foreign Relations. This is very important legislation. I trust that it will be at the White House shortly. It involves $1,375 million. It is generally in keeping with the recommendations of the President. I am pleased that we were able to dispose of it this morning, rather than have it wait until we had acted on some of the pending business.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT LIMITING DEBATE ON CONSIDERATION OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed by the Committee on Appropriations that the Committee has completed action and filed a report on the Interior Department Appropriation bill, H.R. 5915. I hold in my hand the report by the Committee on Appropriations. There are some differences between the bill as reported by the committee and the bill as passed by the House. I am informed that the report states that the bill reported is under the budget estimates and that there is no serious controversy involved.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday, it be in order to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5915, under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate to 30 minutes on amendments and 2 hours on the bill, to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report has not actually been submitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hold in my hand a copy of the report. May the Chair submit my proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the majority leader will yield, I should like to address one comment to him. Last week I expressed the hope that there would be continuous consideration of the nomination which will be before us. I am fully sensible of the fact that the business of Government must go on. Certainly I would never have any objection to a reasonable request. Appropriation bills must be processed before June 30th. The request of the majority leader in relation to the appropriation bill is an entirely reasonable one, and therefore I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, June 8, 1959, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5915) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

GEN. GEORGE CATLETT MARSHALL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of our most distinguished American statesmen once said to me that in a long life he had met only three great men. They were Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court of the United States and Gen. George Catlett Marshall—and he said also that General Marshall was not the least of the three.

Since this appraisal was made by a public servant who has also been a lawyer of national distinction, it is not altogether surprising that two of his three great men were these two most famous Justices of the Supreme Court. It was the inclusion of Marshall under whom this civilian had once served that is intriguing.

The titles which he held and the positions he occupied were alone enough to make General Marshall a famous man, even had he been a man of mediocrity.

In themselves, his war service as the great general of the American and allied victory, and his peacetime service as Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State, give him high rank in the 20th century.

But clearly it is the quality of the service and the character of the man himself for which the American people are, in their hearts, grateful.

The phrase "Architect of Victory" is one often bestowed upon him for his performance in World War II. It is a glittering phrase, a happy generality, until we remember and examine once again the mammoth organization which General Marshall built to crush the most professional armies which ever inhabited this earth.

Even the inexperienced amateur was aware of the awesome size of the man who relentlessly, quietly, and selflessly created the armies, the navies, and the air forces in so brief a span of time—and then supplied them with the ever-mounting tools of victory.

This deed was enough to enshrine the name of Marshall forever.

Life offers too few men, if any, the opportunity to serve their nation as brilliantly in peace as they did in war. The only immediate parallels which come to my mind are those two immortals, George Washington and Winston Churchill.

Twelve years ago, General Marshall stood in the open air of Harvard Square and, in a brief speech, offered a concept which was to change the face of the world. Enough has been said here today of the successes of the Marshall plan that I need not once more detail its accomplishments.

In simple sum, one can well say and prove that the Western World is still the free world because of those words uttered in Cambridge, Mass., only these few short years ago.

And this was because the man who uttered those words was fully capable of transforming an idea of peace, just as he had transformed the theory of logistics in war, into action.

It is rare when nature combines in one human being the man of ideas and the man of action.

This is George Marshall. All Americans, everywhere, of the old generation and the new, owe this greatest living American a debt which even the best informed of us are only dimly beginning to understand.

This soldier would not cherish or appreciate such praise as this. I feel sure he would be more than content if someone said in the simplest of words, "He served his country well." To General Marshall there is not, there never has been, any other form of praise.

Even he in the simplicity of his greatness must know how well he deserves such praise, and how grateful the informed people of the free world are that George Marshall has come this way.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am glad to be in the Senate Chamber when words of appraisal of George Marshall are voiced and are to be voiced by the majority leader, by the Senator from Oklahoma, and by other Senators.

Surely General Marshall is more than one of the great Americans of the 20th century. He ranks with that small and noble group of men who have preserved this Nation in its times of crises. He is truly a soldier-statesman. No man since our Nation was founded has been more dedicated to its welfare and its principles. High as is the regard and appreciation of the American people now for this great man, I venture to predict that history will fix for him even a higher place than that we now might believe possible. The grateful thanks of a people sensible of his massive contribution to the United States of America flow to General Marshall. We hope and pray that his health will be restored and that his years on this earth will yet be many.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, I shall yield the floor, so that the very able and thoughtful Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] may occupy it. I have conferred with him about the statements to be made today, as a result of the inspiration which came from the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, and which permitted me to make my statement when I did.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I consider it a real privilege to be in the Chamber at this time to hear the remarks of the majority leader in praise and in proper evaluation of a truly great patriot. I am certain that the name of George Marshall will be an inspiration to generations yet unborn.

Not only was this man a great leader in his own right; but he also served with great leaders. What a unique period it was in American history when a man like Franklin Roosevelt could be President and a man like George Marshall could be Chief of Staff; and later, as in time of war, George Marshall was in a position to serve his country with such great distinction, honor, and brilliance. We are really a fortunate people. The majority leader has again reminded us publicly, as he has reminded so many of us privately, of the great privilege it is to be an American and to have leadership of this quality.

I know the Senator from Oklahoma is about to pay his respects to the distinguished citizen, George Marshall, and to the Marshall plan. I shall stay to hear his remarks, because this is, indeed, a historic day for our Nation.

I thank the majority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today and tomorrow, June 5 and 6, are anniversary dates of great significance to America and to the world.

One, the June 6 date, marks the 15th anniversary of the American D-day landing on the Normandy beaches. It was the successful planning and superb execution of this mightiest of all amphibious efforts which led the free world to victory in World War II.

The other, far less dramatic, but of transcendent historic importance, June 5, marks the 12th anniversary of the birth of the Marshall plan for the economic reconstruction of a war-torn Europe.

Who can say, in the short years that have passed, which step—the step which led to the winning of the war, or the step which contributed so much toward winning of the peace—achieved the most for America and for the free world? Our view of history is of too short range today to evaluate these great contributions in their true perspective.

Yet on these two great anniversaries all America can take pride in the modest genius who was the architect of both.

Today, at Walter Reed Hospital, General of the Armies George Catlett Marshall, Jr., lies ill; but the strength and vigor and character that he has given to American leadership in world affairs stand as the great hope for freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

In war and in peace, he proved his genius in planning, and in selecting men who could be trusted loyally to carry out to the limit the strategy and the program he had designed. This was especially true in the execution of his task as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Armies and in the selection of the able generals he chose for command. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander in Europe, was one of those selected. It was true of his planning, training, and equipping of the mighty Army that he expanded from 200,000 men in 1939 to over 8 million men on D-day.

It was true in the strategy of global warfare. Against all kinds of pressures, General Marshall always insisted that Germany first had to be knocked out of the war. Allied pressures, especially from Russia, for premature invasion of the European mainland, found General Marshall insistent first on perfection in training, on coordination of land, sea, and air forces, and on complete readiness for this greatest of all military operations.

He had learned his lessons well. In 1901, he graduated from Virginia Military Institute. He entered the Regular Army during the period of reorganization following the chaotic operations of the Spanish-American War. That was at the beginning of the reforms instituted by Secretary of War Elihu Root, who finally had succeeded in getting the necessary legislation authorizing the creation of a general staff.

In 1907, General Marshall was graduated with high honors from the Infantry-Cavalry school, and later from the Army Staff College, at Fort Leavenworth. There, because of his brilliant record, he was retained as an instructor, although still only a first lieutenant.

In World War I, General Marshall pleaded for command, but was selected by General Pershing to be Chief of Operations for the First Army in France. He was disappointed at not having command, but his greatness in France was

recognized by Pershing and all who worked with him. He returned to the United States as aide to General Pershing.

After many assignments, including China, operation of the famous Fort Benning Infantry School, and other commands, he returned to Washington, in the late 1930's, as Chief of the War Plans Division, and later as Deputy Chief of Staff.

His appointment as Chief of Staff of the then tiny Army of less than 200,000 men occurred on September 1, 1939. That was the day when the Nazi armies invaded Poland—and the testing by fire of General Marshall had begun.

With V–E and V–J Days behind him, General Marshall retired as Chief of Staff, hoping to retire to his Leesburg, Va., home with a full career of outstanding service and devotion to his Nation completed.

Scarcely had his retirement begun before President Truman, faced with the crisis in China, recalled him to active duty—as I recall, it was almost on Christmas Eve—to serve at his special envoy to try to reconcile the warring factions and to end the civil war that was then exploding in China.

In 1947, General Marshall began his second great career of service and achievement for the United States. It was in January 1947 that President Truman appointed him Secretary of State.

The victory in Europe that had been welcomed with fanfare and shouting on V–E Day was fast disintegrating under the hammer blows of poverty, unemployment, hunger, and economic stagnation. The problems of reconstruction of their wartorn cities and towns, and of their bombed-out transportation systems and rubble-filled factories were more than the war-fatigued populations of free Europe could surmount alone.

In General Marshall's brilliant and clear speech at the Harvard University commencement exercises 12 years ago today, he launched the United States into a new and constructive role in the world. He called on the nations of Europe to join with the United States in a vast, cooperative effort to repair their shattered economies. General Marshall well knew that without a speedy rehabilitation of Western Europe there could be no lasting freedom for its people, no stability to its democratic governments, no future for employment and production.

Should this war-ravaged condition have continued, the spirit of the peoples of Western Europe, under threat of hunger and despair, could have faltered, under the constant encroachment of Russia, from infiltration and subversion from within, and from military threats from without.

As the fruits of his plan unfolded into action, thanks to such bipartisan leaders of the then Republican Congress as Senator Vandenberg and then Congressman Chris Herter, now Secretary of State, hopes melded into action, and recovery began.

Never before in history has such an economic turn-around occurred in so short a time. The 4-year plan, which was to cost $17½ billion, was completed for a total cost of $13 billion. It brought about production, both agricultural and industrial, in unbelievable abundance. It provided high employment and commercial stability, and it rescued the governments of many nations from the imminent threat of Communist domination.

It paved the way for the creation of the NATO alliance. Perhaps one of its greatest fruits was to set the pattern for European cooperation, instead of conflict. The Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and the Common Market are byproducts of this plan launched by General Marshall, and so ably administered by Paul Hoffman, the first administrator of the program.

Recently Paul Hoffman told me some of the results of this greatest of humanitarian efforts in the history of the world. The $13 billion cost has already seen recoveries in hard currency repayments to the United States of approximately $254 million. This next fiscal year these payments will total about $62 million more.

Freely-elected governments today are strong, and free Europe is more vigorous, militarily and economically, than in the immediate prewar years. Instead of communities that are festering liabilities, teetering before the probing of communism, they offer markets for us and suppliers for us in an ever-increasing world trade. Their military divisions in growing strength bolster the free world's shield against the totalitarian threat of the East.

Each year the Marshall plan nations combine to spend more on the mutual security of the West than the entire 4-year cost of the Marshall program.

It would be impossible to calculate the additional military costs to the United States if this great European community had fallen victim to stagnation, exhaustion, and collapse. Certainly the entire Marshall plan cost of $13 billion for 4 years would have been required—along with additional billions in U.S. military expenditures—to compensate for the loss of this vital part of the world to communism. Even with this extraordinary expense, there would have been no real security for the Western World.

General Marshall resigned because of ill health in 1949. But when the Nation faced another crisis in the Korean war he was recalled to active duty to again serve his Nation. This time he filled the position of Secretary of Defense during the first year of the Korean war. It was in this period that he carried forward the creation of the NATO forces.

In 1951 General Marshall retired, this time for the third and last time. Virginia Military Academy dedicated its third arch to him as one of its most distinguished graduates. It is interesting to note that the first arch honors George Washington, the second Stonewall Jackson, and the third George C. Marshall.

Bernard Baruch, in dedicating this arch to General Marshall, paid tribute to him as a great citizen-soldier in the tradition of George Washington. But he emphasized that the new arch also looked to the future—to the concept of global defense and to George Marshall as the first global strategist.

Many other honors, too numerous to mention here, have come to General Marshall. The highest and best deserved was the Nobel Peace Prize of 1953—the first time it was ever awarded to a soldier.

Time will not permit repeating all of the great tributes paid to General Marshall by those who knew him and who worked with him. President Truman, in his memoirs, writes:

> General Marshall is one of the most astute and profound men I have ever known. Whenever any problem was brought before him, he seemed able to put his finger at once on the very basic approach that later would usually be proposed by the staff as the best solution. He talked very little but listened carefully to everything that was said. Sometimes he would sit for an hour with little or no expression on his face, but when he had heard enough, he would come up with a statement of his own that invariably cut to the very bone of the matter under discussion.

General Marshall has refrained from publishing his memoirs, although fabulous offers have been made to him for their publication rights. Since his retirement, he has remained aloof from all controversies.

The George Marshall Research Foundation at Virginia Military Institute has been established to honor him. He has deeded to it his personal papers. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower have cooperated fully in directing the Departments of Defense and State and the National Archives to make Government documents available.

Shortly before he left office, President Harry S. Truman directed the Secretaries of State and Defense and the General Services Administrator to cooperate with Virginia Military Institute and the George C. Marshall Research Foundation in procuring the documentary material relating to the activities of General George Catlett Marshall as a soldier, as Secretary of State, and as Secretary of Defense.

President Truman asked each of the officials to bring his memorandum on the subject to the attention of his successor "as a matter of urgency." "I feel confident that they will wish to support the efforts that have been commenced to provide suitable recognition to one of the greatest Americans of our age," President Truman concluded.

President Truman revealed then, in January 1953, that he had consulted with VMI officials about the Foundation for more than a year. A committee of representatives of the White House, the Departments of State and Defense, and the National Archives had given considerable study to the procedures by which the Government could assist the George C. Marshall Research Foundation. He expressed the hope that eventually a George C. Marshall Research Center would be open to the public on land provided by VMI on the perimeter of its parade ground, under authorization which had been given by the General Assembly of Virginia.

President Eisenhower, on April 1, 1955, wrote Mr. John C. Hagan, Jr., of Richmond, Va., president of the Marshall Foundation, that arrangements were

being made by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the National Archives to cooperate fully with VMI and the Foundation "subject to applicable provisions of law."

I am delighted to report that a great deal of progress has been made. Mr. Hagen states that more than 37,000 documents have been microfilmed of the 200,000 already processed.

Since General Marshall is one of the few major authorities on this Nation's recent activities in peace and war who has not written his memoirs, I am happy that the research foundation has made 41 hours of tape recordings in General Marshall's own voice and words to shed new light upon events of current history. Fifty records have been made with such contemporaries of the general as Bernard Baruch, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many of the top military and naval leaders who served with him.

Five researchers now are at work in various departments of government under the supervision of Dr. Forrest Pogue, director of research for the foundation, who once served as chief archivist of the Defense Department. One of the problems, of course, is that there are an estimated 3 million papers relating to the general's career and that many of them are classified.

I am grateful to Mr. Hagan for a chance to see the documents from President Truman, President Eisenhower, and Sir Winston Churchill. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the great ability of Sir Winston to express in words the true meaning of General Marshall's contribution to the freedom of the world eloquently portrays the gratitude of one of his associates throughout the crises of war and the crises of peace.

Here for the first time, I think, is presented Sir Winston's letter to Colonel Hagan:

DEAR COLONEL HAGAN: I welcome the decision to commemorate at the Virginia Military Institute the eminent services of Gen. George C. Marshall to the United States, to Europe, and to humanity. I have no doubt that this initiative will be widely acclaimed and supported.

During my long and close association with successive U.S. administrations, there are few men whose qualities of mind and character have impressed me so deeply as those of General Marshall. He is a great American, but he is far more than that. In war he was as wise and understanding in counsel as he was resolute in action. In peace he was the architect who planned the restoration of our battered European economy and, at the same time, labored tirelessly to establish a system of Western defense. He has always fought victoriously against defeatism, discouragement, and disillusion. Succeeding generations must not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example.

It is appropriate to assemble in a place so nearly connected with him documents and mementos relating to this great man. I am glad to think such a notable step is being take . in General Marshall's lifetime.

Yours sincerely,

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

I humbly associate myself with these words of Sir Winston. History will record General Marshall's selfless service, his dedication to the cause of world freedom—the story of a modest man ready always to answer the call to duty.

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 19, 1953.

Mr. JOHN C. HAGAN, Jr.,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. HAGAN: I am enclosing a copy of a White House news release which quotes the memorandum I sent last week to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, asking them to cooperate with Virginia Military Institute and the proposed George C. Marshall Research Foundation in procuring documentary material relating to the activities of General Marshall as a soldier, as Secretary of State, and as Secretary of Defense.

I am glad that there is wide interest in providing such a center and that the VMI board of visitors is taking the necessary steps to make it a reality.

I have asked each Department head to bring my memorandum to the attention of his successor in office as a matter of urgency. I am sure that the research center will afford a fine opportunity for scholars, and I am glad to see proper recognition of this great American.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE,
January 17, 1953.

The President (President Truman) has sent the following memorandum to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services:

"Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services:

"The board of visitors of the Virginia Military Institute has arranged for the organization of the George C. Marshall Research Foundation, Inc., as a nonprofit Virginia corporation. The purpose of the foundation will be to collect and receive papers and records relating to the life and public service of General Marshall, together with other historical objects and documents, and to provide a suitable building to house them at VMI. To assist in effectuating this, the General Assembly of Virginia has enacted legislation authorizing VMI to deed land to the foundation as a site for the building to be known as the George C. Marshall Research Center. This building will be a library and museum and will be open to the public. The foundation project is to be financed by funds raised from private sources.

"The establishment of the foundation has been a matter of great interest to me, and I have consulted with VMI officials about it over a period of more than a year. In connection with these conferences, I agreed that the U.S. Government would insofar as practicable make available to the foundation documentary material relating to the activities of General Marshall as a soldier, as Secretary of State, and as Secretary of Defense. A committee composed of representatives of the White House, the Departments of State and Defense, and the National Archives, has given considerable study to the procedures by which the Government can assist the foundation in obtaining the documentary material that it will want.

"I am now advised that VMI officials are ready to complete the actual incorporation of the foundation, and that they are also prepared to employ the necessary staff to begin the handling and processing of documentary material relating to the career of General Marshall. The VMI library is equipped to receive and maintain such material on a temporary basis pending construction of the research center building.

"Subject to any applicable provisions of law, I therefore direct the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the National Archives to cooperate with VMI and the foundation in procuring this documentary material, and to provide them with access to such records as they wish which can properly be made available to public inspection.

"Under the supervision of the Archivist of the United States, I am hopeful that reproductions of official records relating to the career of General Marshall can be provided the foundation.

"Many of the pertinent Government records will remain classified or will be withheld from the public for a number of years. As rapidly as they can be made public, however, I hope they will be made available to the foundation.

"I am requesting each of you to bring this memorandum to the attention of your successors in office as a matter of urgency. I feel confident that they will wish to support the efforts that have been commenced to provide suitable recognition to one of the greatest Americans of our age."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 1, 1955.

Mr. JOHN C. HAGAN, Jr.,
President, George C. Marshall Research Foundation, Inc., Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. HAGAN: I was very glad to learn from you and General Milton that the George C. Marshall Research Foundation will soon begin to collect and receive papers and records relating to the life and public service of General Marshall, and that the material will be maintained in the library of the Virginia Military Institute pending construction of the research center building.

Arrangements are being made by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the National Archives to cooperate fully with VMI and the foundation subject to applicable provisions of law. It is the policy of this administration to remove security classification from Government documents of historical importance at the earliest possible time consistent with the national interest. I am confident that a continuing flow of documents pertinent to General Marshall's career can thus be made available to the foundation for reproduction.

Through the establishment of this center for study of the career of a distinguished soldier and statesman, the George C. Marshall Research Foundation is making a large contribution to public understanding of national affairs. I wish you every success.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma for his very truthful and stirring words in praise of Gen. George Marshall. I regard General Marshall as one of the great Americans of all time.

There are a number of features about his public career which I think need to be noted. In the first place, it was a great act of faith on the part of President Roosevelt to designate him as Chief of Staff. As I remember, there were 33 on the list of generals at that time. Furthermore, General Marshall was not a graduate of West Point. A differing faction inside the Army, the so-called MacArthur faction, was very bitterly opposed to General Marshall. Nevertheless, the President passed over 32 generals and

chose General Marshall as Chief of Staff. He did it upon the advice, it is understood, of General Pershing; but it was a great act of faith. If the President's choice had turned out badly, it would have been a serious reflection on President Roosevelt. It turned out extremely well, of course.

General Marshall proved himself to be not only a great organizer of armies, but a profound strategist. Within the space of a few years, he had 12 million men within the Army itself, and they were well equipped, well trained, and the generalship was extremely good. I think later history will show that, although General Marshall did not command the armies in the field, he did lay down the major lines of strategy.

I was particularly interested to hear the tribute of praise from Winston Churchill. I have read most of the books which have been published about the inner strategy of the war, and it is perfectly evident that Churchill was the opponent of General Marshall on the grand plan of strategy. Churchill wanted to have the armies make an attack through the back door. Churchill wanted them to go up through Salonika, on through Yugoslavia, and up through the plains of Hungary, to come in through the back door. He was very bitterly opposed to a cross-channel attack, which General Marshall advocated. A reading of Churchill's memoirs, makes it perfectly clear that Churchill put off the actual carrying out of the decision for a cross-channel attack from month to month, and indeed, from year to year. Now to have him pay tribute to General Marshall is, I am sure, very sweet music to all friends of General Marshall.

General Marshall, of course, also wanted to command the troops in the field, but I believe British opposition prevented him from doing so. Instead, General Marshall found a very good substitute in the person of General Eisenhower. In his choice of field commanders—notably, General Bradley and General Eisenhower—General Marshall showed as good sense in his selections as President Roosevelt had shown in his selection. General Eisenhower, as I remember, was jumped from the rank of lieutenant colonel to lieutenant general in the space of a few days, and was given command of the armies in Europe. This, again, was done with the consent of President Roosevelt. Had that experiment turned out badly, I suppose neither General Marshall nor President Roosevelt would ever have been able to live down the mistake, but it turned out, so far as the war was concerned, extremely well.

I am very glad that the Senator has spoken today on the floor of the Senate in praise of General Marshall. General Marshall remained quiet and preserved aloof dignity under all the attacks which were made upon him, although those attacks must have grieved him. He remained quiet when old friends he favored were silent when he was under attack. He acted like a thoroughbred throughout his whole career.

I think the entire Nation joins the Senator from Oklahoma in praise of this great man and in gratitude for his services both in war and in peace.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois for his perception and for the addition of many facts which are vital in regard to the career of General Marshall.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

I earlier made comments with reference to the remarks of the majority leader concerning the illustrious life of this great American, General Marshall.

I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that his comments today relating to General Marshall are not only excellent and inspiring, but also have a direct and current meaning in reference to American investments overseas in what we call foreign aid. The greatest program of American investment in freedom, in democracy, and in reconstruction was the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan was a success, first of all, because there was candor and frankness on the part of the executive branch of the Government with the Congress as to what was required. The sum of money originally estimated was between $15 billion and $17 billion. I remind my colleagues that was a sum of money talked about in 1949, or 1948, and was a substantial sum of money. The timetable required from 4 to 5 years. It was said openly to the American people that this was what the cost would be.

Furthermore, this was not only an American program; it was a program worked out in cooperation with the nations of Western Europe. We insisted on the establishment of the Office of European Economic Cooperation, so that the various nations would help themselves and help each other as we helped them. This is a basic lesson in regard to foreign aid, and I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma would agree with me that in order for a foreign aid program to be really productive it must encompass more than simply the generosity of a country which makes the grants or offers the loans; it must encompass more than even the ability or the capacity of the recipient country; it must include other countries helping each other, within a region or within an area, working together in concert, along with the country or the nation which supplies capital and technical assistance.

I am delighted that the Senator has made these references to the Marshall plan at the time the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is marking up and finally putting the finishing touches to the foreign aid or the mutual security program, because we have proved that foreign aid can be effective. We have proved that foreign aid can be a valuable investment.

The Senator from Oklahoma has cited for the RECORD the fact that the investment in foreign aid in Western Europe under the terms of the Marshall plan may have saved the American taxpayers billions of dollars in terms of our own defense costs, and surely it saved Western Europe from falling either into Communist hands or into complete anarchy.

We owe a debt of gratitude, indeed, to George Marshall for the thought and for the idea. We owe a debt of gratitude, I will say, to the leaders in Congress at the time, on both sides of the aisle, such as the late Senator Vandenberg, the present Secretary of State Mr. Christian Herter, and Members who were on this side of the aisle. We owe a debt of gratitude, I will say, for the persistence of and the decision-making capacity of the President of the United States at that time, President Harry Truman.

It has often been said that democracy is characterized by three "d's"—the right to dissent, the right to debate, and the obligation to make decision. In the instance of the Marshall plan, we had debate and dissent, but finally decision. Best of all, we had a great idea.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for this most timely message as a tribute to a great American, which is more than deserved. I am delighted I am alive at the time and in the Senate to join in the tribute.

I am extremely pleased that the Senator from Oklahoma has reminded us again of the basic principles of effective foreign aid, effective investment in freedom and in democracy. Every Member of this body would be well advised to read carefully the message delivered today by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his very flattering remarks.

I wish to add that the Marshall plan would not have succeeded, in spite of the plans or the money, had it not been for the inspirational leadership which was given to this program by General Marshall.

Programs for foreign aid cannot be carried out with a half-hearted, embarrassed, weak-kneed attitude, for they will lack inspiration, which cannot be given by the mere expenditure of money as if it were only a routine operation. It was General Marshall's vision and the circumstances accompanying his administration—the work of Paul Hoffman and the great men associated with him in the early Marshall plan days—which made the plan truly a crusade for rehabilitation, reconstruction, and revitalization of Western Europe. It stopped the march of communism, which would have wound up on the Atlantic seaboard.

This program would not have succeeded had it not been accompanied by inspiration, as well as the dollars for aid.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator said, this was an exciting and inspiring idea. It became an exhilarating experience. Qualities of leadership were manifested. This is what is lacking today. Today's program seems like tepid tea. What we do, we do because it seems to be necessary. What we do, we do because it seems the established routine.

What we do, we do because we are supposed to be, and are, a big country. There is a lack of drama and inspiration in what we do today. It is for that reason that I think we have faltered. Because of this fact we find ourselves on the defensive. The Marshall plan was an offensive measure, not a defensive measure. The Marshall plan was constructive. It went beyond the mere chance to contain and to hold. It was something which was projected for the future.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague. I agree with him.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to add my commendation to that of Senators who have preceded me for the most timely address delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma with respect to the career of that great American, George Catlett Marshall, a dedicated man, a selfless man, a man entirely without personal ambition, a man who placed his country above everything else in life, and a man of exceedingly great ability and great capacity for leadership, and for influencing and retaining the loyalty of others.

He was always loyal to his friends. I saw General Marshall only once in my life. It was in the days shortly before Pearl Harbor. I was then a young captain in what was then the U.S. Army Air Force, serving on the newly created Air Staff. We were not then even in uniform. I remember that one day I was given the great privilege of going with my colleagues on the newly formed Air Staff to hear the Chief of Staff, George Catlett Marshall, tell us a little about the peril in which he found our country at that time, and the efforts he was making, as Chief of Staff, to mobilize America's armed might. He also emphasized the very great role which he was confident the young and budding Air Force would play in the years of decision ahead.

I came away from that meeting with the conviction that George Marshall was a truly great leader, a man with the capacity to inspire loyalty, a man who understood the problems with which we were confronted. I have never had occasion to change my mind since then. The amazing administrative task General Marshall performed in mobilizing the armed strength of the United States, in directing the major strategy of the war, and coordinating that strategy with our allies, was probably among the greatest military feats in the history of our country.

The dedication with which he determined to stick with the job, instead of taking the more glamorous position of field commander, is something for which all Americans must always be in his debt. Not only was he first in war in our time, but I suspect that when the history of this trying period through which we have all lived is written, he will go down in the annals of our country as also the first in peace.

I think I am correct in saying that this marks the 12th anniversary of the unveiling of the Marshall plan at Harvard University, on June 5, 1947. That dramatic gesture saved Europe from chaos and communism. It was a stroke of genius which dictated it. It was administrative genius which carried it out.

I hope that General Marshall will be able to read, if not hear, some of the things which are said about him on the floor of the Senate today. I, for one, am confident in my belief that when we sum up and evaluate events at the end of the era, it will be found that, in the list of great Americans in the first half as well as the second half of the 20th century, General Marshall's name will stand among the few great leaders of our country.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania for his tribute.

Let me say to him and to the Senate that I discussed General Marshall's condition with the Superintendent of Walter Reed Hospital only an hour or so ago. While General Marshall has been the victim of several strokes, and while it appears that he will have to remain in the hospital for an indefinite period, he still is able to read, understand, and, above all, to appreciate the things he knows have come about as a result of his efforts, which were so great. He, himself, always has treated his achievements with the extreme modesty which is the true mark of a distinguished and great man.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to hear that cheering news, and to know that what the Senator has said is true. What a wonderful thing it would be if, while the general is alive, some tribute of a national character could be paid to him—perhaps the naming of the new national metropolitan airport, or some other recognition to signify the affection and respect in which he is held by the entire body of the American people.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague. It is an honor well merited.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on this anniversary of the Marshall plan, I wish to join in bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that General Marshall proposed the famed program at commencement exercises at Harvard University. Later, it was called the Marshall plan; and it has had a very great deal to do with bettering the economic conditions in Europe and in the rest of the world. We believe it had much to do with keeping the peace after World War II.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I came in contact with General Marshall when he was Chief of Staff, and later when he was Secretary of Defense. I grew to respect and to admire him, and, I hope, to have a mutual personal friendship with him.

Today, unfortunately, General Marshall is in a hospital; but I hope that he is thinking happily of the glorious part he played in furthering peace in the world following World War II.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to be associated with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators in the compliments and commendations they have paid to the retired General of the Armies, George C. Marshall.

I have known General Marshall for approximately 20 years. To my way of thinking, he is one of our Nation's great men. His contributions have not only been many, but they have been worthwhile, as well. He was the directing genius behind the plans which brought our country and our allies victory in the Second World War. He was unassuming, but he had deep and firm convictions. One could always rest assured that what he was saying and what he was doing were always in the best interests of our country, and that at all times he placed the interests of the United States ahead of everything else.

I think our Nation has been extremely fortunate in having had at the time it did a man of the caliber of Gen. George C. Marshall. I know that the contributions he has made to our welfare will never be forgotten, and that General Marshall himself, because of his activities in the military field and because of his genius in devising the Marshall plan, will live in our memories and will be revered by our children for many decades to come.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I concur in the statements the able junior Senator from Montana has made with respect to General Marshall.

General Marshall's service to the country is a unique one—a service which transcends, in fact, the citizenship and the boundaries of the United States and of the Western Hemisphere, and encompasses the entire free world. It is particularly pointed to the preservation of freedom in Western Europe.

The Marshall plan was bold and imaginative. It was also successful and effective.

As a military leader, General Marshall excelled. As Secretary of State, his record is indeed outstanding.

Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I join in the other tributes which have been paid to General Marshall; and it is an honor to do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to join in the testimonials to a really great man in America, Gen. George Marshall.

For a good share of my life I have been interested in the writing of history. Historians are already beginning to record that one of the most unselfish, statesmanlike contributions of a free society emanated from the program which bears the name of Gen. George Marshall. At a time in our history when freedom and democracy were on the firing line, at the conclusion of a war in

which deep bitterness had been engendered, there was real reason to fear that we might lose the war in the peace. It was at that moment, when the temptations of revenge and selfishness were about to take over, that, under the leadership of General Marshall, the United States held out an unselfish hand of opportunity to the vast areas which had been devastated by the war itself.

In Europe, in particular, there were many persons who felt that America, although she had contributed greatly to the winning of the war, might well forget what was at stake in that war and might return home because, again, they were reading in their own history books, and they could remember our great contributions in 1917 and 1918; but they also remembered that, once the shooting stopped, so did our determination to win freedom; and, as a consequence, in 1918 the war to make the world safe for democracy was followed by a peace which made the world only safe for dictatorship. Therefore, America was being tested, once again, at the end of the Second World War in a generation.

What America did was brought to a head and was well epitomized in the program headed by General Marshall; and affixed to that program, rightfully, is his name—a program by which a victorious nation, for the first time in human history, agreed to share its abundant wealth, its great opportunities, and the blessings of having escaped the immediate ravages of war with the sections of the world—regardless of which side they had been on during that war—which had suffered such grievous devastation because of the war. As well they know, the Communists intended to feed on the unrest and the devastation in Europe; and, indeed, they had every chance of doing so. It was the Communists' intent to do nothing in Europe, but to let starvation and suffering breed a demand for communism. It was at that moment that America, through General Marshall, rushed into the vacuum and met the challenge in the only humane and constructive way that could be effective. Because of America's record on this front, all Americans can hold their heads high. We shall stand before the bar of history acquitted of any selfishness or any vindictiveness or any sense of revenge, which so often follow in the wake of great war.

To that end, we in America pay tribute, on this commemorative date, to Gen. George Marshall, one of the greatest Americans of them all.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to join in the remarks which already have been made on this anniversary date with respect to a very great American.

I think many persons believe that this Chamber is filled with those who are concerned with history's verdict regarding them. Consciously or unconsciously, I think all men and women are concerned with history's verdict with respect to them.

General Marshall, happily and deservedly, knows history's verdict, and he knows the gratitude of men and women across the world for him. Mr. President, nothing that could be said here could add to that story, but I think one should note on this anniversary date that the plan which bears his name points clearly to the road which America must follow if we are responsibly to discharge our obligation to civilization. It is not an easy road. It is definitely uphill. But free people, if they are given to understand the necessity, willingly will assume heavy burdens. It is leadership such as General Marshall has given which makes clear to free people the necessity for assuming burdens, and they find it a joy to assume such burdens.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to speak on behalf of a very great American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times of December 25, 1955, entitled "Marshall at 75: The General Revisited"; extracts appearing on pages 245 to 248 from the book entitled "Incredible Tale," written by Gerald W. Johnson; and extracts, as marked, from the book entitled "Peace Can Be Won," written by Paul G. Hoffman.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 25, 1955]

MARSHALL AT 75: THE GENERAL REVISITED

(By William S. White)

PINEHURST, N.C.—The cottage stands among the estates of the quietly and elderly rich who mainly inhabit this place. It is rather small, with a faint touch of pleasant shabbiness, and it looks rather huddled upon itself against the far grander homes across the shaded road. Here, on a winter's day, when a visitor calls upon the master of the cottage, the pines do not so much shelter as command; they are quite green, quite overpowering, and quite cold. The sheen of the sun is cold.

Here lives a great man, now venerable in retirement, an unconscious portrait of the general as an old man. (Whatever else he may be, however right or wrong his high policies in the immense years that he served, the host here is indisputably great, in the personal, human sense certainly; no sharper contrast to the small and the petty could readily be found.)

With him here is his wife, a lady of subdued, relaxed gaiety, whereas the general remains rather like a finely coiled spring. The steel has bent a bit, become a bit less supple with the passing of the years. Still, it remains. Here, too, is the general's orderly, an unobtrusive sergeant in mufti moving about deftly, much as a mobile background shadow alternately comes into focus and fades and dissolves in the eye of the camera.

Among the many, many obvious questions that the interviewer does not ask, is the name of the sergeant. The general would be perfectly polite, perfectly responsive, to such an inquiry. But he would be perfectly astonished, too. There is not the slightest doubt of his fondness, almost his paternal fondness, for this sergeant, who comes along with the other perquisites given by a more or less grateful Republic to a General of the Army.

All the same, the host here spent some 40 years in the professional Army, a good many of them with one or more stars on the shoulder, and even now he has no taste or gift for small talk or small facts. Unquestionably, he would unhesitatingly ford an icy river in winter to pull this sergeant out of a hapless fall. Unquestionably, too, however, a sergeant is a sergeant, a far more interesting being than, say, a second lieutenant, but still not a subject for general conversation.

Indeed, this small facet of character expresses one of the outstanding impressions left in a revisit, after some years, to George C. Marshall, General of the Army, former Secretary of State, former Secretary of Defense, former Chief of Staff, and holder of the Nobel Peace Prize.

That impression, stronger than ever now, is (however wretched the pun) of the profound generalness of the General's mind and point of view. An eminent soldier, credited by many with having held intellectual headship among all the military in prosecuting and winning the Second World War, he discusses, if left to himself, no particular battle and no particular crisis of that war.

This is by no means a vague or fuzzy period in his life, for, as he says with a small, bleakly appealing smile, he is "absolutely all right—from the neck up," although his 75th birthday is coming on December 31. Rather, it is a period, as he sees it in retrospect, and as no doubt he saw it even at the time, of vast, complicated shifting and interrelated designs of effort, of setback, of triumph, of transitory confusion succeeded in due course by firm and fixed consensus of purpose—a deep forest and not a series of trees.

The same is true of his later and purely political life. As Secretary of State he engaged himself primarily on putting over the Marshall plan for European recovery, but to this day nothing sharp, dramatic and alone, of that policy, stands out in his mind.

Instead, he simply remembers the general scene that lay before him: There was the devastation in Europe and the accompanying dangerous state of enfeeblement against the approach of communism. There was the political situation in the United States, specifically the task of persuading Congress to hand over the money for this enterprise. Finally, and at least as high in General Marshall's consciousness as these two other infinitely more interesting circumstances, was—what? "The shortage of a good many of the strategic materials that we were to need in this affair."

Again, as Secretary of Defense, Marshall's memories of his tour are more general and institutional than specific, personal, and intimate. His pride in that particular task lies most of all, as he casually remembers it, in what he did to halt the tremendous strife, as he puts it, that had been going on between the military services and between his predecessor as Secretary, Louis Johnson, and others in the Truman administration.

"I managed to change that," says the general, with quiet satisfaction, "and most of it, I believe, in about 2 weeks." How was it changed? The general spreads his hands, speaks noncommittally for a moment, and changes the subject.

There is no suggestion that he is avoiding the question; he has simply dealt with its important and general aspects and is now eager to pass on to something else.

It is clear that he dislikes Washington very much—his late years, in fact, have involved a series of retreats southward, first to Leesburg, Va., and now down here, so very far, indeed, from all official life. This dislike, it seems, actually proceeds, however, not so much from what others have so often denounced in Washington life—the backstabbing and climbing, and so on—as from General Marshall's intellectual revulsion to what he considers simply the damn nonsense of the place and the drabness of what he calls "Potomac social fever."

This, and any other kind of personalization of his position in Washington, was always a great, boring nuisance to him, and his juniors were given an incredibly free hand in dealing as they saw fit with this sort of thing. Mrs. Marshall recalls with a smile, for an example, that once when the general was guest at a notable affair the band leader felt it obligatory to ask for his favroite song. "The general," said one of the general's aides with a straight face, "prefers either 'Nearer, My God, to Thee' or 'Buttons and Bows'." Marshall himself did not know at the time of this extraordinarily catholic description of his musical interests. He smiles briefly now at the anecdote.

While the years have made their unavoidable mark upon him, the harsh denunciations of him that came late in his career, from the Republican right wing, have made no visible imprint at all. Five years ago, when the general's appointment to be Secretary of Defense was up for Senate confirmation, Senator WILLIAM JENNER of Indiana called him "a front man for traitors * * * a living lie."

Just after the incident this correspondent happened to speak to the general over the telephone on another matter. At the end, I said to him: "General, by the way, some very harsh things have been said about you in the Senate today."

"Oh?" said Marshall. "What were they?" He was told. There was the faintest pause and then he said: "Who? Jenner? Don't know him. Goodby."

The situation is about the same today. The general, having made, years ago, a firm decision never to write or publish a memoir or any other sort of apologia for his career, the question arose as to how and whether he would reply at all to his detractors.

"Don't intend to," he says in the sitting room here in Pinehurst. "I think the record [not "my" record, note] is sufficient. That was rather an emotional period, you know."

What was his hardest job in public life? "The hardest thing I ever did was to keep my temper. I had to work with those people, and that was that." To the question, "What are the indispensables for disinterested public service?" the general frowns a bit, drawing back from the brink of what might seem to be mere hackneyed sentiment, but at length bravely takes the plunge.

"Courage. Wisdom. Tolerance. An understanding of the democratic procedures. Tolerance. You can't operate the democratic system without tolerance." All this he bites off embarrassedly, like a man asked to read his prayerbook aloud.

Many things are part of Marshall. But this, it seems on reflection, is at the very core of it all: Here is a man of the military, a man with a good deal of what sometimes is slightingly called the military mind, an aloof, aristocratic, indrawn man who nevertheless in his life expresses the truly democratic spirit as well as any person this political writer has ever known.

He sometimes expresses it, it is true, with a kind of exasperated resignation; a man still incredulous at memory of the incoherent shouts of the crowd, pinked by the small darts of political enemies, but faithful still to the great plan that makes any public servant, however elevated, the servant at last of them all. To Marshall, for example, any defiance of Congress or President, particularly for a soldier, would be an inconceivable act.

He has wry memories of some of the things Congress did, not to him but to his beloved budgets, especially the most beloved of all, the Army's budgets. It is clear that he has many reservations today about many things in high policy, foreign and domestic. Still, he is adamantly unwilling to discuss any of these things. Proper authority has made these policies and he, moreover, is, as he says, quite out of it now, knowing a great deal of background perhaps, but not at all abreast of current intelligence.

His connection now with the Pentagon is tenuous and largely formal. As a General of the Army he is a member of a very small club that has much in the way of honor but little in the way of explicit duty. He does not often see many members of the club, though one of them, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, was down here in Pinehurst not many months ago to play golf. (Of Bradley, of whom he is very fond, Marshall says in passing: "Bradley's a very junior member of our club, you know.")

Marshall's present relationship with the Pentagon, in fact, is largely nostalgic; he gets a great many letters from among the 10 million or more ex-servicemen with whom, as he says, he is "involved." They ask all sorts of things—one man in fact has entreated the general to do something to preserve the American bald eagle—and the general, with a great show of grumpy complaint that is not very convincing, does the best he can for them. His affection is for the American soldier; even here his concern is general and not particularized.

What he does most of all these days is to sit quietly, reading, contemplating the matters of life and watching television. He is quite pleased with that mechanism; when I called on him a newspaper clipping listing the evening's program was across the arm of his chair.

Nearby was a new and formidable book, "The Lessons of History," by William Smyth, in which was the card of an old Marshall friend, Bernard Baruch. Across the room were many more used books. Along about 5 o'clock in the afternoon the general went out to the kitchen for highballs, not sending the sergeant on this errand for the reason that any gentleman would have no difficulty in understanding: This was a man's home and this was the act of a host.

This home he shows with restrained pride, pointing out in a flat, unemphatic voice several rich oriental tapestries and paintings that hang on the walls. "Gifts to Mrs. Marshall," he says, "from Madame Chiang." He does not elaborate, or even recognize, the irony—for few will fail to recall that General Marshall's mission to China soon after the end of the war was alleged by some of his critics to involve a sellout of the Nationalist Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. He simply repeats "Madame Chiang" and with an expressionless face he lets it go at that.

Then there is a stroll in the garden with Mrs. Marshall and the visitors, the general very straight in a thin tweed jacket and carefully oblivious of the now chill and sharpening wind whistling around the gleaming pine trees.

He has not, as he phrases it, been too well of late; the effects of a bout of virus flu are still upon him, and he finds it physically difficult to do a good deal of the writing—letters and so on—that he feels he ought to do. He could have in a secretary, of course, but this would not really do at all. "Mrs. Marshall and I so value our privacy," he explains.

Later, as his visitors rise to leave, the general goes to the door with them and beyond, leaning over the automobile door as he gives directions on how to get back to the main road. His face is thin, but still powerful in the twilight, and he stands watching in the driveway as the car pulls away toward the Durham-Raleigh Highway.

It is impossible not to look back upon the tall still figure under the now darkening pines. It is impossible to put down the melancholy thought that the truly great ones—not necessarily the right ones or the wrong ones on policy and all that, for all that is not the point—are falling back now into irretrievable time.

Thus, George Catlett Marshall, Esq., of whose like there indeed are not many.

EXCERPT FROM BOOK ENTITLED "INCREDIBLE TALE"

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

And yet—on June 7, 1947, we sounded a blast that echoed around the world. George Catlett Marshall was the trumpeter, but that is a detail, for he was sounding in behalf of the average man; all that the identity of the individual did was give a name to the call. It carried the defiance of the commoner, whose heart and hand must make it good; and the great herald was, after all, merely a herald. Every American who has assented and who has supported the Marshall plan is entitled to say, "the slughorn to my lips I set," for at Harvard University that day the Secretary of State was speaking for us all.

It is certainly true that our motives were not unmixed. The Marshall plan would never have gone through Congress so quickly, and it might not have gone through at all, had not some Members been spurred by fear of communism. Its supposed efficacy as a stopper of communism gave the plan the last group of votes necessary to a majority, and to that extent it is correct to say that terror, not boldness, was the deciding factor.

But it is equally correct to point out that there was a heavy vote in Congress, and a strong sentiment among the people in favor of the Marshall plan before terror was introduced as an additional argument. Fear gave it the final shove, but it was already close to success. Fear is nothing new. Fear has been dictating action since history began. Fear will always be a factor in the decisions that any nation makes. The presence of the oldest of human motives in this decision signifies nothing as regards the political education of the American people. The appearance of a new motive does. Realization that the restoration of Europe is a part of our task was such a motive; and it was powerful, if not controlling.

It is appropriate to the moment that the poem ends with the trumpet call. What happened after that, Browning does not say. What is to happen after our bugle blast we do not know as yet. But the fact that we had the spirit to sound it is one of the great incidents in the tale of our times.

For it was not a defiance of any specific man or of any specific society. It was a challenge offered to certain ancient ideas, stronger than any man, a defiance of traditions older than history. What will come swarming out of the Dark Tower we know no better than the knight errant did, but it will be trouble in multitudinous forms. Perhaps one of those forms will be war, but perhaps not. We got through the first 2 years and well into the third without war, but it may well be upon us before these lines are in print; or it may not come at all. But we have already precipitated plenty of trouble by our defiance and there is more to come.

Why not? No one has attacked an ancient evil yet without starting trouble, and the evil we attacked is one of the oldest in the world. It is the belief, rooted in the human mind before history began to be written, that Vae victis is the supreme law of nations and that diplomacy is simply war in another form. This belief had been challenged before, but never as flatly, never as uncompromisingly as in the Marshall plan. Here for the first time a conqueror assumed that in destroying any part of the world, even that part held by an enemy in arms, he was destroying values in which he had a share, and that the woe that ensued should in justice be shared by him also.

The Marshall plan on its face is a financial measure, by which the American people—not the President and the Secretary of State, but you and I and the man next door—undertake to contribute sums of the order of $5 billion a year for at least 4 years to a pool from which stricken nations may draw to

restore their shattered economic life. But its financial aspect is its superficial aspect. That is proved by the fact that some nations, including some of the worst devastated, refused the offer.

In view of the fact that the money does not have to be returned, except in certain restricted cases, and in view of the fact that the offer was made to all alike, it must have been a powerful motive indeed that induced any nation to refuse an offer so much to its advantage. It is evident that the Marshall plan, in the estimation of these nations, includes much that does not appear on the face of the financial transactions.

It does, indeed. It includes a tacit agreement on the part of beneficiary nations that they will make every effort to restore, not only their domestic productive power, but also that free and friendly commercial exchange necessary to support the economy of the world. This economy is not sustained but damaged by a policy of aggression on the part of any nation or group of nations; hence the Marshall plan by its very nature requires abandonment of the idea of aggression.

In theory a strong nation—Russia, for example—might have accepted the Marshall plan with no intention whatever of living up to this responsibility; but in practice it would not work. The leaders of the Communist state were well aware that if they accepted the benefits of the Marshall plan, intending all along to follow a policy of aggression, they would be left in a position so indefensible morally that they could not make even their own people regard it as justifiable. The Soviet system is powerful; but even so, it is not powerful enough to accept a man's money and then stab him in the back without incurring the condemnation of its own supporters.

But Russia, debarred from accepting the plan, must inevitably regard its success elsewhere with great apprehension, and was compelled, by her own stern logic, to employ every resource to prevent its success. Those resources have been employed, with considerable effect. The blockade of Berlin, for instance, compelled us to resort to the airlift, costing us hundreds of millions and many lives; and that was but one item in a long list. Oh, yes, when we put the slug-horn to our lips we started something that will be difficult to carry through.

The worst of it, though, is not Russian obduracy and ingenuity, but our own fatigue. The moral endurance of the American people has astonished the world, but it is not unlimited. The antagonist who rose before us after 1945 is well aware of the fact and has employed it with great shrewdness. His game has been to facilitate a psychological collapse by every means in his power, and to play for time until it comes about. It is a style of warfare to which Americans have never been subjected before, and the manner in which the average American will sustain it has yet to be determined.

EXCERPTS FROM BOOK ENTITLED "PEACE CAN BE WON"

(By Paul G. Hoffman)

The Kremlin's intent, even before the Marshall plan got under way, became abundantly clear as early as July 1947 in Paris. General Marshall had but recently delivered his great speech at Harvard, calling upon the nations of Europe, upon all of them, to join together in a vast cooperative effort to repair their shattered economies. "It is logical," he had declared, "that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." There were no ideological strings attached to that offer beyond the commonsense warning that "governments, political parties, or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States." This was an offer made in good faith and backed by good will. Its sole object was to lay the groundwork for a more prosperous world in which peace and freedom would be secure.

* * * * *

I can understand why many people feel this way. Much as I believe in peace, I am not for peace at any price. I go along completely with Senator Vandenberg, who, with his customary insight, said at Dartmouth College in 1949: "Appeasement is surrender on the installment plan." And General Marshall, in his eloquent 1950 Memorial Day address, endorsed this view when he declared that "there is nothing to be said in favor of war except that it is the lesser of two evils. For it is better than appeasement of aggression because appeasement encourages the very aggression it seeks to prevent."

* * * * *

On both scores there is hopeful news. Nothing finer could have occurred to persuade Europeans that we are in earnest about building up our defenses, and using them to avert war, than the appointment of George Marshall as Secretary of Defense. They vividly remember his leadership in World War II. They look upon him, and rightly, as a military genius who can construct and conduct a great common defense. At the same time they have an immense regard for him as the author of the Marshall plan as a program for peace. In the same way that he conceived of economic strength as a means of thwarting internal Communist aggression he will conceive of military strength as a means of thwarting external Communist aggression.

* * * * *

If this sounds like fiscal fantasy, let's look at the process in action. The French had made a valiant comeback in their cotton industry, restoring some 80 percent of prewar capacity. Raw materials ran out. Prior to the Marshall plan, French millowners faced the threat of having to shut up shop for lack of raw cotton. Unfortunately, France is not a cotton-growing nation and no cotton was available there. The millowners had plenty of francs, but the American cotton grower couldn't use them. Then the Marshall plan came along. The millowners took their francs to the French exchange control, traded them for dollars (after their requests were approved by French officials and ECA), bought the needed cotton with the dollars and kept their mills going. What about the millowners' francs? They went into the recovery fund and became counterpart—to be used for some such worthwhile project as building a highway or creating new farmland by draining a swamp.

What has happened? The dollars kept the French mills active and thousands of French workers at their jobs. They have provided the French Government with a sackful of francs for recovery projects. They have robbed the French Communists of an excellent opportunity to exploit the discontent of idle workers. More importantly, because the French millowners paid for their cotton—and thus ordered only what they needed—the program avoided the waste that is normal in most "giveway" plans.

We must use guided dollars. As most Americans know, we have been extending to Europe a vast amount of aid ever since World War I.

In 1947, Congress was facing the task of further aid to Europe. But it wanted to put it on a sounder, more solid basis than ever before. Hence Congress made this the central aim of Marshall plan legislation. In my opinion, its efforts were notably successful, with good reason; the problem in Europe had been thoroughly studied by congressional investigators (such as the traveling committee headed by the brilliant Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts). The ECA legislation itself was based upon some of the most protracted hearings in congressional history—the testimony filled five volumes and contained 6,584 pages. When the law finally emerged from these hundreds of necessary but wearisome hearings and conferences, it included among its provisions a directive that the European nations: (1) Submit a detailed program of their needs, (2) discuss with the ECA administration the trade and fiscal policies they would follow, and (3) allow ECA to make end-use checks to determine that American aid was spent as agreed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank all Senators who have associated themselves with the majority leader and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] in expressing their thoughts on General Marshall today. He is a great man—great in the annals of war, great in the annals of peace, and great in the affection of his countrymen.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was on the floor earlier today when the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] paid tribute to the illustrious career of Gen. George C. Marshall. I realize there is nothing I can say which would add to the encomiums paid so deservedly to General Marshall by the Senator from Oklahoma, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and by many other distinguished Members of the Senate. I should, however, like to add one very brief comment.

We in the State of Oregon, which is my native State, have always taken great pride in the fact that Oregon has been General Marshall's favorite scene of recreation. On many, many occasions General Marshall has gone fishing on the Umpqua River, which is one of our lovely coastal and tidewater streams, and in which steelhead trout, salmon, and other game fish abound.

Again and again General Marshall returned to Oregon, and always he has had praise for Oregon's magnificent outdoor beauty and grandeur.

I think it was in connection with his original military service in the Pacific Northwest that General Marshall first came to national attention. At the time the Russian fliers made their epic flight over the polar region in their antiquated airplane—at least antiquated by present-day standards—Gen. George Marshall was a brigadier general in command of the Vancouver Barracks. That is one of our oldest military posts, and is located on the banks of the Columbia River, near Vancouver, Wash., just across the Columbia from Portland, Oreg.

General Marshall at that time distinguished himself by his very adroit handling of the negotiations which took place with the Russian fliers, and in their presentation to our country and to the world after their remarkable feat of aviation. I recall editorials which were published in newspapers in the States of Washington and Oregon, citing the fact that the commandant at Vancouver Barracks was indeed an outstanding military

leader and also a man who knew how to handle his fellow men and to behave very capably in what might have been a delicate international situation.

I note the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is present on the floor. I am sure he will recall the time when General Marshall was commandant of one of the oldest and most traditional military posts in the State of Washington, and indeed in the Pacific Northwest.

I am happy indeed to have had this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the heritage and legacy we of the Pacific Northwest feel we enjoy whenever the outstanding career, both in war and peace, of Gen. George C. Marshall is mentioned.

INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH YEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on behalf of specific steps looking toward the observance of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, lie over on the desk for 10 days so that all of my colleagues who may wish to join as cosponsors may have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The resolution (S. Res. 129) favoring continued efforts by all nations to strengthen cooperation in health and research activities, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope that as many of my colleagues as possible will join with me, because I would like for the world to know explicitly that the Senate of the United States, and I hope the House, thereafter concurring, remain united in favor of this great ideal of an International Health and Medical Research Year.

PAST U.S. AND SENATE SUPPORT OF YEAR

It will be recalled that on August 11, 1958, the Senate unanimously approved my bills, Senate resolution 361 and Senate concurrent resolution 399, inviting the President of the United States to explore the possibility of such a year.

On December 5, 1958, the United Nations General Assembly, with full U.S. support, unanimously approved the concept of such a year and referred it to WHO.

However, the World Health Assembly, which has just concluded its 12th session in Geneva, decided to postpone the year. It asked, however, that the Director General and the Secretariat prepare specific plans for reconsideration of the year at the next meeting of the Assembly, in Geneva, in May 1960.

PURPOSES OF NEW FORM OF RESOLUTION

The purpose of my resolution today is as follows:

First. To utilize constructively the time period of 11 months before the World Health Assembly reconvenes.

We would do so by inviting the President of the United States, acting through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the National Science Foundation; the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council, and other public and private groups to ask the medical profession, and other professions and organizations in the life sciences, in cooperation with the scientific community of the world, to develop concrete plans and programs for the year.

REBUTTAL OF SOVIET CLAIMS

Second. A second purpose of my resolution is to rebut the erroneous Soviet claim to the effect that it was the Soviet Union which originated the concept of such a year.

I should like to say that it is a source of regret to me that the subject of health should be made a pawn in the East-West chess game, or power struggle.

So far as we Americans are concerned, we are interested in the health of mankind because of humanitarian reasons.

Unfortunately, however, the Soviet Union at the World Health Assembly in Geneva attempted to draw a false issue in speech after speech and to assert that it was the Soviet Union which is responsible for this concept.

The fact is that it was an American, former Gov. Adlai Stevenson, who first presented the idea publicly—3 months before the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic took up the idea. It was an American resolution in the U.S. Senate which I had been privileged to draft, which first presentd the idea in formal form. It was an American message to the executive board of the World Health Organization which first drew it to the attention of WHO in the form of my message to Surg. Gen. Leroy Burney.

The Soviet Union at the Geneva Assembly chose to disregard all of these facts, simply relying upon the fact that in September 1958, the Ukraine had introduced a resolution for the year in the United Nations.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it was about 6 weeks before that when the Senate of the United States adopted a resolution asking for an international health and medical research year.

Let me say, in all candor, that I regret that it was not the American delegation in the United Nations which introduced such a resolution. The fact that it did not does not alter the fact that it was at American initiative, that this whole concept developed.

I believe that the U.S. Senate, as such, is to be complimented for having taken the initiative. Now, I want the Senate to maintain the initiative, but I want the executive branch to carry through fully—as I believe it very definitely will.

But authorship of the idea is not nearly as important as fulfillment of it.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE COULD ADVANCE THE YEAR

I believe that it is time that, at the highest possible level, this issue, now derailed, be put back on the track.

If a summit conference between East and West is held, and if a broad-range of nonpolitical issues is taken up, such as was wisely done at Geneva at the summit, in 1955, then I believe that President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President De Gaulle would do well first, to approve the concept of such a year; and, second, to signify their intention to have their governments financially support such a year. I am hopeful that our Government, in the person of our President, will take the initiative in these endeavors.

The fact is that a health year is precisely the sort of relatively noncontroversial issue on which East and West can and should unite. Last year, one quarter of a million Americans and a quarter of a million Russians died of cancer, for example. So, enlightened self-interest requires cooperation.

When I discussed the issue of the year with Premier Khrushchev in Moscow on December 1, 1958, he enthusiastically approved it.

Unfortunately, Soviet actions at WHO did not accord with his comments. This is not, however, an uncommon contrast.

Unfortunately, too, until heads of state flash encouraging word to their own health ministers, to the effect that governments are ready, willing, and eager to back the year with dollars, rubles, francs, and pounds sterling, the health ministers will be unable to pledge more money to international health efforts.

This brings us to consideration of the action at the World Health Assembly, which I believe will be of interest to the Senate.

REASONS FOR ASSEMBLY'S DECISION OF POSTPONEMENT

It is only being frank to say that WHO's decision of postponement was a source of disappointment not only to myself, but to a great many individuals here and abroad who see in the year a magnificient opportunity to strengthen the health of the human race.

The reasons for the postponement are several. I shall not, at present, attempt a complete statement with regard to the Assembly's decision, because I have not as yet had the opportunity to take this up at first hand with American delegates, following their return from Geneva.

I have, however, through correspondence and through information obtained by the staff of the Government Operations Committee conducting the International Health Study, ascertained that the following were among the reasons for postponement:

First. It is universally recognized that the year will require extensive preparation. Yet, it is less than a year since the concept of such a year was first advanced. And many of the nations felt that it would have been preferable to have more definite plans before authorizing a full go-ahead.

By contrast, it should be noted that the eminently successful International Geophysical Year was first discussed as far back as April 1950 before its start 7 years later in July 1957.

Second. A second and equally or more compelling reason for postponement was stated in the World Health Assembly

resolution itself. It pointed to the fact that the nations are heavily committed at present to both national and international efforts to improve health. That means, I might add, principally the underdeveloped nations are so committed.

It is no fault of the delegates to the Assembly that they were apparently under instructions of their home governments not to attempt to undertake additional financial commitments, either nationally or through pro-rata international effort. The Assembly recognized that it still faces enormous financial burdens in programs such as malaria eradication.

Third. Apparently, a third reason for postponement was that the Soviet effort to make propaganda out of the Health Year apparently backfired. As a result of Soviet and satellite propaganda speeches, there was resentment by many delegates against Soviet efforts to take over the year. Let me say, Mr. President, that I do not view the Health Year as a propaganda stunt for or against any nation. I view it as a solid humanitarian effort.

When the Health Year is formally observed, it cannot possibly succeed unless all nations view it in this manner.

Its success will depend in very large measure on full Soviet participation—but Soviet effort should be conducted as a part of the community of nations and not in a manner which will estrange many nations.

If and when a summit conference takes place, I am hopeful that the President of the United States will say in no uncertain terms, with clarity and purpose, that we expect the Soviet Union in these international cooperative efforts to act responsibly, and cease their efforts at propaganda, and cease their efforts at harassment of important international purposes.

Notwithstanding East-West differences, I want it known that I continue to hope that the Soviet Union will leave no stone unturned to contribute to mankind's health. I believe that the impressive talent of Russian science, the manyfold abilities of Russian research should be just as dedicated to mankind's health as the ability and talent which we ourselves can mobilize.

THE IRONY OF INADEQUATE FINANCES FOR HEALTH

Now, let me state this fact concerning the financial problem:

Reports from Geneva indicated that the delegates and many of their governments were concerned about the $600,000 price tag on administration of the Health Year.

I say in all candor, Mr. President, that it is a sad and tragic commentary on the world of the 20th century when the nations can spend $100 billion on arms, but shrink from spending $600,000 for human health.

It is a tragic commentary on man's system of values when the world spends billions to fire rockets into outer space, but hesitates to spend relatively pennies for experiments which will fire magic bullets against diseases which are the enemies of man.

I know that the United States at the appropriate time will make a substantial voluntary contribution for the success of the Year, just as it did in the case of the International Geophysical Year.

If it was appropriate for us to spend tens of millions of dollars not counting logistic support, for IGY, then it certainly is appropriate that we be prepared to make reasonable expenditures available for the International Health Year.

WHO'S ACTIONS PROVES NEED OF YEAR

I point out that the very decision of postponement of the Year underlined a reason why there should be such a Year.

The fact of the matter is that in many countries, the Ministers of Health, through no fault of their own, seem to be, in effect, considered "low men on the totem pole" by some of their governments. I am not speaking of our own country or of any one country in particular.

I am simply stating that when many national budgets are prepared by powerful Finance Ministers and are approved by parliaments, somehow money is always found for top priority Ministries and for armaments and for all sorts of governmental projects, like roads and harbors, etc. But often, at the bottom of budgetary priorities, money is doled out with an eyedropper when it comes to human health.

I have seen country after country where the biomedical community is virtually starved for finances.

I have seen country after country with potential scientific genius being wasted because there are no career opportunities and adequate salaries for medical researchers and for public health physicians.

An International Health Year could go a long way toward ending this unfortunate downgrading of human health.

Fortunately, we of the United States have considerably awakened to health needs. This awakening is due in large part to the superb efforts of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his colleague on the House side, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY.

NUMEROUS ACHIEVEMENTS AT HEALTH ASSEMBLY

But let me pay a well-deserved tribute to those thinking leaders in the executive branch who are likewise to be complimented.

Let me point out that we sent a very able delegation to the World Health Assembly and that fortunately, this year, at long last, it was under instructions to support, not oppose, an increase in WHO's budget.

Let me say further that the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, Dr. Leroy Burney and his colleagues in the American delegation to the assembly are to be complimented for their devoted efforts not only on behalf of the International Public Health and Medical Research Year, but on behalf of the other important and constructive achievements of the assembly.

I refer in particular to the fact that it was agreed by a vote of 51 to 14 to add $500,000 to the Director-General's proposal as a second stage in developing the intensified WHO research program.

As Dr. Burney wrote to me from Geneva, this is an exceedingly important step in the history of WHO. It establishes the principle that research activity is part and parcel of the regular WHO program, supported by all members. A special research fund was also established to permit the United States, and others who may wish to do so, to make special contributions or grants for research projects, as I certainly hope will prove to be the case.

FOUR ITEMS TO BE PRINTED IN RECORD

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that several items be printed in the RECORD following my comments:

First. The text of my resolution.

Second. A series of quotations from letters, telegrams, and postal cards which have come to me from all parts of the United States approving the concept of such a year. I have only selected a handful of the many messages which have come to me.

Third. A National Science Foundation memorandum, summarizing America's vital role in the various stages of the history of IGY. I believe this will be very helpful background, both as to similarity and dissimilarity as between IGY and IHY.

Fourth. The text of an article which appeared in the May 29 issue of Science, the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This article outlines the history of the development of this IHY concept, and it reports upon an extensive discussion of it at the meeting of the National Citizen's Committee for WHO, which I had the privilege of addressing last month.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 129

Whereas Senate Resolution 361, 85th Congress, agreed to August 11, 1958, expressed the unanimous sense of the Senate that the President of the United States be invited to explore through the World Health Organization and related organizations, the possibility of an International Health and Medical Research Year; and

Whereas on December 5, 1958, the United Nations General Assembly with full U.S. support, unanimously approved the concept of such a year; and

Whereas the 12th World Health Assembly in May 1959, expressed "deep appreciation and satisfaction at learning of the interest displayed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in international health matters, including medical research"; and

Whereas the World Health Assembly affirmed that it "appreciates the value and importance of an International Health and Medical Research Year"; and

Whereas the Assembly indicated that because of "the existing heavy commitment on national and international effort," it found it necessary to postpone the year for the present, but that it would reconsider the subject at the 13th World Health Assembly, convening in May 1960; and

Whereas the Assembly requested the Director General to transmit the views expressed in its resolution to the Economic and Social Council at its 28th session and to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its 14th session; and

Whereas the need is greater than ever before for all the nations to proceed without

delay to strengthen cooperation in health and research efforts on behalf of present and future generations; and

Whereas it is the hope and anticipation of the people of the United States that the 13th World Health Assembly will declare an International Public Health and Medical Research Year to be observed at an early and feasible date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States, acting through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the National Science Foundation; the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and such other official and private bodies, as he deems appropriate, should (1) continue U.S. initiative in seeking to strengthen international cooperation in health and research efforts and, in connection therewith, (2) invite the medical profession of the United States, and other professions and organizations concerned with the healing arts and the life sciences to develop plans and programs in cooperation with the scientific community of other nations toward declaration and observance of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

EXCERPTS OF MESSAGES TO SENATOR HUMPHREY ENDORSING HIS EFFORTS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH YEAR

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *May 15, 1959.*

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your plan for an IHY year, as portrayed in the This Week magazine section, is just about the most heartening thing that has come up in a long, long time. With the almost overwhelming advance of cancer—scarcely a day goes by that you don't hear of it—and with the frighteningly unknown radiation hazard, it has been amazing to me that no more has been done.

With the vital need for a program such as this, I can see only two things wrong—first, why hasn't it come forth long ago, and second, why wait until 1961 to start it?

At any rate, I am most grateful to you for what you have done in starting it and hope you will never give up until it has become a realization.

Yours very truly
(Miss) FARRAR ARMSTRONG.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *January 9, 1959.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * *.

Another matter that impressed me greatly was the idea of an International Medical Year. This is the kind of competition we should have with our rivals on this earth. Not only would it be very stimulating but only a great deal of good could come from this rivalry. * * *

Sincerely yours.

RALPH I. FRIED, M.D.

JANUARY 9, 1959.

Senator HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have just finished reading your interview with Mr. Khrushchev in Life.

As chairman of the health and sanitation committee, the Chicago American Chapel, Chicago Typographical Union No. 16, I am attracted to any reference to the subject of health.

Your proposal for an International Year for Public Health and Medical Research under U.N. auspices, it seems to me, has unusual implications for American initiative in strengthening international good will and understanding. Beyond that it opens up new vistas for solving some of the major health problems confronting mankind. Candidly, I feel it is one of the most brilliant proposals of this period. May your endeavor to make it a reality be successful.

Has your proposal been formalized as a statement, petition, or act? If it has I would appreciate receiving a copy. And is there anything a layman citizen could do to assist you in your endeavor?

Sincerely,

EDWARD STARR.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 19, 1959.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have read your article in This Week magazine for May 10, 1959, entitled "IHY, Our Best Hope To Stop Atomic Fallout." It is an excellent idea and I want to commend you for sponsoring it. I wish you success.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT K. ABRAMS, M.D.

BURBANK, CALIF., *May 10, 1959.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Hooray for IHY. You are showing the kind of simple difficult, superlative imagination which may yet save this old world.

Keep thinking big. No matter what people say, Americans will prove big enough for your largest thoughts, and I believe all men will join them.

WM. LOUCHARD.

P.S.—I will help publicize IHY in this district.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., *May 11, 1959.*

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: At long last I feel all is not lost, and am quite excited and encouraged over two developments that have arisen from the other unpeaceful and immoral situations of today.

The first is the World Peace Through Law, from the American Bar Association, and the other is the International Health Year. May I congratulate you on the latter, and offer my most heartiest support and encouragement; may I also assure you that the peoples of this country and of all countries want peaceful and respectful coexistence.

* * * * *

I implore you to beseech your coworkers to recognize and exhort the dignity of all men.

Again, accept my wholehearted support and good wishes in this wonderful project.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. J. R. MCCAFFERTY.

MIAMI, FLA., *May 23, 1959.*

The Honorable Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman of International Health Study,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I read with interest your article, in This Week magazine (May 10 issue) concerning International Health Year.

I am very much interested in keeping up with the plans as they progress and will appreciate you advising me how best to do this, or send me any brochures or information being issued at this particular time, especially if nurses or other personnel will have an opportunity to train under this special organization in how to cope with nuclear radiation and its relation to health as soon as this information has been decided.

Thanking you, I am

Respectfully yours,

PATRICIA POWELL, R.N.

DALLAS, TEX., *May 19, 1959.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Certainly your plan for an International Health Year would be as fruitful as it seems now that the International Geophysical Year has been.

* * * * *

Yours very sincerely,

ELIZABETH S. BRADLEY, R.N.

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 9, 1959.*

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you for introducing the International Health Year project to the U.S. Senate.

Naturally, the article in This Week magazine is only an introduction for us readers. We hope to see and hear much more of this wonderful proposal. * * *

With appreciation for the problems involved, and with all best wishes for your personal efforts in this task, I am

Very sincerely,

Mrs. NORBERT KACEU.

WATERTOWN, WIS., *April 9, 1959.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: Have been reading a great deal about your international health program. Assure you many people throughout this area are looking very kindly toward your effort.

With kindest regards,

L. D. HEFTY.

PITTSBURGH, PA., *May 11, 1959.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In This Week magazine I read your article about IHY. To me this seems to be one of the most outstanding suggestions the world has faced in a good many years.

* * * * *

Yours respectfully,

HARRY LOEWY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 29, 1959.*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your article on IHY in May 10 This Week was the best thing I've read for a long time. So much good solid sense to it—and what wonderful promise. If the whole world would participate in your international health proposal, it not only would do great work toward solving some of the mysteries of bad health and disease, but would go farther than anything we've tried yet to bring about lasting world peace as a possibility.

Great success to you and yours.

Thanking you,

BILLY JENKINS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 15, 1959.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman of International Health Study,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have read the article in This Week magazine outlining your plans for an International Health Year. One should be commended for a program that will give healthier, happier, and fuller lives to all of the individuals of the world.

* * * * *

Yours truly,

W. D. PALLOCIC.

BACKGROUND TO THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR: A BRIEF SUMMARY OF IGY HISTORY

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR

The period July 1, 1957, through December 31, 1958, was designated as the International Geophysical Year (IGY). It was a period of worldwide observations and studies of the sun, and of the earth and its physical environment, including its atmosphere and the space through which it travels. Sixty-six nations took an active part in the program (attachment A).

The IGY was actually the third such scientific undertaking. In earlier periods geophysicists recognized the inherent advantages of studying geophysical phenomena over the entire earth within a relatively short interval of time. During 1882–83, the First Polar Year, 10 nations, including the United States, conducted simultaneous, cooperative scientific observations in the Arctic. Fifty years later the Second Polar Year, 1932–33,

was undertaken, in which 30 nations cooperated in observations primarily in the Arctic. Both of these periods contributed greatly to the store of basic knowledge in the geophysical sciences.

In April 1950 at an informal meeting of geophysicists in Silver Spring, Md., the suggestion was offered by Dr. L. V. Berkner that, because of the tremendous advances in instrumentation that had taken place in the 1940's consideration be given to holding a Third Polar Year 25 years after the second, which would place it in 1957–58, a period of maximum sunspot activity. The suggestion was received with enthusiasm, and in subsequent discussions scientists throughout the world recognized the benefits of extending the planned program to encompass the entire earth and renamed it the International Geophysical Year to reflect the increased scope in coverage.

During the next 18 months the initial proposal was considered and supported by a number of international scientific groups, most of them members of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). The Mixed Commission on the Ionosphere endorsed it, as did also, in rapid succession, the International Scientific Radio Union, the International Astronomical Union, the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, and finally the International Council of Scientific Unions itself.

In 1951 the executive board of ICSU appointed the Comité Spécial de l'Année Géophysique Internationale (CSAGI), composed of representatives of the various scientific unions involved and of the World Meteorological Organization and the International Consultative Committee for Radio Communications. A Bureau of CSAGI was appointed consisting of Prof. Sydney Chapman (Great Britain), president; Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner (United States), vice president; and Profs. M. Nicolet (Belgium), general secretary. Later (in June 1957) Prof. V. V. Beloussov (U.S.S.R.) and Prof. J. Coulomb (France) were added as members of the Bureau.

In late 1951 and early 1952 CSAGI invited member nations of ICSU or its unions to establish special national committees to take part in the planning and guidance of the IGY. As the concept of the program expanded, invitations to all countries of the world were issued to join in the enterprise.

Individual countries were responsible for organizing and supporting their own portions of the IGY program. In general, this meant that each country provided the fund, equipment, and personnel for IGY activities that they undertook within their continental limits, possessions, or in areas where they had traditionally had an interest. In the case of the U.S. program, additional support was given to U.S. organizations to conduct oceanographic observations on the high seas; equipment and services were provided at a network of stations overseas for satellite tracking purposes; and equipment was supplied for certain scientific stations scattered throughout the world, particularly in South America along the 75–80° West longitude line.

The initial support of the international secretariat of the CSAGI was received from ICSU and UNESCO. Grants from the latter of $1,000 to $2,000 and $20,000 were made during this initial period (1952–54), and were supplemented by additional amounts, $15,000–$25,000 a year (1955–58). It soon became evident that the cost of supporting the secretariat, including travel to international planning meetings, distribution of various planning documents, etc., would require considerably more support. The secretariat, therefore, appealed for voluntary contributions to the various national committees of the countries involved with the IGY. The response was quite successful. For example, over a 3-year period the U.S. National Academy of Sciences made available $70,000 to the international secretariat, the funds coming originally from the National Science Foundation.

A coordinated, worldwide scientific program for the IGY was synthesized from various proposals submitted by individual nations and modified through periodic meetings of CSAGI (Brussels, 1953; Rome, 1954; Brussels, 1955; and Barcelona, 1956). At a fifth reunion of CSAGI held in August–September 1958 in Moscow, consideration was given to a review of the accomplishments of the first two-thirds of the IGY, the question of the future of international cooperation in geophysics after the end of the IGY, the problem of the collection, storage, and cataloging of data at the world data centers, and the question of publication of IGY data and results.

II. U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR

U.S. National Committee for the IGY

The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, a nongovernmental organization, as the adhering body on behalf of American scientists to the International Council of Scientific Unions and most of its unions, was the group in the United States that received the CSAGI invitation for this country to participate in the IGY. In response to this invitation, the president of the Academy-Council established in February 1953 the U.S. National Committee for the International Geophysical Year 1957–58, under the chairmanship of Dr. Joseph Kaplan, professor of physics at the University of California at Los Angeles. Dr. Alan H. Shapley of the National Bureau of Standards was named vice chairman, and Dr. Hugh Odishaw, formerly of the National Bureau of Standards, the executive director.

The Committee membership was composed of appropriate representation from the various scientific disciplines involved, selected with a view toward securing as wide a geographical coverage as possible and to include both governmental and nongovernmental groups. An executive committee of the U.S. National Committee for the IGY was named, as were also subcommittees to cover the regional programs planned (Arctic, Antarctic, equatorial regions). In addition, 13 technical panels were established to direct the program in the scientific disciplines of meteorology, geomagnetism, aurora and airglow, ionosphere, solar activity, cosmic rays, longitude and latitude, glaciology, oceanography, seismology, gravity, and in the programs of rocketry and communications and world days. The latter were special intervals, some preselected, others based on observed solar activity during which enhanced observation schedules were activated.

Role of the National Science Foundation in the IGY

The Academy-Council, recognizing the importance of Government cooperation and support to the success of the U.S. portion of the IGY program, on November 25, 1953, asked the National Science Foundation to take responsibility for obtaining and administering Government funds required to carry out the program and to coordinate the interests of Government agencies involved.

After consideration of the recommendation and a study of the proposed program and budget, the National Science Board at its meeting of January 29, 1954, endorsed the general objectievs of the program and the Foundation's participation in it.

After the proposed program and budget for the IGY had been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and after letters in support of the program had been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget from the Departments of State, Defense and Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, the President approved the program in a brief reference at one of his press conferences and included the requested amount for the National Science Foundation in support of the International Geophysical Year in a supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1955. Action by the Congress was approval of an initial appropriation of $2 million for the IGY program (Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1955, 83d Cong., 2d sess.). Subsequent appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the program have been $10 million (Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1956, 84th Cong., 1st sess); $27 million (Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1956, 84th Cong., 2d. sess.); $2 million (Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1958, 85th Cong., 2d sess.); $2,500,000 (Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1959, 85th Cong., 2d. sess.). The total amount, therefore, appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the U.S. IGY program was $43,500,000.

Funding of the various projects in the U.S. IGY program has been administered through grants, contracts, and transfers of funds made by the National Science Foundation, upon recommendations received from the U.S. National Committee for the IGY. These totaled approximately $43 million as of April 30, 1959.

The National Science Foundation has, in order to assure coordination, worked closely with other Federal agencies having an active interest and role in the IGY. These included the Department of Defense, Weather Bureau, National Bureau of Standards, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Geological Survey. Additionally, the Department of Defense provided major logistic support to the Antarctic, Arctic, rocket and satellite programs.

III. EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR PROGRAM AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS

Taking the United States as an example of a country phase of the total IGY world effort, it can be seen how individual national programs were developed and synthesized into the international program.

First, the proposals for IGY projects were based on ideas conceived in individual laboratories or in the minds of individual scientists, thus originating at the grassroots levels in the scientific community. The original idea or proposal was first subjected to a screen process within the framework of the national committee. In the United States this initial screening took place in one of the technical advisory panels that had been established under the U.S. National Committee for the IGY.

The various individual projects that were accepted by the panel were then consolidated into a proposed disciplinary program in meteorology, or geomagnetism, for example. The disciplinary programs were next brought together into a proposed national program at committee level. After a process of trimming to adjust the complete national program to come within the country's budget, it was sent as a proposal to the general secretary of GSAGI, who received many such national program proposals.

A meeting of GSAGI and representatives from participating countries was called to review these programs and out of them to prepare the first draft of an international program. Working groups in the various disciplines were selected from among country delegates, generally capable scientists in the various fields of interest. These working groups were chaired by the appropriate GSAGI reporters, who had been designated to act as convenors for the development and coordination of worldwide programs suitable to the IGY in their respective fields of interest. The synthesis of the international program resulted in modifications to the individual country programs, which then went back to the national committees for reconsideration and implementation.

During the planning period for the IGY, additional suggestions for projects were received after the first cycle of approvals, necessitating a certain amount of reexamination, adjustment, enlistment of additional country support and the reconsideration of international aspects of the program. The United States IGY earth satellite project was a case in point. It was not until after the Rome meeting of CSAGI in 1954 that the U.S. National Committee determined that it was feasible technically to accept the CSAGI invitation to attempt to place a scientific earth satellite in orbit during the IGY period. Similarly, other new programs were introduced after the initial review, and significant additions were made to many other programs.

By the fall of 1956, when the fourth general meeting of CSAGI was held in Barcelona, the world program had been agreed to with but few minor exceptions. Operating details were subsequently resolved and complete accord was reached by the time of the beginning date set for the IGY, July 1, 1957.

Through the National Academy of Sciences' representation at the various international planning meetings held in connection with the IGY, American scientists dealt with their collegues from other nations in the planning of the overall scientific program.

IV. IGY OBSERVATIONAL PERIOD

As far as the actual period of observations was concerned, a general statement can be made that the program was carried through essentially as planned. With minor exceptions, the spirit of cooperation that prevailed during the planning stage of the IGY extended throughout the period of observations. Inevitably, a few of the special stations and programs that had been planned for the IGY did not materialize, in some cases due to lack of financial support, personnel, or due to the fact that the plans were made too late to assemble, set up, and operate the necessary field equipment. Most of these omissions were in national programs other than the United States.

Both before the observing period and during the 18-month interval of field observations, representatives of the various national committees met on occasion to discuss in detail the kinds of data that would be placed in the various World Data Centers. These centers were established to insure the availability of IGY data to all interested scientists. One is located in the United States, one in the U.S.S.R., and one divided between Western Europe and Japan.

To a large extent, a high degree of acceptance was realized on the content and format of IGY data. The flow of data into the IGY World Data Centers is still continuing, since in many cases raw observations must be transmitted from rather remote field sites to central activities where processing is required prior to their transmittal to the international centers. Certainly, within the next year or two, most of this flow should have been completed. Furthermore, there is every reason to believe that fairly complete sets of data will be assembled at each of the three centers. This free interchange of IGY data is, of course, a crucial aspect as far as the ultimate gains produced by the IGY.

V. POST-IGY PERIOD

The major distribution of IGY data for research studies will occur in the post-IGY period. In addition, there is evidence of continued international cooperation to a degree that had not existed prior to the IGY in certain special areas of geophysics. The continued international scientific program in Antarctica is an example.

It is anticipated that scientific investigators will make continuing uses of IGY data over many years to come. These will form the "inputs" to many research projects out of which, it can be confidently expected, will come substantial gains not only in increasing our knowledge of man's physical environment but perhaps, even more importantly, in indicating ways in which we can more effectively adapt ourselves to these conditions.

COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR, APRIL 15, 1958 (66 COUNTRIES)

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China (Taipei), Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, East Africa, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, German Federal Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy.

Japan, Democratic Republic of Korea, Malaya, Mexico, Mongolian People's Republic, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Southern Rhodesia, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam Democratic Republic, Vietnam (Republic), Yugoslavia.

[From Science magazine, May 29, 1959]

NEWS OF SCIENCE

WORLD HEALTH YEAR PLANS ADVANCED

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming recently urged that a great world crusade of health for peace be launched through the International Health Year, a health study period that has been proposed to parallel the International Geophysical Year of 1957–58. His appeal was made at the opening dinner session of the second National Conference on World Health, which was held in Washington, May 7–9, under the auspices of the National Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization.

Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University, was chairman of the conference, which brought together leaders of Congress and of the executive branch of the Federal Government and representatives of organizations and industrial companies interested in health and international relations. The principal objectives of the conference were to discuss the international health legislation now before the Congress, to appraise the value of international health programs in developing habits of cooperation among nations, and to outline a future International Health Year.

STEVENSON FIRST TO PROPOSE

The original suggestion for such a year came from the former Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, in an address delivered June 8, 1958, at Michigan State University. On June 9, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat of Texas., had Stevenson's remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That same day Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, commended the address on the Senate floor. HUMPHREY has been the dedicated champion of the proposal ever since. In mid-August 1958 Senate Concurrent Resolution 99, which he had introduced was passed. It said: "The President of the United States is hereby invited to extend to the other nations of the world, through the World Health Organization, and related organizations, an invitation for the designation of representatives to meet and discuss the feasibility of designating an International Health and Medical Research Year, at such early date as adequate preparations can be made, or of other methods of developing such intensive international cooperation in the field of health as will lead toward the discovery and exchange of the answers on coping with major killing and crippling diseases which afflict mankind."

Some 2 weeks later, on September 6, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic presented to the United Nations General Assembly a resolution for the organization of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year. Under the auspices of 22 nations, including the United States, the resolution was approved in December 1958.

Next, in January 1959, the Health Year was considered by the World Health Organization's executive board, which asked the WHO director general to prepare plans for the proposed Year for presentation at the 12th WHO assembly. That assembly is now in session in Geneva

FORUM DEFINES HEALTH YEAR

Participants in the recent National Conference on World Health in Washington included most of the U.S. delegation to the current Geneva meeting. Some of this group played an active part in a forum on the International Health Year that was held under the chairmanship of James E. Perkins, managing director of the National Tuberculosis Association. The panelists were Albert W. Dent, president of Dillard University; James E. Hundley, special assistant for international health at the National Institutes of Health; and Julius N. Cahn, project director of the International Health Study of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Cahn, who has been working closely with Senator HUMPHREY on the Health Year, was the first speaker. His statement, which represented the views of many of the discussants heard later, presented seven points formulated to help assure the success of the Year.

1. The program should be based on the individual nations' own felt needs.

2. There should be strong cooperation by national governments, but basically—as in the International Geophysical Year—success will be dependent on private initiative, the initiative of the complex of private scientific and other organizations.

3. The Year will require the enthusiastic support of the medical profession everywhere, but it should be broad enough in concept to allow the fullest possible contribution by laymen as well.

4. All the life sciences must be involved.

5. In addition to WHO, the other health-oriented international organizations that are allied with the U.N. should participate, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the International Labor Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the United Nations Children's Fund.

6. Participants should be willing to undertake bold experiments in the health field. There must be an effort to establish new models of experimental collaboration, new approaches, new techniques.

7. Provision should be made for continuation of the projects started during the International Health Year so that the momentum gained during the period will be sustained in years to come.

Cahn then mentioned specific areas that ought to be involved in the project. He emphasized that the most important single IHY program should be the expansion of epidemiological services throughout the world and the strengthening of data concerning the distribution of various diseases. Another great need that could be met by IHY would be that for increased training of professional and nonprofessional medical personnel; this would include increased exchange of scientists in the health field and the organization of international seminars. Further, particular attention must be paid to the problems of providing the world's supply of water and food. The various nations should attempt to single out one or two diseases for a specific campaign of eradication. Examples given, in

addition to malaria and smallpox, currently the subject of control programs, were tuberculosis, cholera, and schistosomiasis. In like manner, certain important problems should be singled out for intensified research. Cahn suggested as possibilities radiation and air pollution. There should be health education of the masses. And finally, certain broad projects should be selected for emphasis during the IHY that would allow citizens to do things for themselves so that they would feel a sense of participation. For example, in the United States this might be achieved through a special campaign to increase the number of women who take annual diagnostic tests for uterine cancer.

The next panelist to present his views was James Hundley, who proposed that each country hold a meeting to reach agreement regarding the final plan for the year for that particular country. He pointed out that the year has two elements: an international cooperative element and the individual programs of the various nations.

With regard to a possible national plan for this country, Hundley made several specific suggestions that fell into three classes: research projects of special importance to the United States, research on problems as important to other countries as to the United States, and research that would be of benefit almost entirely to other countries.

Albert W. Dent was the final panelist to speak. He stressed the importance of citizen participation in the programs selected and the need to evolve better techniques in educating and motivating people to participate in health programs, such as in the program of vaccination against poliomyelitis and that of tuberculosis control. He pointed out that public apathy has developed with regard to both of these diseases.

PLAN BEING CONSIDERED BY WHO

In the general discussion that followed the panelists' presentations, H. van Zile Hyde of the U.S. Public Health Service, and U.S. member of the WHO executive board, outlined briefly what the director of the World Health Organization is proposing with respect to the International Health Year at the current World Health Assembly in Geneva. The object of the Health Year, as presented by the director general's report, is "to stimulate, primarily on a national basis, the intensification of international cooperation in carefully selected aspects of health and of medical research." This will involve the intensification of field activities in the control or eradication of specific diseases and the intensification of research related to WHO's growing program. Examples of field activity mentioned by the director general include renewed emphasis on malaria and smallpox eradication and installation of piped water supplies. As examples of fields for increased research, he cited cancer, cardio-vascular diseases, and virus diseases. The director general further suggested that national committees be formed throughout the world to stimulate interest in and to plan for the IHY.

The Washington forum carried this idea further by proposing that as a framework for the International Health Year a series of national assemblies be held, dealing with health problems in the respective countries, and that the year might close with a climactic congress held in connection with the World Health Assembly in the spring of 1963. The forum session ended with unanimous passage of a resolution that read: "Forum No. 2 recommends urging the U.S. delegation to the 12th World Health Assembly to support the assembly the designation of an International Health Year, to start in 1961, and further recommends that the National Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Congress, and other groups give all possible support to the project."

Under last September's U.N. resolution, WHO has been invited to report on the International Health Year to the U.N.'s Economic and Social Council at its 28th session this July, and to the General Assembly at its 14th session, which will begin in September.

In the United States, congressional sources confidently predict that adequate funds will be provided for the IHY once the appropriate scientific authorities, governmental and nongovernmental, have developed specific programs for the year. As in the case of the International Geophysical Year, bodies such as the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are being asked to draft the framework for the International Health Year program that will eventually be submitted to Congress for consideration.

SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL AID TO POLAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I received a letter the other day from Roman Michalowski, a member of the board of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. He referred to my statement before this body on April 28, 1959, in which I spoke of the expansion of American aid to Poland and provided me with information showing the amount of assistance extended to Poland from 1957 to 1959 by the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America.

I was particularly glad to receive this information since the assistance mentioned testifies to the continued effort by the Polish people in America to keep alive the spirit of freedom which exists in Poland, even in these difficult times.

The hunger of the Polish people for information and knowledge has been shown by the thousands of requests for scientific and cultural publications and books which the institute has received from individuals and institutions in Poland. The work which the Polish Institute has done in filling these requests and in preserving the Polish culture and tradition is worthy of sincere commendation by the American people.

Although there is evidence of renewed tightening of Communist control, the work of the institute and other Polish groups outside of Poland keeps alive the hope that someday the captive countries of Eastern Europe will again be free to determine their own future.

Because of the need to continue and extend the present program of medical aid and educational supplies, I repeat my proposal to establish a Polish-American foundation dedicated to the health of the Polish people and to the improvement of their educational opportunities through the use of counterpart currencies in Poland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from Mr. Roman Michalowski, dated May 20, 1959, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

POLISH INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., May 20, 1959.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On April 28, 1959, you spoke on the floor of the Senate regarding programs of Polish aid, undertaken by the U.S. Government and by private sources during the period 1957 to 1959.

In this speech you referred to the letter of Secretary Macomber dated April 22, 1959. In his letter, Assistant Secretary Macomber gives a comprehensive picture of assistance to Poland in the period between 1944 and 1956. However, as we are not sure that you have information about the assistance extended by the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, during the period from 1956 to the present date, we would like to offer you this most recent information.

The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America has forwarded according to a plan based on formal requests received from Polish academic schools, medical schools, and engineering schools, the following items:

Books and periodicals to the value of	$46,057
Medical instruments to the value of	25,420
Varitypers, multilith printers, office equipment to the value of	13,249
Stipends enabling Polish scholars and students to study abroad	7,310
Total of assistance provided	92,036

In addition, we have at present ready for shipment to Poland items in the book and medical categories to the value of $7,000.

We are enclosing: The charter of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, its bylaws, a certificate from the U.S. Treasury Department testifying to its tax exempt status, and some background material, a report of our activities for 1958, and the information leaflet issued in November 1958.

Respectfully yours,
ROMAN MICHALOWSKI,
Member of the Board.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are we operating under the 3-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are supposed to be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I most respectfully suggest that the rule be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Further morning business is in order under the 3-minute limitation.

NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—TOPICAL INDEX FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I observe on the desks of all Senators the hearings held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. The hearings are in excess of 1,100 pages. It is doubtful that Senators will be able to read the hearings with facility without a topical index; so as a guide to myself, and perhaps as a help to other Senators, I have prepared an index by topic of the more controversial discussions during the hearings.

I ask unanimous consent that the topical index may be printed at this point in

the RECORD, so as to afford at least some assistance to Senators who may wish to read the record of the hearings for themselves.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming yields back his remaining 2 minutes.

Without objection, the topical index will be printed in the RECORD.

The index is as follows:

TOPICAL INDEX FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON THE NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, MARCH 17–MAY 14, 1959

DIXON-YATES CONTROVERSY

Pages 129–190: Senator KEFAUVER testifies on Wenzell conflict of interest.

Pages 523–528: Senator ANDERSON testifies on Wenzell conflict of interest.

SEPARATION OF POWERS/EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

Pages 157–172: Senator KEFAUVER charges Strauss claimed privilege, cites testimony.

Pages 338–344: Strauss views on separation of powers and executive privilege.

Pages 781–788: Senator MCCARTHY statement on separation of powers.

Page 856: Strauss rebuttal to Senator MCCARTHY.

QUESTION OF ADEQUACY OF PREVIOUS STRAUSS EXAMINATIONS

Pages 506–509: Senator ANDERSON claims no real hearing ever held.

Page 587: Strauss claims adequate hearing held.

Pages 592–593: Strauss refuses to withdraw hearing claim.

DR. DAVID INGLIS, TESTIMONY, CONTROVERSY

Pages 363–373: Inglis charges.

Pages 375–418: Examination of Inglis by committee.

Page 827: Strauss: "Never asked for anything on Inglis."

Pages 836–837: Pearson testifies Strauss called AEC about Inglis.

Pages 842–843: Strauss says he called AEC after Pearson's article.

Pages 845–846: Strauss: difference in date of call "heinous difference."

"DUPLICITOUS LETTER" EPISODE

Pages 870–893: Committee print; letter of AEC "duplicitous, false, fraudulent."

Pages 915–936: Committee report; letter of AEC "duplicitous."

Pages 941–947: Minority report.

Pages 970–983: Duplicitous letter controversy.

Page 976: Strauss says House records "molded."

Page 979: Strauss quoted as standing by letter.

DR. DAVID HILL

Pages 429–445: Hill statement and charges.

Pages 730–732: Hill says Strauss persecuted Mr. Wilson, Henderson, Arneson.

Pages 768–773: Letter from Hill to committee.

Pages 824–826: Strauss denies persecution of Wilson, Henderson, Arneson.

Pages 856–864: Strauss' rebuttal to Hill's charges.

SHIPMENT OF ISOTOPES

Page 432: Hill charges Strauss opposed isotopes shipment.

Pages 420–423: Strauss says "unqualified falsehood" he opposed 1949 shipment.

Pages 495–502: Senator Anderson says 1949 "phony date."

Page 498: Senator Anderson says section 5a, 10a, McMahon Act, allow shipment.

Pages 610–629: Controversy over sections 5a, 10a of McMahon Act.

Pages 651–662: Discussion of Strauss' 1949 isotope statement.

Pages 654–662: Strauss' 1949 isotope statement.

Page 666: Strauss: "Stand on record."

Page 697: Strauss says his defense based on section 10a of McMahon Act.

Pages 818–821: Strauss says isotope position unchanged.

ADDITION OF WORD "ALL" TO M'MAHON ACT

Page 606: Strauss doesn't recall addition of word "all."

Page 607: Strauss doesn't believe "all" changed act.

Pages 644–645: Senator BRICKER statement on addition of "all."

Page 685: Strauss says "all" is redundant.

Page 686: Senator MONRONEY says "all" intended as rebuke.

Page 687: Strauss says "all" is "small matter."

ERPF

Page 807: Strauss says Armand Erpf being considered for study.

RELATIONS OF AEC WITH JOINT COMMITTEE

Pages 511–512: Senator ANDERSON says Strauss ignored Attorney General's letter.

Page 598: Strauss rebuttal to charge of not informing Joint Committee.

Page 601: Strauss cannot answer if letter reached his office.

Page 605: Strauss says he probably would have received a copy.

Pages 688–689: Strauss says he was in Havana when letter arrived AEC.

Page 695: Strauss says he should have seen letter, but didn't.

Pages 704–708: Submarine exchange chronology.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, am I proceeding under the usual 3-minute limitation during the morning hour, or under the rule imposed by the Vice President upon the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] the other day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota will please proceed under the 3-minute rule.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The junior Senator from Minnesota will proceed under the rule of the Senate and will complete his remarks in 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, almost every day the newspapers carry reports of statements by Republicans, ranging from the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, down to ward chairmen of the Republican Party, charging the Democrats with fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. President, let us look a the financial condition of the Federal Government as of June 1959—six and one-half years after Mr. Eisenhower was sworn in a President of the United States and the management of the fiscal affairs of the Government was turned over to his appointees. At the end of the fiscal year 1953, the Federal debt was $266 billion; today, after six and one-half years of Republican administration, as we near the end of fiscal year 1959, the Federal debt is $285 billion. When Mr. George Humphrey, the architect of this administration's fiscal policy, left the Government approximately 3 years ago, the national debt had increased to $274 billion. Government interest payments for the fiscal year 1953 were $6,583 billion. Government interest payments for fiscal 1959 will come to approximately $7,600 billion. Whereas the Government debt has increased by about 8 percent in this period, the interest paid on the Government debt has increased by approximately 15 percent. Interest payments on the public debt are expected to be $500 million more in 1960 than they were in 1959. In 1953, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Republicans talked about stretching out the public debt. However, the Federal budget for fiscal 1960 indicates that interest payments on marketable obligations, mainly held by financial institutions, are almost two-thirds of all interest payments and the estimated increase of $500 million in total expenditures for interest on the public debt will occur in the payment of interest on these obligations. The interest rate paid on taxable Government bonds has increased from 2.94 percent for fiscal 1953 to over 4 percent in 1959—an increase of more than 33 percent above the 1953 rate. In much the same manner, the interest rates on 3-month Treasury bills have increased from 1.9 percent to a high at the end of April of this year of over 3 percent.

Throughout 6½ years, the administration has received essentially what it wanted from the Congress in the way of taxation and revenue laws, and the appropriations by the Congress have been less than that which was asked for by the administration. The only major tax reduction was that of 1954 and was accomplished with administration approval. Today the administration is coming to what it has called the "irresponsible Democratically controlled Congress" with three major requests.

One, that we raise the debt ceiling.

Two, that we raise the interest rate on Government bonds.

Three, that we increase taxes on insurance companies and that we extend the corporate profits and the wartime excise taxes.

Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that this is a responsible Democratically controlled Congress, the administration and the Government of this country would well find itself in a financial crisis which would be in large part of the administration's own making. The deficits of recent years would not have been as great if the 1954 tax reduction program of the Republicans had not gone to extremes and if economic recession had not been indeed prolonged, consequently the need to increase the debt ceiling would not be as pressing. The need to increase the interest rates on Government securities is certainly in part the result of the hard money policy initiated in the spring of 1953 by Mr. George Humphrey who then issued long-term Government bonds with an interest rate set at 3¼ percent—a rate which was 30 percent higher than the prevailing rate of 2½ percent. The issue, as you may recall, was extremely popular but what followed was not so popular. The value of all outstanding Government bonds dropped abruptly. In 8 weeks that spring, more than $2 billion was lost in market value of these

bonds. Increased cost in interest on this bond issue alone has been estimated at $200 million. The general increase in interest rates that followed not only increased the interest on the national debt, but also increased the cost of money to all borrowers.

This action was hailed by Republicans as marking the turning of the tide. It was said that George Humphrey meant business; he had replaced the office picture of his predecessor, John Snyder, with the picture of Andrew Mellon. This, it is now evident, was not an empty gesture. It is not surprising that investors hesitated to invest in Government bonds when they have no assurance that the Treasury will not arbitrarily increase the interest rates. A further factor contributing to the crisis in the sale and issuance of Government securities is the Tax Revision Act of 1954, which has undoubtedly encouraged speculation in the stock market and attracted investments to that field rather than to the field of Government bonds—a movement which has undoubtedly been encouraged also by the administration's continuous harping on inflation despite the fact that the price level has been relatively stable since 1957, the big rise in the cost of living occurring between 1953 and 1957, when it rose from 113.5 in 1952 to 120.2 in 1957.

Mr. President, in a number of the States in this United States, Democratic Governors are having financial problems, principally because Republican-controlled legislative bodies which supported appropriations have refused to provide the revenue or to meet the cost of programs which they have approved. This is true particularly in the State of Michigan, and it is true also in the State of Minnesota. It is significant that in the State of New York tax increases have been approved for a Republican Governor by a Republican legislature. And in the State of California tax increases and changes approved by a Democratic legislature for a Democratic Governor. However, in those State governments in which the administration is held by Democrats and the legislative bodies controlled by Republicans the disposition has been to create financial crisis.

If this Democratic Congress of the Federal Government were irresponsible—as the President has charged us with being—if it were irresponsible in the manner of Republican-controlled bodies in the State legislatures have been; we might anticipate a financial crisis at the Federal level. Everyone knows, of course, that this will not be the course taken by the Democrats here in the Congress of the United States. Despite the fact that the financial difficulties in which the Federal Government finds itself are largely the result of policies which we oppose—policies which the administration insisted upon—our response will be realistic and directed to doing what we can to correct the mistakes of this administration and meet the needs of the Federal Government.

I suggest, however, that it might be well for the President to be more aware of the facts and at least for the time being refrain from his baseless charges of irresponsibility against the Democratic Congress. If he is concerned about the general welfare of the people of the United States, it might be well for him to send a message of advice and recommendation to Republican State Legislatures simply urging them to be as responsive in dealing with local and State fiscal problems as he expects and knows the Democratic Congress will be responsive to the needs of the Federal Government.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

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

INTEREST RATES ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama desire to speak during the morning hour?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assure the Senator that my remarks will be confined to the 3 minutes under the rule during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota has just spoken about fiscal irresponsibility. I wish to comment on a hearing which was held before the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning concerning a matter which was discussed briefly on the floor of the Senate several days ago. It relates to the proposed exchange of as much as $335 million worth of 4 percent mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association, and possibly as much as $1 billion worth, for 2¾ percent Government bonds which are not marketable and are not due until 1975.

The 4 percent mortgages, according to the testimony before the committee this morning, will realize a return after servicing and administrative expenses, of 3⅜ percent. They would be exchanged with banks, insurance companies, mutual savings institutions, and other groups, for bonds which will not become due until 1975, and which pay only 2¾ percent interest.

It was admitted in the testimony before the committee this morning that there would be a loss of $40,000 for every $1 million in mortgages exchanged. In other words, if the $1 billion in mortgages is exchanged for bonds, the Federal Government will suffer a loss of $40 million.

In addition, according to the Under Secretary of the Treasury, there will be a potential tax loss of $8,400,000 at the outset.

The Treasury seeks to justify this action on the ground that it will aid in debt management and in balancing the budget, and that it will result in an orderly liquidation of mortgages in the FNMA portfolio. However, if the arithmetic of this proposal is analyzed fully, I think it will be most interesting to observe the rather curious outcome—one which we might keep in mind in trying to ascertain the correct meaning of the term "fiscal irresponsibility."

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

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. My time has expired.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

RETIREMENT OF BARON ROBERT SILVERCRUYS, AMBASSADOR FROM BELGIUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the nation of Belgium has been represented in the United States for nearly 16 years by Baron Robert Silvercruys. These years have marked the climax of an outstanding diplomatic career that has spanned 41 years.

As Ambassador in Washington, Baron Silvercruys has served his country superbly. His work here has been in the finest traditions of diplomacy. It reflected at all times the tact, the geniality, and the wisdom and understanding which are so much a part of the man himself. He guarded and advanced Belgium's interests in the United States very well indeed. But he did not do so as though these interests were a thing apart. Rather, he advanced them as an element of the common interests of both nations. It is a tribute to his exceptional efforts that relations between the United States and Belgium have never been better.

In recent years, Baron Silvercruys has had the companionship and the help of the lovely and gifted Baroness Silvercruys. Mrs. Mansfield and I have had the privilege of knowing both the Silvercruys as warm friends. We are delighted to learn that although the baron has retired from his country's service, he and his wife plan to continue to make their home in Washington for at least part of each year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD an editorial on the retirement of Ambassador Silvercruys which appeared in the New York Times.

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

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1959]

A HAPPY AMBASSADOR

Baron Robert Silvercruys, who has just retired after 16 years as Belgian Ambassador and 41 years in his country's diplomatic service, has had a right to be happy. Best of all, he intends to remain that way in retirement and to spend half his time in Washington and half in Brussels.

The mark that Ambassador Silvercruys has made on Washington is unusual because it

was traditional. This may seem paradoxical, but the type of diplomat that the baron exemplified is, unhappily, a disappearing one—genial, cultivated, a superb host, an unostentatious representative of his nation. At the same time he was alert, intelligent, well-informed and skillful in furthering the interests of Belgium. There are centuries of training behind a diplomat like Baron Silvercruys, but not many men nowadays carry on such traditions or have the personality and ability to do so.

Ambassador Silvercruys had the good fortune to represent a country with which we have had no problems of magnitude. Relations between Belgium and the United States are and have been as friendly as possible and certainly Baron Silvercruys deserves some credit for keeping them that way. It goes without saying that he will be missed in the diplomatic corps but fortunately not in person, since Washington will continue to enjoy his presence.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the assistant majority leader, in his tribute to Baron Silvercruys, who has retired as Ambassador from Belgium. I have known this distinguished envoy during my 20 years in Washington, and I can safely say that during the 20 years I have never met a man who more ably or more sincerely represented his government in Washington or who more thoroughly understood the character, the ideals, and the inspirations of the American people.

He has truly been a great friend of America, and in representing his country he has done much to perpetuate the great historic association that resulted from World War I, and the interwar years, and continued during Belgium's travail in the World War II period.

It is most gratifying to know that Baron Silvercruys will remain in Washington, where his sound understanding of world affairs and the ever brilliant advice of one of the most charming diplomatic ladies ever to serve as the wife of an Ambassador will also be available. Baroness Silvercruys not only is a distinguished wife of a distinguished envoy, but, in her own right as an American citizen, and as the widow of the late great Senator Brien McMahon, she thoroughly understands the things which go to make American foreign and domestic policy and the kind of nation we seek to have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Washington Evening Star of June 4, entitled "Model For Diplomats," and one from the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, June 5, entitled "A Genial Ambassador," both expressing very clearly the great service Ambassador Silvercruys has contributed to his country, and, indirectly, to this country.

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

[From the Washington Star, June 4, 1959]

MODEL FOR DIPLOMATS

If a composite picture were to be drawn of a model diplomat, it might well be a portrait of Baron Silvercruys, who retired this week after 41 years in the Belgian diplomatic service. For nearly 16 of these years, he has been his country's Ambassador to the United States. As it happens, Baron Silvercruys began his diplomatic career here in 1918 with the initial assignment of planning a visit to the United States by King Albert and Queen Elizabeth of Belgium. His final major assignment was to make similar arrangements for the visit last month by King Baudouin.

It is in appearance and personality, as well as competence, that the Belgian envoy may be considered the model of what a diplomat should be. Possessed of these qualifications, he has been a popular and respected figure in official circles in Washington. It is good to know that he and the equally popular Baroness Silvercruys are planning to continue as residential Washingtonians in the future.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 5, 1959]

A GENIAL AMBASSADOR

It is good news for the many friends of Baron Robert Silvercruys that his retirement as Ambassador of Belgium does not mean his departure from Washington. For 14 years before his official termination on Tuesday, Baron Silvercruys was his country's envoy here, and on numerous previous visits he had become familiar with the United States during a 41-year diplomatic career. As Ambassador he combined dignity and courtly bearing with wit and good counsel. He has been a good friend of this country and a devoted servant of free world and NATO affairs with particular interest in economic development matters. Not the least of his attractions has been the fact that he is married to the beauteous widow of the late Senator Brien McMahon. Except for the recent visit of King Baudouin, Belgium has been relatively little in the American news; this is in part a testimonial to the effectiveness with which this genial Ambassador worked to keep relationships between the two countries in good repair. As he is succeeded by Ambassador Louis Scheyven, Baron Silvercruys will have the community's good wishes and the hope that it will continue to see much of him and Baroness Silvercruys.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I suspect it is already too late to invite the Senate to consider the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss in our traditional mood of calm and objectivity.

This afternoon I shall speak briefly on this matter of great importance which has been placed before the Senate, the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Strauss. I am well aware that there are those who share positive views on Admiral Strauss. Some are violently opposed; and many who know and favor this man wonder in amazement at the extent and character of the attacks upon him and his nomination for this responsible position in the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

Mr. Strauss has served under four Presidents of this Republic; he has given four decades of his life to public service, creditably, honorably, and forthrightly. I invite the attention of Senators to this phase of his brilliant record. It is attached to the report on Senators' desks.

A number of our colleagues publicly announced their intention of opposing Admiral Strauss even before his nomination had been voted on in committee.

The mere existence of this haste to get opposition on record indicates that this nomination is being accorded unique attention. Nominee Strauss is not being looked upon merely as a man whom the President would like to have in his Cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. He is being regarded as personifying a philosophy of government which some feel impelled to combat and destroy. Mr. Strauss, quite simply, is a conservative.

As a conservative, Admiral Strauss is drawing the fire of many militant advocates of change. Notably arrayed against him are some who have sought in the past to assert the strength of this body against Mr. Strauss, usually in an effort to push him into doing something he did not think it proper to do. He has never budged under pressure, and he has always stubbornly resisted anything which seemed to him to be an undue encroachment by the legislative branch.

The curious thing about this resistance is that it is not discussed on either side in terms which are properly descriptive. It is touched on, if at all, in some rather sweet-sounding euphemisms.

We are told, for example, that Admiral Strauss refused to give information to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The admiral, in turn has said: I did not refuse. At most, I delayed. I gave everything the law allows.

Mr. President, none of us was born yesterday. We all know the technique, very common on Capitol Hill, of stridently demanding information when what we really want is to influence a course of action. A part of the game is to disclaim the true intent and to wax indignant when challenged.

It is also a part of the game for the people on whom the demand is made to pretend that they do not understand the true import of the demand. All of this is a stylized performance in the

never ending tug-of-war between the legislative and executive branches.

Knowing this, we have to understand that most of the criticisms of Admiral Strauss for refusal to supply information must be taken for what they are—criticisms of his unwillingness to let this or that committee chairman dictate to him on matters of policy not spelled out in the law.

Most of the hullaballoo surrounding this nomination, therefore, boils down to the simple fact that Admiral Strauss is a conservative who errs, if at all, on the side of caution in interpreting the legal rights of the legislative branch and his own legal duties toward it. Added to this is the fact that in resisting pressures from the legislative branch to be less conservative and more liberal, Admiral Strauss has preferred to cite narrow legalisms rather than to assert bodly, "Gentlemen, you are trespassing." This is not a crime. This is not dishonorable. To tolerant people, it is at most merely irritating.

Growing out of the nominee's habit of being legalistic in resisting pressures, there have developed instances which have been magnified out of all proportion. At least, that is the way the Senator from Kansas looks at it. A careful reading of the record will quickly illustrate this.

Efforts have been made to leave an impression that the nominee was evasive, uncooperative, and unrelenting.

Even when the cocoon is unraveled, it contains something that is dead, dried up, and worthless. Nevertheless, such instances are described over and over in grave and resonant tones as "serious, very serious."

Mr. President, saying so does not make it so, and the events will not seem serious to anyone who is reasonably observing and willing to search the total context of an event before judging its meaning.

No Senator will lose his way in searching for the truth about Admiral Strauss if he will bring to his quest his accumulated experience in appraising people, and his accumulated wisdom about what is likely to have happened in a given set of circumstances.

Thus prepared, he can avoid being snared into accepting the thesis that Admiral Strauss, without any advantage flowing from the act, lied to Congress just for the heck of it. On the the other hand, any Senator who insists on wearing blinders can chop off enough at each side of each scene to mislead himself completely.

On the desk before each Senator is a copy of our hearings. It is forbiddingly thick. I can assure Senators that it contains all upon which our wisdom about people and events need focus to arrive at a sound judgment on this nomination.

Of the 1,128 pages in the volume, I should say that about 120 pages have to do with Admiral Strauss. The rest, nearly 1,000 pages, seem to me to tell far more about Admiral Strauss' accusers than about the Admiral himself. Those pages, inexorably, will have their own lengthy counterparts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Less likely to receive attention here are the pages telling of the admiral's qualifications for the post to which he has been named. To those pages, I shall now refer.

The hearings on the Strauss nomination opened on March 17, which was not only St. Patrick's Day, but also the birthday of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE].

The first witnesses were the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and his junior colleague [Mr. KEATING]. Both testified that Mr. Strauss is outstandingly qualified to serve as Secretary of Commerce. Senator JAVITS, in particular, spoke from long personal acquaintance with the nominee, reaching back many years.

The hearing record next shows letters from our two Virginia colleagues, Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, men of outstanding judgment and discernment. Both stated they had known Admiral Strauss for a long time, and both urged that his nomination be confirmed.

The nominee himself then began to testify. The details of his biography will be found summarized in the committee's report, as I indicated a moment ago. I have heretofore referred to parts of it, and the text of his testimony is, of course, printed in the hearings.

The biography is impressive, showing, as it does, important public service starting during the administration of President Wilson when the nominee was Secretary to Herbert Hoover, then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium.

The period between the two World Wars found Mr. Strauss associated with the investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., in New York. He was at the same time a member of the Naval Reserve, and was called to active duty 10 months before Pearl Harbor. Since that time, he has been almost continuously in public service, either as a naval officer, as a member or Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, or on special assignment by the executive branch of the Congress.

From all the recital of biographical detail, two things stand out in my mind.

The first is, that the nominee received the Medal of Freedom, personally awarded by President Eisenhower, in July of last year. This medal is not given lightly. Only 15 have been awarded by act of the President since the medal was authorized, the last recipient being the late revered John Foster Dulles.

The second point of interest in the biographical detail is that the nominee returned from retirement to accept appoint as Secretary of Commerce. Our colleague, Senator PASTORE, asked him why he did so, and this was Mr. Strauss' answer:

> In the first place, I deeply respect and admire the President, and the duty to which he called me was a responsibility in which I felt I could be effective.
>
> In the second place, I held it to be a very great honor to occupy a post in which my former chief, Mr. Hoover, had set so high a standard of public service.
>
> Third, and finally, I believe that the economic warfare which the Soviet Government has declared upon the United States can be most effectively countered in the work and decisions of the Department of Commerce. I have certain strongly held views as to the gravity of the Communist offensive at the present time.

Mr. President, the nomination before us, is that of a man who retired from public service with glory enough for a full lifetime, but who returned when summoned to duty. We can only guess whether he would have responded to the summons if he had known of the obstacles to be strewn in his path.

It is fitting to note here—that his fitness, his competency, and his integrity have never heretofore been questioned.

The hearings which started on March 17 continued through the next day, then jumped to April 21, and then again to April 23.

During those 4 days, Admiral Strauss, in answer to questions put to him by the Committee, testified about many matters connected with his post. He touched upon foreign trade in general and upon trade with Iron Curtain countries in particular.

He talked about atomic-powered merchant ships, about the need for expanded studies in oceanography, about mandatory controls upon imports of petroleum products, about plans for handling the 1960 census, about delay in building superliners, about problems of the textile industry, and about the financing of ship construction.

He answered questions on functions of the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, on so-called runaway flags, and on the transportation study requested by the President.

He gave his views on the Federal Highway Act of 1956, toll roads, the highway trust fund, taxes on aviation fuel, advisory committees to the Department of Commerce, trade missions, and commercial attachés. In answer to questions, he explained how he would deal with the press and volunteered to furnish any personal financial data in which the committee might be interested.

All of the foregoing was covered in hearings taking place on 4 days embracing 7 hours and 10 minutes of hearing time. The inquiry was important, and certainly it was relevant to confirmation of the nomination of a Secretary of Commerce.

However, when the hearings reconvened on April 28, they began to take on a different character. The opening witness was one of our Senate colleagues. He testified at considerable length on the Dixon-Yates matter, his testimony bearing on two points, the first of which can be summarized. I am summarizing the testimony very briefly;

Adolphe Wenzell was involved in a conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates matter. Admiral Strauss denies knowing of the conflict although other people knew. Somebody could be lying. Perhaps it is Admiral Strauss. I further summarize the Senator's second point in this way: In the chronology prepared by the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget to show who took part in the Dixon-

Yates negotiation, Adolphe Wenzell's name was left out. All competent testimony agrees that Admiral Strauss had no part in preparing the chronology, but maybe he did anyway.

In all fairness to our colleague, who then testified, I must admit that he did not claim that his allegations added up to reasons for refusing to confirm the nomination of Admiral Strauss.

He did insist, however, that they presented questions which the Attorney General ought to investigate, and that until such an investigation is completed, the nomination of the admiral should not be confirmed. Maybe that is only a distinction without a difference, after all.

On April 30, Admiral Strauss was given an opportunity to testify in answer to his first adverse witness on the Dixon-Yates matter. The rebuttal testimony pointed out that there was nothing in the adverse testimony that had not been fully developed by exhaustive questioning before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in December 1955.

Further, the rebuttal testimony renewed, most adequately, specific answers and explanations to each of the specific charges.

Mr. President, as I listened to the rebuttal, it seemed to me that any fair-minded and objective person would not have the slightest hesitancy in accepting the explanations. They would be troublesome only to someone embarrassed by the hope that others might find guilt where there is no guilt.

As I have already said, the Strauss hearings at their inception were confined to matters properly relevant to an examination of a nominee for Secretary of Commerce. Their nature changed with the calling of the first adverse witness. From then on, a number of witnesses testified. Their words and demeanor made plain that they share a common aim, namely, humiliating defeat of the nominee.

Concurrently, a reading of this record will show, in my judgment, that some on the committee departed from the role of inquiry on qualifications of a man for this important position to the role of grand inquisitors.

It is only fair to say that they were the members who take greatest pride in the label "liberal" and who look hopefully for the day when the last conservative will be stuffed and in a glass case at the Smithsonian. Let it be clear that I do not share their hope.

I was distressed at the turn taken by the Strauss hearings before our committee. I sensed, as did my colleagues on the committee, that what had started as a detour into genteel mudslinging had too soon degenerated into a far rougher game. It is our opportunity here to redress the balance of the committee hearings and assess the merits of the charges leveled at this nominee in the light of his conduct, his answers, and his responsibility to the security needs of our Nation.

In closing, let me say that I have not attempted to point out in detail much that transpired. In the more than 1,000 pages contained in the printed record of hearings, all those matters, and many others which I consider irrelevant, have been covered. As this debate progresses these matters will be brought before the Senate.

Finally, I am of the firm conviction that Admiral Strauss merits having his nomination confirmed. I am confident that the great majority of the Senate will agree with me if and when they check into the record with open minds, as many of us have tried to approach this problem in the hearings.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that, like my distinguished friend from Kansas, I shall be brief today. As the debate proceeds—and I hope it will not be a prolonged debate, but only sufficient reasonably to cover some of the questions raised by the nomination—I shall probably have something to add to what I shall say today.

I wish to place in the RECORD certain excerpts from the minority views and individual views of other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with reference to the nomination which is now before the Senate. As the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, the hearings were long. The printed transcript of the hearings runs to 1,128 pages. A great number of subjects were covered, and it was a fairly difficult task to separate the important matters from others which were not quite so important, and yet make a report expressing the views of eight Senators on the committee who had opposite views from nine other members of the committee, and do it in the usual form of a committee report.

We had worked on the report a long time, and after many drafts we eliminated a great deal of it; yet it is still a fairly long report. I recommend the reading of the report and the individual views and the minority views to every member of the Senate. In it they will find constant references to the hearings themselves, and constant references also to digests of them. I note on my desk a mimeographed sheet of another index, which relates to the page numbers of different portions of the testimony and of the various subjects which were involved in the hearings.

I wish also to say for the RECORD that earlier in the session, sometime around the latter part of March or the first part of April, there appeared a great number of news articles and radio and television commentaries suggesting that a long time had elapsed since the name of Mr. Strauss had been sent to the Senate and that there may have been some dilatory tactics or delaying tactics in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to the nomination. There appeared to be also a great number of people who wanted the committee to go ahead and report the nomination, and do it quickly. Between those two schools of thought, the committee decided that this was a matter which was not uncontroversial. I am sure when the President of the United States sent the name of Mr. Strauss to the Senate, nominating him to be Secretary of Commerce, the administration did not expect, nor could it be anticipated, that this would be a nomination which would run along in the usual or normal course of the consideration of nominations, and would be reported to the Senate within 30 days, or the usual time.

I do not wish to reply to the articles and commentaries to which I have referred. The amazing thing about it all is that no one called on us and asked us about it. I believe that the Record should show, on behalf of the committee, that there was a reasonable explanation for the seemingly long time which elapsed from January 17, when the nomination was sent to the Senate, until the close of the hearings in committee.

First, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could not organize until after about the 20th of January, because the Republican caucus was having some difficulty in making assignments to committees. So there practically a week went by. Then we have a rule in committee, as the Senator from Kansas well knows, that all nominations must lie over 2 weeks, in case anyone wishes to be heard on a nominee. That put us into the middle of February, or about the 10th of February. Of course that is the week which is known as Lincoln Day Week in the Senate. Nearly half of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had felt impelled to go to various places throughout the country and talk about the Republican Party and Abraham Lincoln. I could not have obtained a corporal's guard during that week. That situation extended until the following Thursday, or so.

Then in order to expedite consideration of the nomination, there was some necessity, or at least it so appeared to me, knowing that there would be a great volume of testimony, of having a small subcommittee work on the matter, because such a subcommittee could sit regularly. My experience here has been that we save a great deal of time by operating that way.

That procedure was objected to, I suppose for very good reasons; apparently some members wanted the full committee to hear the matter. So I said, "Very well; I guess we will have to do that, if that is what a reasonable number of the members of the committee want. But I will insist on a quorum."

Mr. President, it was not possible to get the usual quorum in committee for about 10 days, because the Senate was not active, there were no votes in the Senate, the major committees had not started to their work, and there were not enough Senators here.

Along came the Easter vacation. In the meantime—because I had to hold hearings myself—I was responsible for about 3 weeks' delay, because of conditions beyond my control. I spent most of the time at a place north of town, called Bethesda. So there were at least 40 or 50, and perhaps even 60 days, in which business could not move along normally.

As chairman of the committee, I do not believe I expected at any time that we

would take 1,128 pages of testimony, although as a matter of fact, this was about as condensed a hearing on a confirmation as I have ever seen in the Senate, considering the number of people involved. Actually, about 1,100 of the pages of the testimony, other than documents, are taken up by 11 witnesses 6 of them U.S. Senators, 3 for Mr. Strauss and 3 against him; 4 scientists, 2 for Mr. Strauss and 2 against him; and the nominee himself.

I have thought at times that perhaps the witnesses should have come from wider segments, but that was the type of witness schedule we had in the hearings. Because of the nature of the controversy, and because we would be going back to matters which had happened 3 or 4 years ago in other committees of Congress, which had taken much testimoney, all of us agreed, or at least I did, that in order to keep things in perspective—since the nominee was going to give an answer to everything—when one witness would testify to a certain matter, the nominee, would be given the unusual privilege of answering at that time when it was fresh in his mind. That was what was done.

I say that is unusual, because I have attended many hearings on nominations, and the usual, fair procedure is that the witnesses who favor the nomination testify first, followed by the witnesses who are opposed, and then the committee concludes the hearings. Sometimes a rebuttal will be allowed at the end of the hearings, if a nominee desires that privilege.

In the case of the pending nomination, additional time was afforded, because every time a matter was brought up during the rebuttal by the nominee, many other questions were opened up. That took much time. After we got started, and the chairman and the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee insisted on a quorum, the members of the committee were in attendance almost all the time.

I do not know the number of pages of testimony which were required for the so-called rebuttal, but sometimes there were rebuttals within rebuttals, because we touched on many other subjects. But everything which was discussed is in the record.

I have heard some suggestion that the committee might have been conducting a sort of inquisition of Admiral Strauss. I do not think any question asked by any member of the committee, regardless of whether he was for or against Admiral Strauss, was not a fair question. Some of the criticism which was presented by some of the witnesses might have been in the nature of immaterial remarks or in the nature of picking on the nominee unfairly. But the committee itself certainly did not know what the witnesses would say. So, whatever was said by them had to be gaged as fairly and justly as possible. I think some of the witnesses got away off the subject.

I observe the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in the Chamber. He has attended many more hearings, probably, than all the rest of us in the Chamber combined. I am certain he will agree with me that there never has been a hearing when some witness did not go off on a tangent and speak on something which was irrelevant to the subject under consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. That frequently happens.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the printed hearings are extensive. I took great pains to make certain that a copy of the hearings was on the desk of every Senator as soon as it came from the Printing Office. Perhaps Senators will not read the hearings in their entirety, but they will find in the hearings all the reports which were made and page references to many different subjects.

I have heard something lately about a kind of concerted effort on the part of the Democrats on the committee to hold up the President's nomination, or to look at it a little too carefully, with the implication that that was a terrible thing to do. I shall submit for the RECORD on Monday a compilation of the nominations which have passed through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce since I have been the chairman. The number runs into the hundreds, and there has never been any trouble about them. Each one of the nominations was scrutinized. To some of them there was no opposition. Some of the nominations were of persons whom we knew well, and the nominations were acted on quickly.

I do not know of any nomination which we did not examine carefully. There were two or three of them I wish we had looked at longer, because of what happened after the nominees began to serve in their respective posts. But I do not know why it is so unusual that once in a while some Members of the Senate should have doubt about a particular nomination. I do not think anyone is anointed simply because he is appointed. This happened to be one of those cases.

I do not think anyone likes to indulge in acrimony deliberately. Nevertheless, every Senator has the right to uphold the Constitution according to the oath he took. I know of no amendment to the Constitution which has repealed the words "advice and consent."

No member of the committee had had very much contact with Mr. Strauss. Most of his contact with the Senate had been in two other committees. Some of us who have been Members of the Senate for a while knew Mr. Strauss in a social way or in a political way or in an official way. But certainly the committee did not begin the hearings with any preconceived ideas concerning Mr. Strauss; at least, I did not sense any such feeling. But we knew that his nomination would be controversial with respect to many matters, because we in the Senate knew of his activities in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract, for instance. We knew some of the problems which confronted the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with respect to Mr. Strauss. I knew, for instance, about the controversy he had with the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

So the committee did not expect that in the hearings on the nomination of Mr. Strauss we would all merely listen to his autobiography, consider the service he had rendered, and then simply report his nomination.

For the reasons I have stated, then, the hearings on the nomination took a long time. I think the members of the committee cooperated to the fullest extent. I attended every hearing except one, as I recall, on one afternoon. At that time the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] assumed the chairmanship and presided at the hearing.

The testimony regarding the nominee was presented by only 11 witnesses.

The seven Senators who cast their votes against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Strauss have signed their views, both in the nature of so-called minority views and individual views. Much care was given to this document, which is in the report of the committee. I know similar care was given by those who voted in the committee for the confirmation of the nomination, because the committee had a very difficult task to perform.

I shall read excerpts from the report, but I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report and the individual views be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the report—Executive Report No. 4—was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—REPORT

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the nomination be confirmed.

VIEWS FAVORING CONFIRMATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS

We recommend that the Senate confirm the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

The hearings on the nominee's confirmation were of a scope to reflect to a large extent the nominee's long distinguished public service. The impressive record of Admiral Strauss is summarized in the biographical sketch appended hereto.

The three major points into which the Senate should inquire when considering confirmation of a cabinet appointment are: (1) the nominee's honesty and integrity; (2) his competence; and (3) his record for cooperation. On all of these points, the record of the hearings satisfies us beyond doubt that the nominee meets fully the requirements for confirmation.

Examining each of the criteria in more detail, we turn first to the honesty and integrity of the nominee.

Several witnesses at the hearings made charges against the honesty of Mr. Strauss. The charges were refuted, and much of the refutation was actually contained in adverse testimony. Some of the witnesses who came before the committee knew the nominee well; some had never known him nor had personal contact with him. Some witnesses voiced their belief that the nominee maintained a facade of innocence while operating in a devious manner. Others, and these with one exception, were people who have had the most contact with the nominee, have found him always honest, forthright, and courageous.

The wide divergence in views can be explained partly on the ground that adverse judgments rested largely on double or triple hearsay. It is not surprising that opinions resting on hearsay were the most vehement against the nominee, for unfriendly gossip,

gathers strength as it travels. In the main, however, the adverse testimony is found to stem from disagreements with the nominee on questions of judgment and philosophy, or from inferred affronts to personal or official dignity.

We were particularly impressed by the nominee's efforts to be exact in answering the most searching cross-examination on minute details of his activities throughout his long and useful public career.

After carefully reviewing all of the evidence before us, and after considering as well the nominee's reputation as a man of unblemished character through more than four decades in the public eye, we find Lewis L. Strauss to be a man of honesty and integrity.

On the question of competence, there is no adverse testimony. Even witnesses who testified against him acknowledged the breadth of his experience, his firm grasp of problems in the Commerce Department area and his long record of achievements as a top administrator. Few men in public life can match his long tenure in sensitive and responsible posts and his unique record of distinguished service under four Presidents. It is clear that the nominee is highly competent.

The next test is that of cooperation with Congress. Here, we can count noses. For example, during the time that the nominee served on the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had five chairmen. The first of them, Senator Brien McMahon is dead, but a letter which he wrote to the nominee in 1950 in behalf of the Joint Committee praised Mr. Strauss' service during his first term on the AEC and invited him to become a consultant to the Joint Committee. The second chairman, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, submitted a statement supporting the nominee and testifying to his fine cooperation. The third chairman, former Congressman W. STERLING COLE, by a May 5, 1959, cablegram to the nominee introduced into the record, confirmed "existence cordial relationship with you as Chairman AEC and I chairman Joint Committee * * *." The fourth chairman, Congressman CARL T. DURHAM, who immediately preceded Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON as chairman of the Joint Committee, was reported in the hearing on May 6, 1959, as willing to appear and testify if our committee wished to hear him. We are authorized by Congressman DURHAM to say that had he appeared, he would have testified to a cordial and cooperative relationship with the nominee reaching back more than 20 years. In addition former Senator John W. Bricker, who was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from 1948 through 1958, praised the nominee for his cooperation with Congress.

We would also direct attention to the fact that Senator PASTORE, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since 1953, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation during the review of the proposed transfer to Great Britain of information on the *Nautilus* reactor, on which the question of cooperation was specifically raised, is supporting the confirmation of the nominee. For a more detailed expression of Senator PASTORE on the nominee's cooperation, reference is made to the individual views of Senator PASTORE.

Our committee spent much time in detailed examination of specific instances in which it was charged that the nominee withheld or was grudging in giving information to congressional committees. The few instances charged represent a minute percentage of the nominee's dealings with the Congress. In fact, the nominee showed great diligence in keeping the Congress informed.

Conclusion

The testimony and documentation presented before our committee, in our judgment, does not justify an adverse recommendation on this nomination. On the contrary, there is an abundance of affirmative evidence to establish beyond doubt the nominee's honesty and integrity, competence, and his long record of cordial and willing cooperation with the Congress.

We recommend his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce.

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL.
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.
NORRIS COTTON
CLIFFORD P. CASE.
STROM THURMOND.
FRANK J. LAUSCHE.
THRUSTON B. MORTON.
HUGH SCOTT.

ABBREVIATED BIOGRAPHY, LEWIS LICHTENSTEIN STRAUSS

Government service

1917–19: Secretary to Herbert C. Hoover (then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium) in relief operations overseas, and in the U.S. Food Administration. U.S. delegate at final Armistice Convention.

1941–46: In Naval Reserve 1926; active duty from February 1941 to May 1946; successively promoted through officer grades to the rank of rear admiral.

1946: Appointed member of the first Atomic Energy Commission; resigned in April 1950.

1946–52: Member of the Naval Research Advisory Committee.

1950: Appointed consultant to Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

1950–58: Adviser on occasions to congressional and executive agencies studying and reporting on production and procurement problems for the Department of Defense.

1953: Completed report on "Hazardous Duty and Other Special Pays," requested by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

1953: Appointed special assistant to President Eisenhower on March 9.

1953–58: Nominated to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on June 24, confirmed by the Senate on June 27, and took oath of office on July 2. Designated Chairman. Retired at end of 5-year term, June 30, 1958.

1955 and 1958: Chairman of U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conferences on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva, Switzerland, August 8–20, 1955, and September 1–13, 1958.

1958: Appointed special assistant to the President on matters concerning atoms for peace.

1958: Appointed on October 24, as Secretary of Commerce; took oath of office, November 13.

Business service

1919–46: Associated with the investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., New York, N.Y. Became partner in 1929, resigning in 1946 to take office as AEC Commissioner.

At various times was director of business enterprises, including Radio Corp. of America, National Broadcasting Co., General American Transportation Corp., U.S. Rubber Co., Industrial Rayon Corp., Hudson & Manhattan Railroad, Rockefeller Bros., Inc., Rockefeller Center, Inc., Merchants Fire Assurance Co., etc.

1950: Consultant and financial adviser to Messrs. Rockefeller.

Decorations, honors, and degrees

Awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; and the Legion of Merit with Gold Star (Navy) in lieu of a second award and an Oak Leaf Cluster (Army) in lieu of a third award.

Officer of the Legion of Honor (France); Grand Officer, Order of Leopold (Belgium); and other decorations from foreign governments.

1958: Awarded the Medal of Freedom by President Eisenhower in person in July. Recipient of 23 honorary degrees from colleges and universities in the United States and abroad.

Trusteeships and other offices

President of the Board of Trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

Trustee of the Hampton Institute, the Sloan-Kettering Institute Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases, the New York Institute for the Crippled and the Disabled, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Belgian-American Educational Foundation, Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., Virginia Museum of Fine Arts at Richmond, and Congregation Emanuel of the City of New York (also its past president).

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATORS SCHOEPPEL, THURMOND, AND LAUSCHE

We believe it also worthy of mention that the nomination under consideration is for a Cabinet post, and as such, is an appointment to a position within the official family of the President.

As former Governors of our respective States, we are particularly sensitive to the fact that a Chief Executive is accountable to the people themselves for the conduct of members of the Executive's official family, or administration. Since the Chief Executive must, in the final analysis, answer for the actions of his official family or Cabinet, we feel that the President should be given the widest latitude in deciding whether the nominee's philosophy of government is acceptable; and that the Senate, in considering confirmation, should minimize consideration of his philosophy of government unless a question of loyalty is involved.

This viewpoint applies particularly to the objections to the nominee's confirmation raised by witnesses, whose own philosophy is basically opposed to that of the nominee and who, until challenged during the hearings, assumed the role of spokesmen for science.

The purported reason for these witnesses' objections, in essence, was that the nominee had in the past demonstrated that he was vindictive. As the principal example of the vindictiveness they charged, they cited the nominee's action with respect to the withdrawal of the security clearance of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. The vindictiveness which allegedly motivated the nominee, according to the testimony of these witnesses, arose from the fact that Dr. Oppenheimer had opposed testing of the hydrogen bomb and had favored certain shipments of isotopes to friendly nations, on both of which questions the nominee admittedly felt quite strongly to the contrary.

In every facet of this issue, there was involved solely a question of judgment. On the Oppenheimer case, the nominee was one of nine in an official position who was required to pass on the revocation of the security clearance. The decision of the three-man Gray Board was reviewed by the Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, and thereafter by the five-man Atomic Energy Commission itself. The Gray Board decision was 2 to 1 to revoke the security clearance, in which the manager of the AEC concurred and the Gray Board's decision was upheld on review by the Commission by a vote of 4 to 1. The very number of persons who participated officially in the Oppenheimer case indicated conclusively that the decision was a matter of judgment, not of personal prejudice.

There has certainly been no question of loyalty raised with respect to the nominee. On the contrary, the adverse scientists testified that the nominee's allegedly poor judgment, on which they based their objection

to his confirmation, stemmed from what they suggested was an over-security-consciousness which permeated the nominee's thinking. If the nominee erred in his judgment, it was on the side of our Nation's security for which, in our opinion, he should be commended, rather than condemned.

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL.
STROM THURMOND.
FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE

Through the years I have had the opportunity sufficient in my own reasoning to appraise the nominee, Lewis L. Strauss, and to form my judgment of his qualifications for appointment to the Cabinet of the President of the United States. It is not within my province to pass upon him for any other office or any other purpose—political or economic.

The chasm that separates us in these two categories is wide and, in some instances, unbridgeable. Furthermore, it is not my purpose to persuade the thinking of any other person. It is possible that I do not share the reasoning of any other individual on this committee. I vote my own conscience alone.

In these open hearings I have already voiced the qualifications to which I felt all testimony should be addressed. While these were expressed in running comment during the proceedings I see no reason to add or subtract from them. These qualifications are:

1. The character and integrity of the nominee as it affects his membership in the President's Cabinet.

2. No conflict of interest.

3. Sufficient stability, emotionally and temperamentally, for the position to which he is nominated.

4. The competence, morally and intellectually, to assume the responsibility.

The committee has made an exhaustive record, but nothing materially new has been adduced with which I was not already familiar and, I dare say, not known to the President who nominated him to this responsibility.

I did not know the nominee until I was appointed as a member of the Joint Committee of the Congress on Atomic Energy. But since then, because of our official responsibilities, we came in frequent and close contact, especially so in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Agreements for Cooperation. It was my responsibility to work out with the nominee, his colleagues on the Commission, and staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission 43 bilateral agreements for cooperation with 41 nations.

Moreover, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations in 1955 where the resolution for the establishment of the International Agency for the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy was discussed and enacted, again at the Atoms for Peace Conference at Geneva in the same year, and again as a congressional adviser to the Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency at the United Nations in 1956, and also at the first general conference of the Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna in 1957, I was brought in close association with the nominee to work out our assigned tasks.

In all of these dealings I found Mr. Strauss to be patriotic, honorable, and competent.

We did not always agree and I did not expect perfection. I would not trespass on the divine to say, "There is no fault in this man."

From a similar set of experiences there are those who make a different deduction. They too are honorable men whose record of patriotic service is unimpeachable. I do not quarrel with their right to reason as they may. I merely vote my own conscience in this matter as I feel it concerns our country.

I vote to recommend the confirmation of Lewis L. Strauss as a man who has given to our country an effective patriotism over a period of 40 years and as one who, in my opinion, will make a good Secretary of Commerce.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
By C. J. MAISANO,
Administrative Assistant.

MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

I

Lewis L. Strauss was given a recess appointment as Secretary of Commerce on October 24, 1958, and began serving in that capacity on November 13, 1958. His nomination was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 17, 1959. The committee was compelled to cancel hearings originally scheduled for February, and on March 2 announced hearings for later that month.

Hearings were held on March 17 and 18, and were then suspended because of advice to the committee that Secretary Strauss had previous commitments and because of the official Easter recess. The chairman had suggested the appointment of a subcommittee to expedite proceedings, but upon objection by the minority members the matter was kept in the full commitee. This technically required a quorum, which put the hearings in conflict with other committee business and senatorial duties. Hearings were resumed on April 21, and 14 hearings were held in the next 18 weekdays. During the entire series of 16 hearings Mr. Strauss testified at length in his own behalf and as to questions of policy raised by the committee with respect to matters within its jurisdiction over the Department of Commerce. In addition, he requested and was given the unusual opportunity to speak in rebuttal at the conclusion of the testimony of each of the witnesses who appeared in opposition to his confirmation. Senators JAVITS and KEATING, of New York, testified in the nominee's behalf and a statement in his support was read for Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa. In addition, former Senator Bricker, of Ohio; Dr. Edward Teller, and Dr. Detlev W. Bronk appeared in support of the nomination. Letters urging confirmation were received from Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana; and Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, and were incorporated in the record.

The witnesses testifying in opposition to confirmation were Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, Senator Anderson, of New Mexico; Senator McCarthy, of Minnesota; Dr. David R. Inglis, Dr. David L. Hill, Jarrell Garonzik, James B. Carey, and Benjamin C. Sigal. There was placed in the record a letter from Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, opposing confirmation. In addition, Drew Pearson, Jack Anderson, Robert J. Dodds, Jr., and Arthur Arundel testified briefly with respect to questions which arose during the hearings. This testimony, together with materials inserted into the record, occupies 1,128 pages of printed record.

On May 19, 1959, the committee met in executive session to consider the nomination. At that time Senators PASTORE, THURMOND, SCHOEPPEL, BUTLER, COTTON, CASE, MORTON, and SCOTT voted to report the nomination favorably, while Senators MAGNUSON, MONRONEY, SMATHERS, YARBOROUGH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, HARTKE, and MCGEE voted to the contrary.

II. The Senate's role in connection with nominations

The undersigned strongly believe that the Senate should not confirm the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. This is a conclusion which we do not reach lightly and without the deepest consideration, because we believe, as do those supporting this nomination, that great latitude should be given to a President in the selection of individuals to fill high posts in Government. However, we cannot in good conscience agree with the contention frequently advanced since this nomination was submitted to the Senate that we who serve in that body should automatically and unquestioningly give our consent to every nomination.

The Constitution provides that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law."

We do not understand that this requirement of the advice and consent of the Senate on major appointments was improvidently included in our Constitution. We believe, rather, that it is one of the most important of the checks and balances which have contributed so greatly to the vitality and stability of our system of government. We believe the Senate should no more abuse its power to withhold its consent than the President should abuse his power to veto laws enacted by the Congress. It is clear that there have been and will continue to be instances in which both of these restraints are entirely proper. This was so intended by the Constitution. We are not prepared to abdicate the role assigned to the Senate by the Constitution. When serious questions are raised as to the fitness of a nominee, as is true in this case, we feel that the Senate must discharge its function carefully and resolutely. The performance of its duty may be both distasteful and time consuming but it cannot be shirked on either ground.

It appears to us that those who contend that the President should be completely unhampered in the choice of his Cabinet should, if they are sincere, seek to amend the Constitution accordingly. We believe that in most cases the restraint inherent in the Senate's power to withhold its consent is effectuated by the incentive provided for the exercise of great care before a nomination is proposed. If this check upon the power of the Executive were removed or denied all effectiveness by abandonment of the prerogative, the way would be opened for abuses. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution as it is now written.

A. Differences in Philosophy Cannot Be Controlling

We agree that a President may appoint associates who support his political views, if no violence is done to the Constitution or to our democratic processes. This remains true when, as now, the President is of one party and the majority of the Senate of another. We do not, therefore, base our opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss upon the differences in opinion which no doubt exist between us and the nominee on a number of important political, social, and economic issues.

Some or all of us have perhaps differed with Mr. Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract; on the development of atomic power and the related controversy over the Gore-Holifield bill; on the threat of radioactive fallout to the health and genetic future of our people; on the possibility of detection of atomic tests as a basis for enforceable limitations on such tests in the future; on the proper role of our systems of personnel security and classification of information in providing the maximum of freedom and public information consonant with sound national security; or on the policies to be pursued in the fields of international relations and foreign trade. We have not reached our conclusions as to Mr. Strauss' qualifications

solely upon any disagreements we may have as to these matters.

During the first 4 days of hearings, the committee interrogated Mr. Strauss with regard to various matters within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. Beyond these preliminary inquiries traditionally addressed to nominees for important positions, we are confident that even a cursory reading of the record will demonstrate that we were not only concerned with Mr. Strauss' position on questions of substantive policy. Rather, we were more concerned as time went on with questions of the nominee's attitude toward Congress, his past relations with Congress, and the methods he followed in the course of our own hearings.

B. The Basic Criteria

Confirmation should be denied a nominee for a Cabinet post only for very compelling reasons. Two criteria were cited by Senator Cotton during the course of our hearings—though there may well be other factors which would have to be considered. In essence, the criteria were that a nomination should be rejected for lack of integrity or lack of competence.

As to the latter point, we freely concede that Mr. Strauss has demonstrated competence in the investment banking field and rendered wartime service in the Navy. He no doubt possesses the capacity to direct significant business enterprises or to administer certain types of governmental programs. However, this does not necessarily establish competence for the post to which he has been nominated.

When related to a major administrative and policymaking post in the executive branch of our Government, competence involves something more than mere capability in other ventures. It also involves balance, stability, and appreciation for differing views, a willingness to abandon or modify earlier views when their error is demonstrated, and an ability to work with others in the difficult but essential adjustment of the conflicting interests of different segments and sections of our Nation. If competence in Government entails these and similar traits and abilities—and we believe it does—then Mr. Strauss' record leaves us unconvinced of his competence for the high office to which he seeks confirmation.

It is true that his activities have been impressive in some aspects. We believe, however, that a careful scrutiny of his performance as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from July 3, 1953, to June 30, 1958—and that constitutes his principal record in the field of civil administration—leaves one with grave doubts that he could serve effectively as Secretary of Commerce. We believe that the public record as well as the hearings before our committee indicate rather clearly that he overturned a successful pattern of Commission operation, that he involved the Commission for the first time in partisan political controversy, that he estranged a substantial segment of the country's scientists, and that he substantially impaired what had become, prior to his chairmanship, a very effective working relationship with the Congress.

We do not believe that a man can be adjudged competent for a Cabinet post unless there exists a sound basis for mutual confidence between him and the Congress, despite a showing of the capabilities for competence. As we have already indicated, this does not depend upon political agreement. Now and in recent years Congress has enjoyed satisfactory relations with many executive officials who frequently held sharply opposed views on fundamental policy. This has been true because there existed mutual respect and esteem between them and because the Congress felt assurance that these officials were dealing openly and fairly with it and that the information imparted to the committees of Congress was reliable and sufficiently complete to serve as the basis for congressional action. The country gained by this relationship. We are forced reluctantly to conclude that there is no likelihood that this vital mutual respect and its resulting relationship can exist between Mr. Strauss and the Congress. This would be a loss to what we consider democratic processes at a time when democracy is on trial.

Based in part upon the past record of his relations with different committees of the Congress, and even more strongly upon his conduct before our committee, we have come to the conviction that Mr. Strauss does not understand the proper relationship between the legislative and executive branches. The record indicates he claims for himself the right to withhold certain information from Congress. The record also indicates such withholding is without basis in law, and that the nominee had no concern for the law in this respect. From the record it is clear that the nominee time after time has resisted furnishing the appropriate committees of the Congress with information needed in order for Congress to properly perform its legislative functions. This has led to seriously adverse consequences in the atomic energy field, and so we believe it would in the important post of Secretary of Commerce.

In our opinion, he sought to mislead our committee either by means of what we considered direct misrepresentations of fact or by resort to half truths intended to divert the committee from full discovery of the relevant facts. This course of conduct was repeated so often that it must be judged to have been deliberate. He has so impaired our confidence that we cannot recommend his confirmation.

III. Surprising course taken by hearings

We recognize that Mr. Strauss has sought to serve the best interests of the country, as he sees them, and has made real contributions to its welfare. Most of the committee expected at the outset to vote for his confirmation. We embarked upon our hearings with the expectation that those who were critical of Mr. Strauss would air their past differences, that he would explain his position on these matters, and that conflicts would be resolved.

At the outset the committee discussed with Mr. Strauss certain matters with which he would deal as Secretary of Commerce. But even in this phase of our hearings we began to encounter half facts and misstatements which later seemed to us to become habitual. For instance, on the first day of our hearings in his prepared statement the committee received a very distorted view in respect to his role in the development of a long-range detection system and the development of the H-bomb, particularly in light of subsequent testimony. Mr. Strauss continued this pattern the second day, making two material misstatements of fact with regard to a very important matter, namely, his rejection of an application for a license to export. This was the central feature of a fairly extensive discussion of foreign trade policy and is dealt with at some length below and in the appendix to the hearings. This matter deals with his responsibilities as Secretary of Commerce.

* * * * *

We became mainly concerned over allegations bearing upon Mr. Strauss' allegedly devious and delusive methods which he had employed in certain cited cases. The record of his past performance was convincing in a number of instances. Together with other facts the weight of evidence which primarily has impelled us to our conclusion that Mr. Strauss is lacking in the sincerity and the tolerance required for confirmation came in the manner in which he attempted to meet the criticism leveled against him. (In addition to this, other facts bearing on our conclusion will be given in the views of other Senators included below.)

* * * * *

(1) The nominee was guilty of an outright misrepresentation in regard to his recent rejection, as Secretary of Commerce, of an export license for the shipment of steel pipe. Mr. Strauss informed the committee that his action was taken with the "complete concurrence" of the Department of State—that "there was absolutely no difference between the State Department and the Department of Commerce on this." In actual fact, State's position was completely opposed to that of Commerce—the State Department had objected in unequivocal terms to the denial of the license. Its objection was a matter of record and Mr. Strauss knew of it when he spoke. As the final authority for making a decision in this matter lay with the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Strauss was perfectly within his legal right in overriding State's views. In this light, his outright misrepresentation of the position of another agency is all the more shocking. (See hearings, pp. 43–44 and p. 1067.)

(2) The nominee challenged the integrity of an official transcript of a hearing before a committee of the House, thus impugning the integrity of those responsible for this preparation. He charged that a reported statement by him before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in 1956, in which he had accepted full responsibility for having asked for the preparation of a highly embarrassing letter to the Joint Committee, had in fact never been made. Such an assertion, by itself, reflects a virtually contemptuous attitude toward congressional procedures. Whatever defense the nominee might have had for making this charge evaporated completely when a check of the hearing reporter's stenotype notes showed conclusively that the portion of the record in question had not been altered in any way whatsoever. (See hearings, pp. 978 and 981.)

* * * * *

(4) The nominee consistently offered only partial or oblique defenses in his effort to reply to Senator ANDERSON'S charges of failure to keep the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "fully and currently informed" of AEC's activities as required by law.

As an example of this, the nominee completely ignored the Senator's assertion that Mr. Strauss had suppressed an important letter from the Attorney General concerning the legality of the 1956 amendments to the agreement for cooperation with England. Instead, he based his defense on the wisdom of the proposed amendments to the agreement and on his notification to the Joint Committee that negotiations had taken place. Even as to the latter, he sought to distort the record in order to establish that the Joint Committee had been informed in a timely manner. Actually, contrary to the mandate of the law and contrary to the advice of the Attorney General, the Joint Committee was not informed of these important negotiations until after the completed agreement had been submitted to the President for his signature (hearings, pp. 598–607, 687–695, 1024–1030).

(5) The nominee claimed credit for unsupportable public benefits from a prospective transaction while disclaiming knowledge of or responsibility for underlying issues that question the validity of his plans. When the Dixon-Yates power contract became jeopardized by the conflict of interest of a key participant, Mr. Strauss who was principal architect of the contract denied: (1) Knowledge of Senator HILL'S speech regarding the dual role of Adolphe Wenzell and thereby denied responsibility for proceeding on such a questionable plan (hearings, pp. 333–334); (2) knowledge of the false chronology on Dixon-Yates issued by the AEC on August 21, 1954 (hearings, p.

285) even though Mr. Strauss, as AEC Chairman, discussed with Mr. Hughes the contents of that record (hearings, p. 493); and (3) knowledge of the Government capacity of Wenzell even though Wenzell testified that he told Mr. Strauss that he represented the Bureau of the Budget (hearings, p. 319).

(6) The nominee was prone to accept only official responsibility for ill-advised official actions by the Atomic Energy Commission while trying to create the impression that he in fact really had no connection with them.

An example of this was his explanation of the circumstances surrounding the classification of an adverse safety report on the Detroit reactor project made in June of 1956 by an advisory committee to the AEC. Mr. Strauss admitted that the report's classification, and its consequent suppression from the public, had been a mistake—a mistake which he now seeks to attribute to members of his staff. Yet, a review of the record shows conclusively that he knew this report had been classified and in fact had vigorously defended its classification in correspondence with the Joint Committee. (See hearings, p. 607, and Joint Committee on Atomic Energy print, "A Study of AEC Procedures and Organization in the Licensing of Reactor Facilities," April 1957, pp. 117–122.)

(7) The nominee often resorted to unnecessary untruths in what appeared to be an attempt to put himself in the best possible light before the committee. He categorically denied, for example, that he had ever asked for any information on adverse witness, Dr. David Inglis, and sought to create the impression that the only data which he had received was furnished to him gratuitously by a member of his staff at the time Dr. Inglis testified. Yet, when the question of the nominee's attempts to gain possibly unfavorable security information on Dr. Inglis was put seriously in issue, he admitted that he had personally called the AEC prior to the Dr. Inglis appearance for background material. His exact words were, "I have never asked for anything on Mr. Inglis in my life" (hearings, p. 827). This statement was made May 11, 1959. On May 13 1959 (hearings, p. 844), a letter was read into the hearings from the Atomic Energy Commission dated May 11, 1959, that flatly stated Mr. Strauss had inquired about Dr. Inglis about April 20, and had been given some information on April 21.

When questioned on this point, Mr. Strauss, after first saying, "I see absolutely no significance in whether the date was the 22d of April or May the 5th or what," finally stated, "I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman, on this point" (hearings, pp. 845–846).

Some of the foregoing it appeared to us was not dictated by necessity, because other and better answers or explanations seemed possible. But this would have involved admission by Mr. Strauss that he had been in error, or had forgotten something he had once known, or had misunderstood the charge against him. Such things are understandable, because they involve familiar human failings—but Mr. Strauss seems unable to confess to error in any way. He still insists that the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 forbade the export of isotopes for metallurgical research though the other four Atomic Energy Commissioners, the General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the majority of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (including Senator McMahon, the principal author of the act) all disagreed. He still insists that Senator ANDERSON made his case on isotopes on section 5 of the act whereas he (Strauss) had made his on section 10 (hearings, p. 610), although anyone who reads the record can see that Senator ANDERSON properly considered the sections jointly (hearings, pp. 498–499).

Mr. Strauss has shown a willingness to seek to fit the facts to his preconceived notions as regards the fallout danger (hearing, pp. 433 and 728) and the ability to detect bomb tests (hearings, pp. 441 and 558). He has demonstrated a tendency to carry over from a high security area (atomic energy) to the area of foreign commerce his highly restrictive concepts as to the permissible degree of contact with any nation. The act of February 14, 1903 (5 U.S.C. 596) in setting out the duties of the Department of Commerce, provided, among other things, that "It shall be the province and duty of said Department to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, * * * of the United States;". His rigidity of position and insistence upon policy decisions which ignore or make over the facts hardly seem to promise the kind of flexibility and adaptability required of a Secretary of Commerce in the discharge of his duties both at home and abroad (hearings, p. 1074). These limitations raise serious questions as to the qualifications of the nominee for the position of Secretary of Commerce.

The nominee questioned the integrity of Members of the Congress, charging in one instance that the records and reports of a committee had been changed to his detriment (hearings, p. 976). He insisted on this position to the point of telling a member of our committee that a report was not a report, and that he should be suspicious of the man who supplied it (hearings, p. 973). This statement was made almost immediately after Mr. Strauss had been told the chairman of the committee involved had stated, in writing, that this committee could "use any portion of it without reservation as this is the official copy of the report of the subcommittee" (hearings, p. 971).

Two chairmen of important committees of Congress, one in the House and one in the Senate, have openly and publicly charged Mr. Strauss, when head of the Atomic Energy Commission, with giving false and misleading information to the Congress and to the public.

We believe the printed hearings on this nomination demonstrate how hard it is to get a direct and complete answer from the nominee. The questioning went on for days, yet we had no choice but to continue if we wanted answers. Standing alone, it might be said that some of the things asked were not too important, but tied into the whole proceeding, an impartial and unbiased reader will clearly see the necessity for the manner in which we proceeded.

We think the key role played by Mr. Strauss in the notorious Dixon-Yates case was a deliberate use of public office for improper aid to private business. When the details of this abortive attempt to cripple TVA was finally brought to the attention of the public through the efforts of Members of Congress and some of our great newspapers, the President was forced to repudiate the contract. But Mr. Strauss still defends that contract, as a good one (hearing, p. 329). The hearings disclose that there are many unresolved questions that indicate, we believe, a great deal more knowledge on the part of Mr. Strauss, than he has yet revealed.

The record and background of the Dixon-Yates case is not such as to inspire confidence in this nominee's future relations with Congress and the public, if he is confirmed.

There have been many editorials, discussions, and even arguments as to the constitutional privilege of the President to be unhampered in his selection of his official family. This has been much on our minds.

On this point, one of the distinguished constitutional lawyers of our time, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, senior Senator from Wyoming, wrote to the editor of the Washington Post under date of May 8, 1959. His letter, which we believe ably answers these arguments, follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1959.

EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I not take the liberty of suggesting that your editorial of Saturday, May 2, 1959, entitled "Grasping at Strauss," seems to be based upon a mistaken constitutional premise, namely, that "The President, we believe, ought to be entitled to have in his Cabinet the persons in whom he has confidence."

This is not what the framers of the Constitution believed. They were of the opinion that the President should be required to have the advice and consent of the Senate not only to the appointment of Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls and Judges of the Supreme Court, but also "all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law."

After placing that limitation upon the power of the President to make appointments, the framers of the Constitution added another proviso in these words: "But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior offices, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments." It is not necessary to point out that Congress has never by law authorized the President to appoint without limitation persons "in whom he has confidence" to his Cabinet.

To sustain your argument that the Senate should waive its constitutional power to give advice and consent to the appointment of Cabinet members, you must be able to show that the drafters of the Constitution were wrong in the belief that the public interest requires the Senate to have a check upon the selection of Cabinet members.

Is there any present reason to support this view of the members of the Constitutional Convention? Yes. It is to be found not only in the traditional American principle that this is a government by law, not a government by men, but also in the words of your editorial. You said:

"This newspaper has not been by any means an admirer of Admiral Strauss. It has differed with him strongly in the Oppenheimer case, on his defense of the Dixon-Yates contract, on excessive secrecy in nuclear matters and on a number of other important policy questions."

Let me add, it is more important now that we have a President who delegates to others so much of his power that the Senate should not waive its constitutional right to deny confirmation in the case of a nominee whose record amply establishes the charge that he aspires to have his own way in matters of public importance, the Congress and even the President to the contrary notwithstanding. In the Dixon-Yates case Mr. Strauss denied the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate information with respect to the negotiations after the President had indicated his desire to have a full disclosure made, but also in the present hearings, despite the fact that the President had ordered the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract, Mr. Strauss proclaimed his view that it was a good contract. It was not a good contract from the public point of view, because it was a contract designed to defeat the purpose of a law of the United States by transferring to a private utility combination a function that Congress had given to the TVA.

The battle that is being waged now in the United States is a battle to transfer to private management the powers granted by the Constitution to the Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. It is not

necessary in a case like this to find "evidence of serious misconduct or some similar compelling disqualification," as your editorial asserts. It is only necessary to insist that a man nominated to be a Cabinet officer shall have a record which justifies the belief that he will support a government by law instead of a government by men.

This constitutional view was never better exemplified than in the case of Charles Beecher Warren of Michigan, nominated on March 5, 1925, to be Attorney General of the United States. He was rejected on March 10, 1925, by the Senate by a vote of 41 to 39. President Coolidge renominated him 2 days later and the Senate again rejected him, this time by a vote of 46 to 39. He was opposed by both Senators from the State of Michigan—James Couzens, a Republican, and Woodbridge N. Ferris, a Democrat. The burden of the argument against him was made by Senator Thomas J. Walsh of Montana, whose qualifications as a constitutional lawyer no one will deny.

Senator Walsh, in opposing the nomination of Warren, made no personal attack upon him and did not oppose him for any inferior office. He said he was not qualified to be the Attorney General because of his association in the activities of the American Sugar Co. which was then generally known as the Sugar Trust. These activities, Senator Walsh contended, were such that he could not be entrusted with the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Thus the President's nominee, under clear constitutional authority, was rejected because, in the belief of a majority of the Senate, public policy required his rejection.

This is the situation that exists now in the case of Mr. Strauss. Public policy requires his rejection as Secretary of Commerce. Surely the President can find another nominee in whom he has equal confidence who will be qualified both from the President's personal point of view and from the public policy point of view.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senator from Wyoming.

It appears to us from careful attention to the testimony, that Mr. Strauss has withheld or manipulated information to serve policy or personal ends. On the basis of the record, we have grave doubts as to whether or not information furnished by Mr. Strauss, as Secretary of Commerce would be accurate or complete.

We believe that Congress is entitled to all the facts—whether we agree with the conclusions of the Secretary, or his policies, and we say again that we would not vote against Secretary Strauss solely because of disagreement with his policy positions, but the hearings developed cold hard facts on even this aspect, that go deep into any hope of his ever being, or being able to be, a competent Secretary of Commerce.

As was so well stated in an editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 7, 1959, "If a Cabinet officer must have the confidence of the President, he must have the confidence of a majority of Senators as well. Though the majority cannot fairly demand that a nominee agree with its views, it can and should demand that he possess qualifications of character and a record which warrant consent to his nomination."

Conclusion

We have concluded for all the reasons set forth above—partly on evidence as to his past record, but mostly on the basis of his conduct and demeanor before us—that Lewis L. Strauss is lacking in the degree of integrity and competence essential to proper performance of the duties of the office to which he has been nominated. We regret that this is so, but we cannot otherwise read the record he has made before our committee.

We therefore recommend that the Senate reject the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Respectfully submitted.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON.
GEORGE A. SMATHERS.
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.
CLAIR ENGLE.
E. L. BARTLETT.
VANCE HARTKE.
GALE W. MCGEE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

There was a direct conflict of testimony regarding the role of the nominee and his contacts with Mr. Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates negotiations. Even if I could accept the nominee's version of his participation, I am forced by the weight of evidence and the long testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee to conclude that he knew much more about the negotiations than he revealed before three Senate committees, and that he was one of the chief architects of this bad contract.

It was so directly contrary to the interests of the people of the United States that I cannot but expect from him in the Department of Commerce, a continuation of policies not in the public interest.

The people I represent would find me sadly lacking if I did not voice vigorous protest of such policies in Government, and surely would find me wholly lacking if I should give my advice and consent.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

SEPARATE MINORITY VIEW OF SENATOR MONRONEY

I must reluctantly recommend that the Senate decline to consent to the appointment of Mr. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

It has been suggested that there is something improper in the Senate's withholding its consent to an appointment to a Cabinet post. Because of the intimate relationship of trust and confidence which must exist between the President and the members of his Cabinet, it is argued that the selection of his Cabinet is the sole prerogative of the President, in which the Senate must automatically concur after the formality of a hearing. This view, widely urged in connection with the confirmation of Mr. Strauss, implies that no conduct of the nominee short of criminality is sufficient to justify his rejection.

While a plausible argument might be made for such a procedure, in my view it is not the one provided in our Constitution. I do not regard the Senate's consent as a formality or the withholding of its consent as tantamount to conviction on impeachment. Hamilton wrote of the power of the Senate to obstruct the course of honors, and emphasized that "If an ill appointment should be made, the Executive for nominating, and the Senate for approving, would participate, though in different degrees, in the opprobrium * * *." Nor is the Senate limited, in the exercise of its constitutional obligation, as to the grounds on which its consent may be withheld, the authors of the Constitution wisely leaving it to the Senate to determine the circumstances which would justify its disapproval of a nomination.

It is true that the Senate's consent to an appointment has seldom been refused, largely because of the wise resort to its advice, even in advance of a nomination. In the rather rare periods when different parties control the executive and legislative branches, the Senate has much less opportunity to exercise the advisory function and can only discharge its constitutional obligation by granting or withholding consent.

Mr. Strauss comes before the Senate for promotion to a Cabinet post, after a long period of service in an important, but lesser, position in the Government. The Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy appeared before this committee and testified concerning the conduct of Mr. Strauss during the years in which he was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The incidents discussed in his testimony reflect a continuing pattern of refusal to deal frankly and openly with the Congress; of withholding information which there was a statutory obligation to divulge; of evasion and obfuscation. My association with this witness is sufficient to convince me that his charges are not made lightly, but from deep conviction born of personal experience. I do not propose to reargue the sufficiency of the examples offered to illustrate this pattern, for Mr. Strauss has adhered to it in his conduct and testimony during the hearings on his confirmation.

He labeled it "an unqualified falsehood" that he had opposed the export of isotopes for medical research in 1949, but later acknowledged that he had done so in 1947.

He denied having ever asked for information on a hostile witness, and when confronted with evidence that he had done so, denied that he had denied it.

He devoted several days of testimony to a discussion of his views on the functions and responsibilities of the Department of Commerce, but avoided any reference to proposals for its drastic reorganization.

He denied that he had made a statement attributed to him in a transcript of hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, which statement was inconsistent with his testimony before this committee, charging that the transcript had been altered—a charge which later was disproved.

He stated that limitations on exports of pipe to the Soviet Union had been imposed with the complete concurrence of the State Department, when in fact they had been imposed over its written objection.

He alternately exaggerated or minimized his role in decisions in direct relation to whether they now appear to have been wise or unwise, proper or improper, acknowledging no error of judgment during all his years of public service.

His initial assertions on almost every topic were misleading, and only after persistent questioning was the full story available to the committee.

Information on the conduct of their government is not only the people's right, but an absolute necessity for their effective supervision of that government. They must know, and know in time to be heard before action is taken. Likewise their representatives must be fully informed if they are to legislate wisely. Both the people and the press are entitled to expect from the legislative branch of Government the vigilant protection of the people's right to know. For the Senate to seek to give that protection in the exercise of its power of confirmation is not only proper, it is obligatory.

I conceive it to be basic to democratic government that the people, and their elected representatives in the Congress, are entitled to receive from the officials of the executive branch, not merely literal truth, but full information, freely given without design to soothe, to confuse, or to divert. Because I am convinced that this cannot be expected of Mr. Strauss, I do not believe that it is in the public interest that he be confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

MIKE MONRONEY.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Dixon-Yates controversy was one of the matters in which the nominee was involved. Much of the time of the committee was also taken up with a consideration of the nominee's viewpoint regarding the so-called separation of powers and executive privilege. Much

time was taken up with previous examinations of the nominee before other committees; and a great deal of the evidence dealt with questions involving the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the entire field of atomic energy, all the way from the H-bomb down to isotope shipments to Norway. The committee has covered most of those items.

Following the chronology, the minority views state the position of the minority as fairly as we knew how to state it, in view of what we felt. From our minority views, I now read the following:

II. THE SENATE'S ROLE IN CONNECTION WITH NOMINATIONS

The undersigned strongly believe that the Senate should not confirm the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

After due consideration, we seven Senators say that; and we add the following:

This is a conclusion which we do not reach lightly and without the deepest consideration, because we believe, as do those supporting this nomination, that great latitude should be given to a President in the selection of individuals to fill high posts in Government. However, we cannot in good conscience agree with the contention frequently advanced since this nomination was submitted to the Senate that we who serve in that body should automatically and unquestioningly give our consent to every nomination.

The Constitution provides that the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

We do not understand that this requirement of the advice and consent of the Senate on major appointments was improvidently included in our Constitution.

I am sure the Founding Fathers had good reason for it, and discussed it at some length.

Then we say:

We believe, rather, that it is one of the most important of the checks and balances which have contributed so greatly to the vitality and stability of our system of Government. We believe the Senate should no more abuse its power to withhold its consent than the President should abuse his power to veto laws enacted by the Congress. It is clear that there have been and will continue to be instances in which both of these restraints are entirely proper.

And here is one.

Then we say:

This was so intended by the Constitution. We are not prepared to abdicate the role assigned to the Senate by the Constitution. When serious questions are raised as to the fitness of a nominee, as is true in this case, we feel that the Senate must discharge its function carefully and resolutely. The performance of its duty may be both distasteful and time consuming but it cannot be shirked on either ground.

It appears to us that those who contend that the President should be completely unhampered in the choice of his Cabinet should, if they are sincere, seek to amend the Constitution accordingly. We believe that in most cases the restraint inherent in the Senate's power to withhold its consent is effectuated by the incentive provided for the exercise of great care before a nomination is proposed.

Mr. President, at this point let me suggest that during the course of the hearings, and also several days before, and lately, I have heard some expressions of amazement by persons who say they cannot understand why the nomination of Mr. Strauss is controversial; they say they did not realize it was controversial. Well, Mr. President, perhaps they have not been paying close attention to the proceedings of Congress, or perhaps they did not have such knowledge of what has taken place. They state that he is a fine man, and they say they cannot understand the controversy.

I believe there was rather common knowledge of many of these controversies; and surely nothing received wider publicity all over the Nation, including in this body, than the so-called Dixon-Yates controversy in which his name was prominently mentioned.

Then in our minority views we state:

If this check upon the power of the Executive were removed or denied all effectiveness by abandonment of the prerogative, the way would be opened for abuses. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution as it is now written.

We further state:

A. Differences in philosophy cannot be controlling

We agree that a President may appoint associates who support his political views, if no violence is done to the Constitution or to our democratic processes. This remains true when, as now, the President is of one party and the majority of the Senate of another. We do not, therefore, base our opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss upon the differences in opinion which no doubt exist between us and the nominee on a number of important political, social, and economic issues.

Some or all of us have perhaps differed with Mr. Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract; on the development of atomic power and the related controversy over the Gore-Holifield bill; on the threat of radioactive fallout to the health and genetic future of our people;

And, Mr. President, the last mentioned is an important matter upon which a great deal of testimony was taken, and I am sure it is a matter on which the American people, even as of today, need real enlightenment:

On the possibility of detection of atomic tests as a basis for enforcible limitations on such tests in the future; on the proper role of our systems of personnel security and classification of information in providing the maximum of freedom and public information consonant with sound national security; or on the policies to be pursued in the fields of international relations and foreign trade. We have not reached our conclusions as to Mr. Strauss' qualifications solely upon any disagreements we may have as to these matters.

During the first 4 days of hearings, the committee interrogated Mr. Strauss with regard to various matters within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] mentioned some of those instances.

I read further from our minority views:

Beyond these preliminary inquiries traditionally addressed to nominees for important positions, we are confident—

And I am—

that even a cursory reading of the record will demonstrate that we were not only concerned with Mr. Strauss' position on questions of substantive policy. Rather, we were more concerned as time went on with questions of the nominee's attitude toward Congress, his past relations with Congress, and the methods he followed in the course of our own hearings.

Mr. President, from that point on, I think the minority views have gone into every detail, step by step, case by case, indexed and documented by testimony, from which we finally arrived at our conclusion.

Mr. President, I recommend the minority views and the individual views for reading.

There are many other matters which we could have discussed in a longer report. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I am not so sure that we should not have gone a great deal further into many matters which were brought up in the hearing. In other words, perhaps we should have taken the time to proceed deeper and further into some of those matters. But we felt that we could not take the time to do so, and that we did not have sufficient staff to do so, in view of the great number of matters which come before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and those which come before the Senate as a whole.

Mr. President, in concluding what I have to say this afternoon on this question, I repeat that I hope the debate will not be protracted or unduly long. However, I think there should be sufficient debate on the floor of the Senate, so that every Member of the Senate who did not have an opportunity to sit through the hearings will have sufficient information to be able to exercise his own judgment.

Before I yield to my friend, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], I also wish to state that I do not believe that any Member, including myself, who signed the minority views has ever sought, either since the hearings were held and since the report has been filed, or before then, to suggest or to use any suggestion or influence or to take advantage of any relationship with any other Senator, to ask him to vote either one way or the other on this nomination. I think we have been almost deliberate in our attempt not to be drawn into any such sort of an arrangement or any such campaign to induce any Senator to vote for or against this nominee. We have been deliberate, however, in documenting what we think is the case against him, in the hope that those who read the record and use their own judgment will probably see the issue as we see it.

Despite reports to the contrary, to the knowledge of the chairman there has been at no time any sort of a gathering, caucus, meeting, or anything else, in an attempt to line up any Senators on this side of the aisle so that it would be a partisan matter.

I have heard that Members on the other side of the aisle will vote solidly the other way. I do not know. But, surely, there are many fine Democrats on this side of the aisle who do not agree with us, and we have made no attempt to do anything but to suggest by our actions that if they have an honest disagreement with us, or we with them, that should determine their action.

I do not know of anyone in the committee, or outside the committee, or on the floor of the Senate, or in the leadership, or anywhere else, who has even made such a suggestion. The only time members of the committee, including the chairman, have ever discussed this matter, other than to submit statements as to the facts, has been when a Senator may have asked something about what happened in the hearing, because this matter has been so much in the public eye, or when he has asked us a question, and we have given him a courteous answer. That is going to be the attitude of the Senator from Washington during all the debate on the nomination.

All the facts are set forth in the hearings. Surely, there are enough instances, there has been enough said, enough evidence has been documented, so that each Senator can make up his mind, dictated by his own conscience.

I should like to mention one other matter. I know many Members of the Senate are lawyers. There has been some discussion among the lawyers in the Senate as to their interpretation of the Constitution on this question and matters pertaining to constitutional law. On many occasions since this nomination came to the Senate, the suggestion has been made that the President of the United States has the right to have as members of his Cabinet those whom he appoints, and that the Senate should allow him to exercise that right without any suggestion to him under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution.

I think that involves a very important legal question. The actual role of the Senate in the exercise of the advice and consent constitutional provision is sometimes misunderstood. As a result, a couple of pages in the report were used to discuss this question. I must confess we did not write it ourselves, because I thought the thesis of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on this question was so complete and so precise and so understandable by either a lawyer or a layman that his views on the question should be included in the report. I am sure every Senator, or anyone who knows him will agree with the statement in the report that he is one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers, not only in this body, but in the country.

Mr. President, the chairman of the committee submitted some individual views. Those views are very brief. They touch on a fundamental question. I read from my views:

> There was a direct conflict of testimony regarding the role of the nominee and his contacts with Mr. Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates negotiations. Even if I could accept the nominee's version of his participation, I am forced by the weight of evidence and the long testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee to conclude that he knew much more about the negotiations than he revealed before three Senate committees.

I am not only convinced that he knew more about those negotiations but I am almost firmly convinced that he was the chief architect of the Dixon-Yates contract. I can come to no other conclusion. But, of course, no one wants to have it suggested that he had been associated with that contract in any way. I am convinced that he was a part and parcel of it. Coming from where I do, Mr. President, I believe such negotiations and such a contract are directly contrary to the interests of the people of the United States. I am forced to conclude that the same kind of thinking would be transferred to the Department of Commerce. I would be sadly lacking in the representation of the people of my State if I did not make a vigorous protest against that kind of policy and thinking. And, I surely would be wholly lacking in my duty if I gave my advice and consent to the confirmation of the nomination. That is what I would be doing if I voted for the confirmation of the nomination. Many matters, of course, are controlling on this question, but, to me, this is the controlling one.

Mr. President, I have been hearing the testimony of witnesses before congressional committees for a long time. Before I came to Congress 23 years ago, I had a little experience both as a U.S. attorney and as a district attorney in my hometown of Seattle and King County. I have had much to do with witnesses. After a time, one can tell pretty well what the thoughts of witnesses are from what they say, just as some persons can tell a lot about my thinking if I were testifying.

I think there is something much bigger involved in this case than appears on the surface. I have been worried for a long time. I had not been worried much about my country before this. I remember, when World War II broke out, I thought it would be only a brief matter of time before it would end. All of us thought so. We thought we were so superior we could handle the situation and could work out way out of it. But conditions are becoming worse and worse.

I may be wrong, and I do not say this as a reflection on anyone's integrity or as a lack of confidence, but surely I have a right to have some thoughts regarding the nominee's thinking. I think he has—maybe honestly so—a sort of adamant attitude, almost a stubborness, which, it seems to me, is getting us nowhere in our relations with the world at large. Perhaps it is the proper course; only history will disclose. It bothers me, because I see the breach growing wider and wider and wider.

I say that such an adamant way of thinking—not moving, not trying to work things out—may be the best course in the long run; I do not know; but it seems to me it will lead us down a long road. It is not a road of no return, but I can only see one return if we continue, and that is a return to the whine of some bombs and falling walls and death.

I am hopeful that those who formulate our policy, those who conduct our policy, will look at the world in a little more flexible way, because we are going to have to live in it a long time under different conditions, and we are going to have to do something other than simply be inflexible in our opinions and in our views toward the hundreds of millions or billions of other people who live in the world.

I have many reasons for my position, but the real reason is documented in the report. We reached our conclusion reluctantly, but we have a duty which we must face. At times it has not been easy to make a decision. I hope that in this matter we are correct in our conclusions. I hope time will prove us to be correct, and that we shall make a contribution to the best interests of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his excellent, moderate, and fair presentation. I wish to say, as a new Member of the U.S. Senate, that this is the first nomination which has been vigorously contested as to which I have had an opportunity to sit through the hearings. I cannot imagine a more fair hearing being given to any man than was given to Mr. Strauss by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. Strauss was accorded every opportunity to answer every criticism against him. He was given the opportunity to sit at the witness table during the time those who testified against the confirmation of his nomination were testifying. He was permitted to interject during the testimony of witnesses who were testifying against him in answer to, and often disputing, statements which were made by the witnesses.

If I had been a witness against Mr. Strauss—and I was not—I would have taken rather serious exception, I think, to having the nominee sit there and interrupt every time he saw fit with reference to remarks made in a prepared statement.

Furthermore, the nominee was given the opportunity to rebut immediately and on the spot, following statements made by each of the witnesses, anything with which he disagreed.

As the chairman has stated, this was an unusual procedure. As I say, I had not previously participated in a hearing on a contested nomination. I assume it would be considered an unusual procedure.

Extreme fairness, moderation, and patience were exhibited by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which certainly have

not warranted some of the criticism he has received in the public press.

Moreover, our distinguished chairman did his best to accelerate the hearings, in the light of the calendar of business before his committee and before the Senate. There were continuous hearings in the afternoon, sometimes much to my inconvenience. If I had been an older and more senior Member of this body I might have protested the procedure, because in some instances the hearings were subject to a point of order. No such point of order was made by any Democrat or by any opponent of Mr. Strauss. The hearings continued, afternoon following afternoon, without objection from some of us, and many times without a quorum being present.

Mr. President, I want to compliment our distinguished chairman not only for the fair, moderate, temperate, and sensible statement he has made today, but also for the kind of management and chairmanship he gave to the hearings on this highly controversial and difficult question.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I only wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from California in regard to the excellent presentation this afternoon by the chairman of the committee.

I should like to add, likewise, my appreciation for the forthrightness of the ranking minority member of the committee. As one who sat through the hearings, I think we have had the varying positions very honestly and fairly represented here.

I think there needs to be a particular focus on the aspect of the matter which the Senator from California was just discussing, which was the fairness of the chairman himself in conducting the hearings under sometimes very trying circumstances. At times it was necessary to suspend the ground rules and to meet even when a quorum could not be scraped up in an attempt to keep the hearings moving along, because we were running behind. We met at times when the session of the Senate would have interfered, and when we had agreed in advance we would not meet, in an attempt to speed up the hearings.

I think this is a further tribute to the chairman of the committee, who was interested that there be no more delay than was absolutely necessary.

Finally, I think the fairness of the chairman to the nominee himself was one of the exemplary evidences of how to conduct a committee hearing. The chairman of our committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] leaned away over backward to accommodate Mr. Strauss. There were times when we even interrupted our committee hearings so that Mr. Strauss might make a speech he had long since committed himself to make elsewhere. I think this was a proper accommodation.

It was my observation that there was no attempt to abuse in any way Mr. Strauss' convenience, his requests, or his wishes.

I noted in the RECORD, Mr. President, after a comment by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] as to the importance of a very careful examination of a presidential nomination for a Cabinet position, which was well reasoned and carried forward in the discussion today by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that Mr. Strauss himself replied:

> I most certainly agree with you that there must be a detailed and careful examination of an appointment of this stature.

This, I think, was lived up to. I suppose in a way, the ultimate tribute to the chairman is paid not by his committee colleagues on both sides, but by the ladies and gentlemen of the press. Several of them mentioned in my presence—and I see two of them in the press gallery at the present time—that in all their experience in covering hearings on the Hill, they could not recall when a committee chairman had conducted himself with such responsibility and had leaned over so far backward to try to be fair to all concerned.

Mr. President, I think the chairman rightly deserves the plaudits of his colleagues, as well as of the American public, for his conduct in conducting a hearing on a question which was painful, difficult, and tortuous.

I should like to add a little footnote to the observations with regard to the sincere efforts, and I think successful efforts, to prevent any political insinuations with regard to the Senator's part in these deliberations. At no time do I know of an instance when any attempt was made to line up the antisentiment with regard to Mr. Strauss. At no time to my knowledge was there a call of any group of the committee to try to have a meeting of minds with regard to the candidate.

I do note, however, in a Washington newspaper printed the day before yesterday, June 3, that there is a quotation attributed to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], which suggests that there had been a discussion of this question by the minority policy committee of this body. That may be proper, and I have no quarrel with it. I merely wish the RECORD to show that fact.

The distinguished minority leader is further quoted as saying:

> I have no great alarm about defections on our side. I am sure of my troops.

I think that, too, is commendable. But I think the Record should show where this is being done.

To my knowledge, there has been no official majority effort to hold a policy meeting on this question. I think the chairman was absolutely correct in saying that this is a serious question. As he has said, the issues are deep, and the possible consequences are of such great moment that the question can be resolved only in the conscience of each Senator. It must be an individual resolution, rather than a party or group operation.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee for the high plane on which he placed the issue before this body today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Washington for the service he has rendered as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and for the fine manner in which the Strauss hearings were conducted during the period of time when he was present and presiding.

I do not believe Senators know all the difficulties under which the chairman labored. The chairman of the committee had sustained a broken foot. He had come to the committee hearings on that foot, in pain, for several days, unwilling to give up and go to a hospital, not knowing that the bones were broken. The foot became so badly swollen and the pain so intense that he was unable to bear any weight on it.

An examination revealed that the bones in the chairman's foot were broken. The foot was placed in a cast, and the chairman came to the committee hearings despite the pain, in an effort to expedite the hearings and to give the nominee an opportunity to have the hearings move forward. He came to the hearings day after day with his foot in a cast, walking with a cane, in intense pain, in order to keep the hearings moving. I think the fairness and calmness with which he presided are a great tribute to him. Often, he was the calmest person in the hearing room.

Such qualities are the result of his background as a State district attorney, as U.S. district attorney, as a Member of the House of Representatives, and as a U.S. Senator. I believe it required many years of service to give him the self-control and self-discipline necessary to enable him to conduct the hearing in the very fair manner in which it was conducted, while unjust attacks were being made upon him at the same time by the ranking minority member of the committee, who assailed him in the hearing with a statement to the effect that the hearing was some kind of persecution. Nothing was further from the fact. I believe that the manner in which the hearing was conducted was a great tribute to the chairman of the committee. I am proud that I sat with that committee, and had the opportunity to see the kind of governmental service that the distinguished chairman rendered.

The chairman of the committee did not even respond to the attack by the ranking minority member. It requires great personal self-control and public dedication for a man to be able to perform that kind of service.

In his statement today the chairman of the committee has stated that perhaps we did not go far enough into certain questions. As one member of the committee, I believe that the committee should have gone further in inquiring into certain subjects, particularly the questions raised by the attorney Jarrell Garonzik, of Dallas, and dealt with on page 448 of the record, regarding certain uranium stocks.

There is a sketchy memorandum on page 1100 of the record, on the

question of interlocking directorships and the relationships of Kuhn-Loeb and Rockefeller interests in the uranium field. I sought to have the committee go into the question of what happened to the prices of uranium stocks following the statement by Jesse C. Johnson, Director, Division of Raw Materials, Atomic Energy Commission, in a memorandum dated June 14, 1956. I sought information as to who owned uranium stocks before the statement, and who acquired stocks after the market was broken by the statement.

I do not criticize the committee for its decision. It was the thought of the majority of the committee that this was not a subject properly within our jurisdiction, but rather one that came under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I believe that it was a proper subject for consideration in connection with the nomination of Mr. Strauss.

I am merely trying to illustrate how fair the chairman was to the nominee. I am not criticizing the majority on its decision on the question raised as to whether or not that particular subject came within the province of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or some other committee. Jurisdiction was not assumed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In the light of what actually happened at the hearing, I believe that nothing could be a worse misrepresentation of the facts than the criticism to the effect that the hearing was a witch hunt, or a trial by innuendo. Other derogatory terms about the hearing were used here on the floor this week by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

This hearing was conducted by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington in a manner to reflect credit not only upon the committee, but upon the U.S. Senate itself. It would have done credit to any tribunal. I sat for 5 years as a trial judge in my State in a court of general jurisdiction. For 3½ years I was presiding judge over 33 counties. I have served as the law member of a military commission. I have served as the law officer at courts-martial. I have appeared before many administrative tribunals. I have served some. I have never seen a hearing before a tribunal of any kind, whether it be a court or a board, military or civil, that was more fair and just than the hearing presided over by the distinguished chairman of the committee in his conduct of the hearings on the days when he was present. I think he was present every day except one afternoon, when the pain and swelling in his foot forced him into a hospital.

This is a most important issue to the United States. I hope that each Member of the Senate will study the entire 1,128 pages of the record. That is a difficult task. Most Members have two or three committees meeting simultaneously, and they are under obligation to be present at those committee meetings. Sometimes they are testifying before another committee. Often the Senate is in session at the same time. A Senator is required by the rules to be present at three or four places at the same time, while having a multitude of other duties to perform for his constituents.

I ask Senators to take the time to read the 1,128 pages of the record. I know that that represents quite an undertaking for them, and that this is a broad request to make. However, in view of the attacks that have been made on the integrity of the committee, I ask my colleagues to read the record before they believe any of the attacks. We have seen an effort to confirm an appointee by propaganda.

One Member of the Senate who is not a member of the committee said to me today, "I am reading the record, and I am more impressed every day by the fairness of the hearing."

Again I add my word of appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the objective manner in which the hearing was conducted.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Let me acknowledge at the outset that this is a controversial question. The fact that it is controversial is in some respects reassuring to me. Mr. Strauss has a record of long public service in high office. Were there to be no objection to his confirmation, I might be influenced to believe that during this long period of service the nominee was, in essence, a do-nothing. I am proud that such is not the case.

Although the nominee's record of service is long in period of time, his record of accomplishments in behalf of our country is much longer. He has served in the administrations of the last three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. As a member, and subsequently as Chairman, of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Strauss participated at the highest level in dealing with the most volatile and controversial issue of modern times. The scientific advance in the field of atomic energy, with its original application in the field of weaponry, was so rapid that the fact of its existence preceded a full public awareness and consciousness of its potentialities and far-reaching effects on every phase of our lives. The controversy in this field has not been lessened by the suspicion in the public's mind stemming from the secretiveness necessarily accompanying the scientific advances because of its military applications.

It was in this novel field that Mr. Strauss applied his long and valuable experience as an administrator and his clear and logical judgment in the public interest. In response to his official duties, and consistent with his honest judgment, Mr. Strauss took a firm and resolute stand on such widely controversial issues as testing of the hydrogen bomb, shipping of radioactive isotopes to foreign nations, the dangers posed by radioactive fallout, the adequacy of our nuclear detection system, the extent to which private industry should participate in peaceful uses of atomic energy, and—certainly not the least controversial—the questions on security clearances for employees in the atomic energy field. The judgments which he made on these questions stand as a magnificent tribute to the competency and ability, as well as the unflinching patriotism of the nominee.

It was, indeed, inevitable that there would be a serious conflict in judgment between any public servant in this field who took a firm stand and others in the same and allied fields. The differences in judgment arose and, indeed, were foredoomed, not only from divergent prognoses as to contemplated courses of action in the atomic energy field, but from basic differences in philosophy. Place any man of deep convictions—and I doubt that anyone will question that Mr. Strauss is a man of deep convictions—in the same circumstances, and controversy will result.

Contrary to what appears to be the impression in some quarters—the Washington Post, for example—the fact that a man is controversial does not disqualify him from public service. If such were the case, few, if any, men with the requisite experience would be eligible to serve, and the Cabinet of every President would necessarily be staffed with mediocrity, rather than quality and ability. Let us dispel once and for all any illusion that may exist that the Senate shall establish a new criterion for confirmation based on whether a man is controversial.

As stated in the supplemental views of the committee report on this nomination, I believe that differences in philosophy should be minimized in the Senate's consideration of a confirmation of an appointment to a Cabinet post. The President is presumably aware of the philosophy of any man he appoints to a Cabinet post, and it is inconceivable that the President would appoint a man to a Cabinet post if the nominee adhered to a philosophy substantially contrary to that of the President, or his administration, in the area in which the nominee is to function. The President and his party are accountable to the people at the polls for their philosophy as it is embodied in policy and actions. At the same time, let us hope that the Senate will always have members who are not in accord with the philosophy of the President, for unanimity to this extent would be quite indicative of an abysmal lack of freedom of thought among the people themselves.

The transcript of the hearings on this nomination is voluminous. It contains a variety of objections to the nominee's confirmation. Others have also raised reasons for objections both on the Senate floor and in statements in the press, but they are not substantially different from the reasons given in the hearings.

I attended as many of these hearings as my schedule would permit, and I have studied the transcript extensively. It is my firm conclusion that every objection to the confirmation of this nomination is founded, basically, on a difference in judgment or philosophy, whether the objectors are, or are not, conscious that such is the case.

It is unquestionable that our objectivity is weakened by our emotions. It is an equally human characteristic that our emotions are aroused by the advocacy of philosophies to which we feel deeply opposed.

The hearings on this nomination were prone to arouse emotions, as is obvious to anyone who observed them and even to one who reads the transcript. Although I approached the hearings without any strong feelings about the nominee—in fact, I had never met the man before his appointment—I found myself having to resist emotions of antagonism, inspired by the advocacy of views and philosophies to which I am violently opposed. For instance, when two of the witnesses from the ranks of scientists continued to defend Dr. Oppenheimer, to talk of our "national guilt" for having developed the hydrogen bomb—although they themselves worked vigorously for development of the atom bomb—and raised their wail of woe that our security laws were too rigidly enforced, it was only by the most determined exercise in willpower that I viewed the testimony of these witnesses as merely the expression of impractical idealists, rather than parrots of the Daily Worker.

Similarly, I can understand that those who disagree basically with the nominee's philosophy can unintentionally approach his testimony and record with a desire to find conflicts of statements, conflicts of interests, and unseemly conduct. With the presence of this desire, it is not too difficult to understand how their interpretation of the record and testimony is reached.

An objective consideration of the evidence will not bear out the charges that have been hurled at the nominee. Take, for example, the charge of noncooperation with Congress. There can be no doubt that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] conscientiously believes that Mr. Strauss, as Chairman of the AEC, failed to keep Congress informed and failed to cooperate with it. In considering this question, however, we cannot overlook the fact that all the others who had the same official relationship as chairmen of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with the nominee, take a contrary view to the Senator from New Mexico. The other chairmen were Senator McMahon, Senator Hickenlooper, Representative Cole, and Representative Durham, whose attitudes are summarized in the committee report on this nomination. Lest there be any doubt that the divergent opinion of Senator ANDERSON be attributable to philosophical differences, rather than the nominee's action during the particular period when Senator ANDERSON, as chairman of the Joint Committee, worked with the nominee, one need only to refer to the individual views of the junior Senator from Rhode Island on this nomination. Senator PASTORE was chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation and a member of the Joint Committee during Senator ANDERSON'S chairmanship. It is also indicative that the attitude of these others on the nominee's cooperation does not stem from an agreement in philosophy. Senator PASTORE has pointed out that the chasm that separates him and the nominee in the political and economic categories is "wide, and in some instances, unbridgeable."

Another charge, which has been continuously reiterated by opponents of confirmation, centers around the unequivocal dispute in testimony between the nominee and Adolph Wenzell. Mr. Wenzell stated that he informed Admiral Strauss that he was an employee of the Bureau of the Budget, and the nominee stated that he knew Mr. Wenzell only as a representative of First Boston Corportation. This conflict of testimony is not a late occurrence, but, in fact was given in 1954. It was related and rerelated during the hearings on the nomination in question. Time and again it has been reiterated that one of the two was lying. With this assertion I am satisfied that few will argue; but it is extremely significant that no witness would assert, as distinguished from insinuate, that the nominee was the liar in this instance.

The reason for the innuendo, rather than a clear-cut charge of falsehood, is evident from the facts surrounding the transaction. Mr. Wenzell was involved in a personal conflict of interest matter. Criminal prosecution was in the offing. It was, from his standpoint, a self-service to establish that he had been dealing in the Dixon-Yates transaction above board and out in the open, with no intention to represent conflicting interests at the same time. His statement, in point of law, is known as a self-serving declaration, and, as a practical matter, raises a suspicion, even when not contradicted. It was contradicted by a public servant with a long and devoted record of unselfish service to our country, who had no axe to grind.

The transaction in which Mr. Wenzell was involved concerned an issue of the deepest political and economic philosophy — public power versus private power. There are those who feel most strongly—yes, even emotionally—about this issue. And that emotion is ever present in any discussion of action with relation to the much discussed Dixon-Yates transaction.

The relevant fact with respect to the nominee in the Dixon-Yates transaction is that there was no conflict of interest on his part, and all the rationalization in the world cannot attribute the actions of Mr. Wenzell to the nominee. Even such a springboard of emotions as Dixon-Yates cannot bridge this gap and attribute misconduct to Mr. Strauss.

The whole play of emotions in viewing this confirmation, or any other question, was most ably and succinctly stated by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] during the hearings, and I quote:

> If you don't like a man, I suppose you can construe anything he has done as being ill advised, as being deceitful, as being cunning. It is like anything else.
>
> I have seen a lot of men brag about their children for having done something that they might have spanked someone else's child for having done. But just because it happens to be their child and they see him only with eyes of love, they interpret that action with a certain sense of benevolence. Yet when somebody else does it, that they don't like too much, it seems to be an evil act.

The Senator from Rhode Island has summed up this matter in a nutshell.

The nominee has taken an active part in public affairs for a period of 40 years. He has, in an official capacity, testified before numerous congressional hearings. He has been widely reported in the press, and many columnists have commented on his actions. His services, as I have pointed out, have been connected with highly controversial issues.

With such a public record for a playground, anyone who is so minded can except apparent inconsistencies and apparent illustrations of deceitfulness of the nominee, just as could be done from the record of any other public servant or person in the public eye to the extent that the nominee has been. Viewed in its entire context, however, the record and the verbal expressions of the nominee disclose no disqualification.

In assuming this approach I am not unaware that at least one witness before the committee based his objections solely on the political philosophy of the nominee. The question of political philosophy has not historically been a criterion for the confirmation of nominations, except to the extent that it might affect loyalty to our form of government. I do not believe that the Senate is ready to adopt a new criterion, and I know that I am not.

Only recently it was argued persuasively to this body that the historic criteria used by the Senate on questions of confirmation of appointments were four in number, and consisted of good character and mental soundness, freedom from conflict of interest, loyalty to our system of government, and competency to perform the job for which the appointment was made.

Viewed objectively from these criteria, the nominee should be confirmed by the Senate.

On the question of character, there is an abundance of evidence. An overwhelming majority of the reputable press has supported him editorially. People who have known the nominee for a lifetime of public service have come forward with unsolicited testimonials to his unimpeachable character. These testimonials include statements by Members of our own body from both sides of the aisle. As examples, I shall read, first, a letter from our esteemed former colleague, Senator H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey:

> DEAR STROM: I am writing this personal note to those present Members of the Senate who were colleagues of mine during these past years.
>
> I am distressed over the charges that have been made in the current debate on the confirmation of Adm. Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce which appear to reflect on his character and on his integrity. We must bear in mind that he has been nominated by President Eisenhower to be a member of the President's Cabinet.
>
> I have known Lewis Strauss since World War I when we served toegther in the U.S. Food Administration under former President Hoover. I have been privileged to be asso-

ciated with him in all President Hoover's postwar relief and educational activities. We are both members of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation.

I have followed with great interest and admiration his brilliant business career and his outstanding military service in World War II. I know of no one who has maintained during his entire life higher standards of integrity and dedicated selfless public service than Adm. Lewis Strauss.

Let me add that Lewis has had no part in my sending this letter nor does he know I have done so.

With warm personal regards, I remain

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

From our side of the aisle, we draw on the recommendation of the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who wrote the following letter to the chairman of the Commerce Committee:

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR WARREN: Thank you for your letter with respect to the hearing on the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

I have known Admiral Strauss for a long time. I think he is a man of very great ability and is eminently qualified for this position. He has a great breadth of experience and is splendidly equipped in every way.

I trust your committee will report his nomination as promptly as possible.

With best wishes, I am

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

These are only examples of the testimony to the good character of the nominee.

Opponents to the confirmation of this nominee point repeatedly to the legalistic answers of Mr. Strauss. I mention the inclination of the nominee to give legalistic answers to congressional committees, not as it affects his character, for it has no bearing on that matter, and reflects to no extent on his forthrightness, in my opinion. On the contrary, it does reflect on the question of mental soundness, for it shows that the abundance of experience that the nominee has had in testifying before congressional committees has not gone unheeded. Legalistic answers are often a necessity if one is to survive congressional grilling.

There is no question, actually, as to the mental soundness of the nominee. Even the witnesses who most vigorously opposed his confirmation admitted that the nominee was a man of acute mental perception. There was even a hint that his mental ability was somewhat too good for the likes of his antagonists.

There is no conflict of interest disqualification. Charges in this regard have been substantiated by innuendo only. There has been an effort to find conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates matter, which I have previously mentioned; and on Wenzell's part, there may well have been; but there is no evidence of conflict of interest insofar as the nominee is concerned.

There is printed in the transcript of the hearings, at page 1100, a staff study of interlocking relationships of Kuhn-Loeb and Rockefeller interests in the uranium field. I can only suppose that this study was prepared in connection with the testimony of Mr. Garonzik, who testified in executive session, but whose testimony is included in the hearings. No relationship by the nominee with either Kuhn-Loeb or the Rockefellers was shown during the periods of the nominee's Government service, nor was any current connection shown. The witness, Garonzik, in substance, testified that, in his opinion, the nominee and Kuhn-Loeb think alike. This sort of testimony is involved and is voluminous, and best typified as "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Although there has not been forthcoming any evidence that the nominee would have a conflict of interest, were he to be appointed to any job in the Government, it is still important to remember that the nomination is for Secretary of Commerce, not to some post in the atomic energy field, to which the meaningless testimony on this point was apparently directed.

The nominee is loyal to our form of government. He is intensely patriotic. Every iota of testimony and evidence points unequivocally to this conclusion. As a matter of fact, some of the witnesses objected to his preoccupation with security. If, indeed, he be one of the few preoccupied with security, he should be commended, rather than condemned. It is interesting to note that these witnesses attempted to sustain this particular point by directing attention to remarks in a speech delivered by the nominee at Columbus, Ohio, in November 1953. The remarks of Mr. Strauss which the witness suggested showed his oversecurity consciousness are as follows:

> There are some who think that in the past we have erred on the side of excessive security. There are others who think we have revealed too much information. Many years of association with the problem have shown me that when the error is on the side of too much security, that can be rectified; but if the error has been in the other direction, there is nothing appropriate but handwringing and vain regrets.

I can only summarize the evidence on the question of loyalty by quoting another patriotic Virginian's apt remark, "If this be treason, make the most of it."

As to the fourth of the criteria to which I have referred, it is my opinion that the country is indeed fortunate that a man of the nominee's ability will still consent to undertake this public service. His experience as an administrator extends back for several decades. He has rendered outstanding service in each of the positions of government in which he has served. It would be difficult, if, indeed, not impossible, to find in another man the combination of knowledge of commerce, administrative ability and experience, and familiarity with governmental practices and procedures, to the degree that this combination is present in the nominee.

If, then, we put aside differences in political and economic philosophies, which exist most broadly among the Members of this body on almost any given question, and concern ourselves with pertinent qualifications of the nominee, the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of confirmation.

I feel that I would be remiss if I concluded without at least mentioning what I consider to be a factor for consideration in voting on this nomination, although it is not within the usual criteria of the Senate's tests on confirmations. It arises from unusual circumstances of this nomination, and, indeed, from the unusual times in which we live.

As I have pointed out earlier, and as all of us are aware, the nominee has been in positions of prominence in the administration of our security programs. He has been unflinchingly diligent in enforcing security laws. In the process, the nominee has unquestionably been a thorn in the flesh of subversive elements; for some time, he has even been a target for such brickbats as were at their disposal.

I do not mean to imply that the Communists are in any way directly responsible for the opposition to this nomination in the Senate. Unquestionably, the opposition in the Senate and the opposition of the Communists to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss are for completely dissimilar reasons.

Nevertheless—and this is my point—if the nomination of Admiral Strauss as Secretary of Commerce is not confirmed, the Communists will undoubtedly, albeit falsely, claim credit for having purged from the Government another strong advocate of security. Although such a claim may be without any substance or truth, there is a distinct possibility that the claim will have a deterring, although unconscious, effect on persons who might be called upon to administer our security program in the future.

Fanciful though it may seem at first glance, it is a possibility which deserves the mature and objective consideration of every Member of this body. I do not suggest for a moment that it is a controlling factor; but it is certainly more vital, by far, than some of the considerations which have been suggested.

In conclusion, I admonish each Member of this body to read the entire transcript of the hearings on this nomination. They are voluminous; but only in the full context can the issues be clearly put into proper perspective. In the transcript is everything except the demeanor of the witnesses; and in some instances even that is apparent in the transcript.

Mr. President, I am convinced beyond any shadow of a doubt, from the evidence before the Senate, that the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce should be confirmed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I was one of those who for many days sat with the Senator from South Carolina through the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and after having listened today to his direct, unimpassioned analysis of the evidence relating to the factors bearing on the question of confirmation of the nomination of Mr.

Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, I cannot refrain from saying to the Senator from South Carolina that, although perhaps it means little for one to be commended by someone who happens to agree with him, I only hope that it will be my privilege to be a Member of this body in future years when a nomination to a Cabinet post or other high post in the Government is before the Senate and when the nominee is not of my party or of my philosophy. In such case, the example the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has set here, today, will remain in my mind; and I hope I may follow it, and that I may be as broad in my statesmanship, as unimpassioned and as fair in my approach and as unswerving to my convictions as a Senator as the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has been this day.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his kind remarks.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from New Hampshire in his commendation of the Senator from South Carolina for the outstanding address we have just heard on a most important subject.

I have known the Senator from South Carolina for a considerable length of time. I have the highest admiration for his perception, his courage, and his devotion to duty. I can say to him that this is another outstanding example of the dedication of the Senator from South Carolina to what he believes to be right. I shall speak about this matter later, on my own time, but I should like to say to the Senator at this moment that I have had rather intimate public association with Lewis Strauss since 1946 and that the association included the formative days of the atomic energy program, and other activities.

The Senator from South Carolina, in my judgment, is completely right and sound not only in his analysis, but in his conclusions. I know of no man in public life who has devoted more conscientious time to his country and to the duties of numerous high offices which he has held than has Lewis Strauss.

I think the Senator's brilliant, but unimpassioned, approach to a most serious matter—and the confirmation of the nomination of a proposed Cabinet member is a serious matter—is in keeping with the Senator's own serious dedication to duty in an unimpassioned and highly intelligent, determined, and courageous way.

As a long-time acquaintance, associate, and friend of Lewis Strauss, I want to thank the Senator for his objective approach.

While this is perhaps a comparison which I should not even refer to at this time, I feel I must. I think the difference between the Senator's objective approach to this whole problem and his clear analysis of the facts, are in contrast with some of the impassioned, emotional approaches which have been made to this subject by other Senators whose discussions have been based upon chimera rather than upon the facts as adduced on the record and from the nominee's history.

I want personally again to express my appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina for courageously, intelligently, and forthrightly discharging his duties as a United States Senator in an unassailable manner.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to thank the distinguished Seantor from Iowa for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his very able and brilliant presentation on the fundamental issues involved. I know the Senator has given careful consideration to the question and has been faithful in his attendance on the hearings. With his experience and background, I can say very frankly the Senator has made a fine presentation, because it has touched upon some of the cardinal issues the Senate will have to decide when it finally votes on the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Through my service on the Appropriations Committee, I have had the opportunity to work closely with Admiral Strauss for almost 10 years. Since early 1947, shortly after he was appointed a member of the first Atomic Energy Commission by President Truman, until his resignation in 1950, and again from 1953 when his nomination to that body was confirmed by the Senate until he resigned as chairman in 1958, we have worked together on fiscal matters. During those periods of time, therefore, I have observed Lewis Strauss and participated with him in a most important area of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, and have formed strong convictions about his competency, dedication and integrity as a high-level public servant.

I have always found Admiral Strauss to be clear and forthright, cooperative and honest, in his dealings with me and the Appropriations Committee. His competency was demonstrated to me, for instance, by his fine understanding of fiscal matters, particularly important during the early years of the AEC. I certainly believe Lewis Strauss to be aggressive in going after what he believes in, and I commend him for this necessary characteristic of leadership which is so critically needed in these challenging times.

The fact that the nominee has worked at high levels with such dedication for so long—under three Presidents, and with decorations from both the Army and the Navy for service in wartime—is also naturally influential on my decision. In addition, let me say that I have been able to find no substantial criticism of Admiral Strauss' capability to handle the job of Secretary of Commerce, the job he has performed competently, it appears, since he took the oath of office on November 13, 1958.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe that the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to succeed Sinclair Weeks as Secretary of Commerce should be confirmed.

Concerning the current debate on this matter, Mr. President, and the ultimate vote on confirmation, I wish to commend our distinguished majority leader for the criteria which he set down recently. I think the Senate as a whole can benefit very deeply from his standards. On May 21, the able senior Senator from Texas mentioned that the duty of the Senate to pass upon the President's nominations, whereas not a perfunctory function, ought not to be a political one either. All Senators, he advised, should vote according to the conscientious judgment of each, applying the standards of conscience and conviction "without regard to partisanship." He pointed out that the Senate generally has not attempted to harass the President, and that he would be no party to such a movement. He also said:

> We have to consent and we have to confirm the nominations of the President if we think the nominees will carry out the laws in the manner that they ought to be carried out.

All of us in this body should be grateful to the csteemed majority leader for his words, and I personally hope very deeply that the Senate, in regard to this or any other nomination, will uphold the standards he has set forth. It would be tragic, and against the best tradition of this body, to put Admiral Strauss on trial on the basis of narrower Democratic-Republican loyalties, or, for that matter, according to the so-called liberal-conservative ideological split.

We will do a grave disservice to our country, its governmental system, and to the prestige of this body itself if we consider this question in a partisan or petty way. Emotional reaction and personal rancor have no place here, either.

Much emphasis has been placed on individual decisions and actions of Mr. Strauss. Because he is a man of action, there will of course be those who oppose him. History may prove some of his actions to have been wrong. Every one of us faces the same risk when historians weigh what we have done. However, in the aggregate Mr. Strauss has proven himself to be a devoted public servant of rare ability. His career in recent days has been marked more strongly by the critical cries of those who disagree with some of his decisions than by the words of praise for the able, forthright actions which he has brought to pass.

The heart of the matter, Mr. President, is the nominee's integrity and competence.

The "advice and consent" duty given to the Senate by the Constitution provides a function under America's vital balance of power arrangements. The Senate must discharge this duty thoroughly, yet with

a faithfulness to its purpose. The spirit and tradition of the Constitution give broad leeway to the President in the choice of his Cabinet members.

One of the opportunities which has been afforded me in public life was to serve as Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Many other Members of the Senate have held similar office where the responsibility for planning and carrying out a program of government action has weighed as the heaviest of the many duties of the office. Anyone who has this task becomes immediately aware of his need for top-flight men to serve in the key positions of his official family.

To a much higher degree, the President of the United States is entitled to have in his Cabinet those persons in whom he has confidence, and it is my deep belief that the Senate should confirm his nominees unless there is serious disqualification in the areas which we have discussed—competency and integrity. I do not think it is within the spirit of the Constitution, as written by the Founding Fathers and as valid throughout the years, for the Senate to attempt to revise policies in which the President of the United States believes, by controlling the appointment of his top advisers rather than by the legistive process. Our President, with the demands and almost inhuman burdens of his position, must have the people he wants close by to help him. It is with this belief, incidentally, that I cast my vote for Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce in 1945, even though I disagreed emphatically with most of the views which he expressed at that time and afterward.

I hope, then, Mr. President, that the Senate will demonstrate its traditionally high degree of statesmanship in this matter, and confirm the nomination of Secretary Strauss.

NIKE-HERCULES AND BOMARC MISSILES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I shall direct my comments particularly to House bill 5674, which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Armed Services on May 19, and I shall direct my comments particulary to that part of the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee contained on pages 14, 42, 43, and 60.

Mr. President, two of the defense weapons in our growing arsenal of ballistic missiles are the Nike-Hercules, developed by the Army, and the Bomarc, developed by the Air Force.

President Eisenhower has requested $22,413,000 for the extension and improvement of the Nike-Hercules defense system for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, and $26,900,000 for facilities for Bomarc sites. The House of Representatives has approved legislation authorizing appropriations in these recommended amounts to be made by Congress for the next fiscal year.

The Senate Armed Services Committee now has approved this legislation, the military construction authorization bill, but with an amendment which would sharply cut back the requested extension and improvement of the Nike-Hercules system. It recommends that appropriation of only $5,081,000 be authorized for the coming fiscal year for expansion of the Nike-Hercules system. This would be a cut of $17,332,000 below what President Eisenhower recommended. The committee would authorize the full $26,900,000 appropriation for the Bomarc program.

Mr. President, the proposed cutback in the requested extension of the Nike-Hercules ballistic missile system could be seriously detrimental to our national defense, even to our continued national existence. This comes at a time when the Nike-Hercules is the only close-defense missile in our military arsenal that is ready for use, with proven ability to destroy enemy aircraft flying at supersonic speed.

I am one of the economy-minded Members of this body, and I believe that Government expenditures in all fields should be held to the lowest possible figures consistent with the national welfare. In this particular case, however, the proposed reduction in expenditures would not be consistent with the national welfare. The proposed cutback in the Army's Nike program could seriously impair our ability to intercept an invader and prevent him from wreaking destruction on our homeland. This proposal comes at a time when we cannot afford to create such a gap in our air-defense capability.

The cutback is proposed on the theory that the entire Nike-Hercules defense missile system now in use is obsolete and needlessly duplicates the Air Force's Bomarc weapon.

I vigorously support the Bomarc because, when fully developed, it will become a most effective weapon for our air-defense system.

But the Bomarc still is in the development stage. It will be at least 2, and more likely 3, or perhaps 4, years before the advanced Bomarc B will be ready for full-scale use. Meanwhile, we have the Nike-Hercules in being and fully operational. Army plans for the coming fiscal year are based on a program which would see installations constructed for 50 Nike-Hercules batteries at 25 different locations in the continental United States, and an additional 8 batteries installed in Hawaii. Under the amendment to the military construction authorization bill proposed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, the authorization for the construction and equipping of these installations would be eliminated at a time when they are seriously needed to give us our only existing proven defense capability against invading supersonic planes and ballistic missiles.

I hope the amendment proposed by the Committee on Armed Services will be defeated because I firmly believe the Nike-Hercules and its installations are necessary to our defense system now and for several years ahead. They are essential to help protect us during the interim before Bomarc B missiles are ready to be deployed for use. Together with the newer and more effective Nike-Zeus missile now being developed, they will be highly valuable complements to the Bomarc when the Bomarc B is fully operational.

The Bomarc B is expected ultimately to have an effective range of about 400 miles. The effective range of the Nike-Hercules is about 80 miles, and that of the Nike-Zeus will be substantially greater. No matter how good the Bomarc ultimately is, some enemy supersonic planes and missiles may get past the Bomarc curtain in any attack made on us. As a last defense against such elusive aircraft and missiles, we would still have the Nike system for a final attempt to destroy them before they reach their targets. Such a role for the Hercules and Zeus is vitally important.

Many remarks have been bandied about in recent days to the effect that the Nike missiles system already is obsolete, that it is not a system which can be of value in missile warfare. Let us see what the proven facts are.

It was on November 27, 1951, that a Nike-Ajax made the first successful guided missile intercept of an aircraft. In December 1953, the first Nike-Ajax battalion was deployed in a defensive position to protect a strategic target area. That same year, 1953, intensive work was begun on the second generation, more effective Nike-Hercules.

In November 1958, a Nike-Hercules missile achieved the first free-world intercept of a supersonic target missile by destroying a missile which was traveling over 1,500 miles per hour at an altitude of more than 60,000 feet. Also, in November of 1958, a Nike-Hercules successfully intercepted a balloon-launched target at an altitude of more than 100,000 feet. In December 1958, a Nike-Hercules intercepted a supersonic missile target traveling at more than 2,000 miles an hour at an altitude of 14 miles. This record effectively refutes any contention that the Nike system should be arbitrarily abandoned by congressional action.

An additional factor in favor of continuing the Nike program as scheduled lies in the large number of personnel who have already been trained in handling this weapon. There are now more than 2,000 trained technicians stationed at existing Nike sites. Present programs will about double this number. But a major point in this connection is the extensive training program which the Army has been conducting for National Guardsmen in handling Nike weapons. The National Guard now is itself manning three battalion equivalents of Nike-Ajax units within continental United States, and about 10 additional elements of National Guardsmen are being used in the training of other National Guardsmen in Nike operations. Furthermore, two additional Nike-Hercules battalion equivalents scheduled for deployment in Hawaii will likewise be used to train guardsmen. Guardsmen already trained in handling Nike-Ajax weapons can be

made expert in the handling of Nike-Hercules weapons with only a few additional weeks training. These trained guardsmen represent a reservoir of proficiency in the handling of weapons which it would take a substantial time to duplicate for a completely different weapon. This entire schedule would necessarily be abandoned if the amendment under discussion is adopted.

The President, who is charged with primary responsibility for developing and directing our national defenses, is not advocating that the Nike missiles be discarded. Rather, he has recommended their further development and expansion. The vocal arguments for curtailment and abandonment, on the other hand, are coming from right here on Capitol Hill.

The Congress should leave such military decisions where they rightfully belong—in the hands of the President. He is reported to feel that at least for the time being, development and production should be continued on both the Nike and Bomarc weapons systems. I have confidence in the President's judgment, and this is what he regards as necessary. In the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, I believe we should authorize and appropriate the necessary funds. All the evidence I have found confirms the President's finding that we need both weapons systems.

I respect and congratulate those members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate who are toiling so diligently and assiduously to prevent any waste or undue duplication or overlapping in the expenditure of the billions upon billions of dollars which we necessarily must spend to maintain our defenses. I wish them the greatest of success in these efforts. But on the point of cutting down funds for development and deployment of Nike weapons, I must differ. The extra defense capability provided by these weapons will be more than worth their cost.

If a major new war should break out, we will need to use every weapon we can lay our hands on, for both our immediate defense and for our own strategic retaliation. We have developed the Nike-Hercules and have made it an operational, ready-to-use weapon. We are making real progress in developing the Nike-Zeus. To abandon them now would be perilous folly.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I hope every Member of the Senate will read the views expresed by the distinguished Senator from Iowa. My friend from Iowa does not rise in this Chamber to talk on a subject until he has studied it carefully and has thoroughly digested both sides. I served with the Senator when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I know of his record for economy in government. I know he is a stanch advocate of balancing the budget.

I daresay the Senator feels, as I do, that when it comes to our national defense, if the President tells us a certain development is necessary, we will be greatly influenced by the views of this great military leader. The President has expressed his views on this subject. I have not given this matter the study which the Senator from Iowa has or the study which it deserves. I intend to do so before passing on the proposed amendment.

I am greatly influenced by the views so ably expressed by my friend from Iowa, and I commend and compliment him on the fine presentation he has given us today.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the junior Senator from New York for his very kind remarks, which are appreciated.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NEW YORK AND THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, when our Founding Fathers drafted that greatest of all human documents, the Constitution of the United States, they anticipated many of the challenges which would later confront the Nation. The almost uncanny foresight of that document, combined with its inherent qualities of precision which delineate the bounds for private and public conduct in this land, have permitted the Constitution to grow with time and progress. Indeed, that document—unmatched in the annals of history—has continued to grow in stature and meaning as our Nation has grown great and strong and independent.

Today, our Constitution constitutes the bedrock of our civil liberties and serves as the rallying point for men everywhere who yearn for freedom and for the preservation and protection of human rights, and for the equality which should be the birthright of every human being.

I rise today to speak on one aspect of that great document. And I rise to speak in a manner which that immortal document has made possible. For I speak as both a citizen of New York State and as a citizen of the United States of America. I speak as a free man, proud of my Nation's heritage and traditions, and as one determined to see to it that our Nation progresses and remains free.

Mr. President, I speak today as one who believes devoutly in our Federal system. I subscribe with all the strength at my command to reasonable application of the great principle of States rights. But I also adhere with determination to the concept that in certain areas, the power and prestige and resources of the Federal Government must be applied to solving social, economic, and human problems of the American people.

The difficult balancing between where States rights begin and end and where the responsibility of the Federal Government must come to the fore is not a new problem. It has confronted the people and the lawmakers of our Nation for years. Indeed, Federal-State relations have been the subject of lively discussion and spirited controversy since the early days of the Republic.

Never has the discussion been more heated, nor the stakes higher than today. Nor does it seem likely that there will be any substantial abatement in the argument in the foreseeable future.

Unfortunately, many people tend to paint this problem in black-and-white terms. Too many people tend to look only to the Federal Government for the answers to all our problems, thus ignoring the great place to be occupied by our State governments in meeting challenges. On the other hand, many feel that the States should do almost every job, should be given the responsibility to answer almost every question confronting our people, thus overlooking the important responsibility of the Federal Government in our Federal system.

I have always believed that a middle course held the best hope for serving the best interests of the American people. Succinctly stated, I believe that where fundamental human rights, human liberties, and human equality are concerned, we should not hesitate to bring the full power of the Federal Government to bear in order to insure full compliance with our Constitution's guarantees of equal protection of the laws and full opportunity for every man, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin. But where economic issues are concerned—and I refer most specifically to the spending of taxpayers' money—I believe we should look initially to the States for answers, and only where their powers or resources are inadequate should we bring the Federal Government into the picture. Of course, as interstate problems arise, as situations where nationwide uniformity is found essential, and as challenges which uniquely demand Federal intervention arise, we can and should utilize the tremendous power of the Federal Government.

But more fully than we now do, I feel we should seek means in these situations for more equitable partnership arrangements between the Federal Government and the States. We should try to stimulate a more nearly equal sharing of responsibilities, of costs, and of administration. We should never, in consonance with the Federal concept of our Constitution, allow federally run programs to discriminate against any one State or region of the country. We should never permit Federal projects to favor unfairly any one State or even type of State to the detriment of other States. Yet that is the situation which confronts us today. It is a situation which cries out for exposure, study, and correction.

To me, as a citizen of New York State, the present overall picture of Federal-State relations is particularly disturbing. As a citizen of the United States, who believes sincerely in the Federal system, it is a picture which causes me acute dismay. It is about time we did something about the inequitable manner in which Federal programs of aid to the States are being drafted and administered.

In a sense, of course, the great debate about Federal-State relations is inevitable. Under our Constitution, the powers of the Government are divided

between the Federal Government and the States. The Constitution sets forth the powers delegated to the Federal Government and declares, by the 10th amendment, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." Nevertheless, for 170 years, the judiciary, lawmakers, and learned scholars have been wrestling with the proper sphere of the jurisdictions, the State and the Federal.

The problem of the peculiar function of the Federal Government in its relationships to the individual States is one of particular importance to the U.S. Senate. In one sphere or another, the most distinguished Members of this body have struggled with this question. We need only think of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, to mention only three of the most illustrious of our predecessors. But we need not go back as far as the 19th century.

My distinguished predecessors as Senators from the State of New York, of both political parties, were vitally concerned with this eternal enigma of American government. All grappled with the question of the proper role of Federal and State governments in various areas.

Senator Irving M. Ives, both as a U.S. Senator and earlier for many years as a member of the New York Assembly, demonstrated a keen grasp and full understanding of this problem. In his outstanding work in the field of labor relations, particularly, he recognized the ramifications, and came to grips with the relationship between Federal and State jurisdictions.

As a State legislator, Irving Ives was closely associated with the drafting of New York's laws on unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and elimination of discriminatory employment practices. All of these subjects were also matters of Federal legislation, in which, as a Member of this body, Senator Ives proved himself equally distinguished. In the legislative halls in Albany, as well as in Washington, he consistently worked for legislation which would contribute to the sound growth of America's great labor movement.

Senator Herbert H. Lehman, for 10 years Governor of New York before coming to the Senate, in his own manner proved himself the untiring and eternal guardian and defender of human rights. He was an effective and eloquent opponent of social and religious discrimination, an advocate of a more liberal immigration policy, and an unrelenting champion of civil rights legislation.

Senator Robert F. Wagner, a Justice of the New York Supreme Court before his election in 1926 to the Senate, was a chief sponsor of much of the legislation introduced during President Roosevelt's early years in office, which sought to bolster and strengthen the American economy. He worked long and hard for the Social Security Act, the first National Housing Act, and, of course, the National Labor Relations Act, with which his name will always be associated.

Each of these measures, in its own way, had an impact on Federal-State relations. Each provided for greater Federal responsibility in particular economic areas, with new problems and opportunities for the governments of each of our separate States.

I should also pay tribute to numerous other men who have preceded me in representing New York State in the U.S. Senate. Each, in his own way, has provided a special and unique inspiration to guide my actions in this body. Suffice to say that I intend to adhere to the high principles of dedication and patriotism they exhibited, never forgetting that I am at once a citizen of New York State and a citizen of the United States.

I cannot refrain from also saying a word of appreciation about some of the recent Governors of my State who have been acutely concerned with the problems of Federal-State relations, and who have added luster, not merely to the history of the State of New York, but to the Nation as well.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who served as my State's chief executive for a longer term than any other Governor, compiled a record seldom equaled for brilliance and accomplishment. He set a standard for progressive, efficient, economical government which would bear emulation by all on both the Federal and State level.

Tom Dewey's talent for administration won him well-merited nationwide acclaim. His political party called upon him twice to be its national standard bearer. He bears the distinction of being one of the youngest men ever nominated for the Presidency.

As Governor of New York, he was intensely concerned with the relationships between the Federal Government and his State. His concern for the effect of Federal activities on his State led, for example, to his recommendation for the appointment of the Temporary Commission on the Fiscal Affairs of State Government. This group made a comprehensive study and appraisal of New York's financial affairs, including its relationship with the Federal Government and units of local government. The report it submitted deserves the highest praise.

I am delighted to note that the present incumbent in the Governor's mansion in Albany, Nelson A. Rockefeller, has begun his administration in the finest traditions of action and accomplishment which characterized Tom Dewey's stewardship in office. I am confident Nelson Rockefeller will blaze new and progressive trails as Governor, and I know that from his long and rich experience at all levels of governmental activities he is acutely aware of the problems involved in Federal-State relations.

Mr. President, four Governors of my State have gone on to the presidency of the United States: Martin Van Buren, Grover Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In this century, three more Governors, Charles Evans Hughes, Alfred E. Smith, and Thomas E. Dewey, were nominated for the Presidency.

To each of these men, the respective roles of the State and the Federal Government were matters of intense and active concern. To each of them, the Nation is forever indebted. And I personally, as representative of nearly 17 million people of New York State, look to each of these men for guidance and inspiration as I seek to serve my State and my Nation.

I want today to renew consideration of the respective roles of the Federal and State governments in our Republic. We have been much concerned with this problem in recent years in connection with civil rights legislation. In my opinion this should be one of the most noncontroversial aspects of Federal action since no one can deny the duty of the Federal Government under the Constitution to protect the equal rights of our citizens and to prevent this infringement by arbitrary or other unlawful State action.

It is ironical, under these circumstances, that so much debate has centered on the question of States rights in connection with civil rights and so little on the impact of Federal policies on the economic welfare of the States. It is to this latter problem that I will give attention today.

I particularly want to discuss the impact of several Federal spending programs in my own State of New York since it is becoming increasingly apparent that New York pays a heavy if not exorbitant charge for the services and financial aid it receives from the Federal Government.

It is, of course, unnecessary for me to dwell on the economic importance of the State of New York to our Nation. Today it has a population of about 16⅓ million, still well ahead of California's 14½ million. It has ranked first among the States in manufacturing since the 1830's. It leads all other States in number of wage earners and value of products. New York City is the commercial center of the Nation, if not of the world. Buffalo, at the other end of the State is the leading flour milling center of the world. New York's transportation network, beset with problems though it may be, is still superior to that of almost any other area on earth. It ranks first among the Eastern States in the amount of water power it can develop. New York State leads the Nation in the manufacture of such varied products as clothing, rugs and carpets, sugar, jewelry, paper, printing and publishing, photographic equipment. New York City is the financial, commercial, art, and cultural center of the country. The State ranks first in both foreign and domestic commerce.

As a result of this tremendous wealth, New York has always paid a substantial share of all the revenues of the Federal Government. In 1958, the latest period for which complete State data is available, New York individuals and business firms paid out to the Federal Government a total of $15,348,079,000. This represents 19.19 percent of all Federal internal revenue collections in the United

States for the fiscal year, which aggregated $79,978,476,000. New York paid more than twice as much as was paid by any other State, and more than 50 times as much as was paid by such States as Arkansas, Mississippi, and West Virginia.

Since New York is the leading State of the Nation in manufacturing, it comes as a surprise and a shock to learn that New York is no longer the leading State in the Union in the receipt of military prime contracts. During the Korean period, the 3 years from July 1950 through June 1953, New York received military prime contracts valued at $14.5 billion or 15.3 percent of the Nation's total for that period. At the same time, the second ranking State, California, received military prime contracts of under $13 billion, or 13.6 percent of the Nation's total. Now, during the recent three and a half year period, from January 1955 through June 1958, New York received a total of only $7.6 billion in military prime contracts, or 12 percent of the Nation's total, compared to California's receiving, in this period, $12.9 billion, or 20.3 percent of all military prime contracts let during the period.

For the fiscal year 1958, California received 21.4 percent of all military prime contracts, compared to New York's 11.6 percent, little more than half as much.

And for the first 3 months of the present fiscal year, California received nearly three times the volume of military prime contracts which New York did.

The growing importance of the aircraft and missiles industry in the military budget accounts in good measure for this shift to California, where a major share of the Nation's aircraft production facilities is located.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I have observed that the distinguished Senator from New York has referred to the State of California and to the number of defense contracts firms in California have received. He has compared those contracts with the total number received by the State of New York. Do I correctly understand the Senator from New York to be arguing that the defense business of the country should be allocated on a geographical basis, or a political basis, or a basis on which we would equate the defense business throughout the country in terms of the largest taxpaying States? Is that the import of the Senator's argument?

Mr. KEATING. No; and I believe that has been made very clear in the last sentence, in which I pointed out that there has been a major share of the Nation's aircraft production in the State of California and that——

Mr. ENGLE. Does the Senator protest that? Does he believe it to be unmerited?

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I would say that much of the reason for the change has been due to the great importance of the aircraft and missile industry in our defense structure.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the Senator say it was entirely justified to place that business in California where there is the plant capacity and the competence of personnel and the kind of climate in which people wish to live, as well as the capability of producing for America the defense items needed at the lowest possible cost?

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the stanch support of the State of California by the Senator from California. I believe the selection of the place to locate a plant is something which should be left to those who are investing their funds in the plant. If a group of people desire to start a plant in California, the Government, in my philosophy, should not interfere with the desire to locate the plant wherever they wish to do so.

The point which I am bringing out is the very large increase in California in the amount of defense contracts which have been let, and the very large decrease in the percentage of defense contracts which have been let in New York, because New York does not yield in any respect to California in the abilities and capabilities of its industry or in the number of skilled workmen available to handle a very much larger share of the missile business and other defense business than New York is now getting.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the distinguished Senator from New York protest the allocation of this very large amount of defense business to California on the ground that it should have been placed, geographically, in New York, because geographically New York is a big State, because it pays large amounts in income taxes, regardless of whether New York has the plant capability and the competence of personnel to handle such contracts?

Mr. KEATING. New York has the plant capability and the capability of personnel to handle contracts. Therefore, it should have had a larger share of the total business.

Let me make one thing very clear. Perhaps this will set the mind of the Senator from California at rest. I have nothing but the highest commendation for California and its representation in Congress, especially its present representation in this body, and for the very magnificent way in which they have built up the business in California and the way that the California congressional delegation have met, time after time, for this purpose, and are meeting, I understand, as late as today, for the purpose of endeavoring to meet the New York threat.

What I say to the Senator from California is that it is high time that the Members of Congress from New York and from Pennsylvania—I observe the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania on the floor—States which have not properly shared in this business, become equally alert to what the great Senator from California is saying.

Mr. ENGLE. May I make one comment before the Senator from New York yields to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. ENGLE. I am trying to ascertain whether the Senator from New York thinks that California has gotten these contracts by political skulduggery or whether he is willing to admit that we got them because, on a competitive basis, either by contract bidding or on negotiated competition, California has demonstrated competency and the plant capability of producing these items at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers. Which is it? The Senator certainly is not implying, is he, that political skulduggery is at the crossroads? Therefore, it must be the competence of the personnel and facilities in California which caused the awarding of the contracts to California.

Mr. KEATING. There has been no mention of skulduggery by the junior Senator from New York. In fact, any mention of skulduggery has always emanated from the California side. This really puzzles me. I cannot understand it because there has never been any such allegation on the part of anyone I know of representing the State of New York. It would be quite unthinkable that skulduggery would be engaged in in order to get defense contracts.

Mr. ENGLE. California fears the political power of New York.

Mr. KEATING. I cannot see why. I commend the State of California and its chamber of commerce and other organizations for the magnificent work they have been doing in this field. All I am saying is that the State of New York, its organizations, and its representatives in Congress, had better "get on the ball" and perhaps take a leaf from the book of the representatives of California in this respect.

Mr. ENGLE. Perhaps the distinguished Senator should make his speech in New York rather than on the floor of the Senate. It troubles me when the distinguished Senator from New York makes a speech on the floor of the Senate which implies that there is something improper in the fact that California has gotten these contracts. We assert we got them on the basis of our merits—plant capability and the fact that people like to live in California.

If New York wants to compete with California, California will be glad to compete with New York. We will be glad to compete through bidding or on any other basis. We will be glad to compete for the construction of earth satellites on a negotiated bid basis, because it is necessary to negotiate such contracts since the cost of building satellites and experimenting with them is not known.

I am trying to determine whether the Senator from New York is claiming that someone other than the industries of New York themselves is at fault in failing to stand up and slug it out with California in competing for these contracts, which we are perfectly willing to do.

I call attention to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from New York introduced a bill in the Senate which, it was stated, was directly aimed at California contracts. Further, we

read in the press that an indignation meeting was held in New York, and that for the first time in 40 years or more the entire New York delegation got together and agreed upon one piece of proposed legislation, aimed in one direction, namely, to take some of the business away from California.

California is not afraid of losing business on the basis of competition; we fear the political power of New York. Therefore, we are concerned about the Senator's statement. I am trying to determine whether the Senator is saying that what has occurred has been due to our competence or our political power.

Mr. KEATING. I must answer the Senator when he speaks to the effect that there is any direction of our efforts against California. I feel it is constructive to have had this first consensus, as the Senator from California puts it, in 40 years from the representatives of the State of New York on a piece of proposed legislation, and I am very proud to have had a hand in bringing about such a meeting.

What we are seeking in the proposed legislation is just as much applicable to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or, indeed, California, as it is to any other State. It is to make certain that the taxpayers get a dollar's worth for every dollar they spend.

I have nothing but the highest praise for California and its aims. I cannot understand the injection of the reference to skulduggery. It begins to make New York wonder what has been taking place. Although I entirely negate any charge of that kind, it simply is bound to raise a question in anybody's mind, when, the minute one tries to get a fair share of businesses for his State, someone comes up and says, "You are trying to practice political skulduggery in the matter."

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized to speak for Pennsylvania and, perhaps, for its neighboring State of Ohio.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair.

I commend the distinguished Senator from New York. His encomiums upon his great State have almost persuaded me that he has an interest, perhaps, as a Senator from New York. Certainly, seriously speaking, he is a good Senator, and a good ambassador from his State; for, in fact, all of us are sometimes called ambassadors from our States.

With reference to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from California that perhaps these commentaries might be reserved for our home States, one of the reasons we are here present is not only as ambassadors from our States, but as missionaries, also, to carry to the Central Government in Washington pleas for fairness and equal treatment; the plea, too, that our tax moneys shall not be sent to Washington and then be diverted so far away, in so many cases, that the money actually gets tired and may, in fact, lose some of its purchasing power if we are not careful.

I am very much aware of the virtues of the State of California. It is one of the most wonderful States which comprise our Union. In fact, I am decidedly aware of it, for in 17 years in these legislative halls I have heard many debates and I have observed the passage of many acts to provide, in California, for irrigation, conservation, highways, public improvements, harbors, and port developments of an enormous character, due in part, I am sure, to the extraordinarily able activities and representation of the virtues of California by its representatives in both bodies of Congress.

But I wonder whether it is valid to argue to New York and to Pennsylvania that a greater share than the national average perhaps should go to some States because they, alone, have the necessary facilities, when one considers that those facilities have been made possible in such enormous amounts by the taxpayers of all the States. As I have at many times said to the distinguished Senator from California, I would go along with him in regard to many of his proposals, so long as he does not ask us to build a bridge from San Francisco to the nearly adjoining State of Hawaii. [Laughter.] I think there has to be some limit to the westward trek of the Pennsylvania and the New York dollars.

I am so proud of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] in his comments on New York, that I am very happy that so much of Pennsylvania adjoins the State of New York. I would point out that perhaps in some ways Pennsylvania has a peculiar reason for wishing to be recognized more often in connection with the award of Government contracts and facilities, in that in our State there is a distressingly bad, chronic unemployment situation. Our shipyards stand ready to build ships; our factories stand ready to produce munitions; our other production and manufacturing facilities stand ready and waiting, and in some cases yawning wide, for opportunities to produce the materials which the Government needs in its civilian and its military programs.

So I am very glad the Senator from New York has brought up this matter. Of course, I do not speak in derogation of any other State. Instead, I speak in admiration of the facility with which certain of the States have been able to secure substantial parts of the Federal tax dollar. But, Mr. President, I ask them not to penalize us by using the fact that we have sent our moneys to help build their great States, as an argument that contracts should not also be awarded in our great States.

I am sure the Senator from California will recognize our concern in this regard. He has a great State, a growing State, a wonderful State. But in our State there is chronic unemployment; and we hope he will leave us a few people to continue to pay the taxes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from New York in yielding, so that I may comment on the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Our three States are the first taxpayers of the Nation. At present time New York is the first of all, although it will not be first very much longer——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I did not yield for that purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENGLE. Because California is rapidly overtaking New York, both in population and in the payment of taxes.

According to the last figures, I think Pennsylvania was even with California, or perhaps a little ahead of California, in regard to the payment of taxes. But Pennsylvania is now behind California in population.

So here we are, all three of us.

What the Senator from New York and the Senator from Pennsylvania are complaining of is that California gets more of the defense business than their States do. The Senator from Pennsylvania says there are depressed areas in his State, and that there is unemployment there, and that, therefore, defense contracts should be awarded there. But I say, "No." If Pennsylvania has unemployment, certainly I want to help in that situation. I supported the depressed-areas bill which recently was passed by this body——

Mr. SCOTT. I know; and I am grateful that the Senator from California did.

Mr. ENGLE. And I joined with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I believe, and certainly with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in supporting that proposed legislation.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from California did not join with me in supporting that measure, because I do not think such legislation is sound. However, we do not wish to debate that point now.

Mr. ENGLE. No. But I have supported legislation to help depressed areas.

Mr. SCOTT. So have I, although the bills may have been somewhat different.

Mr. ENGLE. But the defense program should be handled separately, as a defense program, on its merits and on a competitive basis, either by competitive bidding or by negotiated competition, which is necessary in some instances.

What I say to my good friends is that if they want to compete with us, we shall be glad to meet them. But we do not believe the defense program of the Nation should be used as a WPA program; and we do not believe the defense program and the defense procurement of the Nation should be allocated on a political or a geographical basis, in order to take care of States which happen to pay large portions of the Federal revenues.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator from New York yield again to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not wish it to be understood that Pennsylvania is asking for a WPA program. Perish the thought. Heaven forbid. We have gone through that experience; and all of us have suffered its consequences.

We only ask that the unemployed in our State be given a chance to work and be given a fair distribution of Government contracts, so they may be enabled to work, and thereby may avoid the temptation of moving in the direction of the setting sun, in order to find employment. We think that is an undesirable situation for our State. Hence, my expression of concern.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me; I appreciate it very much.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I, too, thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments my colleagues have made in connection with my presentation; such interjections are all to the good.

I realize that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has a problem which is very similar to New York's problem; and I know how much he has been concerned about it. He has talked with me about it. It is a very serious problem.

The situation is not, as the Senator from California has suggested, that this matter is so much one about which complaint is made. The Senator from California has said that I am complaining about it. It is true that I am complaining; but, principally, I am trying to place in the RECORD the facts in connection with this matter; and the same is true of Connecticut, Ohio, Massachusetts, and a number of other States. These are facts which I hope the Department of Defense and others who are concerned with this problem will read in this RECORD. I am making these remarks, today, in order to get the facts before the public.

I wish to say, here and now—and this will be a little balm to my friend, the Senator from California; certainly I desire to be fair about this matter—that the figures I have been submitting, although official figures of the Department of Defense, must be interpreted with some caution. As the Department itself points out, these data on prime contracts do not provide any direct indication as to the State in which the actual production work is done. For the majority of contracts with manufacturers, the data reflect the location of the plant where the product is finally processed and assembled. They do not in any way reflect the distribution of the very substantial amount of material, component fabrication, and other subcontract work which may be done outside the State where final assembly or delivery takes place. It is clear from the overall figures, however, that New York is not getting its fair share of defense work.

At the same time, New York is being heavily discriminated against under various Federal grant-in-aid programs. In the same year that New York individuals and business firms paid to the Federal Government a total of $15,348,079,000, or 19.19 percent of all Federal internal revenue collections in the United States, New York State received in Federal aid payments only $482,102,000, which was only 6.5 percent of total Federal aid payments. California received more—$611,951,000; and Texas, which contributed less than 3.4 percent of total tax collections—compared to New York's 19.19 percent—received almost as much as New York, namely $452,710,000, or 6.1 percent of total Federal aid payments.

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

Mr. KEATING. Having mentioned the great State of Texas, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from the Empire State of this country for yielding to me. Since he has mentioned the placing of defense contracts in my State, I should like to ask him to what year the statistics he is reading refer.

Mr. KEATING. I think perhaps the Senator misunderstood me. I had passed from the percentage of defense contracts. I was giving the figures on the percentage of taxes paid by the residents of the States as compared to the amount which they received on all Federal grant-in-aid programs. I had completed that portion of my remarks which related to defense contracts.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York to the fact that my State is in the identical situation to that which faces the State of New York.

With reference to the plight of defense contracts being awarded to industries in States other than Texas, I call attention to the fact that a few years ago 9 percent of the people who were engaged in the aircraft manufacturing industry worked in my State. That is down to 6 percent now, despite the fact that the total number of people engaged in the aircraft industry has increased. The assembly lines which have been in my State are moving out of the State. The people formerly employed in them have taken less remunerative ways of making a living or have moved out of the State to places where the contracts are being placed.

In January or February of last year, the Department of the Navy closed down overhauling and repairing facilities at the Corpus Christi Naval Base. It had been costing the U.S. Government $20 million a year to maintain those facilities. It was claimed that the closing down of those facilities would save the Government money. The hearings before the Preparedness Subcommittee proved that people were being hired in other parts of the country for that purpose, to the extent of $9 million. A private contract had been let for work in Long Island, amounting to $14 million, for the purpose of overhauling aircraft engines replacing the work which had previously been done at Corpus Christi.

During the first year the Federal Government was compelled to spend $23 million to replace the work which had been done at Corpus Christi at a cost of $20 million, and that did not include the cost of flying or shipping equipment and personnel. Planes which had been repaired in installations on the Pacific coast and the gulf coast will have to be moved farther east for that work, at great additional cost. A helicopter installation at San Marcos, about 30 miles from the State capital, was closed down. The mere fact that installations are being closed down in Texas does not mean that money is being saved. The way people are moving out of the State because of the closing of these installations recalls the movement of settlers across the Sabine River to escape the invading Gen. Santa Ana until Sam Houston stopped him.

Mr. KEATING. So far as I know, none of those facilities has been moved to New York State.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Navy witnesses testified that a $14 million overhaul and repair installation was being moved from Corpus Christi to Long Island.

Mr. KEATING. That is the best news I have heard in this debate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am glad the Senator brought that matter up. Modesty forbade me mentioning my State, because this is a body where all States are supposed to be treated equally. The evidence shows that there has been a discrimination against the State of Texas in the case of defense contracts and military installations.

Recently, an attempt was about to be made to close down Nike-Hercules installations. On that particular point, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] spoke of the necessity of keeping the Nike-Hercules as our defense weapon.

I desire to say that if the State of New York is being treated inequitably in the letting of defense contracts, certainly my State has not been the recipient of those contracts, because we are on the losing end.

Mr. KEATING. I am sorry the Senator from Texas was temporarily detained and was unable to be present when I had my colloquy with the Senator from California. I would have been glad to have had him as an ally. But I will say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that this is the first time I have heard in Congress that Texas had not gotten at least its fair share of everything. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the visitors in the galleries that they are guests of the Senate and that they will have to remain silent. No laughter or other manifestation will be tolerated.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for having yielded to me.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy that I yielded to my friend from Texas.

Mr. President, I was dealing with the comparison of the percentage which New York and some of the other States pay in Federal taxes, and the percentage of the total internal revenue collections, with the amount which they receive from Federal programs.

Continuing on that point, if New York had received 19.19 percent of the total Federal aid payments of $7,420,770,000—that is, the percentage of total internal revenue collections from New York—it would have received a total of $1,424,-

065,000 in Federal aid payments, or $941,963,000 more than was actually received; more than enough to have balanced its current budget without any increase in State taxes.

Under present programs, for every dollar New York received in Federal aid payments, it paid in over $2.95, or for all practical purposes, $3 paid in for every $1 received. How does this compare with payments to other States?

Texas, for each dollar received in Federal aid, paid only 55 cents, Alabama 25 cents, Arkansas 15 cents, Tennessee 41 cents, Wyoming 14 cents, and North Dakota 11 cents. Only little Delaware paid more than New York for each dollar received.

It is distressing that the States with the most progressive records in dealing with their own needs have become the economic victims of Federal grant-in-aid programs. New York, for example, for decades has been in the vanguard of the States with regard to highway engineering and construction. It has been one of the most active States participating in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the 41,000 mile National Highway System designed to meet the highway needs of local and interstate commerce, as well as national and civil defense.

It has already completed or has under way 719.7 miles of new highways, which represents 58.6 percent of its total share of the Interstate System, compared to 28.2 percent of the entire Nation's Interstate System being completed or under construction.

The disconcerting side to this picture is that of the 719.7 miles completed or under way in New York, only 143.8 have been financed out of Interstate funds, which is less mileage than has been financed by Federal funds in 19 other States.

In effect, New York—which contributes more than any other State to the funds for this program—is being taken advantage of for having taken steps on its own in connection with the New York Thruway. Certainly it is unfair for any State to be penalized for its initiative in this manner; and it is imperative, therefore, to a proper administration of the program that States like New York receive a form of equitable reimbursement for their early positive action. The most constructive measure would be to allow Federal payments up to 90 percent—the percentage under the act—for substitute mileage to be added to the system in place of completed highway mileage already approved for the Interstate Highway System. The present law, which does not contain such provisions, is a striking illustration of the manner in which local initiative can be discouraged by the operation of a Federal grant-in-aid program.

These statistics tell quite a story. In the baldest terms they plainly show that the people of New York are being shortchanged by the Federal Government under these national programs. Because of my deep interest in the facts, I asked the Library of Congress to prepare a comparative summary, on a State-by-State basis, of all Federal internal revenue collections and all Federal aid payments. I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Federal internal revenue collections and Federal-aid payments, by States, fiscal year 1958 [1]

State	Federal internal revenue collections		Federal aid payments		Estimated amount of Federal internal revenue collections in each State allocated for Federal-aid payments (thousands)	Estimated amount of Federal internal revenue collections each State contributes for each $1 received in Federal-aid payments
	Amount (thousands)	Percent	Amount (thousands)	Percent		
Alabama	$496,155	0.62	$185,196	2.50	$46,036	$0.25
Arizona	235,036	.29	71,395	.96	21,808	.31
Arkansas	186,009	.23	112,521	1.52	17,259	.15
California	6,753,950	8.44	611,951	8.25	626,662	1.02
Colorado	905,357	1.13	129,025	1.74	84,003	.65
Connecticut	1,398,277	1.75	71,446	.96	129,739	1.82
Delaware	784,815	.98	15,876	.21	72,819	4.59
Florida	1,094,513	1.37	149,794	2.02	101,554	.68
Georgia	846,084	1.06	191,042	2.57	78,504	.41
Idaho	134,826	.17	47,588	.64	12,510	.26
Illinois	6,478,405	8.10	284,860	3.84	601,096	2.11
Indiana	1,798,028	2.25	120,492	1.62	166,829	1.38
Iowa	625,272	.78	155,198	2.09	58,016	.37
Kansas	546,418	.68	106,339	1.43	50,699	.48
Kentucky	1,539,590	1.92	123,864	1.67	142,850	1.15
Louisiana	691,591	.86	177,006	2.39	64,169	.36
Maine	191,286	.24	39,391	.53	17,748	.45
Maryland and District of Columbia	1,871,897	2.34	158,196	2.13	173,683	1.10
Massachusetts	2,194,763	2.74	188,641	2.54	203,640	1.08
Michigan	6,198,156	7.75	248,527	3.35	575,093	2.31
Minnesota	1,245,617	1.56	142,967	1.93	115,574	.72
Mississippi	176,473	.22	136,593	1.84	16,374	.12
Missouri	1,892,308	2.37	244,439	3.29	175,577	.72
Montana	138,940	.17	53,071	.72	12,891	.24
Nebraska	444,234	.56	102,827	1.39	41,218	.40
Nevada	109,986	.14	25,538	.34	10,205	.40
New Hampshire	148,751	.19	27,504	.37	13,802	.50
New Jersey	2,420,308	3.03	119,565	1.61	224,567	1.88
New Mexico	157,411	.20	89,810	1.21	14,605	.16
New York	15,348,079	19.19	482,102	6.50	1,424,065	2.95
North Carolina	1,857,559	2.32	170,161	2.29	172,353	1.01
North Dakota	88,472	.11	73,201	.99	8,209	.11
Ohio	5,355,654	6.70	287,981	3.88	496,922	1.73
Oklahoma	817,388	1.02	183,193	2.47	75,841	.41
Oregon	472,025	.59	102,716	1.38	43,797	.43
Pennsylvania	5,804,794	7.26	294,679	3.97	538,595	1.83
Rhode Island	312,963	.39	44,428	.60	29,038	.65
South Carolina	287,511	.36	90,955	1.23	26,677	.29
South Dakota	87,999	.11	66,651	.90	8,165	.12
Tennessee	622,225	.78	141,049	1.90	57,733	.41
Texas	2,697,309	3.37	452,710	6.10	250,269	.55
Utah	200,022	.25	51,170	.69	18,559	.36
Vermont	76,641	.10	20,364	.27	7,111	.35
Virginia	1,239,931	1.55	100,161	1.35	115,046	1.15
Washington	931,643	1.16	138,503	1.87	86,442	.62
West Virginia	334,804	.42	65,301	.88	31,065	.48
Wisconsin	1,462,224	1.83	123,095	1.66	135,672	1.10
Wyoming	71,724	.09	48,137	.65	6,655	.14
Others [2]	205,052	.26	353,551	4.76	19,026	.05
Total	79,978,476	100.00	7,420,770	100.00	7,420,770	

[1] Alaska and Hawaii are included in the table in the category "Others."
[2] "Others" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and other U.S. Territories, and amounts not detailed by States.

NOTE.—This table has been prepared specifically to respond to inquiries for a comparison of Federal tax collections in each of the States and the amount of collections returned to each of these States in the form of Federal-aid payments. The internal revenue collections, as reported by the Internal Revenue Service for the collection districts, are used. There has been no effort to measure the extent to which the taxes collected in one State are borne by residents of another State.

Sources: (1) Federal internal revenue collections, U.S. Treasury Department, combined statement of receipts, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958. (2) Federal-aid payments, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1958. The data presented here include (*a*) aid payments made to States and local units within the States, and (*b*) aid payments to individuals, etc. within the States. (3) Estimated amounts of Federal internal revenue collections in each State allocated for Federal-aid payments. These estimates were made by multiplying collections by the percentage constant 9.278458 percent. This constant is the percentage of total internal revenue collections ($79,978,476,000) represented by Federal-aid payments ($7,420,770,000). (4) Estimated amounts of Federal internal revenue collections each State contributes for each $1 received in Federal aid payments. These estimates were computed by dividing for each State, the estimates in the preceding column by the Federal-aid payments to the respective States.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the situation may be viewed from a slightly different angle by analyzing the source of revenues of the individual States—how much came from their own citizens through taxes and State and local charges and how much from Federal payments to the State. In 1957, total revenues of New York State and local governments amounted to $4,553,969,000. Of this total 38.5 percent was derived from property taxes, 42.8 percent from other taxes, 13.1 percent from State and local charges, and only 5.6 percent from the Federal Government. Only two States derived a smaller share of their general revenues from the Federal Government in 1957; New Jersey, with 4.7 percent and Connecticut with 5.4 percent. At the other end of the scale Wyoming received 24.8 percent of its general revenues from the Federal Government, New Mexico 22.6 and Alabama 29.9 percent. On a per capita basis, New York in 1957 ranked 2d among all the States in total State and local taxes collected from its residents, but 44th in the per capita revenues from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I know that Senators will be interested in the figures for their

States and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that a summary prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Census showing the source of general revenues of all State and local governments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCES

General revenue of State and local governments, by source, by States: 1957

State	Amounts (in thousands of dollars)						Percent					
	Total	From Federal Government	General revenue from own sources				Total	From Federal Government	General revenue from own sources			
			Total	Taxes					Taxes			
				All taxes	Property	Other	Charges and miscellaneous			All taxes	Property	Other	Charges and miscellaneous
Continental United States	38,162,123	3,843,164	34,318,959	28,803,257	12,850,649	15,952,608	5,515,697	100.0	10.1	75.5	33.7	41.8	14.5
Alabama	510,936	101,679	409,257	319,166	64,085	255,081	90,091	100.0	19.9	62.4	12.5	49.9	17.6
Arizona	262,934	33,691	229,243	183,103	84,911	98,192	46,141	100.0	12.8	69.6	32.3	37.3	17.5
Arkansas	268,694	50,519	218,175	178,716	47,272	131,444	39,460	100.0	18.8	66.5	17.6	48.9	14.7
California	4,358,853	465,061	3,893,772	3,301,496	1,554,633	1,746,863	592,276	100.0	10.7	75.8	35.7	40.1	13.6
Colorado	451,087	66,559	384,528	313,832	159,251	154,581	70,696	100.0	14.8	69.6	35.3	34.3	15.7
Connecticut	559,612	30,359	529,253	464,624	233,706	230,918	64,628	100.0	5.4	83.1	41.8	41.3	11.3
Delaware	89,721	8,149	81,572	58,752	14,102	44,650	22,818	100.0	9.1	65.5	15.7	49.8	25.4
District of Columbia	194,750	35,133	159,617	143,258	52,766	90,492	16,359	100.0	18.0	73.6	27.1	46.5	8.4
Florida	924,209	89,432	834,777	671,124	239,795	431,329	163,653	100.0	9.7	72.6	25.9	46.7	17.7
Georgia	677,870	97,105	580,765	467,328	133,422	333,906	113,437	100.0	14.3	69.0	19.7	49.3	16.7
Idaho	146,476	23,394	123,082	99,973	50,059	49,914	23,109	100.0	16.0	68.3	34.2	34.1	15.8
Illinois	2,116,375	146,108	1,970,267	1,740,745	906,038	834,707	229,523	100.0	6.9	82.2	42.8	39.4	10.8
Indiana	828,327	56,537	771,790	638,553	351,004	287,549	133,239	100.0	6.8	77.1	42.4	34.7	16.1
Iowa	638,149	61,984	576,165	490,727	240,517	250,210	85,438	100.0	9.7	76.9	37.7	39.2	13.4
Kansas	495,399	58,019	437,380	370,115	215,237	154,878	67,265	100.0	11.7	74.7	43.4	31.3	13.6
Kentucky	459,914	66,536	393,378	326,704	119,605	207,099	66,675	100.0	14.5	71.0	26.0	45.0	14.5
Louisiana	795,937	117,369	678,568	499,704	109,568	390,136	178,864	100.0	14.7	62.8	13.8	49.0	22.5
Maine	188,022	22,057	165,965	145,126	74,694	70,432	20,838	100.0	11.7	77.2	39.7	37.5	11.1
Maryland	600,031	51,823	548,208	457,477	192,085	265,392	90,731	100.0	8.6	76.2	32.0	44.2	15.1
Massachusetts	1,218,069	87,886	1,130,183	1,014,657	587,303	427,354	115,525	100.0	7.2	83.3	48.2	35.1	9.5
Michigan	1,809,482	142,921	1,666,561	1,395,625	643,597	752,028	270,936	100.0	7.9	77.2	35.6	41.6	15.0
Minnesota	804,901	79,242	725,659	596,287	307,021	289,266	129,371	100.0	9.8	74.0	38.1	35.9	16.1
Mississippi	346,976	59,094	287,882	235,184	65,543	169,641	52,698	100.0	17.0	67.8	18.9	48.9	15.2
Missouri	769,472	128,159	641,313	553,028	244,064	308,964	88,284	100.0	16.7	71.9	31.7	40.2	11.5
Montana	185,071	32,774	152,297	125,996	73,559	52,437	26,302	100.0	17.7	68.0	39.7	28.3	14.2
Nebraska	281,020	33,764	247,256	202,211	141,844	60,367	45,045	100.0	12.0	72.0	50.5	21.5	16.0
Nevada	93,789	16,339	77,450	60,062	21,780	38,282	17,386	100.0	17.4	64.0	23.2	40.8	18.5
New Hampshire	112,459	10,451	102,008	87,206	54,852	32,354	14,802	100.0	9.3	77.6	48.8	28.8	13.2
New Jersey	1,201,051	56,017	1,145,034	978,422	623,417	355,005	166,612	100.0	4.7	81.5	51.9	29.6	13.9
New Mexico	240,486	54,214	186,272	128,086	29,575	98,511	58,185	100.0	22.6	53.3	12.3	41.0	24.2
New York	4,553,969	254,179	4,299,790	3,720,839	1,754,784	1,948,055	596,950	100.0	5.6	81.3	38.5	42.8	13.1
North Carolina	727,062	117,376	609,686	503,323	135,250	368,073	106,363	100.0	16.1	69.2	18.6	50.6	14.6
North Dakota	167,073	20,614	146,459	107,490	56,665	50,825	38,968	100.0	12.3	64.3	33.9	30.4	23.3
Ohio	1,844,931	147,232	1,697,699	1,408,327	678,169	730,158	289,372	100.0	8.0	76.4	36.8	39.6	15.7
Oklahoma	526,316	91,972	434,344	346,929	105,657	241,272	87,415	100.0	17.5	65.9	20.1	45.8	16.6
Oregon	483,784	67,150	416,634	349,785	148,607	201,178	66,850	100.0	13.9	72.3	30.7	41.6	13.8
Pennsylvania	2,170,568	139,851	2,030,717	1,772,478	588,824	1,183,654	258,239	100.0	6.4	81.6	27.1	54.5	11.9
Rhode Island	164,699	20,155	144,544	130,116	63,572	64,544	14,428	100.0	12.2	79.0	39.8	39.2	8.8
South Carolina	353,872	46,799	307,073	245,981	56,668	189,313	61,092	100.0	13.2	69.5	16.0	53.5	17.3
South Dakota	167,683	27,536	140,147	114,228	67,413	46,815	25,920	100.0	16.4	68.1	40.2	27.9	15.5
Tennessee	569,876	80,894	488,982	406,672	119,193	287,479	82,311	100.0	14.2	71.3	20.9	50.4	14.4
Texas	1,826,485	233,680	1,592,805	1,257,016	579,106	677,910	335,788	100.0	12.8	68.8	31.7	37.1	18.4
Utah	192,103	27,933	164,170	136,680	59,739	76,941	27,490	100.0	14.5	71.2	31.1	40.1	14.3
Vermont	84,591	10,998	73,593	65,628	29,928	35,700	7,964	100.0	13.0	77.6	35.4	42.2	9.4
Virginia	686,274	66,196	620,078	503,819	161,575	342,244	116,259	100.0	9.6	73.4	23.5	49.9	16.9
Washington	722,378	81,025	641,353	512,639	151,778	360,861	128,715	100.0	11.2	71.0	21.0	50.0	17.8
West Virginia	295,539	37,560	257,979	220,014	55,680	164,334	37,965	100.0	12.7	74.4	18.8	55.6	12.8
Wisconsin	886,460	62,711	823,760	711,210	369,462	341,748	112,558	100.0	7.1	80.3	41.7	38.6	12.7
Wyoming	108,368	26,908	81,460	60,796	31,274	29,522	20,663	100.0	24.8	56.1	28.9	27.2	19.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. "State and Local Government Finances in 1957" (CGA-No. 8). February 1959.
NOTE.—Local government amounts are preliminary, in part representing estimates subject to sampling variation; see text. Because of rounding, detail may not add to total

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a similar chart showing the per capita amounts of general revenue of State and local governments, by States, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Per capita amounts of general revenue of State and local governments, by States: 1957

State	Per capita amounts [1]						State rank according to per capita amount of—					
	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property) taxes	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property) taxes	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue
Continental United States	$224.10	$22.57	$169.14	$75.46	$93.68	$32.39	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Median State	227.09	25.47	160.98	77.61	88.51	31.34	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Alabama	161.59	32.16	100.94	20.27	80.67	28.49	44	14	48	49	31	32
Arizona	243.91	31.25	169.86	78.77	91.09	42.80	14	16	20	23	20	8
Arkansas	150.95	28.38	100.40	26.56	73.84	22.17	47	20	49	47	41	43
California	314.06	33.51	237.87	112.01	125.86	42.67	3	12	1	2	4	9
Colorado	271.25	40.02	188.71	95.76	92.95	42.51	8	7	8	11	17	10
Connecticut	246.63	13.38	204.77	103.00	101.77	28.48	13	46	5	6	13	33
Delaware	206.73	18.78	135.37	32.49	102.88	52.58	30	36	38	43	11	6
District of Columbia	237.50	42.85	174.71	64.35	110.36	19.95	17	5	18	30	8	47
Florida	219.58	21.25	159.45	56.97	102.48	38.88	26	33	26	33	12	13
Georgia	179.76	25.75	123.93	35.38	88.55	30.08	40	24	41	41	23	28
Idaho	227.09	36.27	155.00	77.61	77.39	35.83	25	11	29	25	37	19
Illinois	218.21	15.06	179.48	93.42	86.00	23.66	27	45	14	14	27	40

[1] Computation based on estimated population as of July 1, 1957; see table 14.

[2] Not applicable.

Per capita amounts of general revenue of State and local governments, by States: 1957—Continued

State	Per capita amounts [1]						State rank according to per capita amount of—					
	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property) taxes	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property) taxes	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue
Indiana	$183.79	$12.54	$141.68	$77.88	$63.80	$29.56	38	48	35	24	46	30
Iowa	229.30	22.27	176.33	86.42	89.91	30.70	22	31	16	17	21	26
Kansas	235.90	27.63	176.24	102.49	73.75	32.03	18	21	17	7	42	22
Kentucky	151.14	21.87	107.36	39.30	68.06	21.91	46	32	46	38	44	44
Louisiana	259.60	38.28	162.99	35.74	127.25	58.34	10	10	23	40	3	5
Maine	200.24	23.49	154.56	79.55	75.01	22.19	32	30	30	22	39	42
Maryland	207.26	17.90	158.02	66.35	91.67	31.34	29	40	27	29	18	25
Massachusetts	252.34	18.21	210.20	121.67	88.53	23.94	12	39	4	1	24	37
Michigan	234.85	18.55	181.13	83.53	97.60	35.16	19	37	12	19	14	20
Minnesota	242.59	23.88	179.71	92.53	87.18	38.99	15	26	13	15	26	12
Mississippi	160.19	27.28	108.58	30.26	78.32	24.33	45	22	45	44	35	36
Missouri	181.56	30.24	130.49	57.59	72.90	20.83	39	17	40	32	43	46
Montana	275.81	48.84	187.78	109.63	78.15	39.20	7	4	10	4	36	11
Nebraska	195.56	23.50	140.72	98.71	42.01	31.35	36	28	36	8	49	24
Nevada	357.97	62.36	229.24	83.13	146.11	66.36	1	3	3	20	1	2
New Hampshire	196.26	18.24	152.19	95.73	56.46	25.83	35	38	33	12	48	34
New Jersey	213.82	9.97	174.19	110.99	63.20	29.66	28	49	19	3	47	29
New Mexico	295.80	66.68	157.55	36.38	121.17	71.57	4	2	28	39	5	1
New York	282.01	15.74	229.31	108.67	120.64	36.97	5	44	2	5	6	17
North Carolina	162.58	26.25	112.55	30.24	82.31	23.78	43	23	43	45	30	39
North Dakota	259.03	31.96	166.65	87.85	78.80	60.42	11	15	21	16	34	4
Ohio	200.41	15.99	152.98	73.67	79.31	31.43	31	43	32	27	33	23
Oklahoma	233.19	40.75	153.71	46.81	106.90	38.73	20	6	31	36	10	14
Oregon	277.56	38.53	200.68	85.26	115.42	38.35	6	9	6	18	7	15
Pennsylvania	197.13	12.70	160.98	53.48	107.50	23.45	34	47	25	35	9	41
Rhode Island	192.18	23.52	151.82	76.51	75.31	16.84	37	27	34	26	38	49
South Carolina	149.44	19.76	103.88	23.93	79.95	25.80	49	34	47	48	32	35
South Dakota	241.97	39.73	164.83	97.28	67.55	37.40	16	8	22	10	45	16
Tennessee	165.52	23.50	118.12	34.62	83.50	23.91	42	29	42	42	29	38
Texas	199.07	25.47	137.01	63.12	73.89	36.60	33	25	37	31	40	18
Utah	228.69	33.25	162.72	71.12	91.60	32.73	23	13	24	28	19	21
Vermont	228.62	29.72	177.38	80.89	96.49	21.52	24	19	15	21	15	45
Virginia	179.28	17.29	131.62	42.21	89.41	30.37	41	41	39	37	22	27
Washington	265.09	29.73	188.15	55.70	132.43	47.23	9	18	9	34	2	7
West Virginia	150.55	19.13	112.08	28.36	83.72	19.34	48	35	44	46	28	48
Wisconsin	229.60	16.24	184.47	95.69	88.51	29.15	21	42	11	13	25	31
Wyoming	341.85	84.88	191.79	98.66	93.13	65.18	2	1	7	9	16	3

NOTE.—Local government amounts are preliminary, in part representing estimates subject to sampling variation; see text. Because of rounding, detail may not add to total.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. "State and Local Government Finances in 1957." (G-CGA-No. 8). February 1959.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this is in no sense just a New York problem. The present situation should be cause for concern among all those who still believe that the ends of democracy are best served by a government closest to the people.

In the early years of the 20th century, less than one-third of all governmental expenditures were made by the Federal Government, and two-thirds by the States and local governments. Now these proportions are almost reversed. While this trend may be attributed in considerable measure to the increasing needs of national defense, a substantial contributing factor is the constant extension of Federal domestic programs.

Federal aid to State and local governments now averages almost 20 percent of general expenditures at the State level. In four States—Arkansas, Missouri, Nevada, and Wyoming—Federal grants and shared revenue is equal to more than one-third of the State's total general expenditures. In Alabama, Federal grants and shared revenues constitute more than 26 percent of all State expenditures; in Kentucky, over 27 percent; in Mississippi, over 27 percent; in Texas, over 22 percent, and in West Virginia, over 24 percent. And, in New York, 14 percent. These figures show dramatically the extent to which the Federal Government has taken over financial responsibilities of the States.

The heavy dependence of the States of the Union on Federal funds is a matter of national concern, and dangerous to our Federal system. The dispersion of power set forth in our fundamental law is seriously undermined when the Federal Government becomes involved in such a large financial investment in individual States. The trend is bound to encourage domination and control by the National Government and the weakening of State and local initiative. Moreover, the process is a mushrooming one, since the greater the drain on local tax sources by the Federal Government to pay for these grants, the less individual States will be able to meet their problems out of their own resources.

The drain on the resources of New York caused by Federal grant-in-aid programs would be a serious enough problem by itself, but it is compounded by other demands on the States made by the Federal Government. One of these is the result of the large property holdings of the United States. Particularly since World War II, the Federal Government has gone so far into the real estate business that a good many local communities have found their tax revenues seriously impaired by the exemption traditionally accorded Federal property. At the crux of this problem is the fact that much of this real property consists of valuable urban and suburban locations which would normally contribute generously in local taxes and which impose a proportionately high burden in local services and facilities.

This condition could be rectified by having the Federal Government make a payment in lieu of taxes to the local community with respect to such property. It has long been my opinion that when any Federal property, excluding only property devoted exclusively to strictly governmental purposes, enjoys the benefit of local services, it should contribute its fair share of local taxes. Legislation to this end has been pending in Congress for more than a decade. Approval of such a principle would at least partially restore to the States ability to support local programs in accordance with their own needs and desires and out of their own revenues.

Serious consideration actually has been given during this session of Congress to legislation which would have just the reverse effect on New York by limiting its taxing powers even further. I refer to Senate Joint Resolutions 29 and 67 which would prohibit New York from collecting any tax on income earned in the State by nonresidents. The importance of this proposal is underscored by the fact that more than $30 million annually is produced by such taxes on the approximately 190,000 persons affected.

The validity of such taxes was established in *Travis* v. *Yale & Towne Mfg. Co.*, 252 U.S. 60; and *Shaffer* v. *Carte*, 252 U.S. 37, both decided in 1920. The Court pointed out in those cases that the States assume and perform the duty of preserving all persons, property and business within their borders and, in consequence, must enjoy the power to resort to reasonable forms of taxation to require all such persons and interests to contribute to the expenses of government. In the recent case of *Goodwin* v. *State Tax Commission*, 1

N.Y. 2d 680, App. dismissed 352 U.S. 805, the Court specifically sustained the provisions of the New York law which grant to nonresidents less favorable deductions than those extended to residents on the ground that a classification of deductions based on residence was reasonable.

I do not contend that the existence of such a broad power necessarily requires or justifies its full exercise. It is my judgment, however, that the deprivation of this power by the Federal Government through a constitutional amendment would be an unconscionable interference with the taxing power of the respective States. Moreover, when it is considered that a substantial majority of the States have income tax laws, and that under all these laws the income within the State of nonresidents is taxed, it is evident that such action would benefit only a small minority of the country at the expense of the rest of the country.

Such examples of actual or threatened action by the Federal Government tending to undermine the fiscal independence and integrity of the States can be easily multiplied. Perhaps the most egregious of all in recent years is the so-called area redevelopment bill referred to here today, which I believe can more accurately be described as the area dislocation bill.

Every person is concerned over conditions which exist in the economically depressed areas of our Nation. One of the major causes of such distress in the Northeast has been the migration of industry to the South. It is incredible, under these circumstances, to propose legislation as a solution to such problems which would actually accelerate the further movement of industry from this part of the Nation. As if this were not enough, as is typical in such legislation, New York and other Northeastern States, the very States which stand to lose the most from this legislation, would be forced to pay their usual high share of the expense of the program. A better example of the conflict between New York's and the Federal Government's apparent economic interests could not be conceived.

Mr. President, I believe that a complete reevaluation by Congress of the economic relationship between the Federal and State Governments can no longer be delayed. Much spade-work has already been done. The National Study Commission on Intergovernmental Relations under the leadership of Meyer Kestenbaum submitted its report on the subject almost 4 years ago. The President, in an effort to carry forward this work, appointed former Gov. Howard Pyle, of Arizona, a Special Deputy for Intergovernmental Relations. President Eisenhower was instrumental also in creating a Joint Federal-State Action Committee composed of high ranking State and Federal officials. This Committee is now functioning, and has already made some recommendations for action in this field.

The time has come for positive steps by Congress. We must do our part in implementing the work of these special commissions and executive agencies. There have been enough background studies and statistical reports. We should be ready now to come to grips with the specific legislative measures necessary to remove the discriminatory features of these programs and to curb their ever increasing scope.

It would be helpful to consider some of the basic considerations which must guide us in this job. We cannot hope successfully to cope with the far reaching problems in this area unless we first determine our objectives and standards.

I believe that any such undertaking must be premised first of all on the assumption that our Republic derives its strength from the bond of responsible State governments. This means that the Federal Government must avoid encroachment on the activities and resources of local governments. It means also that the States must be ready to fulfill pressing public needs demanded by our citizens. As was said in the First Progress Report of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee:

> The degree to which the States satisfy the governmental needs of modern society determines in large measure the strength of the whole system.

We must also avoid any suggestion that reevaluation of Federal-State programs in this area is designed to encourage retrenchment. Much of the work on this problem can be accomplished without disturbing in any way the scope of the programs involved. Our primary goal should be a redistribution of responsibility, not a diminution of services. I do not say that all the programs involved are sacred. I do say, let us not confuse the merits of these programs with the fundamental problems involved in their proper administration.

A third assumption on which I believe we must proceed is that it is undesirable for any Federal program to be fashioned in a manner which takes undue advantage of the people of any one of the States. In my opinion, present policies require New York to contribute more than its fair share to support certain areas of the Nation favored under the present programs. It is doubtful whether the country as a whole will benefit in the long run from a continuation of this disparity. Any policies which curb or shackle the development of New York and impede its independent growth will harm not only the Empire State, but ultimately the entire Nation, which it serves as a commercial and industrial hub.

The operation of a Federal program in a way which penalizes any State because of the initiative it has taken to provide for the needs of its people should give us pause. I cannot believe that this is a necessary consequence of appropriate Federal action. It may be an inevitable consequence, however, of too much Federal control and participation in welfare programs which should be primarily State responsibilities. All the States of the Union, of course, must be prepared to contribute to the maintenance of certain national standards and goals. The danger point is reached, however, when such contributions are forced at a rate or in a manner which undermines the fiscal soundness of some for the benefit of others. Any such trend has moral as well as economic consequences which deserve our most earnest consideration.

I believe it would be desirable to write into Federal laws in this field a definite statement of the purpose and duration of the particular program. This is necessary to avoid indefinite extension of such Federal activities as a result of legislative inertia and bureaucratic pressures. We all know from personal experience the tremendous difficulties which are faced whenever an effort is made to terminate any Federal activity once it is set in motion, no matter how limited and temporary the impetus for the program may have been originally.

It is therefore vitally important, as the Joint Federal-State Action Committee has recommended, that built-in mechanisms be included in all Federal grant-in-aid programs to prevent continuing operating responsibilities by the Federal Government in spheres properly State and local in scope. The Federal Government can and should stimulate State action necessary to meet national objectives and provide the people with needed services. But safeguards should be included whenever appropriate, to make certain that such grants retain their character as stimulants and do not become permanent operating responsibilities of a centralized bureaucracy.

It must be the objective of action in this area to restore to the States not only the desire but the ability to assume their burdens. Present Federal tax policies make it virtually impossible for the States to raise the necessary revenue to support these programs without subjecting their residents to onerous taxes. A definite adjustment in this situation, therefore, is a necessary condition to any effective measures.

Immediate attention should be given to determining tax sources which might be relinquished by the National Government and absorbed by State and local governments. Several possibilities already have been suggested. The most widely discussed involves the local telephone service tax now levied by the Federal Government. This tax is regarded as particularly appropriate for at least partial transfer to the States because of the wide and uniform distribution of tax source over the country and because of the unlikelihood of State differentials developing.

It is interesting to consider the effects of this proposal on the revenue of the State. Under the most conservative of the suggested alternatives, under which 3 percentage points of the present 10 percent tax would be uniformly distributed and an additional percentage distributed under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury, over $147,500,000 would be yielded to the States. It has been suggested that this plan be combined with assumption by the States of the present Federal share for vocational education and waste treatment construc-

tion programs. If this were done it would mean that New York taxpayers would save more than $11 million which they now contribute to the support of these programs, without any change in their scope. The incredible fact is that this is almost twice the amount which New York now receives in total from the Federal Government as its share of these programs.

Mr. President, it is time Congress did something to implement these considerations. While I have discussed a lot of figures in my remarks, much more than a matter of dollars and cents is involved here. The problems in this field go to the very core of our democratic system. They concern the fundamental concept of our country as a union of sovereign States joined together for their common welfare but forever retaining their separate identities and responsibilities. The strength of our body politic is derived from this diffusion of power and sovereignty. It will be preserved to the extent that we curb the tendency to follow the easy example of other nations toward more and more centralized control over the fate and fortune of our citizens.

The task before us is too great to be superimposed upon any congressional committee already weighted down with the consideration of problems within its jurisdiction. Moreover, this task must be approached from an overall point of view and not from a position already oriented in favor of or against any particular interest or program. Accordingly, I propose the creation of a new Joint Committee of Congress on Federal-State Relations with jurisdiction to conduct a comprehensive study of the problems in this area and with a mandate to recommend to the Congress within a prescribed period of time a definite program for action. I will introduce a specific resolution for this purpose in the very near future. I hope that before too long we can start on the vital work which needs to be done to restore a proper balance to Federal-State economic relations.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in executive session, I move that the Senate adjourn in accordance with the order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 8, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Fred A. Bantz, elevated.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL, MEDICAL CORPS

Pope, John J., O31214.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, DENTAL CORPS

Bascom, Perry W., O25171.
Bunnell, James B., Jr., O31074.
Burke, Allyn D., O78039.
Burnett, George W., O39499.
Campbell, John L., O38863.
Enmeier, James M., O43168.
Fisher, William T., O43171.
Frank, Ogden M., O31101.
Jordan, John E., O38859.
Kirchoff, Arnold W., O31146.
Lang, Norbert S., O31062.
Mosgrove, Richard L., O38880.
Mosley, George W., O43175.
Olsen, Edmund S., Jr., O31071.
Rudisill, John W., Jr., O31128.
Sauser, Clare W., O26444.
Shaver, Robert C., Jr., O78614.
Weeks, Rubert A., O52011.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, VETERINARY CORPS

Allison, Aaron F., O31016.
Anslow, Ralph O., O31093.
Coburn, George C., O31025.
Fechner, Walter W., O31033.
Gould, Clinton L., O40116.
Horn, Wiley H., O31078.
Manges, Joseph D., O31055.
Robertson, Harry J., O23683.
Rubin, Harvey L., O52006.
Sunderville, Edwin J., O23335.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Austin, William L., O37403.
Behrens, Donald H., O37400.
Bouton, Arthur G., O31306.
Brown, Eugene T., O37398.
Chapelle, Francis O., O37399.
Dean, James W., O31300.
Evans, Murray F., O31296.
Frick, Lyman P., O43239.
Gott, William E., O37405.
Hastings, Frederick W., O31313.
Heisel, Wilford P., O37391.
Jones, Herman A., Jr., O31312.
Leivovitz, Albert, O37407.
Marsh, Edwin S., O31307.
Mastrolia, Anthony C., O43244.
Meagher, Harvey E., Jr., O31305.
Nelson, Francis C., O31314.
Noe, Herbert A., O31299.
Olson, Clarence T., O39323.
Pacey, William A., O31323.
Quackenbush, Robert O., O31317.
Richek, Herbert G., O40139.
Wagnon, Glen B., O56201.
Zachar, Martin, Jr., O37388.

TO BE MAJORS, MEDICAL CORPS

Arzola, Asdrubal, O67785.
Barila, Timothy G., O64939.
Borski, Anthony A., O65443.
Bridgeford, Otis E., O65450.
Brown, Paul W., O64946.
Daniels, John R., O65460.
Delia, Claude W., O64952.
Dimond, Francis C., Jr., O65682.
Eaves, Charles C., O65577.
Eberlin, Eugene W., O67813.
Esses, Henry A., O69916.
Ewart, James A., O65449.
Grant, Arthur E., O64960.
Hamilton, Richard D., O65681.
Hopeman, Alan R., O65455.
Hudson, Heber S., O65446.
Kellenberger, Robert E., O64962.
Kleinmann, Mortimer V., Jr., O64975.
Kovaric, John J., O69965.
Langsjoen, Per H., O64949.
McLeod, Donald G., Jr., O65445.
Metzger, Joseph F., O64940.
Mueller, Harold W., O65451.
Nitz, Robert E., O70003.
Parrish, Matthew D., O65447.
Pope, James K., O64941.
Reeve, Arnold M., O65453.
Schanzer, Stephan N., O65465.
Schwamb, Halbert H., O67954.
Shafer, James A., O65464.
Sheffler, Paul W., O65459.
Silberman, Henry K., O66099.
Silverman, Leo H., O65435.
Simmons, John R., O64972.
Stalker, Daniel E., O64959.
Stelter, Grant D., O68052.
Sulak, Michael H., O64951.
Switzer, Walter E., O65442.
Syner, James C., O65462.
Tunberg, Clarence L., O65680.
Vineyard, William R., O64954.
Wright, Lloyd T., O65457.

TO BE MAJORS, VETERINARY CORPS

Bridenstine, William A., O63225.
Carter, Leland B., O69878.
Lampru, Paul D., O84818.
Meckstroth, Leslie E., O65538.
Mehnert, Erich C., O68385.
Miller, Walter W., O65541.
Morgan, Richard B., O65540.
Nossov, Gabriel, O63223.
Ott, Bruce S., O66064.
Rothe, William E., O70031.
Vaninetti, Gus A., O65535.
Young, James B., O70071.

TO BE MAJORS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Raymond E., O79646.
Beakes, Francis C., O80283.
Cevey, Paul E., O80290.
Doran, Gerald J., O84315.
Fanning, William E., O80293.
Fellerman, Erwin K., O80294.
Gray, Irving, O58738.
Hinrichs, Herbert H., O79665.
Holtwick, Philip B., O80303.
Hooker, LaRay D., O80304.
Johnson, Andrew J., O81870.
Kammerer, William M., O79667.
Luban, Albert J., O79669.
Newman, Forest P., Jr., O80313.
O'Hern, Robert S., O79659.
Ostrom, Thomas R., O50576.
Poucher, Clyde R., O79673.
Rogers, O. B., O80322.
Rojo, Fernando S., O84833.
Ross, William E., O80324.
Shepard, Leonard G., O79660.
Tate, Robert W., O81872.
Thompson, Richard C., O84330.
Tsakonas, Charles T., O84809.
Weatherall, Richard T., O76804.
Winkler, Harry T., O80331.

TO BE MAJORS, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Connors, Amy L., N809.
Duc, Stella G., N1848.
Freese, Thelma U., N2838.
Hehn, Mary K., N2822.
Lachette, Mary C., N1707.
McCoy, Goldie M., N2520.
Piergallini, Anne R., N1937.
Witt, Rosemary, N1520.

TO BE MAJORS, ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Cook, Marion E., R10134.
Cotter, Anastatia, R10171.
Frazee, Mary E., M10107.
Hamlyn, Alvera E., M10099.
Hughes, Rosamond E., R10029.
Johnson, Frances J., M10031.
Kemske, Dorothy L., M10052.

Mahoney, Margaret E., M10017.
Rader, Marjorie A., M10068.
Strobel, Phyllis R., M10069.
Torp, Mary J., M10113.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Archer, Rubye W., N1634.
Ball, Katherine, N358.
Bowen, Geneva N., N1966.
Cindric, Rose H., N1983.
Clarke, Gertrude R., N2387.
Clarke, Margaret G., N745.
Colyer, Betty L., N1206.
Cully, Irene E., N614.
Dennis, Anna K., N1965.
Diekroeger, Luella E., N1861.
Duley, Clara M., N1637.
Edenfield, Ruth, N2061.
Egan, Margaret M., N2058.
Eidsaa, Alma O., N167.
Elliott, Dorothy V., N2245.
Ernst, Estelle T., N314.
Feagans, Nellie I., N1547.
Flavelle, Elizabeth L., N1896.
Fuller, Anne L., N587.
Garrard, Delzena E., N1890.
Green, Josephine M., N2400.
Greenfield, Ruth L., N873.
Hayes, Katherine E., N688.
Hollinger, Margaret A., N1962.
Houston, Emma F., N1960.
Jones, Peggy G., N363.
Jordan, Mary C., N987.
Jump, Katherine R., N341.
Laggan, Mary M., N1028.
Lewis, Luella R., N340.
Lozinak, Mary M., N2291.
Maita, Winifred Z., N2370.
Micklick, Irene E., N388.
Parker, Edna M., N271.
Patterson, Evelyn M., N339.
Perreault, Marsciene A. B., N2396.
Pfeffer, Henrietta H., N2413.
Plemon, Evonne L., N1860.
Reutenauer, Marguerite C., N206.
Rime, Mabel L., N1533.
Sandberg, Wilma K., N248.
Satterfield, Ruth P., N2168.
Saulnier, Dorothy N., N249.
Smith, Mary I., N1005.
Taylor, Ruth P., N302.
Thornton, Joyce A., N267.
Tollefson, Margaret E., N329.
Walker, Isabelle M., N148.
Werley, Harriet H., N1241.
Younger, Mary M., N288.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Davies, Elizabeth J., M10102.
Forsythe, Lois M., R10039.
Jones, Elizabeth C., M10114.
Moseman, Martha E., R10031.
Strain, Ruth G., R10070.
Winslow, Ruby Z., R10006.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Adams, George B., O74038.
Aicken, Larry B., O74042.
Alexander, Joseph E., Jr., O79545.
Allison, Robert H., O81573.
Amerson, Hinton S., O74623.
Amos, Julian E., O74047.
Anderson, Duane F., O74624.
Andrews, Robert H., O75052.
Aschettino, Richard F., O78208.
Avera, Graham J., O79547.
Bailey, Clarence A., O78212.
Baird, Richard J., O78215.
Balint, Barry T. J., O74631.
Barrett, Jonathan R., 3d, O83636.
Barry, John W., O74633.
Bassett, Gordon C., O85290.
Bird, Max R., O74077.
Birdsong, Edward M., Jr., O74078.
Blank, James N., O81587.
Bonner, Benjamin J., 3d, O74088.
Booth, John P., 3d, O74642.
Bowden, John J., O84953.
Bower, George L., O78234.
Brister, Delano R., O74646.
Bronson, Richard M., O85129.
Brown, Charles H., O74103.
Brown, Roy A., O74104.
Bruner, Robert J., O81595.
Bruskiewicz, Glenn L., O78248.
Brylla, Charles W., O74107.
Bue, Paul A. J., O78251.
Burke, Francis J., Jr., O85132.
Burton, Donald L., O85133.
Bush, Emory W., O79560.
Cahalane, Robert E., O79561.
Campbell, Donald A., O74118.
Campbell, Joseph R., O74657.
Carucci, Raymond A., O74969.
Castle, Edward R., Jr., O74971.
Cento, Dahl J., O85307.
Chesley, Arthur P., O74128.
Clites, James E., Jr., O79566.
Cockrell, William F., Jr., O81602.
Coffee, Edwin P., Jr., O74130.
Coffman, Richard L., O74664.
Conroy, Robert E., O78265.
Cook, James H., O80221.
Cooper, Willis McL., O85143.
Correll, Ralph T., O74667.
Cox, Randall S., O74138.
Craig, Joe H., O74668.
Curran, Jan D., O74670.
Dedrick, Warren F., O81617.
Deel, Arlin, O79571.
Deetjen, Roy F., O81618.
Delandro, Donald J., O74942.
Dilyard, Rex E., O83648.
DiValentino, Leo E., O74164.
Ditman, William D., O74163.
Dowling, Donald J., O74170.
Dreeben, Lionel, O74677.
Druit, Clifford A., O74678.
Dunn, James E., O74177.
Dvorak, Philip J., O74178.
Earlix, Richard L., O84523.
Eastwood, Clifford A., Jr., O74180.
Edward, Charles A., O85158.
Ely, Sumner R., O78293.
Epperson, Thomas A., O78295.
Evans, Walter C., O81632.
Fennell, George R., Jr., O74192.
Flanagan, Carl P., Jr., O81636.
Foard, John B., 3d, O74201.
Ford, Wilbur E., Jr., O74202.
Freitas, Louis H., O83651.
Frobel, Martin C., O78310.
Gately, Michael P., O74691.
Gentry, Roy C., O74989.
Gereau, Richard N., O75059.
Gessner, Stephen C., O83654.
Giles, George E., O74213.
Gilmore, Joseph R., O74215.
Givhan, Walter H., O74217.
Glover, Richard R., O74219.
Goetz, George W., O74699.
Good, Robert E., O85172.
Greenway, John R., O84994.
Hallinan, James M., Jr., O74709.
Hatch, Vernon L., O74242.
Hatcher, Robert T., O85180.
Hawkins, Richard S., O79582.
Heckman, Richard T., O74245.
Hemminger, Girard L., O74247.
Herbert, Anthony B., O78348.
Hickerson, Arville L., O74249.
Hilmo, Orin R., O83655.
Hilton, Jimmie L., O74251.
Hinkleman, Robert S., O74252.
Hinspeter, William LeR., O74253.
Hobin, Raymond M., O85001.
Hodges, Charles E., O74254.
Hollister, Myron P., O74261.
Hosmer, William, O75066.
Houlis, Harry S., O74269.
Houston, Joseph B., Jr., O74270.
Huddle, Charles E., Jr., O74999.
Humphrey, Paul W., O79586.
Hunt, Byron W., O74275.
Irwin, James T., O74732.
Israel, Glenn A., O74283.
James, William N., O74285.
Jarrell, William J., O78466.
Jenks, George V., O81668.
Jeter, Munford S., O81670.
Johanknecht, George P., O74734.
Johnson, Gerald K., O74735.
Johnson, James M., O84923.
Johnson, Joseph M., O79588.
Kantor, George W., O78376.
Keith, Donald M., O78379.
Kelly, Edward V., O78382.
Kirk, John G., O85470.
Kitay, Peter N., O78389.
Kite, John C., O74310.
Knapper, Aubrey L., O74312.
Knipp, James D., O78391.
Kramer, Bryce R., O74314.
Krome, Alan, O74317.
Lackey, Lyman A., Jr., O74321.
Ladd, John P., O74322.
Lake, Howard K., Jr., O74323.
Larimer, Charles L., O74755.
Laughbon, Richard W., O74328.
Lehner, Scott J., O82282.
Lenderman, William R., O79596.
Lesko, Charles J., O84712.
Lockwood, Willard E., O74342.
Lofton, Marvin, O75013.
Logan, Rodney W., O74343.
Long, John E., O78405.
Losik, Robert C., O74344.
Lyons, Calvin G., O74349.
Maass, Charles G., O74350.
MacDonald, Donald L., O81691.
MacHatton, Joseph G., O78411.
Mapes, John B., O77556.
Marguccio, Robert G., O74357.
Marmor, John W., O83657.
Massey, Oran A., O74365.
May, Francis B., O83113.
May, Richard L., O84092.
McAden, Henry J., Jr., O74767.
McCreery, John L., O74373.
McCullough, James A., O74374.
McKinney, Horatio W., O74384.
Meaney, Edward J., Jr., O82287.
Merritt, Hubert D., O78432.
Milan, Richard L., O75022.
Miller, Donald L., O84225.
Miller, Spencer R., O74782.
Milliron, Joseph F., O74395.
Molinelli, Robert F., O79604.
Montgomery, Ross D., O85217.
Morrison, Kenneth L., O76444.
Mudgett, John S., O84714.
Mungovan, Robert W., O81706.
Murphy, Clifton M., O74407.
Murray, Jackson S., O74787.
Nobriga, Gordon H., O74415.
Norris, James B., O81711.
Osa, Nelson, O74426.
Owen, Thomas D., Jr., O74797.
Padgett, David H., Jr., O74430.
Parker, Murry E., O76493.
Parr, Ivan W., 3d, O83660.
Patte, Chris, O75121.
Pearlman, James T., O81715.
Perry, James R., O74804.
Pertain, George H., Jr., O74806.
Peterson, Walter R., Jr., O74808.
Pharr, Joe B., O74810.
Pickens, Homer C., Jr., O85361.
Pierce, Isaiah B., Jr., O74812.
Pinkston, William R., Jr., O74813.
Pipkin, John R., O79610.
Powers, Max L., O74448.
Price, Roger J., O74815.

Proctor, Marvin P., O79613.
Quinlan, Richard J., O74931.
Raines, Fred B., O74451.
Randolph, William M., O73517.
Reedy, Henry J., O74459.
Reese, Ronald R., O84531.
Reeves, George E., O74823.
Reichel, James E., O74824.
Rembecki, Edward X., O83662.
Reynolds, George P., O85076.
Robinson, Thonius, Jr., O74468.
Roddy, Robert E., O74470.
Russell, George G., Jr., O78486.
Sanches, Manuel L., O74483.
Scherer, George H., O79617.
Schessler, Donald R., O74488.
Schober, Frank J., Jr., O74492.
Schuler, James D., O74495.
Scott, John R., O83663.
Shuman, John N., O74843.
Smith, John D., O79620.
Snyder, Harold B., Jr., O74522.
Snyder, Ronald E., O78511.
Solley, Charles W., O74850.
Spears, Joseph MacK., Jr., O75034.
Stein, Edward J., Jr., O85265.
Stipe, John W. M., Jr., O78518.
Stockhammer, Gordon, F., O79621.
Stoddard, Timothy D., O75039.
Stone, Frank R., Jr., O74536.
Stone, Gordon L., O79622.
Storms, Robert N. Jr., O80230.
Stotser, George R., O74540.
Stringer, Paul G., O74542.
Stuart, James R., O74545.
Sullivan, Noel E., O77716.
Swift, John B., O74551.
Tengler, John A., O74867.
Thomson, Robert W., O85272.
Tieken, Richard V., O74564.
Tindall, Asa W., Jr., O81752.
Treat, Robert B., Jr., O78527.
Tucker, Andrew L., O79623.
Tyner, Robert O., O79625.
Undercoffer, John T., O78530.
Vandergrift, Kennard S., Jr., O82301.
Ventzek, Robert E., O74877.
Vetterling, John M., O74580.
Wagner, Stanley G., O83668.
Waite, Richard D., O78624.
Wakefield, Donald Y., O74583.
Ward, Jerry E., O74883.
Watke, Frederic W., O74588.
Watts, Ronald L., O74589.
Welch, Larry L., O74936.
West, Louis, O78544.
Wetherington, Bernard J., O74885.
White, Billy T., O85281.
Whitt, Lawrence H., O74888.
Wiersema, Kenneth E., O74594.
Wilder, Allen S., Jr., O83670.
Wiser, Bobbie M., O74895.
Witt, Everett L., O85286.
Wolff, John P., Jr., O84721.
Woods, Robert D., O74608.
Young, Charles De V., O74610.
Zickel, Raymond E., O74614.
Zychowski, Edward F., O79629.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

Dee, Jean P., L521.
Halbert, Mary J., L523.
Hess, Anne M., L524.
Shelton, Ellen J., L505.
Sylvester, Suzanne E., L506.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bethel, Howard D., O78161.
Brown, George L., O79558.
Bunce, George E., O78163.
Cedola, Vincent J., O78678.
Dacus, Lester H., O74149.
Darnauer, Paul F., O80341.
Gulevich, Wladimir, O79677.
Heldmyer, Harry F., O78682.
Jordan, France F., O81875.
Kinchen, Robert P., O78683.
Lupien, Earle E., O85205.
Maeder, Donald F., O81876.
Murrell, Dan S., O80348.
Neitzel, Richard F., O80349.
Peterson, Charles W., O78686.
Seeley, Sam T., O78169.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Doucet, Eileen D., N2860.
La Rock, Ethel B., N2884.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, from temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

Tonda, Ricardo D., O75841.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3294, 3291, 3311, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

TO BE MAJORS

Glenn, James C., MC, AO380482.
Kaisch, Kenneth R., MC.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Arnold, Vivian M., ANC, N792070.
Bridges, Berly E., Jr., MC, AO2091772.
Chunn, Van D., Jr., MC, O1873794.
Farrelly, Robert L., MC, O2283260.
Hale, Meredith S., MC, O1917779.
Hall, Betty J., ANC, N792332.
Harrison, Richard E., MC, O5407610.
Hooks, Doris, ANC, N777728.
Levine, Theodore, MC, O5003014.
Louis, Winifred M., AMSC, J100124.
Neale, Julia A., AMSC, R20201.
Rock, Marjorie J., ANC, N723708.
Stappenbeck, Edna F., ANC, N790864.
Tisdale, Patrick D., MC, O2273957.
Vinall, William H., DC, O4045863.
Wigdahl, Luther O., MC, O4073865.
Wilary, Lillian B., ANC, N901299.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Allison, Dorothy S., ANC, N901523.
Bartelloni, Peter J., MC, O2273093.
Berry, Sidney R., MC, O2295010.
Bloom, Gerald E., MC, O2295014.
Brascho, Donn J., MC, O2291442.
Chamberlain, Eugene C., Jr., MC, O2291924.
Decker, John T., MC, O2291355.
Dell, Thomas A., MC, O2291440.
DeMarco, Arnold R., MC.
Fagan, Charles J., MC, O2289928.
Fischgrund, Milton L., MC, O4038340.
Fugelso, Peter D., MC, O2289699.
Graham, John L., MC, O2295067.
Gray, John H., MC, O2289701.
Grisham, Richard S. C., MC, O1942230.
Hall, Thomas M., MC, O2289684.
Hamilton, Elizabeth J., AMSC, M3017.
Hanson, James D., MC, O2289961.
Haynes, Christine, WAC, L1010868.
Hedges, James K., MC, O2289677.
Hill, John E., Jr., MC, O2289922.
Kabat, George J., Jr., MC, O4032571.
Karshner, Paul H., MC, O2289816.
Kerr, Barbara J., ANC, N901506.
Paulsen, Carl A., MC, O4068156.
Pippin, Alton J., ANC, N901888.
Reed, William A., Jr., MC.
Reyna, Consuelo T., ANC, N792369.
Ritter, Richard R., MC, O4004943.
Schleif, Mary E., ANC, N901621.
Snyder, Lowell E., MC, O2295009.
Stewart, James L., Jr., MC, O4044295.
Stewart, Roland R., VC, O4069802.
Thomassen, Robert W., VC, O5500707.
Treasure, Robert L., MC, O2289714.
Tucker, Walter E., Jr., VC, O4043905.
Warnock, Gerald L., MC, O2295030.
Wratten, Gary P., MC, O2295025.
Wygmans, John E., MC, O2291739.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Clegg, George J., MSC, O4021890.
Clifford, Margaret F., WAC, L2289165.
Gierhart, Jane E., AMSC, M3077.
Matsumoto, Eleanor M., ANC, N2290031.
O'Claire, Joyce W., WAC, L2291670.
Raines, Ruth D., WAC, L1010875.
Smith, Gary T., MSC, O4051350.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

TO BE MAJORS

Boardman, Charles H., III, O393863.
Chance, Donald W., O2236534.
Cushing, John M., O1020294.
Dey, Edward H., O1169484.
Fisher, Charles M., O1546978.
Gould, Howard J., O404889.
Harris, William T., O1045570.
Holland, Earl H., O1633281.
Johnson, Glen R., O1103238.
Johnson, Ivan H., O1036211.
Keevan, Edward F., Jr., O1080383.
Kirk, Raymond L., O1555708.
Konopka, Wenceslaus F., O1109427.
Ledbetter, William R., O389559.
Pierson, Leslie E., O391152.
Radcliff, Joseph A., O1309606.
Roemmer, Joseph, Jr., O1329750.
Samborski, Henry J., O1332743.
Shepard, George, O1062289.
Trumps, Shirly R., O1293152.
Zandy, Deno J., O576797.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Adams, Arlye D., O2204130.
Angelini, Joseph, O1597980.
Barker, Irving O., O1317138.
Dalusky, George A., O964568.
Ferguson, James W., O2203315.
Fordyce, John W., O1061395.
Godwin, Harold A., Jr., O2200105.
Gray, John M., O2209645.
Hayes, Donald R., Sr., O2016407.
Henson, Virgil A., Jr., O2014633.
Hodge, Harold B., Jr., O2201540.
Jones, James W., O2204417.
Kesler, Mac P., O2026784.
Matteson, James S., O2210165.
Moore, Gilbert F., O446357.
Murphy, Henry B., Jr., O1879597.
O'Neil, John J., O1889863.
Peterson, Ralph J., O980126.
Price, James R., O550225.
Roy, Joseph E., O2020678.
Russell, Dempsey R., O2033534.
Schwartz, Jack J., O2203290.
Speights, Duris, Jr., O1341914.
Starr, Merle D., O2030534.
Stenger, John E., O1535831.
Utzman, Charles D., O1882641.
Wayman, Elden E., O1885834.
Wenneson, Richard M., O1884033.
West, William I., O50732.
Wilson, Thomas J., O1644233.
Wolfe, Gerald P., O962942.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Adams, Basil R., Jr., O1875706.
Bishop, John G., O4013869.
Blandeburgo, Gasper, O1878126.
Branscum, Billy R., O1940931.
Brock, Eldridge W., O4012541.
Brown, Gene L., O4083757.
Brown, James E., O4028978.
Burch, Eugene L., Jr., O2277112.
Carver, Charley A., O4025948.
Clark, Alastair S., O4032045.
Cochran, Jerry L., O1939794.
Cook, Larry L., O4009844.
Dextraze, William P., O4036666.
Dolfi, Eugene, O4006234.
Evans, Herbert C., O4000164.
Farmer, Garry H., O4018893.
Fleming, Lynne B., O4041843.
Freeze, Richard S., O4030656.
Green, Gilbert R., O4018194.
Gunn, Ernest R., O1925918.
Hance, Carl W., O4023670.
Hawk, Robert T., O2033313.

Hogan, Charles E., O4059010.
Jackson, William B., O1936122.
Jackson, William S., O1872393.
Jones, Beauford Z., O1876443.
Keipp, Martin W., O4034924.
Kelman, Manfred, O4005691.
Klora, David J., O4009486.
Lawley, Fred W., O4031325.
Lytle, James H., O1891745.
McDowell, Rowland F., O4020587.
Miller, Royce D., O4057743.
Payne, Lloyd A., O4042906.
Ralls, Randall D., O4050046.
Rungee, James L., O4042650.
Short, William L., O4050416.
Simmons, Frank J., O2205195.
Sisson, Paul S., Jr., O4005735.
Soyster, Frank L., O2265640.
Speicher, Vernon L., O4018430.
Stewart, Roger A., O4063763.
Stommel, Raymond R., O2295197.
Tokarz, Walter P., O4062724.
Tremper, Edwin O., O4037536.
Watson, Ronald J., O4002594.
Williams, Edwin H., O1881997.
Willey, Burr M., O4004349.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Amend, William B., O5402487.
Antaya, Michel R., O5301984.
Ashley, Charles H., O4085008.
Barkley, William A., O5201643.
Beran, Joseph J., O5400679.
Berman, Leo, O5405332.
Billey, John J., O4045444.
Biskup, Robert L., O5401618.
Bledsoe, Edward P., O5300027.
Blomstrom, Harold W., O5702341.
Bowen, Richard M., O5400465.
Bowman, Samuel S., III, O5503061.
Bradley, John W., O4065760.
Broome, James R., O4047692.
Brown, Charles S., Jr., O5401580.
Brown, Jerry R., O5401381.
Canfield, James D., O5301844.
Coates, George O., O5000047.
Coulter, Richard V., O5300917.
Crane, Kenneth C., O5300954.
Cummings, George P., Jr., O4075880.
Davenport, William H., O5502434.
Davis, Hal W., O5400565.
Decker, Gilbert F., O5204382.
Delius, Robert D., III, O5303562.
Dillon, Gregory P., O4083470.
Dimeck, Philip A., O4065934.
Fisher, Edward S., O2272669.
Frattini, Joseph J., O4065295.
Fulton, Lawrence P., Jr., O4071674.
Gaebel, John L., O5502717.
Geiger, Peter H., O5700556.
Ginex, Thomas D., O5405242.
Gleeson, William J., O4064815.
Glynn, William T., O4085850.
Greer, Robert B., O4025806.
Groves, John E., Jr., O4047751.
Guinn, Ollie R., O5702495.
Gumbs, Selvin F., Jr., O4036539.
Hardy, John D., O5206641.
Harwell, James S., A4033681.
Hehemann, George J., O4075231.
Heidecker, Duane E., O4060095.
Hering, Carroll H., O4048743.
Hess, Carl E., O4052586.
Hicks, David L., O5402471.
Hilton, Thomas G., O5303638.
Holcomb, Samuel A., O5400088.
Holmes, Kenneth E., O4063776.
Hood, George E., O4075815.
Hoyle, Robert W., O4085423.
Jenrette, Nathan P., III, O5300541.
Johnston, Robert P., O4030596.
Jones, Eddie H., O5401177.
Jones, Robert P., O5304601.
Keim, Carl D., O5200974.
Kester, William R., O4062140.
Kilpatrick, William A., O4071245.
King, James H., Jr., O5201885.
Klein, Alvin A., O5501031.
Koehnke, Joseph A., O4074833.
Komer, James E., O5204564.
Kramer, Walter B., Jr., O5405223.
Kraus, John H., O4049150.
Kuehn, Karl P., O5401125.
LaGrassa, Joseph E., O5203421.
Lax, Robert E., O5300546.
Lester, Donald P., O5403350.
Litwiller, Gavin D., O5504625.
Lockwood, Edward D., O5002049.
Love, Richard M., O5205669.
Lynn, Ira I., O5304359.
Manning, Norman G., O4063155.
Matsuo, Herbert T., O4078081.
Mays, Luama W., O4063781.
Meadows, James S., O5405081.
Moffitt, Robert B., O5303351.
Morris, Alva J., O5300750.
Muirhead, Thomas H., O5206621.
Mullen, David A., O4052732.
Mulvey, Richard F., O5002380.
Munn, Jack E., O5300565.
Musil, Louis F., O5303687.
Myers, Read E., O4010172.
Oneillion, Willard M., Jr., O4071669.
Parker, Jerry S., O4071412.
Parker, Raymond L., O5401638.
Parker, Travis W., O4042931.
Pearson, John L., O5507066.
Pease, James W., O5300418.
Peeps, Richard D. J., O5205163.
Piasta, Richard L., O5504931.
Pollenz, Richard S., O5502092.
Poole, Keith L., O5507067.
Prentice, Charles C., O5001108.
Proulx, Clovis B., O4064441.
Puttkammer, Paul D., O4057310.
Raynes, Troyce L., O4071190.
Rehusch, Kenneth S., O5502362.
Reinen, Robert H., O5205176.
Renshaw, David A., O5204590.
Sanders, Walter M., O4069479.
Selby, Robert W., O5507548.
Sharp, Percy A., III, O5411175.
Shellabarger, Harold L., O4061980.
Sprague, James D., O4072020.
Starr, Luther J., Jr., O5400847.
Steakley, David L., O5303914.
Steel, Richard E., O4048827.
Tait, Thomas H., O4036083.
Tamer, Robert S., O2293137.
Thompson, Robert A., O5303537.
Thompson, Ross E. G., Jr., O4083671.
Thovson, Paul W., O5503518.
Tomaka, Karl S., O4064625.
Torretto, Richard J., O5405273.
Trombley, Joseph E., O4085546.
Vaughn, Valentine W., O5401503.
Victorson, William S., O5202182.
Welch, Charles W., O1893374.
Williams, Durward R., O5304745.
Williams, Glen W., O5200162.
Williams, Ross S., O1940640.
Wolfe, Rodney D., O5506213.
Wynd, William R., O4049651.
Yancey, Thomas E., O5400122.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Cohen, Meyer W.
Paul, C. Peter
Sides, John P., Jr.
Yeatts, Frederick L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Acuff, Joseph D.
Alton, Howard W., Jr.
Arch, Walter J.
Arcuri, Francis W.
Baker, Larry A.
Barr, Grady W.
Beal, William R., Jr.
Behannon, Hollis P.
Berg, Dwayne P.
Bergeron, Gary P.
Blickenstaff, Lynn A.
Brown, George N., Jr.
Buff, Max L.
Castell, William T.
Chamberlin, Paul D.
Christy, William C., Jr.
Cowden, Ronald R.
Cox, David C.
Cox, Joe B.
Crawford, Vernon L.
Cromwell, George E., Jr.
Cunningham, Patrick J.
Daly, William F., Jr.
Doubrava, Roy G.
Duckworth, Charles H.
Emery, James S.
Estes, Glen A.
Fortney, Kenneth R., Jr.
Gilbertson, Clarence L.
Glidden, Richard C.
Godwin, Roger D.
Gorham, Frederick A., IV
Gunn, Lloyd R., Jr.
Hammons, James O.
Hanzel, Richard D.
Herrington, James R.
Hurteau, Joseph C.
Jones, Manley W., Jr.
Krause, Donald W.
Kuncl, Pat Y.
Leitz, Franklin W.
Lindberg, Robert J.
Markham, John F.
Mayhew, Jerald A.
McKisson, Raymond C.
McLeod, Norman F.
Merrill, William B., III
Messer, Charles R.
Miller, Joseph, Jr.
Morgan, Harold D.
Moulton, William E., Jr.
Nickelson, Richard L.
Page, Wayne J.
Parks, James D., Jr.
Pastella, Donald R.
Plain, Ray S.
Pool, Robert C.
Pope, John L.
Rask, Richard H.
Reid, Roger R.
Rousseau, Alfred W., Jr.
Samilton, Lawrence B., Jr.
Schrader, Melvin A.
Sears, Perry M.
Shilling, Jack C.
Sommers, Robert A.
Spanjers, Leonard J.
Speck, Gerald E.
Speer, Richard L.
Spratt, David M.
Springer, Anthony T.
St. Amant, Joseph F.
Steele, James H., Jr.
Stritter, Frank T.
Tatge, Edward S.
Taylor, James R.
Taylor, Robert P.
Thompson, Neil H.
Traver, Donald J.
Turner, George J.
Walker, James M.
Weaver, Charles R.
Williamson, John D.
Wilson, James R.
Wilson, John J.
Wood, Merrill F.
Worthington, Wayne L.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Adams, Charley J., 10281A.
Adams, Lawrence A., Jr., 8935A.
Agostinho, Robert J., 10204A.
Anderson, Clarence E., Jr., 9725A.
Anderson, John M., Jr., 6514A.
Anderson, Joseph W., Jr., 9734A.
Anderson, Louis J., 9742A.
Anderson, Millard O., 10185A.
Anderson, Richard C., 32878A.
Andrews, George H., 10014A.
Arcularius, Harry R., 32863A.
Armstrong, John F., 9925A.
Ashby, William K., 32871A.
Ashton, Alfred J., Jr., 14661A.
Askounis, Gust, 32890A.
Aszman, Burton H., 7342A.
Atkinson, Paul G., Jr., 10115A.
Avery, James B., 10050A.
Babb, Harold T., 6242A.
Bachman, Lawrence F., 6896A.
Bachtell, Robert C., 9891A.
Baer, John W., 9820A.
Bainer, John W., 6313A.
Ball, Frank P., 10164A.
Balliet, William E., 9683A.
Barger, David H., 9851A.
Barnes, Richard W., 9905A.
Barrow, David C., 9751A.
Barry, Billie J., 10001A.
Barton, John R., 7450A.
Barton, Richard E., 9910A.
Bashant, Norman W., 10256A.
Bass, Thomas E., 10060A.
Bates, Elbridge C., 9741A.
Bauer, Maurice H., 7534A.

Beck, Charles J., 10219A.
Beckett, Thomas A., 10175A.
Beckett, Walter R., Jr., 10161A.
Beerli, Stanley W., 9875A.
Beeson, Thomas H., 9767A.
Behn, Milton A., 9766A.
Behnke, William C., 10216A.
Bell, Homer C., Jr., 9652A.
Benbow, John W., 13368A.
Benner, Stephen O., 9775A.
Bennett, John M., 9926A.
Benson, Morrie, 11318A.
Bentley, Delwin D., 8528A.
Beresford, Harry E., Jr., 7041A.
Berg, William W., 9961A.
Berger, Raymond J., 8392A.
Berry, Kearie L., Jr., 9833A.
Berry, Lon B., 6960A.
Bestervelt, Harold J., 9785A.
Bevan, Wendell L., Jr., 9780A.
Beveridge, McFate E., 32857A.
Bickerstaff, Burt M., 9867A.
Birbeck, Richard W., 6655A.
Bishop, Cleo M., 9777A.
Bishop, Edward L., 10047A.
Black, Lee C., 9866A.
Blakeslee, Donald J. M., 9362A.
Blank, Jonas L., 10119A.
Blehm, Harold E., 7566A.
Boedeker, Charles W., 7418A.
Bogan, John W., 10027A.
Bondhus, John O., Jr., 6411A.
Boone, Lewis P., Jr., 6524A.
Booth, Joseph L., 10231A.
Booth, Lionel R., 10235A.
Borellis, William F., 9871A.
Boreske, Andrew, Jr., 10121A.
Bossardet, Charles W., 9612A.
Bowden, Theodore W., 7467A.
Bowers, William H., 9874A.
Bowley, Albert J., 10101A.
Bowlin, Roy L., Jr., 9806A.
Bowman, George A., Jr., 9923A.
Bozarth, Theodore W., 9994A.
Bracy, Carroll H., 6741A.
Bradford, James W., 10082A.
Brady, William D., 9822A.
Brannon, Cullen A., Jr., 10146A.
Brazier, Harold W., 9932A.
Brendle, George R., 9946A.
Brennan, Gerald W., 10206A.
Brennan, John J., Jr., 32869A.
Brewer, Lonnie C., 9940A.
Brewster, John H., 9113A.
Brierty, William P., 10135A.
Broach, Richard H., 9797A.
Brooks, Charles L., 9886A.
Brooks, Leo C., 10155A.
Brooks, William K., 10240A.
Brothers, James T., 10045A.
Brown, John H., Jr., 7483A.
Brown, Marshall C., Jr., 32911A.
Brown, Ned H., 10293A.
Brown, Robert D., 10061A.
Brown, Thomas H., 10178A.
Brownell, Gerald S., 6808A.
Brubaker, Thomas F., 10024A.
Bryan, William E., Jr., 9888A.
Bucher, Oliver B., Jr., 10139A.
Buckley, William A., 7998A.
Buckner, John H., 9753A.
Burcky, Claude N., 32895A.
Burdett, Edward B., 10188A.
Burget, Carl E., 13393A.
Burnor, Richard H., 9541A.
Burson, Thomas L., 8773A.
Bush, William K., 6588A.
Bussey, Donald G., 9010A.
Butcher, Chester J., 9846A.
Butcher, William A., Jr., 7035A.
Butler, Clifton L., Jr., 9799A.
Butler, Henry F., 7008A.
Byrd, Bacchus B., Jr., 6949A.
Cabell, John K., 6555A.
Cabral, William M., 6692A.
Cadger, Edward J., 9492A.
Caldcleugh, Clarence M., 10319A.
Cammack, Vernon K., 10070A.
Camp, Clyde H., Jr., 9982A
Cantor, Al, 10257A.
Carey, Max R., 32893A.
Carruth, Francis S., 7341A.
Carson, Charles W., Jr., 10113A.
Carter, Charles R., 9748A.
Carter, Clifford G., 8159A.
Carter, John D., 8580A.
Carwell, Ivan L., 6368A.
Caselli, James L., 32891A.
Cassady, Robert E., 9145A.
Cassiday, Benjamin B., Jr., 10133A.
Catledge, Richard C., 9951A.
Champion, Patrick D., 10296A.
Chandler, John S., Jr., 10102A.
Chapman, Benjamin F., 7402A.
Cherbak, Victor A., Jr., 9857A.
Chessington, James B., Jr., 7002A.
Childs, Marvin E., 10191A.
Christensen, William R., 6545A.
Clark, Robert H., 10154A.
Cobb, James B., 9769A.
Cobb, Melvin B., 7966A.
Coburn, Blaine K., 6447A.
Coffield, Peter L., 9150A.
Coke, John D., 9711A.
Cole, Heston C., 10197A.
Colgan, William B., 9973A.
Collett, Charles E., 9902A.
Collins, Thomas E., Jr., 9904A.
Comstock, Harold E., 9104A.
Conard, Dean D., 32882A.
Conley, Bruce R., 10292A.
Conn, John F., 10226A.
Connell, James S., 9922A.
Connor, Edward H., 3d, 10157A.
Coogan, Francis R., 48713A.
Cook, Harry D., 10010A.
Cook, William J., 9842A.
Cooke, Sherman C., 6990A.
Coonan, Daniel J., Jr., 8247A.
Cooper, James H., 7004A.
Coriell, Eugene F., 33988A.
Cormany, William F., 9714A.
Costello, Edward M., 9764A.
Cotton, Joseph F., 10232A.
Couch, Paul F., 10227A.
Coursey, Richard R., Jr., 10118A.
Courtney, John J., Jr., 9790A.
Couts, Richard L., 8305A.
Cox, Eugene W., 7803A.
Craddock, Reynold C., 9328A.
Cragg, Ernest T., 10152A.
Crahen, Eugene J., 9954A.
Crandall, Thomas O., 7460A.
Crawford, Ben, 10028A.
Crawford, William A., 10005A.
Crick, James M., Jr., 9730A.
Criss, George W., Jr., 9814A.
Crocker, Gage H., 10091A.
Crutchfield, Wilfred B., 9941A.
Cummings, Earl W., 9299A.
Cummings, Louis H., 9749A.
Cutler, Edward W., 10189A.
Cutler, John M., 9848A.
Dale, Hugh W., 9966A.
Damico, Robert H., 9733A.
Daughtrey, Buddy R., 9984A.
Davenport, Ellie E., 10238A.
Davis, Green R., Jr., 7525A.
Davis, Harvey M., 7642A.
Davis, Jack T., 10142A.
Davis, Jesse C., 6492A.
Davis, John J., 9712A.
Daye, John F., Jr., 9824A.
Decker, Lynne E., 9720A.
Delanoy, Charles W., 10277A.
Delia, Andrew, 6321A.
Demelik, Andrew A., 6964A.
Dennis, Charles G., 6515A.
Denton, John H., 6433A.
Denton, Velpeau C., 32872A.
Dettre, Rexford H., Jr., 9768A.
Detwiler, Donald A., 10130A.
Devereaux, John M., 32876A.
Doersch, George A., 9972A.
Dolby, William F., 9856A.
Dolk, Carl E., 9882A.
Donohue, Timothy W., 7995A.
Dorff, Richard W., 9863A.
Dougherty, Russell E., 9985A.
Douma, Cyril R., 6910A.
Douthwaite, William T., Jr., 10058A.
Doyle, James L., 9813A.
Dudley, William B., 10176A.
Duin, Robert, 10035A.
Duke, William F., 6521A.
Duncan, Edward K., 7236A.
Dunphy, Earl F., 9878A.
Durner, Dwight E., 9831A.
Dyser, Francis E., 9967A.
Eades, William B., Jr., 12195A.
Eads, Edwin M., 51696A.
Easters, Robert D., 10043A.
Ebert, Rembert A., 9917A.
Edwards, Edmund B., 9787A.
Eichner, Leonard, 19776A.
Eickemeyer, Karl F., 9872A.
Elam, Rhodes M., 10207A.
Elliott, Gober O., 32874A.
Ellis, Frank T., 9823A.
Engels, Anthony M., 7033A.
Erspamer, Curtis R., 10285A.
Evans, John A., 10214A.
Evdokimoff, Dmitri, 9896A.
Eyres, William G., 6390A.
Farrell, Frank J., 9988A.
Farrell, John E., 2d, 10288A.
Fava, James A., 7981A.
Feallock, William J., 2d, 6358A.
Ferrell, James P., 32896A.
Fetters, Rolland F., 9916A.
Filley, Oliver D., Jr., 9933A.
Finan, George K., 7146A.
Fishburn, James B., 7201A.
Fishel, Robert R., 9757A.
Fisher, Jack C., Jr., 9129A.
Fisher, Lowell B., 9762A.
Fitzgerald, Raymond L., 10236A.
Fletcher, John F., 32862A.
Floyd, Percy M., Jr., 10326A.
Flynn, Charles J., Jr., 9945A.
Folts, John L., 7387A.
Foote, Edward P., 9798A.
Ford, Ross C., 9969A.
Ford, Wilson, 6878A.
Forster, Bernard F., 9737A.
Forster, Joseph M., 10213A.
Fortner, John W., 10301A.
Foulk, Tom B., Jr., 10183A.
Founds, Joseph W., 7873A.
Frakes, James F., 9821A.
Frankosky, James O., 9758A.
Freed, Lyle C., 10322A.
Frink, Horace E., Jr., 9713A.
Fry, Howard J., 9908A.
Fry, Robert M., 10241A.
Fulcher, Kenneth M., 9937A.
Gaffney, George P., 6301A.
Gallienne, Winfred H., 32873A.
Gamage, Leonard A., 6888A.
Gant, Eugene M., Jr., 48711A.
Garland, William J., 6872A.
Garner, Merritt G., 9928A.
Garrett, Leslie F., 6725A.
Garvin, Earl J., 9181A.
Garvin, Loyd C., 10210A.
Gaylord, Donald A., 10003A.
Gaylord, Maurice B., 6299A.
Gazzaniga, Louis A., 10064A.
Gelwix, Joe M., 10051A.
Gerhart, Quinter P., 7189A.
Ghourdjian, Kevork, 32909A.
Gibbons, John P., 10084A.
Gibbons, William L., 10085A.
Giffin, Charles W., Jr., 8854A.
Gilbert, John H., Jr., 6463A.
Gilchrist, William T., 9890A.
Gilkerson, Harold R., 10265A.
Gillmore, Lawrence J., 9859A.
Glover, Donald S., 8547A.
Gold, Morton J., 20034A.
Goodrich, Earle A., 7837A.
Gordon, Anyan A., 10290A.
Gordon, Benjamin, 10320A.
Gorman, John J., 9801A.

Goss, Quentin J., 9776A.
Gourley, Theodore J., 10208A.
Gradwell, Burgess, 10203A.
Graham, Charles S., 6642A.
Gray, Lewis H., 10018A.
Gray, Richard L., 32877A.
Gray, William L., 32865A.
Greensides, Lawrence A., 8606A.
Gresham, Walter V., Jr., 9738A.
Griffin, Donald E., 9838A.
Gulino, Vasco E., 9930A.
Guthrie, Donald B., 51697A.
Guzak, Francis W., 9870A.
Hackler, James F., Jr., 9839A.
Hagen, Alfred D., 10159A.
Halst, Glade F., 6333A.
Hale, Frederick N., Jr., 9727A.
Hallenbeck, Ralph J., 10170A.
Halsey, Fryer P., 6772A.
Hambleton, Bertram L., Jr., 9865A.
Hamel, Albert G., 9877A.
Hamilton, George G., 10328A.
Hamilton, Joseph C., Jr., 8273A.
Hamilton, Joseph L., 9770A.
Hamilton, William M., 9924A.
Hamlyn, Raymond E., 9956A.
Hansinger, Michael J., 9561A.
Hargrove, Clifford W., 10038A.
Harlow, Harold F., 9989A.
Harrington, Robert E., 9818A.
Harris, Bert S., 9938A.
Harris, Teague G., Jr., 10150A.
Harris, William F., 10049A.
Harrold, Frank J., Jr., 10107A.
Harvey, Luther R., 10325A.
Hayden, James H., 9235A.
Haynie, Frank M., 10221A.
Hearn, James A., 9979A.
Hehn, Earl L., Jr., 9778A.
Heller, Edwin L., 9900A.
Hellriegel, William C., 8643A.
Hemsley, Richard T., 3d, 10094A.
Henry, John G., 9903A.
Herbert, John J., Jr., 10000A.
Herman, Boyd, F., 8422A.
Herrington, Russel M., Jr., 9791A.
Hertel, Edward J., 10173A.
Hickey, John J., 10220A.
Higgins, Donald H., Jr., 9868A.
Hoewing, Ralph C., 7198A.
Hoffman, Robert W., 10126A.
Hogan, Henry L., 3d, 10151A.
Holbury, Robert J., 9893A.
Holderness, Arthur W., Jr., 10095A.
Holub, Richard C. A., 10022A.
Horlick, Walter I., 23180A.
Hoss, Robert J., 32860A.
Hough, Luther W., Jr., 10193A.
Hovatter, Elbert T., 9876A.
Hovde, William J., 9836A.
Howell, Sylvanus T., Jr., 9911A.
Hoyt, Robert F., 10006A.
Huau, Joseph H., Jr., 10140A.
Hudson, Jere H., 9983A.
Hudson, John B., 10174A.
Hudson, Ullin L., 10120A.
Hughes, John D., 10168A.
Huguley, Edward A., 10313A.
Hull, Robert R., 8003A.
Hunner, Paul C., 8350A.
Hunt, Marvin L., 7951A.
Huntley, James C., 9854A.
Hurley, Paul J., 10186A.
Hurr, Arthur P., 9850A.
Husztek, William S., 6561A.
Hutchens, David D., 9895A.
Hutcheson, George W., Jr., 10212A.
Hynes, Richard J., 9795A.
Ireland, Clare T., Jr., 10123A.
Irons, Stanley W., 9717A.
Irwin, Robert B., 7474A.
Isbell, Thomas W., Jr., 11956A.
Jack, William A., 10074A.
Jackson, Arthur V., 9817A.
Jacobsen, William L., 9889A.
Jamison, Eldon M., 9885A.
Jarvie, William J., 7688A.
Jens, Henry P., 10205A.
John, Ernest F., 10075A.
Johnson, Joseph G., Jr., 9744A.
Johnson, Merle, 9962A.
Johnson, Ralph A., 9862A.
Johnston, James E., 6827A.
Jolly, Hoyt A., Jr., 7180A.
Jones, David C., 9887A.
Jones, Grafton K., 6931A.
Jones, Oliver K., 32914A.
Jones, Oval W., 9379A.
Jordan, Hugh F., 9840A.
Kahley, William F., 32897A.
Kane, Francis X., 9774A.
Kane, Raymond J., Jr., 8845A.
Keating, Philip J., 9897A.
Keck, James M., 10122A.
Keefer, Norman J., 10198A.
Keith, Benjamin M., Jr., 10276A.
Kelley, Charles A., 13989A.
Kelley, Edward G., 9716A.
Kelly, Benjamin F., 32903A.
Kelly, Thomas C., 7411A.
Kendig, Robert L., 10291A.
Kennedy, Elmore M., Jr., 6634A.
Kenney, Paul H., 9728A.
Kenney, William R., 14428A.
Kerig, John A., Jr., 9786A.
Kilness, Kenneth F., 10255A.
Kilpatrick, William J., Jr., 10108A.
King, Charles W., 32898A.
King, William G., Jr., 8356A.
Kinney, George R., 9844A.
Kirby, Burton M., 9964A.
Kirby, Frank E., 10330A.
Klose, Benjamin B., 32887A.
Knapp, Robert H., 9465A.
Knauber, Leo V. M., 10312A.
Knisely, James W., 10267A.
Knox, Glen E., 9365A.
Koger, Harlis R., 6393A.
Kolody, Walter J., 9596A.
Kommers, William W., 6414A.
Krafka, Edward, 6783A.
Kraft, Eugene J., 6490A.
Kraus, James C., 9927A.
Kreps, Conrad, 10269A.
Kullman, John R., 10171A.
Kunde, Clinton M., 10311A.
Kyle, William D., Jr., 9845A.
Ladner, Pat H., 10329A.
Lamb, Hal W., 9344A.
Laroche, John J., 32866A.
Larson, James R., 10026A.
Latson, Harvey H., Jr., 10110A.
Lawley, William R., Jr., 10029A.
Lawrence, Preston H., 9987A.
Lawson, Harold B., 32875A.
Leclair, Charles A., 32868A.
Lee, John W., 32883A.
Lenfest, Charles W., 9760A.
Lewis, Leo C., 9914A.
Lilley, Earl A., 10228A.
Lilliedoll, Jarrold D., 9948A.
Lindell, Keith G., 9754A.
Little, Edwin L., 9977A.
Longacre, Earl, Jr., 32894A.
Love, Thomas M., 10129A.
Lovell, Carl E., 10237A.
Lovett, John R., 9849A.
Lowe, Jessup D., 9807A.
Lozito, Vincent J., 10012A.
Lucas, Lee R., 10071A.
Lucas, Noel A., 6370A.
Lundin, Robert L., 10217A.
Lundquist, Gilmore J. P., 32858A.
Lusby, Perry M., 9901A.
Lynch, David M., 32870A.
MacDonald, William R., 10019A.
Machemer, Carl C., 10251A.
MacNeill, Edward H., 9997A.
Madison, Gayle E., 10153A.
Madsen, Frank M., Jr., 9991A.
Magee, William F., 10239A.
Magrill, Arthur E., 6416A.
Mahone, John R., 9943A.
Malmgren, Victor P., 10263A.
Maloney, Robert S., Jr., 9771A.
Maloney, William R., 9708A.
Manship, Joseph, 10309A.
Markham, Peter J., 32864A.
Markham, Theon E., 9180A.
Markley, William C., Jr., 9993A.
Marks, Robert J., 6927A.
Marshall, Winton W., 9999A.
Martin, Cecil S., 10223A.
Martin, Maurice L., 10158A.
Martin, Sherman F., 9963A.
Martin, Stanley E., 6413A.
Martin, Thomas E., 7142A.
Mason, William H., 10030A.
Masters, Elmer L., 9880A.
Matelski, Erwin F., 32915A.
Mathison, Charles G., 10218A.
May, Britt S., 9843A.
Mazur, Henry J., 9825A.
McBride, William V., 10077A.
McCabe, Thomas E., 10195A.
McCall, David D., 32886A.
McCarthy, Frank J., 32861A.
McCarthy, Michael C., 9721A.
McClain, Howard P., 9892A.
McCloskey, Richard C., 9419A.
McCormack, Lemuel H., Jr., 9978A.
McCraw, Ruth, 21268W.
McCulloch, Robert C., 9860A.
McDonald, Joseph B., 32902A.
McDonald, Paul R., 10280A.
McElhone, James T., 7712A.
McEvoy, Edwin W., 6506A.
McFall, Dana F., Jr., 9959A.
McGarity, William V., 10017A.
McGee, Donald C., 8108A.
McGonnell, Owen J., 10088A.
McGough, Edward A., 3d, 9819A.
McIlhaney, Sam F., 10264A.
McKenny, Donald C., 10268A.
McLean, Edward R., 9884A.
McLean, Lawrence S., 10304A.
McNamara, James F., 7167A.
McNelly, Fred W., 6241A.
Meadville, Harry W., 9710A.
Mendelsohn, Irving P., 6224A.
Mennell, Robert C., 10066A.
Meppen, Robert C., 32879A.
Mestemaker, Joseph E., 10081A.
Metz, Robert C., 6769A.
Middlebrook, Paul L., 6552A.
Miles, Charles C., 6450A.
Miller, Burdsall D., 9745A.
Miller, George L., 7494A.
Miller, Jesse M., 9739A.
Miller, Robert, 10073A.
Miller, Roger H., 14421A.
Miller, Thomas B., 10036A.
Miller, Vaughan, Jr., 9899A.
Millin, John A., Jr., 8722A.
Millson, Edwin H., 10211A.
Milowski, Walter J., 9111A.
Mlotkowski, Henry F., 10973A.
Moler, John E., 10011A.
Monroe, Thomas G., Jr., 10229A.
Monsell, Charles F., 6706A.
Moore, Clifford J., Jr., 9794A.
Moore, George B., 9968A.
Moore, William C., 10125A.
Morrison, Bruce L., 8672A.
Morse, Raymond J., 32859A.
Mortensen, Fred N., 10233A.
Moxon, George W., 32913A.
Mulcahy, Donald M., 9934A.
Muldrow, Robert, 9788A.
Muller, James L., 7774A.
Mullis, Roy W., 7687A.
Munch, Christopher H., 10117A.
Murphy, Benjamin S., 9421A.
Murrah, Idas T., 6979A.
Murray, David H., 7700A.
Murray, Francis P., 21437A.
Murray, Norman L., 6513A.
Mustain, Ivan F., 9942A.
Myers, Joseph R., 9992A.
Nacy, William P., 9436A.
Nesselbush, Louis K., 10131A.
Neuer, John J., 10100A.
Newbury, Edward S. E., 8144A.
Newsum, Fitzroy, 32867A.

Nicholson, William S., 10279A.
Noble, Daniel J., 10332A.
Noel Frederick J., Jr., 32906A.
Noonan, Stephen F., 6380A.
Noriega, Virgil, 7507A.
Norley, Louis H., 9974A.
Norton, William J., 10008A.
Nunn, John W., 8245A.
Nuthall, Alfred J., 6939A.
O'Brien, Gilbert M., 10331A.
O'Connell, John F., 9747A.
O'Connor, Edmund F., 10200A.
O'Day, Helen E., 21261A.
Odren, Harry M., 8492A.
Ogletree, Robert C., Jr., 9981A.
Oholendt, Gene F., 10057A.
Olds, Robin, 10128A.
Olmstead, Earl O., Jr., 10141A.
O'Reagan, John P., 9912A.
Osborne, Earle L., 9715A.
Oswald, Norbert J., 10149A.
Overbey, George D., 10230A.
Park, Lionel O., 10286A.
Parker, Dan M., 9779A.
Parks, Merton L., 32880A.
Parris, Harry N., 9487A.
Paulsen, Daniel H., 8823A.
Paulson, Myhre E., 8319A.
Paxton, Heyward A., Jr., 9980A.
Pearson, Harvey A., 6969A.
Pengue, Marcy L., 6713A.
Perron, Gregory H., 9970A.
Perry, Joseph H., 10004A.
Peters, Charles K., 10068A.
Pezda, Edwin F., 8888A.
Piatnitza, Michael J., 32912A.
Pitts, William F., 9796A.
Pitts, Younger A., Jr., 9805A.
Pletcher, Gaylord L., 9378A.
Poore, Green B., 9508A.
Porter, George W., 9793A.
Portrum, Peter, 19778A.
Potter, Waldo F., 10165A.
Poulson, Ernest L., 9952A.
Powell, Charles E., 32904A.
Powell, Ellsworth A., 32907A.
Prather, Philip B., 10037A.
Pratt, Jean G., 7151A.
Pratt, Odgen N., 6359A.
Pratt, William C., 9722A.
Proudlove, Lloyd E., 9735A.
Pryor, Roger C., 32892A.
Puskar, Steven, Jr., 10015A.
Ramsey, J. W., 10092A.
Randall, Robert D. M., 10181A.
Rankin, Robert J., 9996A.
Rawlings, John W., Jr., 10172A.
Raymond, William H., Jr., 6476A.
Reed, Lawrence B., 32910A.
Renaud, Louis C., 9213A.
Rhodarmer, Roger K., 9921A.
Richard, Anthony H., Jr., 10202A.
Ridgell, James M., Jr., 6319A.
Riepe, Quenten A., 9883A.
Riley, Lewis R., 7537A.
Robbs, Charles E., 8928A.
Roberts, Joe E., 6499A.
Robertson, Lawrence R., 9367A.
Robinson, John W., 8415A.
Rogers, Felix M., 10067A.
Rogers, Robert C., 10284A.
Romaine, Owen W., 6614A.
Root, George R., 6326A.
Rose, Howard C., 10016A.
Rosenthal, Herbert, 7484A.
Rosness, Joseph H., 10192A.
Ross, Amos H., Jr., 10023A.
Rowland, Dwight R., 20023A.
Rule, Richard I., 10087A.
Rundell, Francis E., 2d, 10114A.
Russell, Leroy G., 10127A.
Ryan, William G., 9555A.
Sagert, Stanley A., 10065A.
Salter, Richard D., 7536A.
Sanctuary, Robert H., 10031A.
Sansone, Philip, 9936A.
Sargent, Hubert E., Jr., 9746A.
Sarte, Victor J., 6214A.
Savage, Cary L., 9913A.
Schaefer, Chris J. H., Jr., 10056A.
Schaffer, Louis, 10078A.
Schamber, Stanley Q., 32899A.
Schenk, Norbert R., 6950A.
Schilke, James F., 9986A.
Schlosberg, Richard T., Jr., 9816A.
Schlukbier, Alvin G., 6909A.
Schmidt, Herman J., 8962A.
Schmoldt, Harold D. L., 7697A.
Schutten, Bernard J., Jr., 9995A.
Schwartz, David G., 10194A.
Schwengels, Forrest V., 6485A.
Scott, George E., 8820A.
Scott, Travis M., 6352A.
Scott, William F., 10179A.
Searles, Dewitt R., 9907A.
Seiler, James R., 8429A.
Seith, Louis T., 9756A.
Sewell, Virgil R., 10083A.
Shadell, Kenneth L., 7959A.
Shaefer, Richard F., 10096A.
Shambeck, Clarence H., 9949A.
Shea, Daniel F., 10143A.
Sheley, Edward L., Jr., 9752A.
Sherrill, Stephen H., Jr., 10196A.
Shiely, Albert R., Jr., 1C106A.
Shirk, Harley O., 6556A.
Shockley, Thomas L., 10002A.
Shomo, William A., 8509A.
Shook, Carmel M., 10063A.
Shotwell, William B., 6915A.
Showalter, Roy R., Jr., 9976A.
Silvester, Lindsey M., 10156A.
Simmons, William B., 8966A.
Skeldon, Joseph L., 32881A.
Slusher, John T., 9614A.
Smith, Charles C., 9354A.
Smith, Earl O., Jr., 8607A.
Smith, Francis H., 32908A.
Smith, Harold V., 10295A.
Smith, Kenneth B., 10112A.
Smith, Lowell B., 10103A.
Smith, Ralph L., 10089A.
Smith, Richard E., 6998A.
Smith, Russell J., 9811A.
Smith, William K., 6895A.
Smith, William K., 8002A.
Snavely, William W., 10177A.
Snodgrass, James P., 10318A.
Snyder, Wayne K., 9898A.
Sorrell, Larue S., 6958A.
Souleyret, Kenneth, 10009A.
Sours, Robert J., 9179A.
Spieth, Charles, Jr., 10199A.
Spitler, Lee W., 10052A.
Stafford, Gordon H., 6454A.
Stein, Frederick P., 9500A.
Steinle, Paul L., 10169A.
Stevens, Charles J., 32884A.
Stevenson, John T., 9448A.
Stevenson, Robert J., 7209A.
Stewart, James P., 32885A.
Stewart, Raymond R., 10314A.
Stewart, Tom B., 7854A.
Stewart, William R., Jr., 9835A.
Stoddard, Richard W., 10138A.
Stokely, Joe E., 6396A.
Strang, Charles F., 9935A.
Stuart, Joseph A., Jr., 9828A.
Sturdevant, Donald E., 10093A.
Suehr, Richard C., 7886A.
Suggs, John J., 6570A.
Sullivan, Roy M., Jr., 13942A.
Sullivan, William C., 10079A.
Summers, Clifford L., 48709A.
Swan, Clinton D., 10224A.
Swan, Frederic F., 10271A.
Swanson, Darwin E., 7496A.
Sweat, Dale S., 10190A.
Sykes, George K., 9763A.
Talbott, Carlos M., 9853A.
Taliaferro, Walter R., 9792A.
Tapscott, Wilbur A., 10076A.
Tarbutton, Paul R., 48712A.
Taylor, Charles M., 6551A.
Taylor, Emery D., 10033A.
Taylor, Lester G., Jr., 9802A.
Teller, J. Craig, 10184A.
Thomas, William K., 10307A.
Thomasson, Samuel M., Jr., 20025A.
Thompson, Donn G., 10062A.
Thompson, William M., 9841A.
Tillman, Herman G., Jr., 9990A.
Trimble, Harry W., 7127A.
Truesdell, Carlyle L., 32905A.
Tucker, Albert S. J., Jr., 10182A.
Tucker, Janna, 21234W.
Turk, Wilbert, 9740A.
Turner, Hiram G., Jr., 9784A.
Turner, Vernon R., 10145A.
Tyminski, Edward F., 32889A.
Tyrrell, Robert L. F., 10020A.
Umoff, Alexis P., 9919A.
Vague, Harold R., 22991A.
Vanden Dries, William P., 9873A.
Vanduyn, John E., 9827A.
Vaughn, William E., Jr., 6261A.
Verbeck, Peter, 6300A.
Verdel, Thomas H., 48710A.
Vetter, Fred W., Jr., 9719A.
Vignetti, John L., 6410A.
Vicek, Donald H., 9783A.
Wade, William G., 10215A.
Walker, James H., 10116A.
Walker, William A., 6586A.
Wallace, Duane G., 10222A.
Wallace, Robert D., 7757A.
Wallach, John A., 9931A.
Wallen, Francis L., 7528A.
Waller, Walter R., Jr., 9549A.
Walling, Robert J., 9829A.
Wambold, William H., 10025A.
Watkins, James H., 10104A.
Watson, Lawrence M., 10109A.
Watson, Richard C., 6455A.
Watson, Warren K., 32901A.
Watson, William B., 7011A.
Watts, Ralph K., 7844A.
Wayne, Byron M., 10234A.
Weart, George S., 9789A.
Weber, John L., Jr., 9772A.
Weil, August E., 9736A.
Weir, Robert A., 10225A.
Weller, Russell K., 8865A.
Wenk, Walter R., 8000A.
West, Howard F., 6529A.
Westbrook, Marston T., 10148A.
Whitaker, Keith A., 10163A.
White, Andrew M., 6991A.
Whitescarver, John T., 10327A.
Whitlow, Robert V., 9837A.
Whitson, Jack H., 10105A.
Whittington, Riley N., 6193A.
Wickham, Wallace, 9718A.
Wigbels, Lawrence G., 8586A.
Wight, Carroll H., 7555A.
Wilfong, John J., 8983A.
Williams, Coleman O., Jr., 9709A.
Williams, Owen J., 10261A.
Williams, Philip Y., 49131A.
Williams, Richard A., 6498A.
Williams, Todd G., 10059A.
Willis, Lloy C., 6828A.
Wilson, Campbell P. M., 6229A.
Wilson, Louis L., Jr., 9803A.
Wilson, William M., 9920A.
Winget, Francis E., 6296A.
Winkler, John M., 8283A.
Winn, Otis E., 10013A.
Wiseman, Joseph L., 10041A.
Woida, Joseph A., 7215A.
Wojdyla, Henry E., 10289A.
Wolfe, Gerald, 9939A.
Wood, Willis H., 10297A.
Woodruff, Laymont V., 9971A.
Woodward, Valin R., 32900A.
Wooles, Marcellus R., 6271A.
Workman, Bryant A., 8201A.
Worrell, Rowland H., Jr., 32888A.
Wright, Edmund A., Jr., 10180A.
Wright, Robert J., 9953A.
Wright, Robert L., 10048A.
Wright, Wallace A., 7015A.
Wydner, Clarence S., 9975A.

Yopchick, Michael P., 9732A.
Yount, Barton K., Jr., 9834A.
Zubon, Michael, 10134A.

Medical Corps

Bell, Horace S., 24650A.
Borah, William N., 19274A.
Campbell, Daniel C., Jr., 19290A.
Condit, Norman I., 19956A.
Connor, Joseph A., Jr., 19279A.
Cook, Charles E., Jr., 26629A.
Everett, William F., 27583A.
Kurland, Anthony M., 19277A.
Leiter, Eugene R. K., 26691A.
Lifton, Solomon E., 19318A.
Parish, Herman S., Jr., 24109A.
Peters, Don P., Jr., 19248A.
Prior, Bradley W., 19249A.
Rudolph, Stephen J., Jr., 26350A.
Thomas, Herrick M., 19566A.
Tirman, Robert M., 19255A.
Troxell, John R., 21682A.
Willmarth, Charles L., 29612A.

Dental Corps

Brandt, Alfred E., 18933A.
Doran, Arthur S., 19960A.
Jameson, John R., 18955A.
McMahon, Charles A., 25731A.
Merrill, Bob K., 23120A.
Rudd, Kenneth D., 27487A.
Weber, Carl E., 21426A.
Wolfe, Rowland D., Jr., 18924A.

Veterinary Corps

Beadner, Harold F., 18997A.
Hempy, Jack H., 19003A.
Lasher, Norbert A., 18998A.
Maceachern, Neil G., 19004A.
Nichols, Wilbert C., 19920A.
Taylor, Albert A., 22461A.

Medical Service Corps

Bassoff, William, 48897A.
Edwards, Gerald, 48898A.
Eledge, William W., Jr., 19465A.
Fulton, John D., 19452A.
Gfeller, Walter F., 48896A.
Jarboe, Wallace E., 19470A.
Johnson, William M., 19469A.
King, Paul W., 19457A.
Liles, Ben C., 19456A.
Meyer, Alvin F. Jr., 19463A.
Moore, David L., 19458A.
Rogers, John M., 19455A.
Sangster, Maynard A., 19471A.
Shanahan, Eugene L., 19466A.
Thompson, Ralph E., 19464A.
Turnipseed, Lawrence L., Jr., 19468A.
Wagner, Owen B., 19454A.
Westra, Donald F., 19467A.
Wood, Ross A., 19451A.

Nurse Corps

Bedard, Evelyn M., 21107W.
Brimmer, Aileen E., 20947W.
Coffman, Catherine A., 21927W.
Echols, Hilda R., 21037W.
Fill, Wanda I., 21096W.
Fintak, Florence F., 21983W.
Kelly, Evelyn A., 20950W.
Krieble, Alice R., 21956W.
Price, Margaret M., 20948W.
Skinner, Alice L., 20994W.
Thorp, Frances P., 20902W.
Tregea, Ruth E., 20949W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Larue, Jack, 22057W.
Laughlin, Mary M., 22058W.

Chaplain

Blatz, Roman T., 18793A.
Brennan, George J., 18795A.
Clasby, William J., 48563A.
Daniels, John F., 48559A.
Gardner, Marvin O., 48562A.
Guiler, Horace A., 48561A.
Hepner, Thomas G., 18794A.
Johnston, Alfred T., 55096A.
Murphy, Francis X., 48560A.
Northrop, Albert H., 55097A.
Tomasovic, Paul, 48564A.
Whitlock, Harold T., 18797A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment as permanent professors of the U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(b), title 10, United States Code:

Col. Christopher H. Munch, 10117A.
Col. James V. G. Wilson, 1112A.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

TO BE MAJORS, USAF (MEDICAL)

Harvey W. Hertz, AO2241170.
Myron J. Woltjen, AO3076978.

TO BE MAJOR, USAF (DENTAL)

Harcourt M. Stebbins, AO3043741.

TO BE CAPTAINS, USAF (MEDICAL)

Joseph H. Coleman, AO3041899.
Harold A. Holtman, AO3045953.
Chester W. Peeples, Jr., AO2261989.
Donald R. Seidel, AO3074788.
John T. Whitley, AO3076701.

TO BE CAPTAINS, USAF (DENTAL)

Arnold A. Angelici.
Donald E. Barnhill, AO840055.
Robert L. Jensen, O4050791.

TO BE CAPTAINS, USAF (JUDGE ADVOCATE)

Paul V. Dixon, AO842789.
James C. Hancock, AO2216004.
Robert A. Zellers, AO1554501.

TO BE CAPT 'N, USAF (NURSE)

Mary J. Schuelke, AN792464.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, USAF (MEDICAL)

John A. DeBruin, Jr., AO3074952.
William F. Deverell, AO3075577.
Dennis C. Drake, AO3045273.
George E. Hanson.
David L. Hegg, AO3075024.
Alan G. Herrington, AO3075084.
William E. Painter.
Carlton J. Peterson, AO3075008.
Samuel C. Petrie, AO2217404.
Herbert B. Spencer, AO3075141.
Ed L. Stevens, AO3078055.
Stewart A. Vernooy, Jr., AO3075300.
Bruce H. Warren, AO3088650.
James F. Wittmer, AO3079264.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, USAF (JUDGE ADVOCATE)

Arthur E. Arnow, AO3050087.
Richard M. Bayus, AO3060614.
Kenneth B. Knowles, AO3051761.
John J. Stirk, AO3060822.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, USAF (NURSE)

Mary L. McLaughlin, AN3078247.
Twila M. Wills, AN2243489.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, USAF (NURSE)

Sally A. Souder, AN3078713.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

TO BE MAJORS

Paul M. Callahan, AO581479.
Henry L. Dailey, AO649175.
Clyde D. Douglass, AO663875.
Charles B. Findley, AO746523.
Glenferd E. Funk, AO735563.
Marvin W. Glasgow, AO746091.
Clarence H. Hagins, Jr., AO522304.
Burnie P. Hayes, Jr., AO729625.
Earl L. Holcomb, AO2061382.
Robert L. Hunt, AO568737.
George W. MacSparran, AO659829.
Peter S. Marioles, AO801185.
Leon W. Moline, AO833177.
Matthew E. Perry, Jr., AO569738.
Jesse G. Pickering III, AO564040.
Alfred J. Rumburg, AO726484.
Thomas G. Sams, AO710185.
Meredith H. Shade, AO407127.
John C. Shumate, AO1534145.
Herschell E. Simmons, AO556895.
Emanuel N. Stevens, AO2040711.
Harry S. Waller, AO772922.
Perry P. Wells, AO726864.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Raymond D. Anderson, AO1860938.
Narsh D. Benson, AO2223819.
Edward P. Burrus, Jr., AO2216512.
Luther M. Hawkins, AO1910979.
Donald R. Hayes, AO2223627.
Bernard R. Hazelbaker, AO784154.
Robert S. Johnson, AO2223854.
Hilton P. Jones, Jr., AO2236371.
Edwin H. Kohlhepp, Jr., AO830621.
William F. Loyd, Jr., AO2223760.
Milton W. McRae, AO2236308.
Donald L. Olson, AO2223885.
Joseph J. Student, AO1854790.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Willard C. Bachli, AO3064453.
William F. Baird, Jr., AO3052505.
Billy W. Batson, AO3046455.
Hugh G. Blocker, AO3052584.
Thomas G. Bonser, AO3052535.
John J. Christensen, AO3053793.
Robert B. Clayton, AO3053789.
William B. Crockett, A3026753.
Jay B. Day, AO3064632.
James H. Frogge, AO3052771.
Clarence C. Gay, Jr., AO3052392.
John R. Gilchrist, AO3053177.
William J. Gorman, AO3064504.
Leonard E. Haskovec, AO3053795.
Norman E. Hermes, AO3064508.
George M. Jarvis, AO3064679.
James D. Jefferson, AO3052266.
Claude J. Johns, Jr., AO3051691.
Frederic A. Kay, AO3052267.
Warren F. Klima, AO3053322.
Clifford L. Lee, AO3052809.
Robert F. Loken, AO3064494.
Leland M. Martin, AO3064654.
William C. Maxwell, AO3064656.
Roger E. McClure, AO3053043.
John N. McCormack, AO3064686.
Danilo B. Medigovich, AO3028274.
Rolland W. Moore, Jr., AO3048097.
Stephen E. Pettko, AO3052544.
Philip M. Pillar, AO3064694.
Victor G. Ramage, AO3053676.
Dean D. Roelle, AO3064569.
James L. Russell, AO3053203.
Thomas V. Soltys, AO3064524.
Jeremy C. Thomas, AO3058531.
William E. Thomas, AO3064700.
Donald R. Vallance, AO3053550.
Robert W. Weaver, AO3051508.
Charles L. Wilmot, Jr., AO3051056.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS—DISTINGUISHED OFFICER CANDIDATE GRADUATES

Donald B. Button, AO3101426.
Wayne L. Christison, AO3101386.
Brian D. Cornett, AO3101487.
Robert W. Farland, AO3101257.
Mylan A. Haugen, AO3087904.
Sheila M. Henry, AL3101602.
Gary J. Holliman, AO3101214.
Robert K. Kelly, AO3101265.
Darrell D. Lynch, AO3101307.

Reynolds W. McCabe, AO3101326.
Gene E. Perkins, AO3101538.
Joseph A. Schmitt, AO3101557.
Harry Sexton, AO3101563.
William J. Soltis, AO3101572.
Cedric D. M. Viggers, AO3101587.
James W. Wassall, AO3101588.
Bryan T. Woods, AO3101597.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

William S. Kinkead
Robert C. Lorenzetti

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 5, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Psalm 145: 18: *The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him, to all that call upon Him in truth.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we are again assembling in this Chamber, grateful for the manifold manifestation of Thy might and Thy mercy.

May the kind and gentle Spirit of our blessed Lord possess and permeate our souls more completely, making them fragrant with Thy grace and fruitful in service for needy humanity.

We beseech Thee to illumine our minds with a clearer vision and a deeper experience of Thyself, for Thou alone art the source of the true, the good, and the beautiful and the only hope for peace and good will in a discordant and distracted world.

Grant that all the barriers of rancor among the nations and the prejudice and bigotry, which blind the heart of mankind to brotherhood, may be taken away.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7007. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research, and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. DODD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. MARTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7120. An act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and for other purposes.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

(H. REPT. No. 435)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 16. (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to request and consent to an increase of $1,375,000,000 in the quota of the United States under article III, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Fund, as proposed in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Fund dated February 2, 1959.

"'(b) The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized (1) to vote for increases in the capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Bank, as recommended in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Bank dated February 2, 1959, and (2) if such increases become effective, to subscribe on behalf of the United States to thirty-one thousand seven hundred and fifty additional shares of stock under article II, section 3, of the articles of agreement of the Bank.'

"SEC. 2. Section 7(b) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by striking out 'of $950,000,000', and by striking out 'not to exceed $4,125,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$8,675,000,000'."

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
EDGAR W. HIESTAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
WILLIAM LANGER,
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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill amended the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to increase by $4,550 million (from $4,125 million to $8,675 million) the amount authorized to be made available through public debt transactions for the payment by the United States of its subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The corresponding provision of the House amendment eliminated the figure of $8,675 million, substituting an authorization of "such amounts as may be necessary" to implement the existing agreements. The House recedes. The managers on the part of the House agreed with the Senate conferees that the phraseology in the House amendment without any clearly apparent monetary limitation might be misunderstood.

The Senate bill contained a provision under which the amendments made by the bill would not become effective until July 1, 1959. This provision was deleted by the House amendment. The committee of conference agreed to the House amendment in this respect, so that the bill as agreed to in conference will take effect on enactment. This will permit the United States to take a position of leadership in putting the authorized increases into effect.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
EDGAR W. HIESTAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

SOVIET SUBMARINES AND BASES

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a headline in the Washington Post this morning reads: "Red Missile Submarine Seen by Navy in Atlantic."

It seems a case of whisky was offered as a prize to the crew sighting this phenomenon in time for the consideration by Congress of the military appropriation bill.

I will offer a case of whisky to any naval personnel who can cite a single ice-free open sea base the Soviet possesses from which to operate these submarines; and I will double it if it comes in time to save the taxpayers the extra quarter of a billion dollars the Navy is getting to fight the baseless Soviet submarine fleet.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the House that on June 2, 1959, report No. 422 to accompany H.R. 3 from the Committee on the Judiciary, was filed in the House, and on page 36 of that report as signers to the minority views of section 2 of H.R. 3, my name appears. This is incorrect. On page 19 of the same report, my name does appear as one of the members of the House Committee on the Judiciary that signed the minority views on section 1 of H.R. 3. This is correct.

May I state, Mr. Speaker, that I am in favor of section 2 of H.R. 3, the bill to establish rules of interpretation for Federal courts involving the doctrine of Federal preemption.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon on the Public Works appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday my very dear friend, the majority leader, had some harsh things to say about our side of the aisle in connection with threats of vetoes on pending legislation. Just to keep the record straight and to carry out a promise I made yesterday to check the RECORD in order to find out what the facts were and are, I think I should make a statement.

First of all, the majority leader said:

> I remember when it was confidently predicted on the floor of the House, when we had the railroad retirement bill up, that the President would veto it.

I said that I had made no such statement and recalled no such statement having been made by any Member.

Then the majority leader said:

> I do not say that the gentleman from Indiana made the statement, but certainly other Members made the statement.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that before the debate started on that bill I called the White House and was told no information could be given to us as to the attitude of the President on the bill. The whole debate proceeded on that basis as far as our side of the aisle was concerned.

In the course of the colloquy yesterday I stated to the membership, and that is the principal reason I speak today, that I wanted to check the RECORD myself to find out whether any Member made any such statement as referred to by the majority leader. That has been done and the RECORD is completely devoid of any such threat or statement.

To what I said yesterday, I want only to add that I said to the President that if the bill were vetoed the veto would be sustained, not only by votes on the Republican side but by votes of many on the Democratic side.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 66]

Adair	Chamberlain	Friedel
Addonizio	Coad	Garmatz
Alexander	Collier	Giaimo
Anfuso	Daddario	Granahan
Ayres	Daniels	Gray
Baring	Davis, Tenn.	Green, Oreg.
Barrett	Dawson	Green, Pa.
Barry	Denton	Griffiths
Bass, Tenn.	Derounian	Hall
Bates	Derwinski	Halpern
Baumhart	Devine	Hays
Becker	Diggs	Hemphill
Betts	Dingell	Holtzman
Blitch	Dixon	Hosmer
Bolling	Dollinger	Irwin
Bosch	Donohue	Jackson
Bowles	Dooley	Johnson, Calif.
Boykin	Dorn, N.Y.	Karth
Brewster	Durham	Kasem
Buckley	Evins	Kearns
Burke, Mass.	Fallon	Keith
Byrnes, Wis.	Farbstein	Kelly
Cahill	Fascell	Keogh
Canfield	Feighan	Kirwan
Carnahan	Fino	Kluczynski
Celler	Forrester	Knox
Laird	Pillion	Taylor
Latta	Powell	Teague, Tex.
Lindsay	Quie	Teller
McCulloch	Quigley	Toll
Macdonald	Reece, Tenn.	Tuck
Machrowicz	Riehlman	Utt
Mack, Ill.	Rodino	Van Pelt
Martin	Rostenkowski	Wainwright
May	Saylor	Wallhauser
Meader	Scherer	Walter
Merrow	Schwengel	Westland
Moeller	Sheppard	Whitener
Multer	Shipley	Withrow
Norblad	Smith, Miss.	Wolf
O'Brien, N.Y.	Staggers	Zelenko
O'Konski	Steed	
Patman	Stratton	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 306 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion I ask the gentleman from Iowa if it will be agreeable to him that general debate extend not to exceed 2 hours.

Mr. JENSEN. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Iowa and myself.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7509) with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the consent agreement the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, paraphrasing the last words of a great patriot: "We regret that we have but one Treasury to give to our country."

We could have used many treasuries merely in supplying the amounts requested by Members of the House and Senate.

As an indication of the extent of the amounts requested I include a tabulation.

REQUESTED PROJECTS

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
ALASKA										
Chena River at Fairbanks	1.7	$10,790,000		0			$300,000		$300,000	Hon. Ralph Rivers.
Dillingham Harbor	1.3	412,000			0			$406,000	406,000	Do.
Douglas Harbor	1.2	370,000		0			12,000		12,000	Do.
Harbor and Rivers of Alaska (Navigation)	Not applicable	400,000	$30,000			$79,000			79,000	Do.
Harbors and Rivers of Alaska (flood control)	do	850,000	25,000			51,000			51,000	Do.
Homer small boat basin	1.5	553,000			0			545,000	545,000	Do.
Juneau Harbor	1.05	1,970,000		0			36,000		36,000	Do.
Kodiak	Not applicable	25,000	0			20,000			20,000	Do.
Matanuska River	do	1,000	0			1,000			1,000	Do.
Naknek River	1.7	23,000			0			21,000	21,000	Do.
Ninilchik Harbor	1.3	202,000			0			197,000	197,000	Do.
Petersburg Harbor	Not applicable	18,000	0			18,000			18,000	Do.
Rampart Canyon	do	[1] 130,000	0			100,000			100,000	Do.
Seldovia Harbor	1.5	840,000			0			816,000	816,000	Do.
Seinard	Not applicable	25,000	0			15,000			15,000	Do.
Skagway	0.9	960,000			0			937,000	937,000	Do.
Wrangell Narrows	1.1	735,000			0			733,000	733,000	Do.
ALABAMA										
Holt lock and dam	1.1	33,000,000		0			150,000 (By transfer from Jackson lock and dam)		200,000	Hons. Armistead I. Selden, Jr., George W. Andrews, and Albert Rains; Senator John Sparkman; Hons. Frank Boykin, Carl Elliott, Kenneth A. Roberts, and George Huddleston, Jr.; Senator Lister Hill; Hons. George M. Grant, Robert E. Jones, and Frank W. Boykin.
Millers Ferry lock and dam	1.1	52,300,000		0			200,000		200,000	Hons. George W. Andrews, Albert Rains, and Frank W. Boykin, and entire Alabama delegation.
ARKANSAS										
Arkansas River bank stabilization [3]	1.1 [2]	[3] 102,800,000			[4] $4,000,000			9,500,000	[3] 9,500,000	Hon. W. F. Norrell and Senator Mike Monroney.
Beaver Dam	1.1	50,500,000			0			1,500,000	[5] 1,500,000	Hon. James W. Trimble.
Benton Dam survey		5,000	0			5,000			5,000	Hon. W. F. Norrell.
Clarksville seawall	1.6	273,000			0			259,000	259,000	Hon. James W. Trimble.
DeGray Dam	1.2	32,000,000		0			$150,000		150,000	Hon. Oren Harris.
Gillham Reservoir	1.4	10,100,000					150,000		80,000	Hons. Otto Passman, Carl Albert, and Oren Harris.
Ouachita River, 9-foot channel	1.3 (July 1957)	[6] 21,700,000		0			150,000		[7] 150,000	Hons. Oren Harris and Otto Passman.
Red River	1.3	9,880,000			700,000			1,000,000	700,000	Hons. Oren Harris, Overton Brooks, Harold B. McSween, and Carl Albert.
CALIFORNIA										
Bodega Bay (O. & M.)								481,000	481,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
Bolinas Channel		25,000				15,000			15,000	Do.
Black Butte Reservoir	1.4	18,300,000						5,500,000	5,500,000	Hons. John E. Moss and Harold T. Johnson.
(R) Central Valley project, water study of San Felipe division.			50,000			50,000			50,000	Hon. Charles S. Gubser.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
CALIFORNIA—continued										
(R) Chowchilla irrigation loans					0			$2,633,000	$2,633,000	Hon. B. F. Sisk.
Dry Creek resurvey (Russian River)		$150,000				$50,000			50,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
(R) Georgetown Divide Public Utilities District	Not available				0			3,878,000	3,867,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Humboldt Harbor resurvey		25,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
(R) Jackson Valley irrigation	Not available				0			1,091,000	1,320,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Los Banos Creek Study		30,000				10,000			10,000	Hon. B. F. Sisk.
Merced Stream group study		80,000				20,000			20,000	Do.
Mill Creek levees	2.1	1,740,000						500,000	500,000	Hon. Harry R. Sheppard.
Mormon Slough survey		40,000				20,000			25,000	Hon. John J. McFall.
New Hogan Dam	1.7	19,300,000						1,500,000	1,500,000	Hons. John J. McFall, Harold T. Johnson and Senator Clair Engle.
New Melones Dam	1.2	80,600,000					$600,000		600,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Noyo breakwater	1.2	2,250,000					56,000		300,000	Hon. Clement W. Miller.
Red Bank and Fancher Creeks		25,000				10,000			10,000	Hon. B. F. Sisk.
Redwood City Harbor	1.6	1,380,000						1,378,000	1,378,000	Hon. J. Arthur Younger.
Sacramento River deep water channel	1.2	45,600,000			$7,500,000			11,500,000	11,500,000	Hons. Harold T. Johnson and John E. Moss.
Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	1.2	1,760,000					50,000		50,000	Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1.2	23,000,000			1,100,000			2,000,000	1,200,000	Do.
San Francisco Bay study		3,760,000	$400,000			750,000			900,000	Hons. John F. Shelley, William S. Mailliard, and Charles S. Gubser.
San Francisco Bay to Stockton		150,000	25,000					46,000	46,000	Hon. John F. Baldwin.
San Lorenzo Creek	1.2	6,240,000			1,200,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	Hon. George P. Miller.
San Luis (Obispo) Harbor		60,000	15,000			30,000				Hon. Charles Teague.
Santa Clara River	3.0	2,930,000			1,300,000			1,500,000	1,500,000	Do.
Santa Cruz Harbor	1.6	1,740,000						500,000	500,000	Hon. Charles S. Gubser.
Santa Maria River	2.2	11,400,000			2,200,000			2,500,000	2,500,000	Hon. Charles Teague.
Sausalito Irrigation District (loan)	Not available				0			4,384,000	4,384,000	Hons. Harlan Hagen and B. F. Sisk.
Soquel Creek		52,000				3,000			10,000	Hon. Charles S. Gubser.
Stewart Can on debris basin	1.4	1,670,000		$62,000			Increase budget somewhat.		62,000	Hon. Charles Teague.
Success Dam	1.3	14,200,000			4,000,000			4,500,000	4,500,000	Hon. Harlan Hagen.
Sweetwater River		75,000				75,000			40,000	Hon. Bob Wilson.
(R) Trinity River Division	2.38	262,000,000			37,128,723			42,128,723	37,128,723	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
(R) Trinity River power facilities	Not available	59,607,000			0			2,500,000	2,415,000	Hon. Clair Engle, Senator Thomas Kuchel, Hon. Harold T. Johnson.
(R) Trinity River power facilities (opposition)										Hon. James B. Utt, Hon. Charles S. Gubser.
Whitewater River		320,000	20,000			40,000			40,000	Hon. D. S. Saund.
Public Law 685, new projects								4,000,000		Hon. John F. Baldwin.
COLORADO										
Purgatoire Dam, Colo. (Trinidad)	1.2	19,200,000		75,000			75,000		75,000	Hon. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
(R) Smith Fork, Colo	1.2	4,420,000			0			740,000	730,000	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
Do								750,000		Hon. Henry Dixon.
Do								750,000		Hon. David S. King.
(R) Curecanti Storage Unit	1.23	72,450,000						2,000,000	1,400,000	Hons. David S. King and Henry Dixon.
CONNECTICUT										
Baltic (project not yet authorized; to be considered in survey report on Thames River).									0	Hon. Chester Bowles.
East Branch dam at Torrington	1 3	2,010,000		0			150,000		250,000	Senator Thomas J. Dodd.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
CONNECTICUT—continued										
Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir	2.4	$2,210,000		$75,000			$150,000		$250,000	Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Hon. Chester Bowles, and Hon. John S. Monagan.
Mad River Reservoir	1.2	5,970,000		75,000			252,000		275,000	Do.
West Thompson Reservoir (project not yet authorized; recommended in survey report).								$409,000	(2)	Hon. Chester Bowles.
Surveys:										
Connecticut River navigation study, vicinity of Essex		7,500	0			$7,500			7,500	Do.
Poquonnock River navigation study		10,000	0			10,000			10,000	Do.
Thames River navigation study		9,500	0			9,500			9,500	Do.
FLORIDA										
Apalachicola Bay, East Point Channel (reimbursement)	Not applicable	39,100			0			39,100	39,100	Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes.
Apalachicola Bay, St. George Island (reimbursement)	do	43,000			0			41,900	43,000	Do.
Cedar Keys harbor and channel survey		15,200	0			15,000			0	Hon. Billy Matthews.
Cross-Florida Barge Canal	1.1	165,100,000		0			160,000		160,000	Hons. Charles E. Bennett, Billy Matthews, and A. S. Herlong, Jr.
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River.	1.3	6,860,000			0			1,400,000	1,400,000	Hons. Paul G. Rogers, William C. Cramer, Carl Elliott, and James A. Haley.
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	Not evaluated	19,200,000			$1,130,000			1,230,000 ($100,000 for planning below Fort Pierce.)	1,530,000	Hons. Charles E. Bennett, William C. Cramer, Dante B. Fascell, A. S. Herlong, Jr., Billy Matthews, Paul G. Rogers, Robert L. F. Sikes, and James A. Haley.
Central and southern Florida flood control	3.8	237,500,000			9,000,000			20,371,800	13,000,000	Do.
Ybor Channel and Port Sutton study						27,000			27,000	Hon. William C. Cramer.
Port Everglades	2.2	6,740,000			0			1,250,000	1,250,000	Hon. Paul G. Rogers.
Suwannee River project survey		100,000	0			57,000			40,000	Hon. Billy Matthews.
Port Tampa Channel and turning basin								2,014,000	2,014,000	Hon. William C. Cramer.
Intracoastal Waterway, St. Marks River to Tampa Bay		100,000	0			60,000			60,000	Hon. Robert L. F. Sikes.
GEORGIA										
Altmaha River investigation		76,000	$26,000			100,000			26,000	Hon. Iris Blitch.
Brunswick Harbor	1.5	2,030,000			1,150,000			1,350,000	1,350,000	Do.
Savannah turning basin		4,000	0			4,000			4,000	Hon. Prince H. Preston.
HAWAII										
Kahului Harbor	2.9	963,000						945,000	(10) 945,000	Hon. John A. Burns.
IDAHO										
Bruces Eddy (opposition to)										Hon. William H. Meyer, of Vermont.
(R) Palisades project, preserve appropriation for reregulating reservoir (carryover).					(500,000)			(500,000)		Hon. Hamer H. Budge.
ILLINOIS										
Big Muddy River		260,500	30,000			124,000			124,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Calumet Union Drainage District	1.8	716,000			0			716,000	250,000	Hon. Edward J. Derwinski.
Degognia-Fountain Bluff Drainage and Levee District		39,000	0			39,000			39,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Drury Drainage and Levee District	3.7	1,520,000			0			540,000	540,000	Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield.
England Pond levee	0.5	660,000		0			10,000		10,000	Hons. Edna Simpson and George E. Shipley.
Fort Chartres-Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District		30,000	0			30,000			30,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Grand Tower Drainage and Levee District		28,000	0			38,000			28,000	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
ILLINOIS—continued										
Henderson River diversion	2.8	$1,750,000			0			$550,000	$550,000	Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield.
Hunt and Lima Lake Drainage Districts	1.8	5,420,000			0			1,000,000	1,000,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Indian Grave Drainage District	1.5	5,420,000		0			$100,000		100,000	Do.
Little Calumet River Basin study		48,000	0			$98,000			20,000	Hon. Edward J. Derwinski.
Miller City		63,100	0			35,000			35,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Prairie du Rocher Drainage and Levee District		40,000	0			40,000			40,000	Do.
Shelbyville Reservoir	1.6	17,600,000		$50,000			125,000		125,000	Hon. Peter F. Mack.
Stringtown Drainage District		20,000	0			20,000			20,000	Hon. Kenneth J. Gray.
Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District No. 1.	2.5	4,180,000		0			100,000		100,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Wabash River at and above White River		292,000		25,000			40,000		40,000	Hon. George E. Shipley.
INDIANA										
Brookville Reservoir	1.3	19,300,000		0			25,000		25,000	Hon. Earl Hogan.
Cannelton Lock	4.2	65,900,000		0			150,000		150,000	Hon. Winfield K. Denton.
Clinton levee	Pending restudy	93,000		0			5,000		5,000 (restudy)	Hon. Fred Wampler.
Crooked Creek		35,000	0			25,000			25,000	Hon. Earl Hogan.
Monroe Reservoir	2.3	4,960,000		75,000			100,000		100,000	Do.
Patoka River study		76,200	0						Combined with Wabash River study.	Hon. William G. Bray.
Sugar Creek levee	1.5	370,000		0			15,000		15,000	Hon. Fred Wampler.
Terre Haute L.P.P. (Conover levee)	Pending restudy	240,000		0			2,000		2,000 (restudy)	Do.
Uniontown lock	3.2	52,500,000		0			250,000		250,000	Hon. Winfield K. Denton.
Wabash River Basin above White River		292,000	$25,000			40,000			40,000	Hon. Fred Wampler.
West Terre Haute L.P.P.	1.2	473,000		0			30,000		30,000	Do.
Whitewater Basin study		70,000	0				25,000		25,000	Hon. Earl Hogan.
Huntington Reservoir	1.3	14,200,000		25,000			25,000		25,000	Hons. William T. Murphy (Ill.), Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Peter F. Mack (Ill.), and William L. Springer (Ill.).
Mississinewa Reservoir	1.2	22,000,000		150,000			150,000		150,000	Hons. William T. Murphy (Ill.), Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Peter F. Mack (Ill.), and William L. Springer (Ill.).
Salamonie Reservoir	1.6	15,500,000		150,000			150,000		150,000	Hons. William T. Murphy (Ill.), Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.), Melvin Price (Ill.), Peter F. Mack (Ill.), and William L. Springer (Ill.).
IOWA										
Floyd River	1.7	9,100,000		100,000					150,000	Hon. Charles B. Hoeven.
Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	1.7	1,570,000		0			75,000		75,000	Hons. Edna Simpson and Fred Schwengel.
Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1.4	7,920,000		100,000			100,000		750,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Mississippi River at Clinton:										
Repair of damages	Not available	155,000			0			147,000	154,000	Hon. Leonard G. Wolf.
Improvement of Beaver Slough	4.0	267,000			0			241,000	262,000	Do.
(*R*) Missouri River power and transmission lines for Iowa.	Not available	8,888,000			0			1,000,000	800,000	Hons. Steven V. Carter, Merwin Coad, Neal Smith, Charles B. Hoeven, H. R. Gross, Fred Schwengel, and Leonard G. Wolf.
Rathbun Dam	1.1	21,000,000					130,000		130,000	Hon. Steven V. Carter.
Red Rock Reservoir	1.5	71,400,000		113,000				2,000,000	2,000,000	Hons. Fred Schwengel, Neal Smith, Steven V. Carter, and Merwin Coad.
Saylorville Reservoir	1.2	47,000,000		0			200,000		200,000	Hons. Fred Schwengel, Steven V. Carter, and Merwin Coad.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
KANSAS										
(R) Cedar Bluff	2.02	$18,313,600			0			[2] $700,000	$700,000	Hons. Wint Smith and J. Floyd Breeding.
Cedar Point Reservoir	1.8	6,450,000					$25,000		25,000	Hon. Newell A. George.
Council Grove Reservoir	1.8	12,700,000						300,000	300,000	Do:
Cow Creek, tributary of Arkansas River		35,000				$35,000			25,000	Hon. J. Floyd Breeding.
Elk City Dam	1.3	25,000,000						500,000	400,000	Hon. Denver D. Hargis.
Fort Scott Dam	1.1	16,800,000					25,000		25,000	Hon. Newell A. George.
(R) Glen Elder	1.32	57,222,000		$73,000			225,000		73,000	Hons. Wint Smith and J. Floyd Breeding.
Hays		28,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Wint Smith.
Hillsdale Dam	1.1	9,400,000					25,000		25,000	Hon. Newell A. George.
Marion Reservoir	1.8	7,540,000					25,000		25,000	Do.
Melvern Dam	1.1	21,000,000					25,000		25,000	Do.
Milford Reservoir	1.5	45,700,000		170,000				1,200,000	1,200,600	Hons. Newell A. George, Edward H. Rees, and Richard Bolling.
Neosho-Cottonwood (Mud Creek at Marion) (not authorized).		40,000				27,000			[11] 27,000	Hon. Denver D. Hargis.
(R) Norton-Almena	1.03	15,420,000			0			1,000,000	1,000,000	Hons. Wint Smith and J. Floyd Breeding.
								1,120,000		Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
Perry	1.6	18,500,000		125,000					225,000	Hons. Newell A. George and Richard Bolling.
Tuttle Creek Reservoir—land purchase amendment	1.7	85,900,000						23,600	Language required	Hon. William H. Avery.
Wilson Dam	1.2	18,100,000		161,000				1,000,000	1,000,000	Hons. Newell A. George, Wint Smith, and Richard Bolling.
KENTUCKY										
Barren River Reservoir	2.3	23,500,000			0			500,000	1,000,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Big Sandy River		217,600	$10,000			35,000		1,000,000	10,000	Hon. Carl D. Perkins, OVIA, and Hon. W. Pat. Jennings.
Bunches Creek (study not authorized)						35,000			0	Hons. Eugene Siler and William H. Natcher.
Cannelton lock and dam	4.2	65,900,000		0			150,000		150,000	Hons. William H. Natcher and Frank W. Burke.
Fishtrap Reservoir	1.6	39,400,000		200,000			300,000		300,000	Hon. William H. Natcher, OVIA, Hons. Carl D. Perkins and W. Pat Jennings.
Green River No. 2 Reservoir	2.0	8,470,000		0			50,000		50,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Haysi Reservoir	Restudy underway	18,400,000		0			250,000		0	Hons. Carl D. Perkins and W. Pat Jennings.
Kinniconick River		33,000	0			10,000			10,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Licking River Basin		85,000	0			20,000			20,000	Hon. William H. Natcher, OVIA, and Hons. Carl D. Perkins and W. Pat Jennings.
Locks and dams Nos. 3 and 4 (Green River)	O. & M.							100,000 (O. & M.)	100,000	Hon. William H. Natcher.
Lock and dam No. 3 (Big Sandy)	O. & M.							100,000 (O. & M.)	100,000	Do.
Middlesboro flood control project extension	Restudy underway	1,080,000			0			1,200,000	[12] 0	Hon. Eugene Siler.
No. 2 Green River Reservoir	2.0	8,470,000		0			50,000		50,000	OVIA, Hons. Carl D. Perkins, W. Pat Jennings, and William H. Natcher.
Nolin River Reservoir	1.3	14,400,000			$1,800,000			3,400,000	3,400,000	Do.
Ohio River Basin review		1,710,000	400,000			800,000			800,000	Do.
Panther Creek, Daviess County		47,500	20,000			32,500			32,500	Do.
Pound Reservoir (see also Virginia)	1.2	17,700,000		194,000				2,500,000	2,500,000	Do.
Rockcastle River		50,000	0			40,000			25,000	Do.
Sturgis local protection	1.1	708,000		0			10,000		10,000	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
LOUISIANA										
Intracoastal Waterway from Barataria, La., to gulf	3.5	$2,400,000			0				$1,000,000	Hon. Hale Boggs.
Jefferson Drainage District [13] (Reimbursement)		1,420,000						$1,420,000 (O&M)	1,420,000 (O&M)	Do.
McGee Bend Dam, Tex	1.6	55,400,000			$5,800,000			5,800,000 plus	7,000,000	Hon. Overton Brooks.
Parish Line Canal		15,000	0			$15,000			15,000	Hon. Hale Boggs.
Port Allen Indian Village cutoff (Plaquemine-Morgan City route).	1.7	27,300,000			5,951,000				7,925,000	Hon. James H. Morrison.
Red River levees and bank-stabilization below Denison Dam.	1.3	9,880,000			700,000			1,000,000	700,000	Hons. Overton Brooks and Harold B. McSween.
MAINE										
Monhegan Harbor		11,000	0			2,500			2,500	Hon. Frank Coffin.
MASSACHUSETTS										
Boston Harbor, reserved channel	2.3	829,000			0			720,000 to 800,000	825,000	Hons. John McCormack and J. A. Burke.
East boat basin	1.2	465,000			0			460,000	460,000	Hons. Thomas P. O'Neill and Hastings Keith.
East Brimfield Dam	1.4	6,570,000			1,102,000			1,712,000	1,102,000	Hon. John McCormack.
Hodges Village Dam	2.0	4,810,000			0			50,000	[14] 50,000	Do.
Provincetown breakwater	1.1	2,260,000			0				600,000	Hon. Hastings Keith.
Town River channel dredging, Quincy	5.0	690,000			0				([14])	Hon. James A. Burke.
Town River survey		16,500	0			10,000			9,000	Hon. John McCormack.
Westville Dam	1.1	7,450,000			0			1,800,000	1,800,000	Hons. John McCormack, Philip J. Philbin, and Chester Bowles.
MARYLAND										
Baltimore Harbor, deepen and widen channel	3.1	30,000,000			0			7,000,000	5,000,000	Hons. George H. Fallon and Edward Garmatz.
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal (pt. II)	1.3	94,150,000		$180,000				2,000,000	500,000	Hon. George H. Fallon.
MICHIGAN										
Cedar River Harbor study						10,000			(Not authorized).	Michigan Waterways Commission.
Cross Village-Good Hart	([15])								(Not authorized).	Do.
Frankfort Harbor (O. and M.)					20,000(O&M)			350,000	254,000	
Grand Marais Harbor	([15])	965,000			0			965,000	360,000	Hon. Victor A. Knox and Michigan Waterways Commission ($320,000).
Great Lakes connecting channels	1.8	146,500,000			27,000,000			32,000,000	29,000,000	Michigan Waterways Commission.
Hamimond Bay Harbor of Refuge	([15])	1,100,000						400,000	20,000(PL)	Do.
Holland Harbor: Lake Michigan-Lake Macatawa channel		13,500	0			13,500			13,500	Hon. Gerald Ford.
Les Cheneaux Channel		13,000	0			13,000			13,000	Hon. Victor A. Knox.
Little Lake Harbor of Refuge	([15])	815,000						400,000	500,000	Michigan Waterways Commission.
Ludington Harbor (O. and M.)					30,000(O&M)			280,000	308,000	
Manistee Harbor (O. and M.)					25,000(O&M)			700,000	325,000	
New Poe lock	1.6	40,100,000		367,000				750,000	750,000	Do.
Port Sanilac Harbor (O. and M.)								60,000	6,000	
Red Run-Clinton River		60,000				10,000			10,000	Hon. James G. O'Hara.
Traverse City Harbor of Refuge		36,000				14,500			10,000	Michigan Waterways Commission.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
MISSISSIPPI										
Pascagoula Harbor	1.8	$1,248,000			0			$1,189,000	$422,000	Hon. Wm. M. Colmer.
FLOOD CONTROL—MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES										
Mississippi River levees	6.8 [16]	221,000,000			[17] $2,500,000			3,740,000	4,096,000	Hon. Paul C. Jones, Mississippi; Valley Flood Control Association and State delegations.
Bank stabilization	6.8 [16]	468,000,000			22,500,000			25,000,000	29,850,000	
Vicksburg Harbor	3.0	4,520,000			1,500,000			2,000,000	1,600,000	
Greenville Harbor	4.1	2,490,000		0				100,000	60,000	Hon. Frank Smith.
St. Francis Basin	2.4	84,400,000			3,500,000			4,000,000	4,070,000	Hon. E. C. Gathings.
Tensas River Basin	3.5	[18] 21,700,000			[18] 920,000			1,000,000	[18] 1,000,000	
Yazoo Basin:										
Lower auxiliary channel	2.7 [19]	12,100,000			1,075,000			1,275,000	1,225,000	
Tributaries	2.7 [19]	27,600,000			125,000			225,000	225,000	
Yazoo backwater	2.2	30,900,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Frank Smith.
Atchafalaya Basin	6.8 [16]	119,000,000			5,290,000			6,900,000	6,910,000	
Lake Pontchartrain	1.8	6,190,000			500,000			700,000	700,000	
West Tennessee tributaries	2.9	8,400,000			0			300,000	200,000	
Wolf River	1.2	2,025,000			0			300,000	300,000	
General investigation			$110,000					117,500	125,000	
Advance engineering and design, lower White River [20]	3.5	10,810,000			0			110,000 (110,000)	107,000	Hon. E. C. Gathings.
Maintenance					17,000,000			18,500,000	18,300,000	
Baton Rouge improvement program	2.1	2,800,000			0				[21] 0	Hon. James H. Morrison.
MISSOURI										
Chariton River		25,000	0			$50,000			25,000	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder.
Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District No. 1	2.7	1,050,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Kasinger Bluff Reservoir	[22] 1.1	102,000,000		$150,000				300,000	250,000	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder.
Marion County Drainage District	1.04	960,000		0			$73,000		73,000	Hon. Edna Simpson.
Meramec River Reservoirs (Cedar Hill, Meramec Park, and Union) (deferred for restudy)	1.4	62,700,000		0			150,000		150,000	Hons. A. S. J. Carnahan and Thomas B. Curtis.
Pomme de Terre Reservoir	1.6	16,700,000			4,000,000			5,000,000	4,200,000	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder.
Archeological investigations			172,800			249,500			249,500	Hon. Morgan M. Moulder ($10,000 for Missouri).
MONTANA										
(R) East Bench unit	2.07	20,597,000			0			1,000,000 650,000	1,000,000	Hon. Lee Metcalf. Hon. Wayne Aspinall.
Libby Dam	2.0	308,000,000		0			500,000		387,000	Hon. Lee Metcalf.
(R) Yellowtail Dam	1.71	109,300,000			0			6,000,000 5,000,000	6,000,000	Hon. LeRoy Anderson. Hon. Lee Metcalf. Hon. James E. Murray. Hon. Wayne Aspinall.
NEBRASKA										
Gering and Mitchell Valleys	1.8	1,463,000		50,000				350,000	350,000	Hons. Phil Weaver and Donald McGinley.
(R) Red Willow Dam	[23] 1.87	6,597,000		150,000	0			525,000	675,000	Hon. Phil Weaver.
Salt-Wahoo (Salt Creek and tributaries)	1.4	16,890,000		90,000				400,000	400,000	Hons. Phil Weaver and Lawrence Brock.
NEW JERSEY										
New Jersey Meadowlands		500,000	0			25,000			25,000	Hons. Frank Osmers, Dominick V. Daniels, and Cornelius E. Gallagher.
Newark Bay-Passaic River Channel		50,000	0			30,000			15,000	Hons. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Hugh J. Addonizio, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Albert H. Bosch, Frank Osmers, and Seymour Halpern.
Sandy Hook Inlet (Shrewsbury River, N.J.)		50,000	0			50,000			25,000	Hon. James C. Auchincloss.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
NEW MEXICO										
Abiquiu Dam (wants uncontrolled outlet)	1.2	$18,000,000			$3,300,000		$1,800,000			Hons. Thomas G. Morris and J. T. Rutherford.
(R) Hammond	2.1	3,280,000			0			$500,000	$500,000	Hons. Henry Dixon, David S. King, Joseph M. Montoya, and Thomas G. Morris.
Rio Grande floodway between Cochiti and Rio Puerco	1.2	4,400,000						2,000,000	2,000,000	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall ($400,000), Hon. Joseph M. Montoya.
								2,000,000		Hon. Thomas G. Morris.
Two Rivers	1.2	6,900,000						250,000	75,000	Hons. Joseph M. Montoya and Thomas G. Morris.
Middle Rio Grande	2.9	31,500,000			1,400,000			3,000,000	1,400,000	Hon. Joseph M. Montoya.
NEW YORK										
Buffalo Harbor (Ohio Street Bridge)								1,000,000	2,000,000	
Buttermilk Channel survey		19,000	0			$10,000			10,000	Hons. Albert H. Bosch and Seymour Halpern.
Buttermilk Channel	Safety	2,910,000			0			1,550,000	1,551,000	Hon. Seymour Halpern.
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway:										
Lowering lock sills	3.2	38,950,000			730,000			403,000	730,000	Hons. K. B. Keating, C. A. Buckley, Jacob K. Javits, and Albert H. Bosch.
Replacement of Waterford guard gates	5.5							1,000,000		
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway Survey		25,000	0			10,000			10,000	Hon. Albert H. Bosch.
Hudson River, 32-foot channel to Albany	1.9	36,300,000			0			1,550,000	640,000	Hon. Leo W. O'Brien.
Hudson River siltation		550,000	0			114,000			114,000	Hons. K. B. Keating, C. A. Buckley, Jacob K. Javits, Seymour Halpern, and Frank Osmers.
Little Neck Bays		13,000	0			13,000			13,000	Hons. Albert H. Bosch and Seymour Halpern.
New Jersey pierhead channel and anchorage	1.4	5,740,000			0			500,000	1,311,000	Hon. Seymour Halpern.
New York Harbor deep-water anchorage		31,000	0			20,000			10,000	Hons. Albert H. Bosch and Seymour Halpern.
Tonawanda Creek		32,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Harold C. Ostertag.
NORTH CAROLINA										
Morehead City Harbor	1.9	1,382,000						1,197,000	1,370,000	Hon. Graham A. Barden.
Pantego and Cucklers Creek	1.5	536,000		$40,000				413,000	51,000	Hon. Herbert C. Bonner.
Wilkesboro Reservoir	1.2	8,350,000						1,000,000	1,000,000	Hons. A. Paul Kitchin, Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and B. Everett Jordan.
OHIO										
Belleville L. & D., Ohio and West Virginia	2.7	54,400,000		0			125,000		125,000	Hon. John E. Henderson.
Erie RR. bridge No. 19 (Cleveland Harbor)	4.5	16,900,000		0			200,000		250,000	Hons. Charles A. Vanik, Michael A. Feighan, Frances P. Bolton, and William E. Minshall.
Mad River drainage basin		22,000	0			22,000			22,000	Hon. C. J. Brown.
Muskingum River Reservoirs (Black Fork, Mohican River channel).	Not applicable	523,000			0				523,000	Hon. Robert W. Levering.
Sandusky River Basin		131,000	0			60,000			60,000	Hons. A. D. Baumhart, Jr., and Jackson E. Betts.
Scioto River Basin		110,000	$30,000			55,000			55,000	Hon. Jackson E. Betts.
West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	1.3	6,940,000		229,000	0		0	525,000	525,000	Hon. Michael J. Kirwan.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
OKLAHOMA										
(R) Mangum	Not available	Not available	$19,300			$34,300			$19,300	Hon. Toby Morris.
Pine Creek Reservoir		$15,400,000					$200,000		80,000	Senator Mike Monroney. Senator Robert S. Kerr.
							150,000		80,000	Hon. Carl Albert. Hon. Oren Harris.
Recreation facilities (Denison Dam)	Not available	Not available			$75,000			$250,000		Senators Robert S. Kerr and Mike Monroney.
OREGON										
Blue River	1.9	15,800,000		$105,000			200,000		200,000	Hon. Charles O. Porter.
Green Peter	1.4	60,800,000						2,500,000	2,500,000	Hon. Charles O. Porter and Senator Richard Neuberger.
Hayden Island	1.5	598,000					25,000		25,000	Hon. Edith Green, Senator Wayne Morse, and Hon. Al Ullman.
Hills Creek	1.7	40,000,000			8,300,000			9,800,000	9,800,000	Senator Richard Neuberger and Hon. Charles O. Porter.
Hood River small boat basin	2.3	380,000					18,000		18,000	Hon. Edith Green, Senator Wayne Morse, and Hon. Al Ullman.
John Day lock and dam	1.8	387,000,000			20,000,000			25,000,000	25,000,000	Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Richard Neuberger, and Hon. Edith Green.
Lower Columbia bank protection	1.4	7,690,000						600,000	600,000	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Malheur	2.3	423,000						353,000	353,000	Do.
Rogue River	1.2	1,500,000			1,500,000			2,000,000	2,000,000	Hon. Charles O. Porter.
Sauvies Island	1.7	439,000						150,000	150,000	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Siuslaw Harbor	1.3	1,900,000						21,000	21,000	Hon. Charles Porter.
Upper Snake		400,000			46,500	76,500			76,500	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Willamette River bank protection	1.4	12,100,000			500,000			800,000	800,000	Senator Richard Neuberger.
Willow Creek		28,300				18,400			18,400	Senator Wayne Morse, Hon. Al Ullman, and Hon. Edith Green.
Yaguina Bay and harbor	1.3	22,300,000					100,000		100,000	Hon. Walter Norblad.
PENNSYLVANIA										
Connoquenessing Creek (Project not authorized—Recommended in Survey Report).							500,000		35,000	Hon. Frank Clark.
French Creek		120,000	25,000			25,000			49,900	Hon. Carroll D. Kearns.
Shenango River Reservoir	1.7	28,000,000		150,000				500,000	500,000	Do.
Walnut Bottom Run		33,000	0			33,000			15,000	Hon. Frank Clark.
Allegheny River Reservoir (Kinzua dam)	1.3	113,000,000						5,000,000	2,000,000	Hons. Robert J. Corbett, James G. Fulton, William S. Moorhead, James M. Quigley, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Leon Gavin, and Senator Joseph Clark.
Sandy Lick Creek at Dubois						49,300			20,000	Hon. James E. Van Zandt.
Tyrone	1.2	9,949,000		85,000			90,000		125,000	Do.
PUERTO RICO										
San Juan Harbor	2.3	7,000,000		0			400,000		70,000	Dr. A. Fernós-Isern.
SOUTH DAKOTA										
Missouri River, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Nebr.		15,000	0			15,000			15,000	Hon. George S. McGovern.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
TEXAS										
Arkansas-Red River pollution survey						$75,000			$75,000	Hon. Sam Rayburn.
Big and Little Vince Bayou		$21,000	0			21,000			21,000	Hons. Albert Thomas and Robert Casey.
Buffalo Bayou	1.4	51,531,000			$1,650,000			$2,150,000	2,150,000	Hon. Robert Casey.
Colorado River survey		500,000	$75,000			75,000+			150,000	Hon. O. C. Fisher.
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Colorado River Channel	1.5	1,310,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Clark Thompson.
Houston ship channel	2.1	8,420,000			1,150,000			[24] 5,000,000 6,000,000	1,400,000	Hons. Albert Thomas and Robert Casey.
Lavon Reservoir, survey (East Fork—Trinity River)		100,000	37,500			50,000			50,000	Hon. Sam Rayburn.
Matagordo ship channel	1.4	11,300,000		0			$150,000		150,000	Hon. Clark Thompson.
Navasota River survey		150,000	60,000			100,000			100,000	Hon. Olin E. Teague.
Neches River survey		285,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Lindley Beckworth.
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi: Waterway channel to La Quinto. (Reimbursement)	5.4	959,000			0			[25] 954,000	[25] 954,000	Hon. John Young.
Proctor Reservoir	1.4	17,100,000			0			300,000	300,000	Hons. Omar Burleson and Frank Ikard.
Sabine River survey		320,000				25,000			25,000	Hon. Lindley Beckworth.
San Jacinto River survey		15,000	0			15,000			15,000	Hons. Albert Thomas and Robert Casey.
Trinity River survey		675,000	200,000			450,000			414,000	Hons. John Dowdy and Bruce Alger.
Waco Reservoir	1.4	39,750,000			4,000,000			4,600,000	4,600,000	Hon. W. R. Poage.
West Fork-Double Bayou		2,000				2,000			2,000	Hon. Clark Thompson.
VIRGINIA										
Pound Reservoir	1.2	17,700,000		$194,000				2,500,000	2,500,000	Hon. W. Pat Jennings.
Potomac River Study (and D.C.)		1,501,500	500,000						712,000	Opposed by Hon. Howard W. Smith and Senator Robertson. Supported by Hons. Lankford, Foley, Broyhill.
Dismal Swamp (opposes discontinuance of lock O. and M. on Dismal Swamp Canal).										Hon. Watkins M. Abbitt.
WASHINGTON										
Bellingham Harbor	1.8	117,000			0			83,700	109,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee Division	7.0	10,280,000			0			700,000	724,000	Hon. Walt Horan.
Chehalis River Basin	Not available	Not available	66,500			5,000,000			66,500	Do.
Edmonds Harbor	do	35,000	0			35,000			25,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Hoquiam and Chehalis Rivers		20,000	0			20,000			10,000	Hon. Russell V. Mack.
Oak Harbor		36,000	0			36,000			36,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Sammamish River Channel	2.0	1,050,000		0			88,000		88,000	Hons. Thomas M. Pelly and Jack Westland.
Swinomish Slough		12,000	0			14,000			14,000	Hon. Jack Westland.
Wynoochee River		99,500	25,000			46,000			46,000	Hon. Russell V. Mack.
WEST VIRGINIA										
Belleville lock and dam	2.7	54,400,000		0			125,000		125,000	Hon. Ken Hechler.
Cheat River		210,000	20,000			80,000			80,000	Hon. Harley O. Staggers.
Deckers Creek		41,000	0			15,000			15,000	Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey and OVIA.
Do		41,000	0			40,000			15,000	Hon. Harley O. Staggers.
East Lynn Reservoir	Pending restudy	10,900,000		0		10,000			0	Hon. Ken Hechler.
East Rainelle	2.0	840,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey and OVIA.
Opekiska lock and dam	1.8	21,900,000			0			2,000,000	1,000,000	Hon. Harley O. Staggers.
Princeton	1.8	1,085,000			0			500,000	500,000	Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey and OVIA.
Summersville Reservoir	2.6	46,800,000			0			2,000,000	2,000,000	Do.
Twelvepole Creek, W. Va		20,000	0			10,000			10,000	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

REQUESTED PROJECTS—Continued

State and project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total cost	Budget			Requested			Agency capability	Requested by—
			G.I.	Advance planning	Construction	G.I.	Advance planning	Construction		
WISCONSIN										
Eau Galle River	1.1	$7,250,000					$150,000		$150,000	Hons. Alexander Wiley and Lester Johnson.
Colorado River storage (advance planning)	Not available	Not available		$818,000			1,800,000		818,000	Hons. Joseph M. Montoya and Henry Dixon.
Colorado River storage going work	1.3	615,687,107		[25] 1,538,000 (Total, 77,035,000)	$75,497,000			[27] $87,035,000	77,035,000	Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall.
WYOMING										
(R) Seedskadee	1.5	37,885,000			0			1,500,000	1,554,000	Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Gale W. McGee, Hons. Keith Thomson, Joseph M. Montoya, Henry Dixon, and David S. King.

[1] To initiate study.
[2] Multiple purpose plan.
[3] For emergency bank stabilization and regular stabilization program.
[4] For emergency bank stabilization.
[5] Use of these funds are dependent upon completion of additional studies by the Department of Interior to determine whether power revenues can repay the cost allocated to power.
[6] For authorized plan, based on July 1957 prices. The modified plan, being developed in the review report is expected to cost more.
[7] Could be used on modified plan only, if authorized by Congress.
[8] Study complete.
[9] $100,000 of authorized.
[10] Pending authorization, no work can be accomplished. After authorization, planning and construction of the project could be accomplished in 1 year with an amount of $945,000. Project recommended for authorization by Chief of Engineers in H. Doc.-109, 86th Cong.
[11] Study not authorized.
[12] No capability pending completion of restudy and furnishing of local assurances of cooperation.
[13] Payment to local interest for Plaquemine Parish pumping station. Payment will be from "Operation and maintenance appropriation." No funds included in budget.
[14] Funds for completion are already available.
[15] Not evaluated. Benefits for safety to navigation.
[16] Composite for main stem.
[17] Includes New Madrid, Mo.
[18] Boeuf, Tensas River, etc. only.
[19] For Yazoo Basin.
[20] For White River backwater levee only.
[21] First increment has been completed. Second increment dependent on need for same.
[22] System benefit-cost ratio.
[23] For Frenchman-Cambridge Division including Red Willow Dam.
[24] 40-foot channel.
[25] Repayment to local interest for work accomplished by them.
[26] Includes $720,000 preconstruction work on transmission division.
[27] For general acceleration of going work.

This is a minimum list and does not include applications received by letter. Nor does it include Members appearing with colleagues in behalf of the same project.

Mr. Chairman, I am agreeably surprised to be able to report the bill is within the budget.

When we opened hearings there was such an avalanche of applications for money for projects that it hardly seemed probable we could stay within millions of the estimates.

But the total budget estimate is $1,176,677,000 and the bill before you carries exactly $1,176,677,000.

We are within the budget.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we should not take unto ourselves any great credit on that account, because in the good old days when statesmanship prevailed on the floor of the House, it was always understood that the budget estimates were the ceiling. We judged the efficiency of a chairman by the amount he was able to cut his bill below the estimates. Unfortunately, those halcyon days are long past and now we frequently bring in bills which are millions above the estimate. But for the time being at least we are at par.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the important bills of the session. It is the bill which unbalances the budget.

When the average Congressman goes home and the taxpayers at home stop him on the street and complain about the way Congress is spending their money in Washington and protest because we have not reduced taxes, the Member explains unctiously, "We had no choice. It was a matter of defending the Nation. We had to provide money for the national defense so I reluctantly voted above the budget estimates to keep the Russians out of the United States."

But, Mr. Chairman, you know—and if you do not know—this bill demonstrates conclusively that it is not the national defense expenditures that unbalance the budget. It is the nondefense items that unbalance the budget.

Yesterday we were deeply gratified when the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] brought in the armed services bill, $400 million under the budget. So when you go back home this time and your constituents ask how it is that you voted so much money that you unbalanced the budget, remember that the war bill was $400 million under the budget estimate, while the so-called pork barrel bill reported today is barely within the budget, and there are Members all around waiting with blunderbus amendments to run it over the budget. In short it is these other nondefense items that unbalance the budget and keep taxes up.

But, Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that this committee is entitled to great credit. With all these applications for money we had to refuse a large number of applications, and the number of projects and the amount of the appropriations recommended in the pending bill is the minimum. If we had acceded to all requests submitted, the money carried by this bill would have been in excess of $2½ billion. This bill which we offer to you today is only a small part of what we were asked to allow.

In order that you might have some idea of the extent of these requests, you have but to consult the list above and read the voluminous hearings embodying the testimony of more than a thousand witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee.

The crowds of applicants for appropriations which came in such numbers that it was sometimes impossible to get them all in the committee room, was preceded by the Corps of Engineers, who were invariably in favor of the largest expenditures the committee could be prevailed upon to make. Much of their testimony was wholly unreliable. When they were consulted on the cost of a proposed project they invariably underestimated the cost. In no single instance in the last several years have they given us a true figure on estimated costs. In many instances when the committee had under consideration the advisability of undertaking a project we discovered after it was too late that the cost of completion was a number of times the figures given us by the Corps of Engineers. I hope Members of the House will find time to read through the hearings and note the discrepancy between the costs estimated by the engineers when the project was initiated and the cost when completed.

Of course costs of construction and material and labor have all risen sharply as inflation proceeded but not enough to account for anything like the wide differences you will find in the hearings. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that they were either incompetent or deliberately misleading—and it is still more unlikely that they did not know the multiplication tables and could not add, multiply, and subtract.

And then the Member from that area comes in with these figures and says, "Why, I just want this small amount for planning. I am sure you would not deny me that small amount." Although he knows and we ought to know that when he once gets planning money, his foot is in the door.

It is also interesting to note the applications of chambers of commerce for Government money. Important businessmen from all over the country, usually accompanied by mayors and frequently by Governors of the State appear before the committee urging large expenditures.

And let me diverge briefly here. The prime argument offered for many of these projects is not that they are urgently needed. The feature they emphasize is that times are bad and there is a lot of unemployment, and business is slow.

But we are not authorized to provide in this bill money for public works to improve business. We can only appropriate money for public works to provide irrigation, flood control, or to improve navigation. Recreation or employment may be incidental, but only incidental.

And when I go back to the office, I find the payoff. There is a letter from the same chamber of commerce asking why Congress is spending so much money, and wanting to know when we will reduce taxes. So we are puzzled sometimes to know which is entitled to priority, the chamber of commerce at the hearing wearing its expenditure garb, or back home writing letters on its economy stationery.

Now, we do not want to mislead you, my friends. We want to be perfectly honest with you. This bill proposes to spend a lot of money. These projects in this bill will cost a lot of money before they are completed. And to be perfectly frank with you, we do not have the money in the Treasury.

We have only two sources. We can borrow the money or we can raise taxes.

When we spend more money than we have, we raise taxes or we must sell bonds.

Well, there is nothing to be concerned about. Everybody is against raising taxes but it has always been a simple matter to put a few more U.S. bonds on the market. The newspapers obligingly supply free advertisement as a public service. These free advertisements tell the public that Government bonds are the best investment you can make; absolutely safe; nothing better than a Government bond.

And they do not cost the Government much in interest. We have been selling bonds that paid as little as 2 percent—less than 2 percent by the time the public put them away in the banks and safe deposit boxes.

But something has happened to the interest rate on U.S. bonds. In order to sell bonds the Government is now paying as high as 4¼ percent. And now suddenly they cannot sell them even at 4¼ percent. Why? What is the trouble? What is going on here?

We have continued to spend money we did not have until our credit is bad. No one wants Uncle Sam's paper. Since the public debt started on this last spree.

It used to be that foreign nations wanted our dollars. They were eager for hard currency. But now they are getting a little uneasy. They are beginning to say they will take the gold instead of the paper dollars or the bonds. So the gold at Fort Knox is dropping every day.

Who is responsible for this distressing development? No one but ourselves. I am talking right now to the gentlemen who have brought this situation about. Why are we behind Russia in war armament today? Why are we a second-rate power? Because Congress voted the bills that provided the second-rate armament. We cannot shirk the responsibility. We cannot say, "the administration" or "the Bureau of the Budget" or "the War Department" or "the Pentagon" or "they."

Congress has the last word. Congress can reject any advice or recommendation or proposal and control any expenditure. Congress can approve any policy and provide the money to implement it.

We cannot escape the responsibility for the situation as we find it today. Congress spent the money and increased the national debt and brought on the inflation. The responsibility is right

here on this floor. We cannot offer an alibi. We cannot pass the buck. And the reason we can no longer sell bonds at 2 percent is because we have steadily and stubbornly and continuously refused to retrench expenditure and begin systematically and methodically to reduce the national debt and stop inflation. Congress did it and let no one try to make the people back home believe any different.

The President issued a statement to the press yesterday. In effect he told the Nation he could no longer borrow money. He could no longer sell Government bonds at 4¼ percent. He might have added that Congress has spent so much money and lived so far beyond our income—an income far above that enjoyed in any other administration—and brought on such inflation and so depreciated the currency—that he will have to pay more and higher interest on Government bonds.

He will also have to ask Congress to raise the debt ceiling. We are already above the debt limit. Do you realize we have already broken through the debt ceiling and on the 30th day of June, the 30th day of this month, the public debt will be $3 billion above the statutory debt limit. I have voted against every increase in the debt limit since I have been a Member of the Congress, but in every recent session of the Congress you have voted to raise the debt limit. Congress voted twice one session to raise it. One heist a session was not fast enough to keep up with congressional spending. And a large part of it was for things we could have done without.

Many of us have announced belligerently that no Budget Bureau could tell us what to do. And we kicked the budget into the ashcan. No President could tell us there should be no new starts. Congress was the authority on such matters. So now Congress can take the responsibility.

The Government must pay its obligations. We do not have the money. If we do not get it in taxes, then we have to borrow it and you cannot borrow it any longer at 4¼ percent. Government bonds are a drag on the market because we have spent too much for what we could get along without. How about you Congressmen who have a lot of Government bonds? If you have a lot of them, I will have to concede that you are not good businessmen because good businessmen today cannot afford to keep their money in Government bonds. And good businessmen are not in the market for Government bonds today. But, I hope that out of pure patriotic motives you have continued to buy U.S. bonds. And if so then you will be glad to know the President is going to raise the interest rates on your investments. He will pay you above 4¼ percent. He is doing it because you insisted on it—because Congress insisted on voting money out of the Treasury.

Now, if anybody wants to move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill, of course, I am bound under the rules of the House to oppose him, but I am not saying it would not be good statesmanship.

But I am saying that the committee has done the best it could and it is a remarkably fine job, driven through with all the wolves hanging on our flanks, as we tried to hold it down to the budget estimate.

I noticed in this morning's paper an item in which you may be interested. It said that some of the financiers were opposed to raising the rate of interest on Government bonds.

They said that when we raise the interest rate on Government bonds it means less money for investment in private business and industry throughout the country. Investors will put their money in bonds instead of investing in business projects.

This means we will have fewer homes, less housing, less employment. Instead of investing in home mortgages, in homes the people need, they will put their money in Government bonds because of the increased interest. That means a lot of people have got to go without homes; a lot of builders, workmen, and laborers will be out of jobs just because we raise the interest on Government bonds.

I cannot refrain from touching on a subject I have inadvertently mentioned on this floor once or twice before. Every time we spend money we do not have, every time we compel the President to dip here and ask us to raise the debt limit, every time we vote to increase the interest rate on Government bonds, we increase the cost of living on every family in the United States. Do not think that when these things are voted only a part of the country is concerned about it.

Every family in the United States is hard hit—that means every family in your constituency—do not make any mistake about it, and do not try to dodge it—the cost of living, the cost of groceries, the cost of sending the children to school, the cost of shoes, the cost of everything goes up.

There are children in America who are hungry today, and I quote the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], who is an authority on that subject. She is close to the hearts of the people and knows what families need. We men do not pay much attention to the family, we do not give much thought to the children, the clothes they wear, the food they eat, but the women of the house do, and the whole country owes a debt of gratitude to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] and her colleagues in the House who realize that the next generation is the greatest asset and greatest responsibility this country has.

We must see that they have proper food. We must clothe them. We must educate them. That is truly the greatest issue before the American people today. Mrs. SULLIVAN says so, and the rest of us heartily concur.

But this Congress has doubled the cost of breakfast, doubled the cost of school clothing. Ah, it comes home to you. Congress has increased the cost of living of every family in the district of every Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Congress a great bill. It is within the budget. Every dollar of it, every dollar in it will be well spent; every dollar in it is a good investment. But I want to be frank with the House, I want the House to understand just what it is doing and what the effect will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 31 minutes.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy listening to our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I know he is greatly concerned about the fiscal situation which faces our beloved country today. I also am sure that he is grieved over the fact that Members on his side of the aisle, a majority of them, seem to pay so little attention to his admonitions. I am quite sure that grieves the gentleman and I know it grieves all of us on this side of the aisle. It grieves a lot of us on this side of the aisle when we try as best we can to save taxpayers dollars here and there so that we may prevent this great country of ours from being destroyed through the bankruptcy route.

I offered an amendment in committee which would have saved over $30 million, but it was defeated by an almost strict party vote. I shall offer that amendment again today, and I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will favor it, for he has said to me many times: "Whenever we can save money, I am for it." Of course, I must add that I am not in a position to commit the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, nor would I attempt to do that. I do hope my amendment will be adopted. I shall explain it briefly at this time, but in more detail when I offer it during the time the bill is being read for amendment.

The amendment will provide that all construction items in this bill of $5 million or more shall be reduced by 5 percent. Five percent may seem small, and it is small. But it will effect a saving of over $30 million which is certainly worthwhile. It will hurt no project, and I doubt that it will even slow up any job, because the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are today receiving bids, generally speaking, below the estimates, some of them considerably below the estimates of the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Of course, the budget is made up for the agencies almost a year ahead of the time the budget is sent to the Congress. During that time, as I have said, these bids have been coming in considerably below the estimates.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just told you that the budget request was $1,176,677,000. The committee allowed exactly that amount, to the penny. That is, I can assure you, quite an unusual situation—in my book it is a herculean accomplishment. I hardly know just how it was done, but it has been done.

As is so often said, we Americans do the possible in a few minutes. The impossible takes us a little bit longer. So this looks like an impossible task, but we did it. The facts are, however, that I did not know about it until the night before the full committee met because I had not seen the report until the night before, and I marvel at the fact someone did hit the bull's-eye right on the budget's nose.

Now, as far as the good report is concerned, I must give credit to our able clerks. They always do a wonderful job. The report explains the bill very well. It tells you how much money is contained in this bill for every project for construction and planning. Most of the funds for investigation, of course, are shown in lump sums. There is such a huge list that about the only way you can ascertain whether you have money in this bill for investigation for your project is to ask the clerks or call the Army Engineers, and they will give you the facts.

We listened to about 1,150 witnesses who came before the committee from every section of these United States asking that we at least appropriate or recommend the amount in the budget. But, generally, they asked us to recommend more money than the budget contained. And, it is quite interesting to note, the report says:

> Over a 2-month period the committee took testimony totaling 4,222 pages in the printed hearings from representatives of the agencies involved and approximately 1,150 other witnesses, including 243 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Members of the House and Senate requested funds for approximately 230 unbudgeted projects at a total estimated cost of $2,458 million.

We did allow some unbudgeted items. I have no objection to them for the very simple reason, my colleagues, that every dime in this bill is spent for America, for the protection of our natural resources, for the conservation of our precious topsoil in all these great areas of the public domain, and because of the fact that so much flood work is needed in most every area of America.

Now, it is true that funds for flood control are not reimbursable, but I am happy to say that during the past 2 years the committee put language in the report saying that the committee would not look with favor on any project that was mostly for local benefit, unless there was proof of a substantial local contribution. And I am pleased to say that most every group that now comes before us shows proof of the amounts of local participation that they would contribute to their projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, we are a long way from Christmas. We are told this by the hot and humid weather, by the blooming flowers and the magnificence of the fully leafed, deep greened trees and the verdancy of bush and grass. But, today, everyone in the Congress looks under the gift tree for the expensively wrapped packages that bring cheer to their districts and constituents. Mr. Santa Claus, in the person of that marvelously unique statesman, scholar, oft-times genius, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] personally handles the reins as he guides his fully loaded sleigh, drawn by hard-working, exhausted, sometimes frustrated, committee associates, to this floor today.

No one expects, least of all the members of this Committee on Public Works, that all of our colleagues will bounce with delight at the parcels that we bring. The appetite for the goodies that we offer is insatiable and limitless. Anyone in this tough profession of politics knows full well that you cannot satisfy everyone all the time. So, one does the best one can with the money that it has, with the priorities and with the problems.

So, Mr. Chairman, here it is; $1,176,677,000 allocated for 363 nationwide projects that represent a fully funded cost of $13,300 million. Vernacularly speaking, "That ain't hay." But, neither is it all pork or blunder.

The money carried by this bill represents an investment in America and adds to its wealth. It enables the Nation to harness the wild, the unruly, and likewise, the meandering and gentle stream and river. By this, the vast potential of power and energy is utilized; water is spread upon arid wastelands to make it bloom and productive; waterways are developed to bring food and fiber and the treasures of the bowels of the earth to home and industry; recreational possibilities are enhanced that make the Nation stronger, healthier, more pleasant. And more importantly than all, the greatest portion of expenditures goes to the saving of life and property by a sensible program of controlling the ravages of floods.

Mr. Chairman, the total amount in this bill squares with the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal 1960. Of course, we did not accept in toto the desires of the President or the Bureau of the Budget with respect to particular projects or programs. In many instances the committee substituted its judgment and increased, reduced, or canceled. It rejected the concept of no new starts. This was done on the basis that the water resources program ought to be expanded and developed if we are to attain our long-range objectives.

This committee believes that it has done a good job. It sat for many weeks through tedious hearings and listened, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] indicated, to 1,150 witnesses and took testimony that runs to 4,222 pages. The final recommendation for expenditures is $40 million above the current fiscal year; that is, for fiscal 1960, $40 million above fiscal 1959. For my part, though this is the second money bill of some 10 that has come to the floor that does not show any reduction from Budget recommendations, it is a good bill and one that ought to be adopted by this committee.

I think we ought to keep in mind that the 263 Members of Congress who appeared before our committee requested funds that would have meant a total of some $2.8 billion. We also must keep in mind that the total number of authorized projects, all of the projects that have been authorized by the Committee on Public Works, would run to a total of some $60 billion. This committee has tried to put some common sense into the public works program. We think we have done it here, and we hope that the Committee of the Whole will accept the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Public Works.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the Allegheny River Reservoir project was authorized and approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. Actually, it was authorized by three acts—the acts of 1936, 1938, and 1941.

The project was authorized after the devastating floods in 1936 in the Allegheny Valley with $736 million property damage and the loss of some 33 lives.

Including fiscal year 1956, I might say, $241,000 were spent on plans for this project. And in 1956, for fiscal year 1957, Congress appropriated $384,000 to complete the project report. Thus, $625,000 have been spent on plans, specifications, design, and so forth.

The project has been under study for many years. No objections were voiced, until the first appropriation of $1 million was made for fiscal year 1958 for actual construction of the dam.

Then an additional $1 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1959; the expenditure of which was restricted by language in the conference report of August 18, 1958, which stated:

> None of the funds provided for the Allegheny River Reservoir project are to be obligated pending decisions by the Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court in the event that the Seneca Nation of Indians appeals its case to prevent construction of the project to the latter.

Of these two appropriations, there remains $1,400,000 unexpended.

The opponents of this project lost their plea for an injunction both in the U.S. District Court and in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. It is now before the Supreme Court and it is expected the Supreme Court will rule as to whether or not it will hear the case by the 15th of this month. Now if the Supreme Court should refuse to hear the case which would end the litigation, if this $1,400,000 is deleted as recommended in the report, no money would be available to continue construction on this project.

I might point out to the House that the Allegheny watershed is one of the most prolific watersheds in the eastern part of the United States. It contributes four-fifths of the flow, while the Monongahela and Youghiogheny Rivers contribute one-fifth of the flow at Pittsburgh to form the Ohio River. This watershed contributes greately to the

destructive floods which periodically occur in the Ohio Valley.

The opponents of this project offered an alternate proposal—the Conewango—to the U.S. Army engineers.

After this proposal the U.S. Army engineers secured the services of Tippets-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton of New York, consulting engineers, to study this and four other alternate plans.

I hold here this report on the various proposals. It is estimated this report to have cost in the neighborhood of $75,000. This means, I might say to the House, that $700,000 or more have already been spent in studying all phases of this flood-control project.

Time will not permit me to discuss this alternative plan; however, on page 2 of a news release, the division engineer stated:

> In view of the fact that this report indicates that the authorized project can be built at a lower total cost than any of the various diversion schemes, will flood less land, and will cause dislocation of fewer people, Colonel Smyser stated that he is forwarding a copy of this report to the Chief of Engineers with the recommendation that work continue on the authorized project.

You will note on the map that this project is not in the planning stage. It is already under construction and approximately $1,400,000 is available from the $2 million already appropriated to initiate construction.

In the House Appropriations Committee report on page 17, it is stated:

> In view of this fact and the further fact that litigation on the matter of the Kinzua Dam is still pending in the Supreme Court, the committee directs that the $1,400,000 balance of previously appropriated funds available for the project be reprogramed to other projects.

This, even though it is expected the Supreme Court will act by the 15th of this month.

Now, my good friends, let us consider the humanitarian aspects of this project. I want to call to your attention that it cost $728 million and the loss of 33 lives in the flood of 1936.

I want to call to the attention of the House that in 1956 the Allegheny Valley was severely hit with floods. And in the recent floods in the forepart of this year, 1959, thousands of people were made homeless and it is estimated the loss in the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Mahoning Valleys was approximately $32 million and the loss would have been $79 million if the other dams such as the Tygart River, Youghiogheny, Loyalhanna, Conemaugh, Crooked Creek, Mahoning, and Tionesta Reservoirs had not been completed.

In the Ohio Valley as a whole, the loss was estimated at $75 million and had there not been dams already built the loss would have been estimated at $121 million.

I understand the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee has been considerably concerned about the various alternative plans and that a request was made by the U.S. Engineers for an analysis of the Allegheny River Reservoir project and the alternate proposal. Recently this analysis was submitted to the chairman by Maj. Gen. E. E. Itschner, Chief of Engineers. I want to call the attention of the House to the last paragraph of that analysis, and I quote:

> I have personally studied the report of Dr. Morgan, but find that his recommended plan 6 does not provide a solution to the water resource development problems of the Allegheny River Basin that compares favorably with the authorized plan. I find that his recommended plan gives insufficient treatment to some important engineering aspects and that the estimates he presents are not reconcilable with the scope of work involved, or the conditions under which it must be performed, to construct a completely operative facility. I consider that the Allegheny Reservoir, as presently planned, is the most economic solution to the problems involved and that construction of the project should proceed as soon as court actions have been completed.

I would like to point out to the House that the Allegheny River originates in Pennsylvania, flows into New York State and then into Pennsylvania and on down the Allegheny Valley to Pittsburgh serving an estimated 5 million people.

Water is the lifeblood of our people. Our economic, our industrial, and our domestic life depends on water and we hope to harness this water for useful purposes of several million people rather than permit the devastating, destructive floods which now occur in the Allegheny and Ohio Valleys.

This project is the key to the overall flood protection program of the Allegheny, upper Ohio, Beaver, and Monongahela Rivers Basins.

I sincerely trust that favorable action will be taken on Representative FENTON'S amendment by the House to restore the $1,400,000 so when the Supreme Court acts, this project can proceed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this committee for some time. I sat through these hearings for 2 long months and listened to the testimony of 271 Congressmen, Senators, and other witnesses telling about conditions throughout America. May I say this morning that you have got to be up around my age to know you have not seen anything yet. This is going to be one of the smallest bills that ever came before the House involving public works.

Why do I say that?

Fifty years ago in driving along American highways, and we used the horse and buggy in those days, the water after a rain went up to the horse's belly and then found its way to its own level, either underground or in the thousands of little creeks, from which it went on into a river that was not blocked up with a lot of debris.

In the modern America as we see it today they have left what they used to call a city downtown and they have gone out into the suburban areas. Every time you put in a drive or a finished street, you have interfered with the water drainage. It has to go along into the sewers, then into the ocean. That is what we have today in connection with every stream unless it is kept in shape by the dredges of the Army Engineers. They are all blocked and after a rainstorm there is no river channel to take it away and it spreads all over. Therefore, a few days' rain will cause a flood anywhere in America.

As I stated, this is one of the smallest bills to come here for consideration. We are spending billions of dollars for housing. You are going out into the country. Every time you build a drive you put that water into a sewer and it is on its way. You have to have flood control projects. You have to have the debris taken out of the river. You have to store it some place for mankind.

When you go along the modern highway of today you see the automobile, which is the biggest part of our economy. You will see the county or State with its equipment keeping the drainage clear. In a heavy rain, in a couple of minutes in any county today there are floods. That is before it finds its way into the river. But the river cannot take it all because it is full of debris. So it spreads all over the land.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the smallest bills to come to the Congress and will be from here on in. You are living in a new America. The airplane tells you that as you fly from Maine to California. There are new villages or towns. The old town is still there, but the rain falling on that cement goes to the river. You have new towns all the way from Maine to California. I can tell you that every highway that is built, every drive in any home you build, or whatever you may be building, results in the creation of floods.

That is why I am asking you here today to vote for this bill. It is a good bill. There is not too much money in it. It is a very, very good bill. I have been trying now for years to get a dam up there in the district I represent. It would cost $12 million to build this dam. The city or the district will pay one-half. They are going to pay $6 million of it. However, there was damage to the extent of $16 million in January and February of this year alone and this project, this flood-control project, would cost only $12 million. You can see it up there with your own eyes, if you had rainfall for 2 days you would have an additional $16 million of damage.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. I presume the gentleman understands that we are not asking for any new money; that I only presented my case for retaining the money that has already been appropriated.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not referring to the gentleman. I have been for that project since the day I came on the committee, and I am for it now.

So, I only want to tell the committee here today that for 2 months I have listened to testimony. And, from one who has bummed all over this country half a dozen times before he ever thought of settling down, and since I have been a Member of the Congress, there is not a year that I have not seen practically every river in this country. I spend at

least 2 months a year traveling over America. And, when you fly over this great land of ours, you will see the necessity of spending this money on flood control and navigation and everything else, which is so necessary for the preservation of our soil.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee, I sat for many long days and hours listening to the testimony given to our committee in the plea for projects that might help the various communities. I certainly agree with the former speakers here today in what they have said. This is a very fine bill and a difficult bill to please each and every Member of the Congress.

I always enjoy the remarks of our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who, as he said, goes through the length and breadth of this land looking for and seeking information that can be of some help to the Members of this House—and this country, I might say. I believe my record for attendance at the hearings on this bill is pretty well known to the Members of this House, and certainly to the membership of our committee. I tried to be in attendance at every hearing whenever possible. On very rare occasions I was not there. The main reason for not being there was when another subcommittee of which I happened to be the ranking Republican member had a hearing on at the same time, and that was not very often.

So, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7509, the public-works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960, has been pretty well explained, as I say, by previous speakers. As our report shows, we heard 1,150 witnesses, in addition to various representatives of the agencies, which required 4 volumes of testimony containing 4,222 pages. Two hundred and forty-three Members of the Congress of the United States testified before our committee.

As you know, this bill is comprised of three titles. The first title contains appropriations for the civil functions, Department of the Army. Title II refers to appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeast Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the Office of Secretary. Title III, of course, refers to appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up too much time of the Committee, but I feel that I must say something about the project that has already been referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], the Allegheny River Dam.

It is to be regretted that there is a holdup in the construction of adequate facilities to protect the people and property downstream on the Allegheny River from the New York State line in Pennsylvania, from recurrent floods.

Since the Indian tribe in that area has sought to prevent the dam being constructed at the site selected by the Corps of Engineers and the case is now pending in the Supreme Court, the Committee on Appropriations has frozen the already appropriated funds for the past 2 years.

There is now an unexpended balance of $1,400,000.

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

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] will resume.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in regard to the Allegheny Dam, as a member of the subcommittee—unfortunately, I was not able to attend the hearings very much this spring, but nevertheless I have gone into this subject thoroughly in previous years—that I think this is the one great error in this bill as to the action which this committee has taken. I hope to see the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] accepted later on in the day.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying:

Because of litigation and the controversy concerning the site for the dam, the committee is having a special engineering investigation as to the relative merits of the alternate plans.

The committee therefore thought it advisable to withhold the unexpended funds until the question is resolved.

However, I would like to direct the attention of the membership of the House to language on page 17 of the report on this problem.

I am in full accord with the language in the first sentence of the item, quote:

> The committee has ordered an independent investigation of the merits of the alternative proposals advocated by the Corps of Engineers and the engineering consultants for the Seneca Indians for the development of flood control storage in the upper Allegheny River area.

I do object to the second sentence of the paragraph in which it states:

> The committee directs that the $1,400,000 balance of previously appropriated funds available for the project be reprogramed to other projects.

My objection is based on the fact that this was not considered or even discussed in our subcommittee and we did not make such a demand as to direct that the $1,400,000 balance be reprogramed to other projects.

I will now ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if that is not a correct statement?

He is not here, evidently, but I am sure the other members of the subcommittee can verify that.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. In the absence of the chairman, and I being the ranking minority member, I want to verify the statement that the gentleman just made.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, may I say further that the report as written, was not seen by me until the full committee met on Tuesday, although I requested a copy on Monday and my request was not granted.

These reports are only made available to the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member before we meet in full committee.

This policy may be all right, but I do think the reports should at least be factual.

As a member of the subcommittee I believe my record for attendance at our hearings is well known to the membership and leadership of that committee.

I shall offer an amendment to restore those funds when we come to reading the bill.

I shall also make a statement to the effect that the amendment is offered with the understanding that the restriction on the use of these funds as set out in the conference report on the 1959 appropriations bill will continue to apply, and further, that the funds will not be available until after the committee has completed its own independent study of the relative merits of the Kinzua project and the Conewango project.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7509, the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960, has been pretty well explained by the previous speakers.

As usual the committee held hearings for about 2 months and in that time as stated in our report heard 1,150 witnesses in addition to the various representatives of the agencies, requiring 4 volumes of testimony for a total of 4,222 pages. Two hundred and forty-three Members of the Congress testified before our committee on this bill.

TITLE I

Title I of the bill contains appropriations for civil functions of the Army.

(a) Quartermaster Corps for cemeterial expenses, $9,194,000, an increase of $194,000 over fiscal year 1959.

(b) Corps of Engineers for a total of $863,440,500, or an increase of $260,500 over 1959.

The total amount for the civil functions of the Army is $872,634,500, which is an increase of $51,042,200 over 1959 and $454,500 over the budget estimate.

TITLE II

Title II contains appropriations for the Department of the Interior.

(a) Bureau of Reclamation, $253,409,500, a decrease of $12,405,035 under 1959 but an increase of $2,213,500 over budget estimate.

(b) Bonneville Power Administration, $32,582,000, an increase of $2,101,800 over 1959 and a decrease of $2,668,000 under the budget estimate.

(c) Southeastern Power Administration, $735,000, the same as 1959 and the budget estimate.

(d) Southwestern Power Administration, $2,030,000, which is the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and $998,750 over 1959.

(e) Office of the Secretary, $2,765,000, which amount also is the budget request and $998,750 over 1959.

Total amount recommended for the Interior Department or title II is $288,756,500, a decrease of $454,500 under the budget estimate and a decrease of $9,304,485 from the 1959 appropriations.

TITLE III

Tennessee Valley Authority, $15,286,000, which is the same amount as the budget estimate but $1,564,000 under the 1959 appropriations.

Total fiscal year 1960 appropriations for H.R. 7509, $1,176,677,000, which is the same as the budget estimate and an increase of $40,173,715 over fiscal year 1959.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not take this time to criticize the committee. I think they have worked hard on this bill and have done a good job, and I expect to support the bill so far as that is concerned. But I do come to call to the attention of the House an item which was overlooked in this bill, and I simply do not understand it. May I say that I, for about 15 years, served on the committee having jurisdiction of public works which was then known as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I know a little something about the problems that the committee undoubtedly had to meet. But in appearing here, I am not being inconsistent with my normal attitude which is to look after the welfare of the Government and to try to save money for the Government whenever it is possible to do so because the project to which I refer is the Morehead City Port project. That is a harbor in North Carolina, 3 miles from the sea, and within about 12 to 14 miles of one of the big Marine bases, Cherry Point Marine Air Base, and within 30 miles of another, Camp Lejeune, and 3 other bases that are dependent upon Morehead City Port for fuel and other supplies. It is the port of embarkation for two of the large Marine bases which require heavy ships. It has been operating for a good while. You might say, "Why do you say it is so necessary?" In figuring the benefit ratio of this project, it is not only one of the highest but I doubt if there are many in the 42 projects that the committee has approved which has as high a benefit-cost ratio. In addition to that, the State of North Carolina has already spent $6 million on this port and the State legislature of North Carolina is appropriating a half million dollars more for this year. The commerce at that port is tremendous and it has more than doubled in recent years as I will relate more in detail later. But throw all that out of the window and disregard it, if you so choose. What I am talking about now is the benefit to the Government of the United States. Here are the words of Admiral Will, who is the commander of MSTS. He is responsible and pays the bill for these oil tankers. In a few moments I expect to include Admiral Will's full letter and go more in detail of this matter but for the moment I will only discuss brief excerpts from his communication. After giving the cost and the expenses of taking one of these T-2 tankers into port at Jacksonville, Fla., and partially pumping it out before it can go into the port where the whole load is really needed to extra port call, each trip, due entails added cost of $4,950. And in the last 9 months there have been 14 such tankers.

Simple arithmetic will show on this item alone during the last 9 months the Federal Government has suffered an out-of-pocket additional cost of $69,300.

Now they want to use heavier tankers. Every drop of this oil is United States shipments to United States military bases. Now they want to use the heavier tankers to cut down the per barrel cost and that will continue to be an out-of-pocket loss to the United States of over $100,000, and will undoubtedly within the next 3 or 4 months involve an out-of-pocket interest rate of 5 percent or better on the amount of $1,300,000 that the deepening of this channel by 5 feet over the bar will be to the Federal Government. But throwing aside all that, throwing aside commerce and everything else including damage to ships, underloading, and delays. This is money lost out of pocket to the U.S. Government. It probably comes out of defense moneys, but it is still taxpayers money.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the committee did not put it in the bill, except their intended desire to cut expenses. I want to save the Government money. By failing to deepen this channel you are throwing over $100,000 a year out the window.

The Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps are all very anxious for this.

The U.S. Government has larger tankers than the T-2 type which they would like to put in service but they cannot be used with a channel under 35 feet across the bar and 34 feet inside.

All we want to do is put this item in.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. JENSEN. I must say to the gentleman that this matter was not fully discussed before our committee, especially in the markup.

Mr. BARDEN. I think the gentleman is right. I sympathize with the tremendous problem the gentleman had. There is no question about the complexity of his problem.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not think the committee would disagree with the objectives as the gentleman explains them now.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not think so myself, but I had only 5 minutes in which to present this to the committee. I did my best. I believe the gentleman is equally interested in this matter from the economical standpoint just as I am, and I believe the other members of the committee would be if they understood it.

Mr. JENSEN. I remember now, I came into the committee hearing just about the time the gentleman had finished his statement and I did not hear the import of his testimony.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know what we can do on it, but I hope it will be put in. It is a very serious matter, and should be worked out.

And Mr. Chairman in the hopes that it will be worked out I at this time ask to go more in detail so that this information might be available.

The committee report shows that in the Army civil functions part 24 unbudgeted general investigating items were added and 44 unbudgeted construction and planning items were added. It should be pointed out that in the original Bureau of the Budget recommendations North Carolina, along with two other States, was completely left out, notwithstanding the fact that there were several desperately needed, fully approved projects. I do not know the reason for this, and I am glad to see that the committee saw fit to add one construction item and one planning item to the bill.

As stated, the cost of this project would be about $1,300,000. This Morehead City Harbor Project, was approved, after having been highly recommended by all Government agencies, in the Rivers & Harbors Act of 1956, which was vetoed by the President. Again in 1957 it was included in the Rivers and Harbors Act, which was vetoed. In neither case was the veto in any way related to this project. The adjusted cost estimate has gone up a little over $100,000, but the adjusted cost-benefit ratio is still as high or higher than it was when it was first approved. It shows clearly the economy of the project and the urgency for its construction without any further delay. It is a project which has a high cost-benefit ratio and the most substantial direct monetary benefits of the project would accrue to the Federal Government. I repeat the Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force are tremendously interested in the matter, however, each one is depending upon the other or on the Corps of Engineers to do the job and of course if the job is not done the Federal Government will continue to lose money.

At Morehead City Harbor the Marine Corps has its main port of embarkation on the Atlantic coast, serving its bases at Camp Lejeune Marine ground troops, some 30 miles distant, and Cherry Point Marine Air Base, about 12 miles away. An enlarged turning basin is part of the project and this portion is vital to the Marine Corps in its embarkation operations.

There is also located at the harbor a large fuel storage terminal which is leased to the Federal Government. This terminal supplies aviation and jet fuel for three Air Force bases and the Cherry

Point Marine Corps Air Base, including its outlying auxiliary fields. Under the joint-service arrangement the Navy Military Sea Transportation Service supplies the fuel to the terminal by means of Navy tankers, although the Navy itself does not use the fuel provided. The fuel is hauled from there by rail tank cars and highway tank trucks to Seymour Johnson and Pope Air Force Bases in North Carolina, and Donaldson Base in South Carolina. The terminal is in the process of being further expanded and additional tanks are to be erected. Beginning this summer a portion of a Strategic Air Command B–52 wing will commence operations at Seymour Johnson Air Base and the Air Force advises me that when this takes place the fuel demands for that service will be almost doubled overnight. The Military Sea Transportation Service has informed that their fully loaded T–2 tankers carry a depth of slightly more than 30 feet, and that due to channel depth restrictions, cargo tonnage has necessarily had to be reduced by some 4,000 long tons or more than 25 percent. In approximately 9 months this service alone, just for fuel tankers, has delivered 14 part cargoes. As a result of the restrictions providing the delivery of fuel cargoes the additional space in the Navy tankers destined for Morehead City has been loaded with petroleum products for Navy facilities at Jacksonville, Fla.

Admiral Will, commander of MSTS, advises me that this additional port call at Jacksonville increases the length of the round voyage by approximately 1½ days. He also stated that the minimum cost of a T–2 tanker is $3,300 per day. His full letter shows clearly the picture. It follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1959.

Hon. GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BARDEN: Reference is made to your letter of 22 April 1959, requesting information in connection with deepening the channel at Morehead City, N.C., and also the degree to which tankers use this port.

A T–2 type tanker fully loaded has a draft of 30 feet 1½ inches. The present restricted channel depth for Morehead City and Beaufort, N.C., is 25 feet. This restriction reduces the cargo tonnage a T–2 can carry by 4,000 long tons, or more than 25 percent. During the past 9 months, July 1958 to March 1959, 14 Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS) tankers have delivered part cargoes into Beaufort and Morehead City. All the cargoes were delivered for the U.S. Navy. As a result of the depth of water prohibiting the delivery of full cargoes, the additional space in tankers destined for this port is loaded with petroleum products for the U.S. Navy at Jacksonville, Fla. For a T–2 type tanker loading in a port in the U.S. gulf or the Netherlands, West Indies, the additional port call at Jacksonville increases the length of the round voyage by approximately 1½ days. The cost of operation of a T–2 tanker is $3,300 per day.

MSTS is greatly interested in the improvement of port facilities and increasing channel depths. The present commercial trend to large tankers makes these improvements necessary. A number of commercial tankers presently under charter to MSTS, 26,000 deadweight tons to 32,500 deadweight tons, have a loaded draft of 35 feet.

I hope the foregoing will serve your needs. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. WILL,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy, Commander,
Military Sea Transportation Service.

At the time the project was originally approved by the Congress in 1956 the cost-benefit ratio was approximately 1.9. The above cited fuel situation could not at that time have been given full consideration, for the situation did not exist.

I still cannot understand why the committee failed to make an investment such an investment, which is purely a sound business proposition, benefiting not only general seagoing commerce, but our various armed services.

I have been trying to get the cost-benefit ratio of the additional construction projects added to the bill, for I believe justified though they may be, few have as great a justification as does this project.

Some of the important facts to be considered in connection with this project include:

First. The State of North Carolina has spent in excess of $5,400,000 on the development of this port terminal. This expenditure represents a compact and complete deep sea ocean port with all necessary allied facilities. The legislature is now in session and has been asked to appropriate an additional amount in excess of one-half million dollars to construct additional warehouse facilities. In addition to regular facilities, specialized facilities consist of a modern fumigating plant, a grain-loading facility and a large petroleum tank farm.

Second. Freight traffic has greatly increased since the establishment of the State port some 7 years ago. As an example, in 1957 there were 158 vessels handled at the port terminal. In 1958, there were 204 vessels handled. In 1957 there were 25,000 hogsheads of tobacco. In 1958 there were 50,000 hogsheads of tobacco. In 1957 dry cargo handled totaled 29,728 tons. In 1958 it totaled 47,000 tons.

Third. During 1957 the Interstate Commerce Commission approved a petition by Southern Railway Co. to acquire the railroad running from Goldsboro to Morehead City, and now Southern is operating directly to the port. The results of this important development are now being felt in the development of considerable industries along the Southern Railway road. This will play an increasingly important role in the development of this port. One of the greatest needs in North Carolina for a century has been rail service by a trunk line carrier across the State east and west. This is now a reality.

Fourth. The importance of the port as a port of embarkation for the 2d Marines has steadily grown and Morehead City is now considered the prime port of embarkation for the Marine Corps on the Atlantic seaboard. More space is needed for anchoring and maneuvering military vessels. Considerable delay is experienced in awaiting favorable tides before entering the basin and waiting for the departure of other ships.

Fifth. The desired improvement is relatively inexpensive when compared to other ports along the Atlantic coast. Morehead City is only 3½ miles from deep water in the ocean. This factor makes this port the most accessible one on the Atlantic coast. A much shorter time from ocean steaming to dockside is required at Morehead City than any other port. This results in tremendous savings, for in many ports upward to one-half day, and in some cases even longer, is required from the time a pilot is taken aboard to docking.

Sixth. A close examination of this project in the light of developments since the submission of the report to Congress 5 years ago, should show beyond question that the cost-benefit ratio is materially improved. The savings to the Marine Corps in the handling of troop movements as well as the immediate saving to the Military Sea Transportation Service could well prove to be in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the project over a period of a very few years. And of course, all of these military and Government considerations are beyond and apart from this important justification and that is the commercial development of the port itself. The people of this area, the North Carolina State Ports Authority, an official State agency, and myself feel that the delays in constructing this project resulting from two vetoes of omnibus rivers and harbors bills, make it all the more urgent that work proceed without further delay. It is unwise from my way of thinking to delay this improvement longer, when it will undoubtedly continue to cost the American taxpayer more and more each year. The fact that this money may come from defense appropriations makes no difference so far as the U.S. Government is concerned. It is still taxpayers' money.

Seventh. In the last several years, I have found myself called upon numerous times to intercede with the Corps of Engineers on an emergency basis to obtain maintenance dredging due to the shoaling in certain parts of the channel. When the matter reaches an emergency stage, the Corps of Engineers of necessity has to do the dredging on a crash basis, many times resulting in a higher maintenance cost than would normally be required. It is felt that the additional depth in the channel would materially improve the maintenance situation and would practically eliminate the emergency situations which have arisen.

To sum up, it seems clear to me that this project is purely and simply a sound business proposition for the Federal Government and will result in direct and indirect monetary benefits immediately.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS].

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, as a newcomer to the House, I have not made a practice of doing a great deal of talking on the floor. I have tried to sit quietly and simply listen and learn from the senior Members. I can assure you

that I have no intention of departing from that general practice. But today I am compelled to rise in objection to that action which the Appropriations Committee has taken in eliminating funds for a public works project in my 38th District of New York.

The project is known as the Irondequoit Bay project, and the total cost has been estimated at $4,412,000. It is not the Federal share of this total amount which was involved in the committee action. However, the entire request for this year amounted to only $129,000, the bulk of which was to be used for completion of the planning phase of the project, so that actual construction could begin in the spring of next year. Now, however, unless the committee action is reversed in the Senate—as it should be, and as I hope fervently it will be—serious delays will result, and the whole timetable for the project will have to be adjusted.

Is there any justification for the committee's action? No one in the Congress is a more staunch advocate of economy and thrift in Government than I am, but even so I cannot condone the committee's decision to eliminate this particular project. To do so is, in fact, to condone the wasting of $132,000 in taxpayers' funds, for this is the amount of Federal money which has already been authorized, appropriated, and spent on the project, and which will be totally wasted if this decision to abandon the project is not reversed.

Briefly, the facts concerning the project are these: It was authorized with the full approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Army Corps of Engineers during the 84th Congress, following the completion and submission of preliminary examinations and surveys which were authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946.

Following this authorization in the 84th Congress, funds in the amount of $113,000 were appropriated last year in the 2d session of the 85th Congress to carry forward the final planning phase of the project. Coupled with the funds which were made available for the preliminary examinations and surveys—which amounted to $19,000—the total appropriation for the project to date has been $132,000. I am informed by the Corps of Engineers that virtually all of this money has now been spent, which means that we have already put $132,000 of Federal money into the project.

Furthermore, the State and local community have taken extensive steps preparatory to making substantial financial commitments of their own. Less than 90 days ago the New York State Legislature enacted legislation enabling the local community to go ahead with their plans for participation, and a five-man commission to supervise the construction and equipment of a wharf, mooring facilities, access roads, and parking facilities is already functioning actively. In addition, the State department of public works and the New York Central Railroad have also made rather extensive plans to participate in the project. All of this planning—which has been both extensive and expensive—will be for naught if the Federal Government now reverses its plans to participate.

The $129,000 requested for this year is contained in the President's budget, so that question is not involved; and in addition, the benefit-cost ratio is now 2.4 to 1, and there could be substantial improvement even of this favorable ratio if negotiations with the New York Central Railroad concerning the discontinuing of a small line of theirs are successful.

All things considered, Mr. Chairman—including the expenditures which have already been made, the complete willingness of the local community to bear their share of the cost, the very favorable benefit-cost ratio of the project, and the fact that the funds requested are relatively small and wholly within the Federal budget—I am hopeful that the Congress will carefully reconsider its decision to delete this project from this year's appropriation. To do otherwise is certainly a complete breach of faith with the people of my community.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express an interest and concern in the Irondequoit Bay, N. Y., project referred to on page 16 of the committee report.

Although an item of $129,000 was included in the budget request and recommended by the Army Corps of Engineers, the committee deleted this amount because of the apparent need of such funds for other projects involving flood control and navigation.

I hope that a reconsideration will be given to restoring these funds in order that this project may move forward.

Mr. Chairman, Irondequoit Bay is located in Monroe County, N.Y., on the south shore of Lake Ontario, 4 miles east of the city of Rochester at the mouth of the Genesee River. This project was authorized in the 1958 Rivers and Harbors Act, and the benefit-cost ratio is 2.4 to 1.

In the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1959, $113,000 was made available for planning purposes. According to the Army engineers, construction would start this next year and commitments have been made with regard to the relocation of an existing railroad bridge. Revised figures in connection with this project indicate a total estimated cost of approximately $4,400,000, with local and State governments sharing, in the amount of approximately $2,230,000.

This is an increase of $98,000 over the latest estimates submitted to Congress. As I understand it, this increase is due primarily to higher price levels and the estimate includes preauthorization study costs. In connection with the status of local cooperation, the New York State Legislature, during their 1959 session, enacted the necessary enabling legislation authorizing the Monroe County Board of Supervisors to act in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, you can readily see that this project not only has the necessary authorization but all primary steps have been taken, including that of local and State commitments. The project itself, while it does mean improvement of recreational facilities, will likewise reduce vessel damage and provide a refuge to vessels cruising between ports on Lake Ontario. I might point out that the bay is virtually landlocked, and ingress and egress are restricted except for very small boats. This improvement would tend to bring about an increase in the circulation of water in the bay, thereby reducing the unsanitary and stagnant conditions thereof, and commercial fishing would be revived in the area. These improvements at Irondequoit Bay, in accordance with the plans as approved and recommended by the Engineers in their report, are indicated to be economically justified.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this project was included in the budget and recommended by the Engineers for initial construction and, in further view of the fact that it has been justified in every way, I hope that the requested $129,000, which was included in the budget will be restored at this time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1960 construction and rehabilitation budget submittal of the Bureau of Reclamation contained $600,000 for the East High Canal irrigation area. This amount was for the purpose of continuing studies to determine the best means of serving from between 215,000 to 395,000 acres in the eastern portion of the Columbia Basin project. The House Committee on Appropriations in its recent report directed that the $600,000 be reduced to $100,000.

Such a reduction would greatly retard an important study for the continued development of the Columbia Basin project. The continuation and completion of the East High Canal area study is required so that the impact of the addition of such extensive area upon the rest of the project will be known.

As originally contemplated and authorized the Columbia Basin project consists of approximately 1,029,000 acres. However, certain areas within the scope of the original project have been eliminated for various reasons, such as the withdrawal of lands by the Atomic Energy Commission. Nevertheless, major work such as the main pumping plant, the feeder canal, and the equalizing reservoir—Banks Lake—were designed and constructed to furnish water to over 1 million acres. It is important, therefore, that substitute lands to restore the originally contemplated acreage be defined. The East High Canal study is essential in this respect.

Irrigable areas of this vast undertaking have been developed on a gradual basis

until today facilities are available to supply water to approximately 400,000 irrigable acres.

Decision as to means of serving the remainder of the irrigable acreage of the Columbia Basin project is now at a crossroads in planning. The works to serve the various portions of the overall service area are, in many aspects, highly interrelated and completion of the East High Canal irrigation area investigation is necessary to insure that the continuing construction on the Columbia Basin project will proceed in conformity with the best overall plan for completion of the project.

The decision as to the area to be served from the East High Canal is essential to the proper sizing of the main canal from the equalizing reservoir up to the point from which the East High Canal will branch. The sizing and scheduling of the important Bacon siphon and tunnel are also dependent upon the East High Canal study. Construction of these works must be initiated in the near future to serve lands which can be brought under irrigation under existing contract. These works are costly and it is extremely important that from the standpoint of economy and efficiency that they be built to the proper size. Drainage structures for areas already under development will be affected by the extent of development in the East High area along with the designs of major multiple-purpose waterways and wasteways. The ultimate plan for the East Low Canal also will depend upon plans to serve the East High area.

Following an orderly procedure for development of the Columbia Basin project a detailed study of the East High Canal area was initiated in fiscal year 1958; $350,000 was assigned to the study in fiscal year 1959 and $600,000 scheduled for fiscal year 1960. Severe curtailment of this study will preclude the Bureau of Reclamation from obtaining timely answers to several important decisions involving millions of dollars of future construction work. It will also, by disrupting a going investigation program be costly in terms of investigation funds. Existing contracts such as for aerial photography and mapping, although subject to cancellation, can be canceled and later resumed only at significant expense to the Federal Government. It is also always inefficient and expensive to break up an existing planning group and reassemble it later.

Over $500 million have been spent on the Columbia Basin project to date. The $600,000 requested for continuing the East High study is a small amount to obtain decisions necessary to assure that works already constructed, including Grand Coulee Dam, are utilized to their maximum effectiveness and to make certain that works yet to be built will be properly planned and designed. Because of the serious effect that the $500,000 reduction would have not only as to the East High area study itself but in relation to future actions on a major part of the entire Columbia Basin project it is strongly urged that this matter be reconsidered and the full amount of the $600,000 be restored.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I join with my other colleagues in congratulating the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on the commendable job they have done in bringing this appropriation bill to the floor today. As has been mentioned by several members of the committee, the committee patiently listened to 243 Members of Congress testify in favor of certain public works projects as well as 1,150 witnesses from different places throughout the Nation in support of a project that was of special interest to them.

A recent development in Frankfort, Kans., prompts me to take the floor this afternoon to advise the committee of a local circumstance that I feel merits attention of the House as well as the other body. The city of Frankfort, in Marshall County, Kans., located near the mouth of the Black Vermillion River, experienced the highest flood in the 100 years' history of their town on Saturday, May 30. Not only was this a flood that inflicted heavy damage on the town, it came only 11 months after a similar flood in 1958 and a comparable disaster occurred to the same city in 1948 and 1951.

In this flood on last Saturday, 167 homes were damaged as well as extensive damage to over 60 places of business in the city. This, in itself although extremely serious, is not the only reason that I am presenting this matter to the House today. You will note in the committee report that $18 million has been provided for further construction of Tuttle Creek Reservoir. At the present time it is anticipated by the Corps of Army Engineers that Tuttle Creek Reservoir may be completed and closed either late in 1959 or in the first part of 1960. The real estate taking line for Tuttle Creek Reservoir is 1140 feet elevation. This 1140 feet elevation for the reservoir will back water into a portion of the city of Frankfort, to which I have just referred. The inundation of a portion of the city of Frankfort would naturally impose an obligation on the Corps to acquire such houses and other improvements as are located in this portion of the town which would be inundated. Although it is not reasonable to assume that the reservoir would fill to a full pool level immediately after closure, the Corps has the long-established policy of not allowing residences to remain below the full pool elevation level for an extensive period after the closure and completion of a reservoir project.

In the public works bill of 1958 local flood protection project for Frankfort was authorized. The Corps of Engineers advised me that if they know this local flood control project is to be built, it will not be necessary for them to acquire the residences as I have described located under the full pool elevation of Tuttle Creek Reservoir. They further advised me that this project was not included among those recommended to the Bureau of the Budget because those recommendations had largely been selected before the Frankfort project was authorized in the closing weeks of the 85th Congress. They are in full agreement that it would be in the public interest to proceed with planning money for the Frankfort project in the next fiscal year and they have a capability of using $50,000 of planning money to that end.

It is the understandable position of the Appropriations Committee to resist all amendments offered to this bill when it is under consideration by the House. Therefore, I am not offering an amendment to the bill this afternoon, but did want to establish a record supporting the Frankfort levy and will look to the Appropriation Committee in the other body for further consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, this bill includes an item of $50,000 to commence a feasibility study on the San Felipe division of the Central Valley project. The study will be financed 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by local interests and was directed by this Congress by the act of August 27, 1958.

The area to be given water service if the study is favorable contains the 15th ranking county in the Nation in agricultural production. It is cut off by the coastal range of mountains from the principal sources of water in California. It is an area of self help which has, at its own expense, conserved every drop of local water. It has taxed itself in one district at a rate of $3.80 per hundred dollars of assessed valuation for water conservation. Despite this local effort millions of dollars invested in orchards and improved farmland is endangered from a receding water table. This study is urgent and is needed at the earliest possible moment.

Following the passage of the act of August 27, 1958, the Bureau of Reclamation requested permission to reprogram $50,000 of appropriated funds for fiscal year 1959 in order to make possible an earlier start on the study of the San Felipe division of the Central Valley project. This was in recognition of the extreme urgency and need for the study. Unfortunately the tremendous workload imposed upon the Appropriations Committee made it impossible to consider the request for reprograming until this bill was marked up in committee. At such a late date it is conceded that there would be no opportunity to utilize fiscal year 1959 funds and no useful purpose could be served in authorizing the reprograming.

In view of the urgency of this matter to my district and in view of the possibility that more than $50,000 could be utilized in fiscal year 1960 by the Bureau of Reclamation, I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] in the absence of the distinguished

chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if the following fact is not true:

That the Bureau can reprogram for use in this study in fiscal year 1960 an amount not to exceed 15 percent of any other study which will not be expended during that fiscal year?

I should also like to ask if a greater amount than the above-mentioned 15 percent might be reprogramed provided the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate grant permission?

Mr. RABAUT. The answer to both questions is yes.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Should such a request be made by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Committee on Appropriations will give it consideration?

Mr. RABAUT. We would consider it, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to ask some clarifying questions about the Allegheny River Reservoir from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

I would like to refer the gentleman to page 17 of the committee report which accompanies the bill. I notice that the first sentence on that page reads, in part, as follows:

> The committee has ordered an independent investigation of the merits of the alternative proposals advocated by the Corps of Engineers and the engineering consultants for the Seneca Indians.

Is it not true that the Corps of Engineers has not advocated any alternative proposal but, on the contrary, since 1936 and consistently thereafter, has advocated the Allegheny River Reservoir?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Is it not true that the Allegheny River Reservoir supported by the Corps of Engineers is the same or substantially the same project as was authorized by the Congress first in 1936 and later in 1938?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Is not the Allegheny River Reservoir the same project for which Congress has appropriated some $2,733,000 in past years?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Since this project has been under exhaustive study since 1936 by the Corps of Engineers, and since it has had repeated approval by that corps, does the gentleman believe a further study of this project is necessary?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman asked a question. The report answers the question.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Did the committee make any determination as to the length of time that would be required for this independent study?

Mr. CANNON. The report explains the bill. It speaks for itself.

Mr. MOORHEAD. It does not appear on page 17.

Mr. RABAUT. It might be in the hearings.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. I call your attention to the fact that this year a report was made at a cost of $75,000.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I am speaking to the subcommittee now. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Public Works Subcommittee intended this $1,400,000 to remain intact for use of the Allegheny River project?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman in answer to his inquiry that it was the intention of the committee that this money should not be available until the litigation was cleared up and until we had an opportunity to make our own engineering studies.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that that was the contention of the whole committee. I wondered if there was a different approach by the subcommittee.

Mr. CANNON. I am speaking for the subcommitttee.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I see. Again I would like to direct my question to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and ask if there was any understanding with respect to the language to be used in the report dealing with the Allegheny River Reservoir project.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, there was a misunderstanding about the language. The committee never did rule on that.

Mr. CANNON. Our report was made to the whole committee, and the whole committee approved the recommendation of the subcommittee.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the House Appropriation Committee has demonstrated and announced that no amendments will be made to H.R. 7509, the public works appropriation bill, I feel compelled to add my protest to those of my colleagues from Pennsylvania to the omission of two very worthwhile projects.

First, the failure of the committee to include the flood control project for the Turtle Creek Valley, which lies partly in the district of Congressman HOLLAND and partly in my district.

Second, the elimination from the appropriation bill of $1.4 million for the Kinzua Dam project.

In the first instance, we are faced with the dangerous industrial unemployment crises. This valley gives employment to approximately 35,000 persons primarily through Westinghouse plants. This valley is faced with flood conditions which have meant the loss of millions of dollars in wages, production, and cash outlay for rehabilitation purposes. The large corporations find themselves stymied in the money markets when seeking loans for the modernization and expansion of their plants due to the ever-present threat of costly flood damages, since there are to be no amendments here, and this also holds true for the Kinzua Dam project.

Congressmen HOLLAND, MOORHEAD, FLOOD, GAVIN, and others are appealing to the upper body through our Senators, CLARK and SCOTT, for the reintroduction into the bill the necessary and vital flood control projects.

Considering how great the contributions of the State of Pennsylvania are and have been to the national Treasury, the comparatively small amount required to alleviate these disastrous and recurring conditions is little enough to ask and expect from Members who come from States who have been direct beneficiaries of moneys from the public Treasury entirely out of proportion to their contributions.

Those of us from heavily populated States have contributed our support over the years to what were termed necessary and essential projects for every State in the Union. We now appeal to you to give us your support in this instance of direct and compelling need.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express appreciation to you, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations, for allocation of funds for the Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir in New Hampshire.

Your committee has seen fit to approve $5,568,000 for fiscal year 1960 to continue this flood-control project on the Hopkinton Dam on the Contoccook River above the junction of the Merrimack River. The site of the Everett Dam is on the Piscataquog River, which is 16 miles above the junction of the Merrimack River.

This project is an important unit in the overall plan of improvement for flood control in the Merrimack River Basin. You will recall that in 1936 and in 1938, due to the floods on the Merrimack River, there was millions of dollars of damage to 200-odd industries and other properties in the Merrimack River Valley.

This project was authorized under the 1938 Flood Control Act and the total project cost estimate is $30,800,000. Your committee allotted funds up to June 30, 1958, in the amount of $705,100 and in the current fiscal year 1959, $1,461,900. With this allocation in this bill of $5,568,000, the balance to complete this flood-control project after fiscal year 1960 will be $23,065,000. It is planned to advertise the dam contract in September of this year and then to award the same in October.

The committee has made no mistake, and we in the Merrimack Valley in the State of New Hampshire and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are indeed indebted to the Committee on Appropriations for their most thoughtful consideration.

Mr. MADDEN. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Little Calumet River which runs through the 1st Congressional District of Indiana and across the State line into Illinois in an east-west direction, during periods of heavy rainfall or spring thaws, floods vast areas of residential and truck garden property for a number of miles both in the Calumet region of Indiana and in the Illinois area.

My colleague, Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI of the adjoining Illinois congressional district, and I, some time ago filed with the Appropriations Committee, a request for the sum of $48,000 to be included in the pending Public Works Project legislation for a completion of a study by the Army Engineers of this necessary flood project. In the last 10 or 15 years, thousands of homes have been built in this area. This great influx of population came about by reason of the mammoth defense production caused principally by World War II, and the Korean War. Three major steel mills, the Carnegie-Illinois, Youngstown, and Inland Steel are located in adjacent Gary and East Chicago, Ind. All the major oil companies have their refineries and branch offices in the adjacent East Chicago and Whiting, Ind. The only available area for residential development is in the Little Calumet basin.

Over 10 years ago the Army Engineers made a survey of this area, but did not complete an exhaustive study as to the finding of methods of relieving this area of the devastating damage caused by periodical floods. Only recent, heavy rains in the area caused considerable damage and necessitated hundreds of persons living in the vicinity to dike the Little Calumet River with sandbags and other embankments in order to defer the flood damage to their homes and property. Every few years devastating floods hit the Little Calumet River causing millions of dollars in property damage.

Congressman DERWINSKI and I are asking the Congress to provide not the full amount which the Army Engineers estimated would complete this necessary study and survey, but merely for a $20,000 appropriation this year so that work can commence on this important project. The Army Engineers reported over 10 years ago that it was necessary for a joint survey to be made both in Illinois and Indiana as flood remedies in one State would merely cause water to inundate the areas in the adjacent State.

I do hope the committee will give every consideration to this necessary and relatively small amount to start an Army Engineer study and survey on this important project.

Mr. DERWINSKI. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to your attention this afternoon the urgent need for funds to resurvey the Little Calumet River basin which runs through my district, Fourth-Illinois, and adjacent Indiana. In the last few years this river has inflicted floods in this area during the periods of heavy rains and spring thaws which cause increasing damage each year.

A flood control project for this area was authorized by the Corps of Engineers by the Flood Control Act of 1954. Colonel Corey of the U.S. Army Engineer District in Chicago has advised that approximately $48,000 is needed to complete the study. This review study is vitally necessary to all the growing communities along the banks of the Little Calumet River.

For the record, I wish to state that Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, First District-Indiana, joined me in requesting from the Public Works Subcommittee the appropriation of $48,000 and Congressman MADDEN joins me here on the floor in making the same request of the Committee of the Whole.

Since the Corps of Engineers realizes the urgent need for this work, I ask that the funds be made available as soon as possible so that the increasing residential growth of this area be free from these periodic damages. I have records at my disposal to indicate the complete awareness of the Corps of Engineers as to the absolute need for quick action on this survey. I have assurance that as soon as the survey is completed all local participation and cooperation necessary will be provided by the municipalities affected in this area.

At a recent meeting I held with mayors and village presidents of south Cook County suburban communities I was assured of their 100 percent interest and have received pledges of complete cooperation. Your interest and support of this vital survey will be appreciated, and I can assure you it will be of tremendous benefit to the residents now adversely affected by flood conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I further wish to call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole the action of the Appropriations Committee in this Public Works Appropriations Act of 1960 deleting $930,000 in connection with the Western Avenue Highway Bridge in the Calumet-Sag navigation project.

The Truman-Hobbs Act originally applied only to railway bridges. It was later amended and became Public Law 564 of the 82d Congress to provide for Federal participation in the cost of relocating publicly owned highway bridges in connection with navigation and flood control projects.

However, prior to the amendment the Cal-Sag project had already been authorized with local interests to bear full cost. The Appropriations Committee takes the position that to include Federal participation at this time in the relocation of the bridge in question is retroactive and should not apply to this bridge. It further takes the position that this will be setting up a precedent if this is allowed to go through. For that reason, they deleted the money. Under the Truman-Hobbs Act the Federal Government pays basically the extra cost of removal or alteration over and above the depreciated value of the bridge based on its original cost. I cannot agree with their thinking.

It must be pointed out that in the omnibus river and harbor bill of 1958 the House Public Works Committee, after a separate survey report had been ordered and had gone through the usual channels, authorized the inclusion of this bridge under the Truman-Hobbs Act believing the project to be fully justified and specifically broke the cost down into three parts so as to bear the payments by the Government over a number of years. For further details I refer you to House Report 1894, 85th Congress and ask that you give it serious study. Your attention is called to section 109 on page 69 of the report which gives a detailed explanation of the reason for the inclusion of this project in the 1958 act.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Cal-Sag navigation project is the most important public works project being undertaken at this time by the Federal Government. It is a vital part of the navigation system of continental significance. Its completion will link, far more effectively than heretofore, the Nation's two main arteries of waterborne commerce: The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system to the north and the Mississippi-Gulf intracoastal system to the south.

It is obvious to all who have studied this project that it has more reaching effects on the economy of the Middle West—in fact on the entire Nation—than any other comparable project.

The interpretation that has led the Appropriations Subcommittee to reverse the actions of the previous Congress is to be deeply regretted by all who have an awareness of the importance of this project. I urge you, my colleagues, to give this matter your serious study so that we may next year bring about a more realistic understanding of the effects of this action and approve the application of the Truman-Hobbs Act, as amended, to specific application of this Cal-Sag navigation project. Industrial and commercial expansion of the entire Middle West and Great Lakes area is at stake in this project.

Mr. HOLLAND. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I note that the Appropriations Committee has recommended funds to commence planning or construction of a number of flood control projects not yet started and which were not in the President's budget. I commend the committee for putting the urgent needs of flood-plagued communities ahead of the rigid and parsimonious financial policies of the administration. It is unfortunate that the criteria used by the Appropriations Committee in selecting new projects to be appropriated for could not be extended to

the urgent flood-control problem in the Turtle Creek Valley of Pennsylvania. The total estimated cost of relieving this critical flood situation is only $13,417,000. A relatively small sum of even $50,000 to commence the advanced planning of this project in order that construction could begin next year would be of vital importance to the 30,000 people employed at the various industrial plants located in the Turtle Creek Valley.

I consider it shortsighted that the Budget recommended no funds for this important project, and I very much regret that the Appropriations Committee made no provision for it.

The flood protection work needed in the Turtle Creek basin of Pennsylvania is small in volume and in cost compared to many of the large dams and other works which the Federal Government has built and is building in other areas of the country. The Turtle Creek Valley is a highly industrialized, densely populated area which suffers greatly from recurrent floods. The area subject to flooding contains extensive heavy industries, railroads, and commercial and residential developments. It is an important part of the Pittsburgh industrial area and is a significant factor in the defence and industrial well-being of the United States. This is a project where a relatively small expenditure would do a large amount of good.

It is well known that Pennsylvania contributes many more tax dollars to the Federal Treasury than do many of the States in which large sums in the pending bill will be spent, and I think the Turtle Creek, Pa., project should be promptly financed with Federal funds.

The Turtle Creek Valley has been plagued by many destructive and costly floods for more than 50 years. In times of flood the entire economy of the area becomes paralyzed. Direct costs running into millions of dollars have been incurred repeatedly by local residents and industries, and the indirect costs to the entire economy of the valley are many times greater. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has estimated that a recurrence of the last major flood, which came in October 1954, would result in direct damages to property and in excess of the $13½ million total construction cost of this project.

Mr. Chairman, a remedy for this flood control problem was authorized over 15 years ago but no appropriation was ever made under the original authorization which provided for a dam and reservoir. In the meanwhile urbanization of the valley has made a storage reservoir unfeasible, and last year a new authorization was included in Public Law 85-500, providing for "widening, deepening, stream bed and side slope protection and paving, and streamlining the channels of lower Turtle Creek." The new plan also includes modification of some existing structures, as well as construction of debris basins.

I would like to point out that a local flood control agency has already undertaken part of the work needed in the Turtle Creek area. This work was paid for with local funds, substantial portions of which were supplied by industrial concerns in the Turtle Creek area. If the Federal share of the work is not undertaken soon the value of the locally financed work will be lost. This is another important reason for getting Federal funds now for this project.

I had intended to offer an amendment here in the House in the hope of getting an appropriation for Turtle Creek, but history shows that such amendments have little chance of success. Therefore, I have decided it would be wiser not to force the issue at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have urged that the other body provide planning funds for the Turtle Creek flood control project, and I know that both of the Senators from Pennsylvania are making a strong plea for funds for Turtle Creek. I sincerely hope this effort will be successful. If the Senate does make provision for this project, I urge that the House conferees accept such an amendment in order that this urgently needed work can get started.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong approval of the action of the Committee on Appropriations in repudiating the "no new starts" reclamation policy of the administration. As stated by the committee in its report:

> This unrealistic policy which the administration has attempted to adhere to in the past few years would ultimately dry up the water resources program of the Nation.

We need to develop our land resources for new farm homes and our water resources for production of power, the full cost of which is reimbursable. The Nation can well afford to invest one-third of 1 percent of our annual income for the development of our natural resources in the fields of reclamation, power, navigation, and flood control.

I am extremely disappointed that the committee did not include an item for resuming construction on the Yellowtail Unit of the Missouri River Basin project of the Bureau of Reclamation. This project has been approved by Congress and an appropriation of $4 million for construction was made in 1956, but because reservoir and damsite title had not been clarified, most of this appropriation was subsequently swept up by the Committee on Appropriations in 1957. Late in 1958, by legislation, title to the reservoir and damsite was obtained from the Crow Indian Tribe, and the project, now fully engineered and ready to go, awaits only the reappropriation of construction funds. It is a self-amortizing project whose cost will be repaid the Government along with interest. It has a benefit cost ratio of 1.53 to 1. An investment of more than $5 million in this project already has been made by the United States.

I express the hope that when the conference committee takes final action, the bill may contain an item for the Yellowtail unit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this problem comes up on continuing the appropriations for construction of a proposed flood control dam in Pennsylvania at one of the best damsites in the country. It is called the Kinzua Dam near Warren, Pa. The site is on the Allegheny River that flows down south from New York State to Western Pennsylvania through the city of Pittsburgh, and joining with the Monongahela River, forms the Ohio River, which goes on down to the Mississippi River.

Pennsylvania, according to our Governor, David Lawrence, is the State most hit by river floods of any State in the Nation, because we have hills, mountains, narrow valleys, and many industrial cities and towns built along these rivers and tributaries. In 1956, southwestern Pennsylvania was declared a national disaster area because of floods. In the summer of 1958 a flood struck the city of Sharon, on the Shenango River, and it has had two floods since. In January 1959, there was another big flood in this area which caused many millions of dollars worth of damage. The city of Meadville had the worst flood in its history. Beaver Falls, Warren, Farrell, New Castle and Wheatland have suffered repeated flood damage. In recent floods in 1959, the loss in the Allegheny, Monogahela, and Mahoning River Valleys was approximately $32 million. In the Ohio Valley as a whole, the loss was estimated at $75 million. I strongly feel it is necessary to keep this dam moving. There is $1.4 million not spent of the past $2 million appropriation; $1 million was appropriated in 1958 and $1 million was appropriated in 1959 fiscal years. Unless we have the protection of this dam, which is the keystone of our flood control program in Pennsylvania, we may have another tragic flood loss as we had in Pittsburgh in 1936 when there were lost 21 lives and $100 million worth of property damage to homes, industries and public facilities. All we in Pennsylvania are asking for at this time is to restore the $1.4 million previous appropriation which Dr. FENTON, the head of our Pennsylvania Republican delegation, will offer as an amendment. I wish you would consider it as a very small down payment on an insurance premium against flood losses for western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and the Mississippi tributaries.

My feeling, too, is this, that if we in our industrial areas of western Pennsylvania, through some great emergency caused by a flood should be out of action for 6 months or so, it would be a great risk to this country on our national effort for security and defense, because Pennsylvania is the workshop for the United States and the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the committee an important Rural Electrification Administration transmission line in that it

has been stricken from the budget request of the Department of the Interior and consequently does not appear in the bill now before us.

The transmission facility of which I speak is a proposed line which would run from Redmond to Burns, Oreg., to provide adequate electric service to the Harney Electric Cooperative which now serves farms and ranches in Harney and Malheur Counties. This needed transmission line would also supply power to the Harney cooperative which would be utilized to provide central station electric service to northern Humbolt County in Nevada. The Harney County Electric Cooperative has for many years worked diligently to bring adequate electric service to its rural customers. The cooperative now provides service to its customers from the Idaho Power Co. over lines of very limited capacity which are owned by the California-Pacific Utility Co. The contract between the cooperative and the Idaho Power Co. expires in December 1961, and is presently limited to a maximum of 2,000 kilowatts.

The Harney cooperative has made the necessary engineering studies and developed plans of service to cover its entire service area, thereby providing an adequate power supply for its southeastern Oregon customers and its neighbors in northern Humbolt County. Most of these people do not now have access to central station power supply and are dependent on very high-cost small diesel plants.

The Harney Electric Cooperative has been working very closely with the Rural Electrification Administration and the Bonneville Power Administration in order to obtain the power they need. A comprehensive load study which was made by the cooperative in cooperation with REA and BPA clearly demonstrates that the line from Redmond to Burns is necessary. I am informed that this line fully meets the feasibility standard which was established by the Department of Interior in 1946 and which is the standard for the area. The line was recommended for construction by the Bonneville Power Administration. It was approved by the Department of Interior, accepted and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and recommended to the Congress for construction in the President's budget.

I recognize that at the time this item was before the House Appropriations Committee, there had not been sufficient time for the Harney cooperative to have its plan of service approved by the Rural Electrification Administration and to process the REA loan necessary to build its distribution system. Meanwhile, I am informed that on Tuesday next, June 9, the final field review of the application will have taken place and it will be sent to the REA Administrator for his approval. Discussion of this matter with REA officials here in Washington leads me to believe that this is a routine application which will be duly accepted and approved within the next 2 weeks.

I have every confidence that in light of this additional information that the other body of Congress will have adequate reason to favorably reconsider this budget request and that it will be restored.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I want to first congratulate the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and especially those serving on the Public Works Subcommittee, for their dilligent work on this appropriations bill now before us. The committee has held seemingly endless hearings on the various public works projects and all-in-all it appears to me that they have come out with a fairly equitable program.

I was, however, distressed to learn that the committee has seen fit to cut the Missouri River Basin project investigations funds for the Garrison diversion unit by $250,000. The budget estimate was $550,000 on this particular project.

I just want to mention briefly that this project was proposed to help compensate North Dakota for the loss of some of our very best lands which had to be given up due to the flooding caused by construction of the Garrison dam in North Dakota, which has been practically completed. When these lands were taken, Garrison Diversion was the glowing promise we received as a compensation. Our North Dakota people took this promise seriously. For instance: Farmers have already organized over 300,000 acres into irrigation districts. They have elected board members. They are now anxiously waiting for the day when water for irrigation will be made available, as was promised.

These farmers, who have acted in good faith, hope that the Garrison diversion unit can be cleared of all hurdles at the earliest possible time—before the next drought strikes, if they are lucky.

At this point in the RECORD I include a news story on diversion from the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News of June 1, 1959:

DIVERSION ANSWER TO WATER SUPPLY FOR MANY TOWNS—103 NOW FACING PROBLEMS

While Garrison Diversion is regarded primarily as an irrigation project, studies conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation and the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission indicates it will also go a long way in solving municipal water problems for many North Dakota cities and towns.

Latest appraisal by the water conservation commission shows 103 North Dakota cities and towns with a present water supply problem and 18 others facing water supply problems in the relatively near future.

Of the 103 with an immediate problem, all but 40 are either scheduled to receive municipal water as part of the diversion project or could be aided by provision of supply works and relatively short transport of water, statistics furnished the News by the Bureau of Reclamation show.

Of the 18 with water supply problems to be faced in the near future, 9 could get supplemental sources of supply from Garrison Diversion.

In all, the project is set up to serve 55 cities and towns with 34 others that could be served with relatively minor outlays.

The official 1950 population of the 55 cities and towns in the project area due to receive water totaled 73,261.

A 1956 population estimate of the 34 towns and cities that could also be served came to 98,356.

Between the two, they represent nearly a fourth of the population of the State.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the Fenton amendment when it is offered at the proper time and for a most extraordinary reason I think we ought to have full attention to what we are going to attempt to do. Generally, when amendments are offered to this particular type of appropriation bill they are requests for new money or for new projects to get underway. But here we have the most amazing thing that I have ever seen or heard of in some 17 years in this House. Here is what is proposed by this bill. A project that has been authorized three times and for which money has been appropriated is going to be terminated and the money distributed to other projects without any proper committee action. Somebody, somewhere simply wiped the money out and said it shall be programed for other projects. I just do not know how that can happen. To the best of my information, the subcommittee did not act on this matter or even discuss it. When there was a technical acceptance of the report, a protest was raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], and he was given some assurance that there would be a correction. But there was no correction.

Here is what we are asking. We ask in this amendment that money already appropriated for the project not be taken away from it because of litigation before the Supreme Court, which we are told will be ended by June 15 of this year. Here we have a situation where one of the most important flood control reservoirs in the entire United States is going to be held up for a year or 2 years or 3 years—we do not know how long because somebody directed that language be included in this report reallocating the funds to other projects. Obviously you cannot amend the report. You have to change the total amount in the bill to even have the project back in operation. It is a most extraordinary thing.

Mr. Chairman, justice, doing the right thing requires that the Fenton amendment be adopted when it is offered and the Allegheny Reservoir at Kinzua be built with the most economical promptness that is possible. I hope you will, in support or orderly procedure and in support of the decision of the Congress in other years, not permit this matter to be reallocated because somebody so directed. One or two Members should not be allowed to veto the expressed will of another Congress by utilizing technicalities.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer my words of commendation and appreciation to the House Committee on Appropriations for the constructive approach which they have taken in presenting the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960 to the House for consideration, which bill

in my opinion is a most modest approach to the problems involved. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I desire that the members of the Committee on Appropriations, particularly those who have worked so diligently and constructively on the Subcommittee on Public Works, know that I believe that in the field of water resource development they have presented one of the most realistic programs that has been presented to Congress since I have been a Member of this body. As an individual Member of Congress I want to thank the committee for its sympathetic approach to the continuing and orderly building of the Upper Colorado River storage and development project.

I am most appreciative of the language that the committee has seen fit to write in its report on the subject of "no new starts." Although to some the language used may seem a bit harsh, nevertheless, those of us who must work very closely with the conservation and wise use of the Nation's water resources think the language appears to be wholly justified. The conservation programs related to our natural resources should not and must not be made matters of partisanship thinking or maneuvering. While I am not in sympathy with such policy, nevertheless, I think I can understand the administration's "no new starts" policy—but to me it has been and is a most shortsighted policy. A nation, though beset with terrific pressures from outside its own borders, cannot, in my opinion, neglect, refuse, or fail to continue to build within its own borders. Also, a nation which cannot use wisely at least 1.5 percent of its income to protect and develop its most valuable of all resources is laying up trouble for the future.

I think that the great Committee on Appropriations, realizing the importance and necessity of protecting and developing such resources, has done a most commendable piece of work.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to join the gentleman in his commendation of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations for their action and especially for their very accurate and strongly worded report about the administration's policy with reference to these starts. The committee very effectively demonstrated the fallacy of that policy.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. I understand that the appropriation for $1,900,000 for the Whitlow Ranch Reservoir in Arizona was taken from the bill at the request of the Corps of Engineers. The reason the Corps of Engineers requested it be taken from the bill was due to a favorable bid on construction. Enough money has already been appropriated to complete the project so no further funds are required. Is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. That is right. No further funds are required. There is already a sufficient amount.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time remaining on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, every year this bill has grown by leaps and bounds. This year it jumped only $41 million. I expect that is an accomplishment. At the same time, however, we are developing so many projects, either started or plans authorized, that we would be unable to meet the bills if we provided for all of them.

This new start proposition may sound nice, and it is something that has to be done where there is real need; on the other hand, when you get to putting in projects which have a cost-benefit ratio of only 1 to 1, it is pretty hard for anyone to understand why it is necessary to put such items in the bill. The bill itself calls for the start of at least 35 new projects which will have an overall construction cost of $555 million; and all 35 of these are new starts.

Frankly, I do not believe we can afford to start that many, and I do not believe we can afford to start projects that would gross such an enormous sum to complete. There are already in process, as I understand, at least $8 million worth of projects, started in previous years.

Now I want to say a word or two so that it may be understood, about this Kinzua Dam proposition. Here is what actually has happened: There has been a lawsuit pending in the courts which has held up the start. Dr. Arthur Morgan, who was the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority for quite a while and who is one of the greatest engineers in the United States, at the request of some of those people in that area has prepared an alternate route which would save the Government at least $30 million. It is possible that we should not try to save $30 million. Dr. Morgan's report looks very much to an ordinary citizen as though it were sound.

The Committee on Appropriations voted to have an independent study. I will be perfectly frank, I have had so many experiences with the Corps of Engineers in which they were wrong that I have not as much confidence in what they would do or say as some of the rest of you have. I have run into many instances where they did not have the right answers, and so everlastingly many where the project cost way beyond what they estimated it would cost, that I have lost a great deal of the faith that I had in their pronouncements years ago. For that reason I was glad to see that the committee was going to have an independent study of this proposition and was going to try to find out just what it should do on it before it jumps.

When the money was put in the bill by the committee, frankly, a question was raised about it, but no one made any motion to strike out the language which was in the bill, and for that reason it was impossible for anybody to say that the language did not represent the opinion of the committee.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

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

Mr. FENTON. I did raise the question in committee.

Mr. TABER. There was no vote.

Mr. FENTON. I was under the impression that the chairman of the committees asked the clerk to make a proper adjustment in the language, and I say that sincerely.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman did, I did not hear it.

Mr. FENTON. Or I would not be up here today doing what I am doing. I may say to the gentleman that the amendment I am proposing will do exactly what he wants to do. In addition to freezing $1,400,000, the committee will not take action until it gets a report from the engineering investigation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we go now to the amount of the appropriation. Projects had been put in, so far as new starts are concerned, at least 35 of them, maybe more—I am sure of that many—costing overall $565 million to be started either by survey or by construction, as the result of the committee submitting new starts without budget estimates of any kind. Frankly, the bill is in such shape it is going to be easy for me to say that I am opposed to the bill and will not vote for it. It is so big that it is just impossible for anyone to see how we can continue in this way and go on and on with unbudgeted items and with items that are new starts when we should not have them and when we are running behind what the revenues of the Government will produce.

This is not, to my mind, the time to branch out with a great lot of new starts. I will admit that there has been a very considerable sentiment on the part of a lot of people to have new starts; at the same time, if we had coupled with it the proposal that we shall raise additional taxes to meet the amount of the deficit that the Treasury has to report this year, I do not believe the support would be as big as it is.

Mr. WEAVER. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, this public works appropriations bill is in large extent the artery carrying the economic lifeblood of the State of Nebraska. Like many States in the Great Plains region, we are both a have-not and have-too-much-water State. In our western prairies we have too little water for much of the year. In the east we are cursed by constant flooding and the threat of flooding. And along our eastern border rolls the mighty Missouri which, when in a friendly mood, serves as a traffic arterial carrying commerce to and from our river ports in an ever-increasing flow. When rampant, the

Missouri thunders down on us carrying death and destruction with its flood crests.

In considering the problem of Public Works construction, Mr. Chairman, I think the House Committee on Appropriations and most specifically the Subcommittee on Public Works under the direction of that most distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has done a remarkable job. The committee has put together a bill which considers the problems from all aspects, and takes care of our most pressing needs, not only in Nebraska but in the Nation as a whole, very admirably. The most remarkable feature is that the committee has accomplished this within the restraints of a balanced budget and within the bounds of available funds. This is by no means any easy task and it was accomplished only because the subcommittee members have spent long and tedious hours listening to the testimony of the interested parties, and then, with the assistance of their competent and hard-working staff, sifted through that voluminous record to arrive at the facts and to make their judgments.

The subcommittee, its chairman and the distinguished ranking minority Member from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] are to be commended for their diligence and effort, and are to be thanked for their accomplishments. They have done a really worthwhile job.

I would like to take time here to discuss the projects in which I am so keenly interested one by one. First, there is the tremendously important job of Missouri River channel and bank stabilization which the Army Corps of Engineers is undertaking. There is an increasing need for a stable, deepwater channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river. Although railroads in our great region have been and are doing a remarkably good job of hauling freight, there are seasons when this form of traffic must be augmented by barge hauling. The great corn and wheat crops must be moved quickly to marketing and milling points and in the spring the great loads of chemical fertilizers must also be moved into the region. Additionally, the farmers and growing industries of the area are dependent to a greater and greater extent on the barges for hauling petroleum products and heavy steel pipes, plates, and forms.

To make of the Missouri a more useful and less dangerous stream, the Corps has undertaken a long-range program of bank and channel stabilization. To carry forward this program the fiscal 1960 appropriations bill provides a three-stage development program totaling $8,400,000. Of this, $5,600,000 is for the stretch of river from Sioux City to Omaha. Another $2,800,000 will go for work on the stretch from Omaha to Kansas City, and an additional $3,475,000 for the stretch from Kansas City to the mouth.

Although we are directly concerned with only a small portion of this development in our district, the entire project will have a bearing on the economic life not only of our State but the entire Plains States region.

There are two very important flood control projects in our State provided in this bill. One, the Gering Valley control project, is long overdue and has been long-authorized. This project will probably mean the difference between continued growth or stagnation in the Gering Valley. For this purpose, the Committee has provided $350,000. This project in northwestern Nebraska is not in my district but I was most eager and happy to take a hand in presenting the case for Gering before this subcommittee. It has long been my firm belief, a belief engendered through family tradition, that what is good for one section of our State is of benefit to the entire State and all its residents.

I would like to go into detail at this point on one very important project which is close to my heart, the Salt Creek and Tributaries project, which is more commonly known locally as the Salt-Wahoo project.

This is a flood control project which is not altogether an engineer's undertaking but is also partly the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture which has undertaken a watershed conservation program.

This watershed encompasses some 1,600 square miles of land, and includes one of the major cities of our State, Lincoln, the State Capital. There are other towns in the watershed and the lower valley of the Salt-Wahoo watershed comprises some of the best, and most flood-ravaged farmland in the Midwest.

In fact, only a few weeks ago a vast area was once again inundated, the result not of a steady day-after-day torrent, but of only a moderately heavy rainfall.

The watershed is drained by two principal creeks, Salt and Wahoo, both of which have a wide variety of tributaries ranging from tiny streams to good-sized creeks.

The rainfall in this 1,600 square mile area is drained into these two creeks which, time after time over the years, have erupted from their banks, destroying both farmland and urban property, washing out bridges and railroad lines, to the tune of millions of dollars. Over the years, many times the $13 million this project will ultimately cost have been destroyed by these floods. Lives have been endangered, and communications have been disrupted.

Some 200,000 persons reside in this area which has been, and still is one of the most economically sound areas of the State or the entire region. However, this economic stability is constantly threatened by the flooding of Salt and Wahoo Creeks.

There is one additional and growing concern on my part and that involves the military aspects of the situation. As you undoubtedly are aware, Lincoln Air Force Base lies in the valley near Lincoln, Nebr. This is one of the principal bases of the Strategic Air Command and is, indeed, one of our front lines of defense and one of the principal mainstays of our policy of deterrence.

This base's importance to our overall defense capability was increased threefold early this year with the announcement that it would become the center of an Atlas missile complex. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know personally where these missile launching sites will be located, nor can I say with a certainty that they will be located in a spot endangered by future flooding of Salt and Wahoo Creeks or any of their tributaries. This, however, is not the only essential fact involved. The road complex feeding these missile bases would definitely be involved, or could be washed out by future flooding. Thus, should the sudden need arise for quick access to these bases, the danger of flooding does exist. Even though this may seem a remote possibility in the minds of some, it nevertheless is a possibility, and should be considered by this Committee.

All of these facts I submit to the House for its consideration.

Bearing in mind the need for a balanced budget, and firmly believing that can be accomplished without in any way stinting on the needs for protection of our people from the dangers of continued flooding, we are asking for $90,000 to be appropriated for construction of the Salt Creek and Tributaries project. This is not an excessive amount, and it will start the job.

Turning now to the problems of reclamation in the more arid sections of Nebraska.

There are three separate and important reclamation projects under construction in Nebraska, Bostwick, Farwell, and Frenchman-Cambridge. A fourth, Ainsworth, has been authorized and initial funds were appropriated. However, because of some local opposition and some uncertainty due to litigation on the part of local people, the subcommittee decided this year to defer action on Ainsworth until the problems are settled. It is my hope that this is temporary and that the project can be resumed when these matters are ironed out.

For the continuation of Bostwick, we are being asked to approve $2,338,000 in additional construction money. This will go a long way toward completing this very essential project.

For Farwell, an added $3 million has been recommended by the committee and I strongly urge its approval.

For Frenchman-Cambridge, $4,076,000 is being requested. This project is nearing completion and the money must be spent to continue the work already so well begun.

There is one more very important construction program funded in this bill and one on which I would like to devote some time. That project is Red Willow Dam and Reservoir.

I would like to outline briefly for the House Red Willow project, which is part of the Frenchman-Cambridge project. It can be considered a "new start" only by those looking to the excuse of semantics. Actually this is a long-planned and very important phase of the overall Frenchman-Cambridge project. Mr. Chairman, this project has been authorized for the past 15 years, as part of Frenchman-Cambridge. It is necessary, indeed, vital, to the orderly and logical

development of our resources that this project be funded and begun at once. Without it, Frenchman-Cambridge is an incomplete thing; with Red Willow included, Frenchman-Cambridge takes on the aspects of a fully operative, complete project.

Although originally authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944, Red Willow's supporters felt strongly that all technicalities of law should be met and it was reauthorized by concurrent resolution last year. There were some who felt this was over-authorizing the project, but most of us felt it wise to make sure no loopholes existed in the law. The Congress agreed with us. And by that agreement is implied the overwhelming sense of Congress that the project should be undertaken forthwith and without the delays imposed by the Bureau of the Budget.

This brings up the question of what constitutes a "new start." Logically, the term should be applied to projects which break new ground, so to speak, and are a fresh creation of the people directly involved and from this inspiration a freshly created project authorized by the Congress.

I can think of a number of such projects. I myself have testified concerning two such projects, Ainsworth and Farwell in Nebraska. Incidentally, in both instances your committee saw fit to launch these projects and in a succeeding year the Budget Bureau, despite earlier objections, approach you for additional funds.

This, then, would be a new start. At one time, Frenchman-Cambridge was a new start. But the day the first truckload of dirt was hauled, Frenchman-Cambridge itself was started. That means the whole project was launched, not just one dam or one reservoir or one canal. Frenchman-Cambridge was conceived as an entity; it was designed as one and was authorized as a complete project. To consider one part of that project, Red Willow, as something apart, something new and different, would be like trying to separate the kitchen from the bedroom of a home. The house is not complete without both. This applies to Red Willow. It is part of the orderly and logical development of Frenchman-Cambridge which is already well under construction and with Red Willow will near completion. Without Red Willow, Frenchman-Cambridge is incomplete; with it, the project becomes an entity.

Perhaps the Bureau of the Budget measures its "new start" philosophy with the yardstick of time. If this is the case, then Red Willow cannot be considered a new project. It was authorized as a part of Frenchman-Cambridge in 1944. When we found little cooperation from the Budget Bureau we determined to close any possible loopholes last year; this accounts for the lag between 1944 and 1958. That the President himself recognized the status of Red Willow is signified by the fact he signed last year's report and that report includes Red Willow as part of Frenchman-Cambridge.

Perhaps the Bureau of the Budget has determined Red Willow a new start because the parent project can function without it; I have heard that excuse used. This would be like starting to build a home using a master architect's plans only to set up a camp stove on the front porch instead of building the kitchen. True, a family could be fed that way, but I doubt if many Americans would line up to buy the House.

I also doubt if the American people are willing to buy a multi-million dollar project like Frenchman-Cambridge only partially completed. The American people have supported reclamation projects, but they want them to be completed projects, not houses with camp stoves on the front porch instead of kitchens.

The Bureau of Reclamation has been placed in the position of accepting the "new start" terms laid down by the Bureau of the Budget. But it has been obvious from the start that the Bureau of Reclamation considers Red Willow to be an important part of Frenchman-Cambridge and not a project which could or should stand by itself. This is not to imply any less degree of merit in Red Willow than in other projects; it merely is a reiteration of the fact that it is a part of Frenchman-Cambridge and as such cannot be considered in reality a new start.

Under original planning, the Bureau has asked for $150,000 for design and plan work and land acquisition for the dam, and another $60,000 for the same purpose for the irrigation canals and other adjuncts of Red Willow as part of Frenchman-Cambridge funds. Under their plans, first contracts will be let late next year, provided, and here I quote a Bureau source, "there is an end to the 'no new start' prohibition next year."

There is no assurance that there will be an end to this prohibition by the Bureau next year, or the year after that, or for years to come. Are we to stand by idly and watch this project recede into the dimness of the future?

I hope this is not to be the case. For that reason, we are at the present time asking for $525,000 to begin construction on this project. With that money appropriated and funded, construction work could begin as early as next spring, and the project would be well underway.

I would like to discuss briefly one final point. That involves survey money, not specifically identified in the report, for the Little Blue project. Frankly, I do not know whether Little Blue will prove to be a feasible project or not. I am no engineer nor do I qualify as an expert on the economics of this type of project. For such information we must depend for guidance on the experts.

There are those who maintain flatly that Angus Dam on the Little Blue is one of the finest prospects left untouched in the State of Nebraska. There are others who bitterly oppose the project and maintain that it not only will not do a flood control or irrigation job in the area but would actually be highly detrimental.

Because of these conflicting views, I submit that we must get at all the facts. It is my hope that the survey funds, $68,500, requested in this bill, will be useful to that end. It is also my hope that the Bureau will use this money to make an objective survey and not simply to amass statistics to back up an already-assumed position.

In conclusion, I might say that this bill is a good one; it does not violate the principal of a balanced budget and does provide for almost every section of the country those projects which are needed and essential to continued orderly growth. I ask support for this measure from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BURDICK. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, the decision of the Appropriations Committee to cut the budget estimate for the Garrison diversion unit from $550,000 to $300,000 was met with great disappointment by the people of North Dakota. This will mean an additional slow-down in the project.

It should be remembered that the Garrison diversion unit was a part of the Missouri River Basin Project, which was authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act. North Dakota has given up over a half million acres of land for dam and reservoir, which have been taken from the local tax rolls, in furtherance of the project; yet, after 15 years, not only has the Congress failed to provide construction money, but has now reduced the necessary planning funds.

At page 445 of part 2 of the hearings we find the following testimony:

Mr. RABAUT. Why should we not drop this investigation? How much are you getting for that a year, $500,000?

Mr. BENNETT. The Garrison unit is running at the rate of about $500,000 per year.

Mr. RABAUT. Why could we not drop that until we find out about some of the recapture of this water? That is a lot of money.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RABAUT. It has been going on since 1947.

Mr. BENNETT. It takes quite a lot of investigation to get a million acres of land ready.

We think we will have most of the work, including the work on the various service areas ready in about another 2 or 3 years.

The $500,000 a year is now being used to firm up the plans, to get the final locations on the canals and the distribution systems for the service areas. The overall work is done so that we know the amounts of water to be diverted; we know where the return flow is and how much it is.

The work we are doing now is firming up the plans for the service areas.

Mr. RABAUT. Firming up the plans.

Mr. DOMINY. This criticism you have brought up here about the downstream concern about diverting water, the amount that would be taken from the Missouri River for diversion for Garrison is no more than was contemplated from the very start.

Now the dams have been built for flood control and for power and for navigation and they were also built with the definite plan of diverting water for irrigation; so, in a sense, it is the kind of criticism that happens; when one group gets what they wanted, they are willing to have the project stopped. But actually the full plan has not been carried forth as was originally contemplated and authorized until the irrigation benefits have been authorized.

North Dakota is contributing the storage reservoir, a lot of ranches and farms were

retired to put water in storage for the downstream use and they were, of course, agreeable to doing that on the basis that they, too, would share in the overall benefits of the Missouri Basin by the availability of power and by the irrigation of large blocks of land within their State.

Mr. BENNETT. I think we should point out, Mr. Chairman, that this entire area has been organized into a conservancy district covering 25 counties in the State.

They are also now in the process of organizing irrigation districts within the confines of that conservancy district.

We are in the process now of reaching agreement on a final draft of repayment contract for these irrigation districts.

Mr. Chairman, the North Dakota delegation will continue to exert its efforts in the Senate for a full appropriation.

Mr. GRAY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inform the Members of the House of a very serious injustice done to the people of southern Illinois and the Nation in deleting funds with which to continue a study of the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek Canalization project. A $30,000 item was requested in the budget for this study and was deleted by the committee. I am not here to blame any one person because I am certain that someone has received erroneous information. I do not intend to take up the valuable time of the House with an amendment today; however, I want to clear up the record as far as this project is concerned because I feel confident the other body will restore this item.

The committee report gives the following reasons for deleting the funds:

> This project was one previously found unfeasible, the water supply of the stream is inadequate to support navigation, and the committee is of the opinion that navigation will never be so badly needed that it has to be provided with supplemental water by pumping or other means.

Mr. Chairman, the language contained in this report is completely erroneous. First, the present survey underway on the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek is in no way similar to the 1933 survey made that was found unfeasible and referred to in the report. The 1933 survey was on 35 miles of the lower reaches of the river and did not take into account the billions of tons of coal deposits that are presently landlocked and for which we are now surveying 66 miles of the Big Muddy River. Furthermore, I am amazed at the action of the committee in trying to pass judgment on the merits or demerits of a project before the Army Corps of Engineers are halfway through with a full scale study. This certainly is not the long established procedure of Congress.

The Committee on Public Works of which I am a member approved a survey of this project. The Committee on Appropriations last year allowed my request for $120,000 to begin a full scale survey of this project and the engineers and the Bureau of the Budget asked for $30,000 with which to continue work for fiscal 1960 and now we have this committee taking this unusual action of stopping a meritorious project in the middle of a survey. Mr. Chairman, this action reminds me of the fellow who was going to swim across a lake a mile wide and when he reached within 10 yards of the opposite shore he decided he could not make it and turned around and swam back. That is exactly what has happened here. We have spent over $120,000 of the taxpayers' money to seek valuable information and now the committee wants to lose that amount of time and money by not providing the remainder of the funds needed. As to whether or not this is a feasible project let us turn to the record. I quote from the official report of the Army Corps of Engineers dated April 29, 1958, not in 1933. This report was made under the old procedure of making a preliminary examination report before proceeding with a full-scale study. The preliminary report was ruled upon by not only the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers but also the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors composed of division engineers. The report is as follows:

> The Board recommends that a survey of Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek be accomplished to determine the best plan for improvement in the interest of navigation, the advisability of its accomplishment, and the local cooperation which should be required.

Mr. Chairman, this action came after a preliminary examination and close scrutiny of this project by the top engineering minds of the country, therefore, with all due respect to the distinguished members of this committee I cannot understand for the life of me, why they would want to pass judgment on a project before a report has been half way completed. I again remind you that this is a 1958 report on a completely different project than the one referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in the hearings. He referred to a 1933 report on a completely different type project, and has no bearing on the intended purpose of providing navigation for our billions of tons of high quality coal that is presently land locked. This is a very meritorious case and by all means is certainly worthy a report to determine once and for all whether or not there is a favorable cost benefit ratio. I do not believe it is fair for the committee to call the baby unfair names before it is even born. I hope the other body will restore these funds and that this committee will agree in conference. All we are asking is to be allowed to finish the study to determine the feasibility of the project and if it is not sound I will be the last person to ask that the project be approved by Congress. In closing I want to again take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee and my colleagues for the many kind and courteous things they have done for me in the past and I have every confidence that justice will prevail in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, preliminary examinations, surveys and studies (including cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law Numbered 520, Seventy-first Congress, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented), of projects prior to authorization for construction, to remain available until expended, $9,518,400.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not for the purpose of using the full 5 minutes but to clear up any doubts that might be in the minds of my friends on this side of the aisle in connection with the amendment to be proposed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Dr. FENTON]. My distinguished friend from Pennsylvania and my other distinguished colleague from the great city of Pittsburgh [Mr. MOORHEAD] spoke in support of the proposed amendment some time ago. I want to assure my friends on the Democratic side that there are no politics involved in this amendment. We are united as Pennsylvanians; we are united as Americans. We are united as firm believers in the principle of what this amendment proposes, and I would be more than grateful to my friends here if you would extend that support to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] and to the amendment to be offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Dr. FENTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, we have now come to the point where amendments are going to be offered to this bill. I think this ought to be said for the committee, specifically with relation to general investigations. You will note that the amount carried in this bill is $9,518,000. I hope the committee of the whole stays with the full committee on this matter. Just as indicated by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] than whom there is no better man in this Congress with respect to public works, they indicated that they were completely satisfied with what the committee has done with the bill this year. We departed completely from the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and we inserted into this bill a number of projects both for construction and general investigation. Now, you cannot give everything to everybody. That is an impossibility.

Let me say this, that these particular projects that were put in under general investigation, I believe, on a priority basis. They were put in on the basis of what is the best project for the Nation, what is the most feasible, what is the most desirable, and what is the most important. Now, some Members get up here and say, "This is a most important project to my area." So it might be. But, the fact of the matter is that we gave consideration to this argument, and we have decided that we would put in

some 29 additional projects on general investigation. This has seldom been done before. This committee has gone all out to satisfy the membership of this Congress with respect to this bill, and I think the Committee of the Whole ought to stick with the Appropriations Committee on these items. We added 29 projects on general investigation. I would have been delighted to have seen other projects added, but I think I have an obligation to sustain the action of my committee. I think the subcommittee has done a good job here with the 29 projects that we have put in only under general investigation, which will cost $800,000. Just a moment ago I added up all of the projects that were requested by all of the Members under general investigation, and they totaled over 100. If we put all of the 100 general investigations in requested by all of the Members of this Congress, we would add a total figure to this budget for general investigations alone running into the millions of dollars. I think we have done a good job here, and I ask the members of this full House committee to sustain the Appropriations Committee on this bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEYER: On page 3, line 19, strike out "$9,518,400" and insert "$9,528,400."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. That paragraph has been passed by and we are on the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. We are on this paragraph. We are on general investigations. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I propose this amendment to clarify a mistake that was made in the report of the committee on the Lake Champlain Waterway. This is the budget item of $10,000, which has been deleted pending expression of Canadian views and decisions on the project which will be obtained from the State Department.

Public Law 85-500 authorized and directed the Secretary of the Army to cause a survey to be made of the water route from Albany, N.Y., into Lake Champlain, lying between New York and Vermont. This law provided further that due consideration was to be given to the possibility of ultimate connection of such a waterway with the St. Lawrence River in Canada. This project we refer to in Vermont as the Champlain Cutoff.

For purposes of making preliminary evaluation studies of such a water route, the Corps of Engineers in 1958 estimated that $25,000 would be needed for a 2-year period. This would be the first stage in the studies for a big project like this, and would provide the information upon which to base further decisions as to undertaking detailed studies and plans, as well as whether to undertake the project itself.

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

Mr. MEYER. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Was not this item in the President's budget estimate?

Mr. MEYER. Yes, it was.

Mr. DINGELL. I hope the gentleman will repeat that for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. MEYER. This item was in the budget.

Congress appropriated $15,000 for this purpose in 1958, and now, in order to complete the preliminary studies, the remaining $10,000 is needed, and was requested in the fiscal 1960 budget. It is needed for route studies, for land surveys, for public hearings, and for traffic studies, in other words for completion of preliminary evaluation of the project.

However, the committee report indicates that this $10,000 item was deleted, and the only basis given is that it was deleted pending an expression of Canadian views and decisions, to be obtained by the Department of State. Yet, Canadian views and decisions have no direct, immediate, or even necessary bearing at all on this part of the planning program. And the point raised in the report is not germane to the inclusion of this $10,000 item for completion of that part of the studies which has already been begun.

A careful reading of the Corps of Engineers' report to the committee at page 1036, part I of the hearings, shows just this which I have been saying, namely, that: "Work has been initiated on the study and general information is being collected." This is the preliminary evaluation study, and $25,000 was the corps estimate for this purpose. Congress already has appropriated $15,000 for this purpose, and it seems only wise to continue the preliminary work that has been undertaken. Otherwise, the studies will be interrupted, delayed, and the first appropriation will actually be wasted. Only $10,000 is sought for completion of this portion of the study, and it is needed now.

The corps report to the committee goes on to conclude that since consideration of ultimate connection with the St. Lawrence River will require cooperation with appropriate Canadian agencies, the Department of State has been requested to ascertain their views and desires in the matter. This is certainly fitting and proper. Such coordination will undoubtedly take time, and it is well to initiate discussions at this early stage of planning in order to know Canadian feelings and to assure mutual understanding.

But this does not require, or even suggest, that the preliminary study should be abandoned while waiting for such a Canadian report. On the contrary, the U.S. portion of the project will be the larger part. It will require longer and greater preparation, and good planning makes it imperative to continue this year with the preliminary studies which have already been started.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can I get 5 minutes, or do I have to trot out another motion to strike the enacting clause?

Mr. BOLAND. I would be glad to yield the gentleman 3 minutes of my time, if he wishes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that this was budgeted. This is not the only one that was budgeted. We knocked out some others, too. Also, the Bureau of the Budget did not support other projects and we put some of those in. That is in direct reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee when this project was being considered by the Subcommittee on Public Works, and I think the action of the subcommittee was reasonable and logical. All we are doing here is saying that we should delay the appropriation of this $10,000 for this particular survey and general investigation until we have had the cooperation of the Canadian Government. The cooperation of the Canadian Government is an essential if this particular project is going to work. If the survey is going to get anywhere, we have to sit in with the Canadian officials. All the committee did was to hold up the $10,000 until that cooperation was forthcoming. I see no reason for appropriating this $10,000 now until we have the cooperation of the Canadian Government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 54, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] a short while ago stated that the committee could not give everybody everything they wanted. Of course, that is obvious, but we continue to go along here and there ever increasing and appropriating money that we do not have and which evidently it is necessary to have an increase in the interest rate when we have to borrow the money before we can spend it.

My purpose is to call attention to the fact that we have to now share our income from taxes with labor unions which have incomes of millions but do not pay taxes. To emphasize that point, I would like to read a little from the testimony taken this morning before the

House Committee on Education and Labor, and which shows how the unions extort millions from the employer—millions which are added to the cost of living. It was Mr. Gene Bragg, a Mercury dealer from Galesburg, Ill., who was testifying.

Back in 1956, the unions started to organize his employees. None of them at the time wanted to join the union. One month after May 16, 1956, these two unions launched a campaign, an organizational campaign. They put out organizational pickets. He testified that red paint was poured on six cars. Acid was thrown on 10 used cars. Plate glass showroom windows were broken by gunfire and thrown bottles. Paint remover was poured on seven other new cars. Now that kind of procedure was an effort to make the workers share part of their earnings with the unions—it was extortion—instead of giving it to the U.S. Government by way of taxes. Do you see how it cuts down our ability to do these things for our constituents which so many of us want to do?

The witness further testified:

After these activities, the Teamsters' representative told us to sign a union contract, or "we will stay with you till we break you."

In early August 1956, the dealers of Galesburg staged a parade to promote the sale of used cars. The unions tried to break it up by force.

Because of the violence and intensity of union activities, the Council of Churches of the city investigated the situation and reported that at no time did the unions represent a majority of our employees.

In September 1956, the city council passed a resolution asking the unions to cease picketing and halt the strike. The union leader told the city council that he had $30 million to spend to force the automobile dealers to sign up, and that is what he would spend, if need be.

On October 2, 1956, the dealers asked for an election, and the union said they would consent to an election if the 126 employees still working were denied the right to vote, and if the 41 on strike were the only ones permitted to vote. We offered to allow the union 60 to 120 days in which to sign up members and then to hold an election. They would not agree to this. We were told this was an organizational strike, and that the unions could be brutal if they chose to be.

In early 1957, and twice thereafter, our dealers' association petitioned the NLRB for an election, but it was denied one on all three occasions.

We again offered the unions an election in early 1958, but the unions refused stating they knew they couldn't win.

In April 1958, the retail merchants of Galesburg, including the automobile dealers, promoted a "you auto buy now" campaign similar to campaigns held in about 200 other cities. These campaigns were designed to stimulate business and help end the recession and curtail unemployment in line with President Eisenhower's appeal for people to buy.

The unions tried to influence the merchants and businesses not to participate. They did this by sending a letter to retail businesses in Galesburg stating that to participate would be considered, by the unions, as an unfriendly act to labor. The unions also sent a letter to all union members telling them not to buy from merchants participating in the "you auto buy now" promotion.

Union leaders held a 4-hour session with our mayor on April 8, 1958, because of the union's opposition to his signing a "you auto buy now" proclamation.

On April 11, 1958, the city of Galesburg was picketed at the city limits, and the chamber of commerce was also picketed.

Six of we dealers petitioned the NLRB as individuals October 1958, under the reduction of qualifications. We were granted an election set for April 10, 1959, however, the unions sent a letter of disclaimer stating they represented none of our employees and had no interest in us. On April 9, 1959, the NLRB called off the elections.

Until late February or early March 1959, the unions invoked secondary boycotts and no new cars were allowed to be unloaded in Galesburg. Parts, accessories, and other merchandise could not be delivered to the dealers' places of business because of the picket lines. Building repairs and maintenance couldn't be done because carpenters, painters, electricians, and other tradesmen stated they were fearful of union reprisals.

The unions have fined their members for patronizing the dealers in Galesburg and have also made them do picket duty for crossing a picket line.

Unions have threatened their members with loss of their jobs.

As a small businessman, it seems apparent to me that any condition of the law which will permit these practices to prevail needs changing. We think the answer is self-evident, and trust that you will take immediate action to amend the law so as to outlaw organizational picketing and secondary boycott practices.

Someone asked, "What would you do?" Well, what would any Member of the House do if goons came around and threw acid or paint on his car and began shooting through the windows of a car one was in. What would the average man do if he was armed, shoot back? Ultimately, I know what will happen. Somebody is going to shoot back. Now do not make any mistake, and I hope people or the reporters or anyone else will not say that I am advocating violence, but that is just what will happen eventually.

The reason I am acting as I am is that this thing is getting serious. Ever since 1936 on the last day of December, when this thing started in Michigan, it has been going on without interruption; and the point I am trying to make is the one suggested not long ago by Senator McCLELLAN who said if there was not effective legislation in force, you would have lynch law. And that is just exactly what you would get ultimately; that is, these people and the country will get—not you.

I will put this entire statement in the RECORD.

Then this gentleman says there were three of these witnesses who went through the same situation and the same course of conduct.

The reason I speak about it now is because next Wednesday the subcommittee will end hearings and the full committee will begin writing a bill. It will come before this House I hope under an open rule. It is, therefore time that every Member of the House began to consider the facts, the undisputed facts, and determine whether we intend to let these organizations levy taxes, or tribute by extortion or whatever one wants to call it—it is extortion—whether we intend to let them do that, or to make union activities which are unlawful when practiced by others subject to the law.

Maybe some think this is an exaggerated statement, but how long do you think men like this man who testified today will let these organizers come along and ruin their businesses?

When the labor bill comes before us, two things must be written into it if the average citizen is to have equal protection under law: One is the provision against blackmail picketing; the other is the provision against secondary boycotts.

Permit me to read a statement from the Chicago Tribune of June 2 by William Moore. I read:

A blackjack-packing-bride of 2 weeks was the star witness Tuesday among those who told the Senate Rackets Committee of alleged collusion between law enforcement officials and gangsters to control the multimillion dollar gambling racket in Lake County, Ind.

She was slender Margaret (Maggie) Hagler, 29, who said she lost one suitor who was driven off by threats of murder by men from the sheriff's office and then found another who married her.

An extortionist is an extortionist even though he travels under a union label.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN: On page 3, line 19, after the sum shown, add "and in addition, $13,000 for a study of Little Neck Bay."

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, this only involves $13,000—not $13 million—not hundreds of thousands, but $13,000 to help alleviate a drastic, chronic situation.

Little Neck Bay is on Long Island Sound, N.Y., at the northeast corner of Queens County. It forms part of the dividing line between Queens and Nassau Counties. It is 2.5 miles long and 1 mile wide.

It is rapidly silting up as a result of erosion from the adjacent land caused by construction and building. This soil has deposited on the bottom of the bay creating vast quantities of muck and slime which is not carried outward by the tide and which continues to trap other eroded soil.

This resulting slime traps and holds contaminating bodies in the bay and is the cause for abominable fumes which rise from the flatlands except for brief periods of abnormally high tides. These noxious fumes are a menace to the health of the inhabitants of the area and the concentration of fumes is getting worse.

More than a million people live in the area contiguous to the bay. It was once used as a bathing and recreational facility and as a fine harbor for boats. It has little use now for bathing and it has become so shallow that boats are being forced to anchor out beyond the bluffs on its northeast side thus losing the protection of the anchorage. If the muck were dredged from the bottom, New York City would be able to build a marina and provide facilities for bathing and recreation for the people who surround its shores.

Furthermore, the bay has an extraordinary value for civil defense. In the event of an emergency it would provide

a natural means of access to the mainland by boat for the people of Long Island and Queens provided its waters were navigable. Observation of the areas affected by a simulated bomb explosion over Governor's Island—operation alert, 1957—indicated that all bridges and tunnels leading from Long Island were decommissioned with the exception of the Whitestone Bridge. The official report notes that "an endeavor must be made to move all those persons who should be evacuated to the mainland" over this slender bridge. Such would be exceedingly difficult and it would be patently impossible to provide, by one bridge, for the needs of the remaining 5 million Long Islanders, nor could reconstruction be effectively carried on.

Served as it is by a parkway and a network of streets, Little Neck Bay would, if made navigable, be vital to the people of Long Island in such an emergency. This in itself, to me, would amply justify the study.

The Council for Little Neck Bay Reclamation and Preservation has been exceedingly active in attempting to have a review study made of the bay by the engineers. It is endorsed by the Port of New York Authority.

The study has been authorized by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works respectively on July 16, 1958, and November 14, 1957. All that remains is the appropriation of the very small sum of $13,000, the cost of the study as estimated by the Army Engineers.

For reasons of public health, civil defense, and recreation for a population of over 1 million people, I urge that this amendment for a study of Little Neck Bay be accepted.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. Chairman, what the distinguished gentleman from New York says is true. This is only $13,000. But it is just another matter of $13,000, a very small one. I think it is a good project, I think it is a fine project, provided the State of New York builds it. In this bill we have put in above the budget for the State of New York, and have done this in all sections of the United States, but specifically for the State of New York, we have put in $146,000 over and above the budget for investigations and surveys of the waterways of the State of New York.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] appeared before the committee. I think he has another one of these projects.

With respect to this particular project, I take the testimony of the gentleman from New York in a letter which he left with the chairman of the committee indicating that this particular project is a haven for pleasure craft and for recreational activities. There are a number of projects in which recreation is included, but that ordinarily goes along with other aspects of the project. But this is purely a recreational project. It is a haven for pleasure craft. If the Federal Government wants to get into the business of protecting pleasure craft and recreational faciilties, it can put in this $13,000, but if you do it, it is the first time this Congress will have done so.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. The gentleman mentioned that this is a project to provide a haven, as he puts it, for pleasure craft. That might be so, but I stressed in that same talk, if the gentleman will read further—in fact he has taken out of context that language—that the need goes far beyond that. It is a matter of public health and civil defense, as well as a marina for the people of that community.

Mr. BOLAND. I know of no project that is not connected with the public health. It does go to a project that is a haven for pleasure craft and for other recreational activities.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAMPLER: On page 3, line 19, after the word "expended" strike out the amount "$9,518,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,533,400."

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one of two which I will offer today to combat the disastrous flood situation that has proven so hazardous to the people of the Wabash Valley.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide an additional $15,000 for the Wabash River Basin study, above the White River, in Indiana, bringing the total amount of money appropriated for the study to $40,000. President Eisenhower's budget for the fiscal year 1960 requests only $25,000 for this vitally important flood control investigation. General Person, the Assistant Chief of the Army's Corps of Engineers, has informed me that the Corps has the capability to utilize $40,000 during the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1. The additional $15,000 which I am requesting for the Army Corps of Engineers will enable them to continue their investigations and studies along three major flood contributing tributaries, namely, Sugar Creek, Wild Cat Creek and Big Pine Creek, all in Indiana.

The continuation of the Army's investigational efforts in this tri-creek area is of prime and pivotal importance if the Army's flood control and prevention projects elsewhere in the area and in the State are to be geared effectively.

I feel quite certain that most of the Members of this body, particularly those representing districts surrounding the Wabash Valley, are aware of the recent flood devastation experienced in the Wabash Valley during February of this year. The February flood, Mr. Chairman, thus far, is the most tragically damaging flood my people have experienced this year; but, nevertheless, it is only one of four floods that we in the lower reaches of the Wabash River have experienced this year.

I certainly hope that my colleagues will see fit to allow the Army Corps of Engineers to continue its flood control studies in this area by voting to adopt this amendment and thereby grant the Corps of Engineers an additional $15,000 for the Wabash River Basin study, above the White River.

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

Mr. Chairman, on general investigation we have $25,000 for this project, Wabash River above the White River, Illinois and Indiana. Is that the project that the gentleman has been addressing himself to?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, there is a transferability of 15 percent on the part of the Army Engineers if they wish to use it for that purpose, and if they wish to use additional money, they would have to come to the committee. It will take $133,000 to complete this project. Now, if some small amount added to this would complete the project, that would be a different matter, but we are giving $25,000 toward this project with a transferability right of 15 percent this year.

Mr. WAMPLER. May I state to the gentleman that I have conferred with the Corps of Engineers on this project, and I have a letter in my possession that the amount of money and the capability——

Mr. RABAUT. Oh, capability; that is a different thing.

Mr. WAMPLER. And we felt we should not ask for anything other than that.

Mr. RABAUT. It amounted to $40,000.

Mr. WAMPLER. The total amount was $40,000, which the gracious subcommittee agreed to cut to $25,000.

Mr. RABAUT. That is true of many projects that are in here today. Not all of them are getting the full capability, but you have a little leeway over this $25,000 on this project.

Mr. WAMPLER. In accordance with the conversation with the Corps of Engineers, they have 15 percent, but there is no way to receive any other money than through appropriation channels.

Mr. RABAUT. I think the gentleman is somewhat confused between capability and the completion of the project. The only time we raise the amount of money is where some small amount of money over and above the amount allocated or appropriated in the bill is needed for completion. You understand?

Mr. WAMPLER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. But it takes over $130,000 to complete this project, so it is not a project that falls within the rule. Here you have $25,000 plus 15 percent available that they can use this year, unless the committee overrules.

Mr. WAMPLER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAMPLER].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATTHEWS: On page 3, before the period at the end of line 19, strike out "$9,518,400" and insert "$9,565,400."

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished members of this committee and I certainly hope, if they cannot agree with me in this presentation, that they will hurt me as little as they can.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone before this distinguished committee for several years, and I still have not found Santa Claus. In fact the effect of my efforts has been, "No runs, no hits, and no errors." But I want to say that I admire every one of them tremendously.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the members of the committee admire any other individual Member more than we admire the gentleman from Florida. But, did we not give him a little something a year ago or a couple of years ago? It was not too much, but was there not a little harbor project in the area somewhere?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman's knowledge astounds me. I would like to make the record a little clearer by saying that I had a little help from the other body. But let me say again how appreciative I am of the fact that when the other body inserted that amount, the distinguished gentlemen of this committee helped me to maintain that amount.

Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment concerns a beautiful river in Florida called the Suwannee River. I called the attention of the House to some of the problems of the Suwannee last year. You know, that river has been made famous by Stephen Foster. But so many times the words of Stephen Foster are maligned. You know, the Florida State song is "Way Down on the Suwannee River," and so often in this great metropolitan center, when we go down to the Statler for our little banquets, the band puts on the same little show, they play all the State songs and we stand up and wave our handkerchiefs, and then when they come to Florida they play "Moon Over Miami." And despite my love for the honorable DANTE FASCELL, the gentleman from Miami, it makes me unhappy. And they change the words to that song. You know, the real words are, "Oh, Darkies, how my heart grows weary." But in some of the books they carry it, "Oh, old folks, how my heart grows weary." And in other books you read, "Oh, brothers, how my heart grows weary."

Mr. Chairman, I want to get the Suwannee River in a position where it serves the people of Florida to the extent that it should. It courses through 9 counties of the 15 counties in my Congressional District. It rises up in the Okefenokee in the great State of Georgia and it meanders in a very peaceful fashion until flood times, down into the Gulf of Mexico. But this great river would lend itself, I think, to a variety of development purposes. It would mean more prosperity to many of the wonderful people in my district.

Mr. Chairman, you know, 14 of the 15 counties in my district are rural. When you think of Florida now please think of the north central part of Florida. That is the part I represent. Fourteen of these 15 counties are rural. When we had our recession last year, to be perfectly frank with you, we did not feel it very much because so much of my area always has a little recession.

This particular amendment, if it be carried, would add $47,000 to this item in the bill, to provide a survey of the Suwannee River that has been approved for years and years. $1,000 has already been spent. Then the Korean war came along. I have gone to the Corps of Engineers and they say, "Your project is not quite important enough." I come before this great committee and they give me a wonderful hearing and they look so friendly, but I have not yet been able to get the money that we need to make this survey.

Mr. Chairman, you know, many people talk to me about pork barrel projects. I want to say that any project that gets through this great group is not a pork barrel project. First of all, you go to the great Public Works Committee to authorize a survey; then you get the Corps of Engineers to carry out the survey; then you get this great Appropriations Committee to appropriate a little bit of money; then you worry about the budget, the economic justification by the Corps of Engineers, the fact of whether or not we will have new starts, and all of the other actions of the other body—I want to tell you I do not know of any pork barrel project when it goes through these processes.

This is not a pork barrel project. I think it is a worthwhile one.

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

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman. After doing all of the things he said had to be done and you ultimately secure the project, how would the gentleman like to have someone in the committee take it out, after you got the appropriation?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, it would make me so unhappy that I would stand right up here and cry.

Mr. GAVIN. Believe me, I am; it is with great difficulty that I restrain myself.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I sympathize with him.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise in opposition to the amendment, but I do rise to strike out the last few words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman from Florida to cite the authority for the Suwannee, and I do not mean Stephen Foster, but I would like to know what is the authority for this particular project.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman that I do not have that available, but it has been approved. The survey has been approved by the Committee on Public Works. The Engineers tell me the only reason in the world that I have not had the survey is because of what you might call the line item and there is not enough in the appropriation.

Mr. BOLAND. I will accept the gentleman's word for the authorization. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there has ever been a survey before?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The river has not been surveyed in the last 50 years. It was one of the first authorized projects in the State of Florida. Along toward the close of the 19th century, they had a channel in a part of this river. But, ever since that time, we have been trying to get more work done on the river. My predecessors have worked hard and I am trying to really get some work done.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman's predecessors did not work any harder than the gentleman from Florida is working now.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, there is a very good reason, may I state to my very good colleague from Florida, why we have not done very much work on the Suwannee River and that is because we want to keep that great stream just as it is. There is not even good trout fishing in that stream, I am told, because they don't want folks to mess around down there. You folks are so sort of living within yourselves and enjoying life that we just do not want to interfere.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that if you will help us do a little digging, we will keep the trout. What we want to do is to live graciously—but not be quite so poor. And I think you can do both.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows, of course, there is no Member of the Congress who is more beloved than he is and if he does not know that, I will tell him so right now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. We would love to do something that the gentleman would like to have the committee do, but after all it is not in the bill and it is not authorized, and we just cannot do it for the gentleman. I am very sorry.

Mr. BOLAND. There have been two surveys. We have some information on that. There have been two surveys and both of them were not favorable. But, I make this promise to the gentleman from Florida. You come before the committee and if I am on the committee, I will certainly favor something that is feasible and has a good benefit-to-cost ratio. And you can hold me to that promise—but not on this one.

NEW ENGLAND APPROPRIATION SMALL BUT SIGNIFICANT FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a little more than $28 million for 16 New England flood control projects, which, my colleagues I am sure will agree, is a rather insignificant proportion of the $1,176,677,000 appropriations bill before us. However, this sum is quite adequate for flood control planning and construction

needs in New England during the next fiscal year, and we in New England are grateful to the members of the Appropriations Committee and the full House for patiently listening to our pleas and sympathizing with our cause to provide adequate flood control in a region that was so badly damaged by floods in August of 1955.

POPULATION OF NEW ENGLAND COMPACT AND SETTLED ALONG RIVERS

When the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, on which I sit, was conducting its hearings, I pointed out that we have a number of projects in New England, but they are occasioned by the fact that we are a rather closely knit area. The New England population is rather compact and when this six-State area was first settled in the colonial period, the people established communities along the river banks. Consequently, it was necessary for the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan whereby we could give adequate protection for those people. This resulted in a number of projects, but all of them are relatively small in cost, but major in the protection that they offer to the people of New England.

RIVER COMMUNITIES HAVE SUFFERED FROM DEVASTATING FLOODS

Mr. Chairman, New Englanders have experienced considerable flood damages for decades. The more recent incidents were 1927, 1936, 1938, 1944, 1954, and 1955. The latter was one of the most devastating and costly in terms of human life and property damage. The Connecticut River is one of the wildest of rivers when it is on a rampage, but I think the program that the Corps of Engineers has presented for the Connecticut Valley will give the people of this area the protection that is needed to keep our industry there, to keep our people dry and happy, and maintain this beautiful section as a vital economic entity of the Nation.

This bill will make the following appropriations for projects in the Connecticut River Valley basin program: Ball Mountain Reservoir, $2,560,000; North Hartland Reservoir, $2,571,000; North Springfield Reservoir, $2,040,000; and Townshend Reservoir, $2,500,000, all in Vermont; Littleville Dam and Reservoir, to be constructed on the West Branch of the Westfield River, in western Massachusetts, $100,000 for planning. The Littleville project was authorized last year. It will operate in conjunction with the Knightville Dam and Reservoir, already constructed, and it will provide measurable benefits to the communities of Westfield, West Springfield, and Agawam, on the Westfield River, and, together with other reservoirs in the Connecticut basin, will substantially lower flood crests in the lower Connecticut basin. Had the Littleville project been in operation during the August 1955 flood it would have reduced flood stages by 2.4 feet at Westfield and would have prevented losses of over $3,300,000.

ALL NEW ENGLAND PROJECTS COST LESS THAN ONE LARGE WESTERN PROJECT

The present estimated cost of all of the 60 authorized flood control projects for New England, including those which have been completed, those under construction, and those yet to be started, is estimated at only $330 million. This is less than the cost for one single large project in the West, say the John Day Dam and Reservoir on the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's candor and I am still hoping, and hoping for the best.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); and not to exceed $1,200,000 for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for conservation of fish and wildlife as authorized by law; to remain available until expended, $658,300,100: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by a law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for "Construction, General," in this Act shall be used on the project "Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth," for any purpose other than bank stabilization work.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PASSMAN: On page 4, line 7, strike out "$658,300,100" and insert "$658,800,100."

Mr. PASSMAN. I certainly have a definite obligation, as a member of the Appropriations Committee from Louisiana, to offer this amendment.

We are here requesting funds for a project that was recommended in the budget. I had considered the project of such evident merit as to assume that the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations would so recognize it, and recommend funds accordingly, and I feel that this was not done simply because of oversight.

With respect to many of our streams in Louisiana, and also in about seven or eight other Southern States, we are plagued by the menace of the rampant water lily. The Federal Government has emphatically recognized that measures must be taken to eradicate the lily from these streams.

The annual loss from this plague to Louisiana's economy alone, I should point out to you, is approximately $30 million.

Ordinarily, when I come to the well of the House, it is to ask you to help reduce appropriations bills, and not to help increase an appropriation. But in this particular instance, I am certain of the merits of the request and ask your support for it.

Section 104 of the authorizing legislation states:

There is hereby authorized a comprehensive project to provide for control and progressive eradication of the water lily, alligator weed * * * and so forth.

The budget request to implement the authorization was in the relatively small amount of $500,000 for fiscal 1960. Money was appropriated for the project last year. The appropriation is on a matching basis with State funds. The program is under way.

As I have stated, my usual practice is to fully support the position of the Appropriations Committee. However, I surely do not feel as if I am a Judas when I occasionally disagree with the committee's position. Specifically, I certainly do not want to be placed in any such light as that today.

I trust, therefore, you will support this amendment upon the basis of merit.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Unless these funds are made available and expended, we will have to suspend the program for another year and will have lost entirely the benefits of what has heretofore been spent because of the tremendously rapid growth of these water hyacinths.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is correct; the expenditures heretofore made will have been very largely wasted unless we appropriate this relatively small amount to continue this very important project.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do hope that the committee will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. As he pointed out, these funds are requested to carry out a public law that this Congress passed, known as Public Law 500 of the 85th Congress. It was authorized and voted upon. Then last year this House appropriated $282,000 to carry out that public law, and the Budget Bureau this year made a request for $500,000.

The Engineers have testified that they could use more.

Now, I want to point out to you what this water lily pest is. These water lily pads grow and expand literally like wildfire. These pads can support a human being walking on them. With their long roots they clog up and block up all navigation channels in our area. In the last few years these pests have extended to Texas; they are in Florida, Mississippi, in Georgia, and the Carolinas, and part of Virginia and elsewhere. It is shortsighted not to have a nationwide program of eradication, because if you treat it on a county-by-county or State-by-State basis the channels that cross State lines carry the pest, and the water becomes infested again. It must be attacked on an areawide basis involving these Southern States. It does no good to attack it in any other way. In the State of Louisiana alone the damage to fish and wildlife, the damage to agriculture and the damage to navigation amounts to over $30 million a year.

This is a matching program, Mr. Chariman. In the past the Engineers have been maintaining important channels of navigation by chopping up these weeds and killing them by chemical and mechanical means. So we have spent money on it. They do spend money every year, but in a haphazard way.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield gladly.

Mr. TABER. The impression that was made upon the committee when this matter was before the committee was this: The testimony in support of the request was vague and indicated lack of clear thinking and planning on the subject. That is the impression the people who came before the committee made on the committee members. That is a correct statement from the report as far as the impression created goes.

Is there any way we could budget anything that would tie this in to the work of the Corps of Engineers? The things that have been brought out here are very largely things you would expect to find in the Fish and Wildlife Department.

Mr. WILLIS. I am glad the gentleman posed that question.

Mr. TABER. How much money will it cost?

Mr. WILLIS. Let me answer the last question first. This is a 5-year program. It is contemplated that we will have to appropriate for 5 fiscal years. We have already appropriated the money for 1 year, that was last year.

Now, with reference to the shape of the record, I am very glad the gentleman brought that up. As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] stated, perhaps we should take the blame. Here you have an authorized project, here you have a public law, here you have funds appropriated last year, here you have it in the budget message. We heard no opposition to it. But somehow or other apparently the single witness representing the Government, or whoever presented it, might not have detailed the work contemplated by the law authorizing the program.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) he was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the other question, if you will read the public law, section 104, Public Law 500 of the 85th Congress, you will see that by its very terms this is a joint program, to be participated in by the Department of Agriculture, by the Public Health Service, and by the Wildlife and Fisheries Commission. They are to utilize all of the scientific forces at the command of all of these agencies, not only the Corps of Engineers.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that if we do not get this small amount of money the project will have to be stopped?

Mr. WILLIS. Why, of course. I talked with the engineers at New Orleans a little while ago, and they are up in the air. They have made contracts based upon our commitments, the work is going on. So we will have wasted the $282,000 we appropriated last year for this project.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I recall very clearly when that matter was before our Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, we spent a considerable amount of time. It presented new aspects with which we were not formerly familiar. The story presented to our committee was presented most effectively. We had photographs of the area, we had detailed specifics, we had specialists who presented the problem to us. It was clear to us it was a very serious problem, and the only area in which there was some difference was the share of local participation. After considerable discussion and consideration, we did come to an agreement.

Mr. WILLIS. The matching proportion is 70–30, the Federal Government 70, local government 30.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is a serious problem, and if delay is experienced you will have a bigger problem. This is a 5-year program to eradicate weeds that grow like wildfire. I recall the project very well.

Mr. WILLIS. I am grateful to the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. We consider in connection with projects like this the ratio of benefit to cost. This would be on the basis of 60 to 1 benefit to cost in the short period.

Mr. WILLIS. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The problem is so serious as to indicate that were it not that salt water would kill the water hyacinth you would be able to walk to Europe today because of their rapid expansion. We have now been informed that a special breed through transition is developing that will live in brackish water. So the problem is serious.

Mr. WILLIS. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings the testimony was to the effect that the benefit-cost ratio here had not been determined and presumably it was not one to one and was below that. While I can sympathize with the problem that was recited here by the gentleman from Louisiana, the $500,000 is merely for a start. The total cost of the study will amount to something like $6 million.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I would like to advise the gentleman that the $500,000 is not for a study. Contracts are already in effect. Louisiana, for instance, has been spending millions of dollars each year on this same problem, and studies over the past 15 years have proven that the water hyacinth can be eradicated. The amount here will go mostly toward contracts already in effect for the destruction of the hyacinth. We already have made the study on how to do it.

Mr. PILLION. As I recall the testimony, there is no definite method or sure method of eradicating this nuisance, and that this is merely a biological survey of the few streams that are involved in this particular $500,000 item. In the meanwhile there are dozens and dozens of other streams that are also having this difficulty throughout the South, and studies are being made by the local conservation and wildlife bureaus as well as the States in an endeavor to control this nuisance. This problem is not properly within this bill and should not be here. It is a biological matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I hope the gentleman will be open to be told what is being done. This is not primarily for a study or studies. We have developed methods that have been most successful in the destruction of these hyacinths. We even eradicate some of them mechanically, but now we have learned how to destroy them in their breeding places, and this amount of money will be sufficient to complete the program.

Mr. PILLION. May I read two sentences of the testimony with reference to this particular subject?

Mr. RABAUT. Do you have any plans for a different sort of approach, something different than what has been taking place?

General CARTER. Not yet. Everything is brand new, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The program started last year as far as the Government is concerned. However, these States have been in the process of fighting these hyacinths ever since the plants have been known.

Mr. PILLION. Actually, the testimony was so vague and so indefinite that the committee just did not think it ought to be in here.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Yes, and the members of the Louisiana delegation apologize for not making a strong case.

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

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. You understand that the State is making a contribution to the program on a matching basis. This is not entirely a Federal project, by any means. As far as bringing this matter before the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations is concerned, it was left up to me, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to testify and explain the facts involved; but being busy on another appropriations subcommittee, I must admit that I neglected doing so. I repeat, the State is contributing its share of funds to destroy this very costly menace to our streams.

Mr. PILLION. I appreciate the gentleman's situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 59, noes 58.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 59, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: On page 4, line 16, after "work" strike out the period and insert: *"Provided further,* That $1,400,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the Allegheny River Reservoir."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to say that this amendment does not add any money to this bill. It merely seeks to do what the committee intended it to do. It merely seeks to freeze the $1,400,000 until there is a decision of the Supreme Court as to whether or not the dam shall be constructed at the site suggested by the Army Engineers. It also suggests that these funds will not be available until after the committee has completed its own independent study of the relative merits of the Kinzua project and the Tonowanda project.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair to say that this project has had $2 million appropriated to it in 2 previous years. The litigation by the tribe of Indians has gone from court to court and is finally in the Supreme Court. If I were trying to do something that the committee did not want done, it would be one thing, but I am trying to live up to the rules and regulations of our committee. I do not think the phraseology in our report gives the true facts. As I said in my remarks during debate, I am in full accord with the language on page 17 in the first sentence of the paragraph, "that the committee has ordered an independent investigation of the merits of the alternative proposals advocated by the Corps of Engineers and by the Seneca Indians * * *" and so forth.

But I do object to the second sentence of that paragraph, in which it is stated:

The committee directs that the $1,400,000 balance of previously appropriated funds available for the project be reprogramed to other projects.

I do not think that is quite fair. As I said before, my objections are based on the fact that this was not considered in the subcommittee and we did not make such a demand as to direct that the $1,400,000 be reprogramed to other projects. It was during your absence, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and while I had the floor I wanted to ask you a direct question and I will now ask you, sir, as chairman of the subcommittee, if that is not a correct statement.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the gentleman understands that the proposition before us included the question of whether or not we were to have our own survey, and the decision was that we would.

Mr. FENTON. We did discuss that, Mr. Chairman, but we did not discuss the second sentence.

Mr. CANNON. No motion was made that could possibly have affected this situation.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, you are not answering my question. We did not discuss that in the subcommittee, that we should take the money and distribute it on other projects.

Mr. CANNON. That was in the proposition before us.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. A gentleman advised me this morning on the telephone that when he was on the floor he made the statement that his idea was to have this dependent upon the decision of the court and upon the investigation that the Committee on Appropriations has ordered.

Mr. FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. The language that is in the bill, as part of the bill, is wide open and it could be used without restriction in any way. I would not oppose the gentleman's amendment if there were tied to the amendment the words "to be available after the disposition of the Seneca Indian case."

Mr. FENTON. May I say to the gentleman that that is the understanding here, and that is what I am trying to say.

Mr. TABER. It ought to be right in the law.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. It ought to be right in the bill. It ought to be right in the language of the amendment that it should not be available until after the investigation. I cannot support it or sit by and allow it to go through without that being done.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I think when you try to explain something on the floor of the House as to what the intention of the amendment is, which is just what I am trying to tell you, that that ought to be sufficient for everybody.

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

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the gentleman completely on the statement that he has made. I would suggest to the gentleman that he accept the language which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has suggested. If he will do that, I am quite sure that the House will approve of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FENTON. If it will not be subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot see how it could by any stretch of the imagination be subject to a point of order. It is simply giving the Congress the authority under a limitation which is in the language of your amendment to permit this money to be spent after the investigation is made.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FENTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, this is of vital concern to the citizens of Pennsylvania, particularly to the people along the Allegheny River.

I have a telegram from the Governor of Pennsylvania. I should like to read it:

HARRISBURG, PA., *June 5, 1959.*

HON. IVOR D. FENTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Kinzua Dam project vital to citizens western part Pennsylvania, but in addition will be a big boost to the economy of the Empire Commonwealth. Urgently request your support of project which comes up for debate.

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

The Governor of Pennsylvania appeared before our committee during the hearings and made a valiant plea for this project.

As I said during the hearings, I am not wedded to any particular dam. What I am concerned about principally is the saving of life and property. If the alternate plan will do the same job as the Kinzua Dam is supposed to do and at a saving of $30 million, why should we not have it?

So I am in favor of our own private investigation by the committee, and I am in favor of holding the funds until such time as the committee decides when we get the report and the decision of the Court, to release funds appropriated to a project.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly what the committee agreed to, nothing else.

Mr. FENTON. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON to the Fenton amendment: At the end of the amendment add the following: "to be available after the disposition of the pending legal action of the Seneca Indians and the completion of the engineering studies ordered by the Appropriations Committee and the approval of the Appropriations Committee."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Committee that it is agreeable to us to limit it in the way the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has mentioned and in accordance with the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; that is to say, that first there shall be the study ordered by the House Appropriations Committee.

The purpose of my amendment to the amendment is so that the engineering

study to be made by the House Appropriations Committee will first be completed and there shall then be an approval by the House Appropriations Committee; and, secondly, that the case that has been instituted by the Seneca Indians and is now pending in an action before the U.S. Supreme Court shall be first decided and gotten out of the way. That spells out the two objections by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I ask the gentleman from New York if I am correct.

Mr. TABER. Yes

Mr. FULTON. It makes it satisfactory to me.

I ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if this is not tailored to insure the carrying out of the study by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is subject to a point of order but I am willing to withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws his reservation?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. FULTON. Let me explain to the House that this is a flood-control project in western Pennsylvania. One of the chief things we have to defend our industrial areas against in that part of the State is floods. They have recurred many, many times; in fact, in only 1 year out of the last 5 has western Pennsylvania not been flooded. We have had floods in 4 out of 5 years.

The next point is that this money has already been appropriated. This is not new money, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] said; $1,058,000 was in the bill for 1958 and $1 million for 1959. There is $1,400,000 in existence.

The committee has said it wanted first to have this case of the Seneca Indians tried and disposed of. They are a tribe of Indians in northwestern Pennsylvania and neighboring New York State. It is a suit to determine whether they have the right to block this dam. It is now before the Supreme Court on request for a writ of certiorari. The lower court has ruled that these Seneca Indians do not have the right to block the dam.

The other point is that the House Appropriations Committee has asked for an independent engineering survey to make sure that this is the right place for the dam or the right route to afford proper flood control.

I hope the House will adopt the amendment which I have submitted, an amendment to the Fenton amendment. It has been agreed to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; and, as you saw, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, withdrew his point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I again wish to bring to the attention of the committee that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] as it is now presented in the form of an amendment to the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] is entirely acceptable to us, to me and to our friends. I would be very grateful that this amendment be embellished by the hyacinths with which we were so recently concerned.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in this project for many, many years, and I, too, heartily concur in and support the Fenton amendment. I trust it passes overwhelmingly.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment. We in Pennsylvania have been waiting since 1936 for this dam. The amendment as amended will require another 6 months of delay; however, we will accept that delay because we do desperately need this dam, and I hope the amendments will be supported by this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered would return to the Allegheny River Reservoir at Kinzua near Warren, Pa., $1,400,000.

The money was appropriated by two past sessions of Congress.

It has now been taken away and diverted elsewhere by an obscure sentence in the report accompanying the Public Works Appropriations Act of 1960 which we are considering today.

Both the dam and reservoir are vitally needed to protect human lives and property from heavy flood damage throughout an important industrial area in the Allegheny and Upper Ohio River Valleys, but there is more to this amendment than an effort to save a flood-control project important to one's district.

The amendment, more importantly, embodies a fight against creation of a dangerous precedent of dishonoring commitments of past Congresses by casually tossing aside projects upon which the competent Army Engineers have spent years of planning—planning, incidentally, of which Congress has been kept abreast and which Congress has approved repeatedly.

Five times Congress has endorsed the dam to be built at Kinzua; in 1936, 1938, and 1941 by planning authorizations and by including nearly $2 million in construction money for it in budgets for fiscal 1958 and 1959.

Alternate plans were proposed by well-intentioned amateurs and engineering consultants employed by parties of special interest. Career experts in the Corps of Engineers rejected these proposals because of cost and engineering flaws.

Efforts to impede the project through a court suit were turned aside by both the District Federal Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Meanwhile, because of this suit, about $1.4 million of previously appropriated funds have been held in escrow so to speak until the court matter is finally terminated. This termination may come any week now from the U.S. Supreme Court and is most likely to come before the current fiscal year ends.

Yet a single sentence in the committee's report would allocate this money to other projects. It would, in effect, waste $1.3 million already spent on planning and at a time when Army engineers are waiting to begin initial construction which could have the dirt flying at the dam site by next spring.

Ironically, the action comes on the heels of testimony by Maj. Gen. Emerson Itschner, Chief of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, that, had the reservoir and dam been operational last year, they would have reduced flood damage in the Allegheny and Upper Ohio River Valleys by $3,300,000.

This unusual overriding of the repeatedly expressed intent of Congress occurs on page 17 of the report. The sentence reads in part: " * * * the committee directs that the $1,400,000 balance of previously appropriated funds available for the project be reprogramed to other projects."

Nothing appears in the bill itself informing members of the reallocation or enabling them to pass upon the dubious merits of this unorthodox taking away of previously appropriated funds.

If this were the usual fight for more money for a project in a Congressman's district we might say let the project take its chances in the competition for Federal funds.

But it is not. Here we have a few careless words killing the hopes and plans of a generation. Past appropriations are upset. Years of planning work are wasted.

It is against such an outrage that the amendment is offered to retain the $1.4 million previously appropriated for the Allegheny River Reservoir.

The principle involved here could be of extreme importance someday to every other Member of this House. This is why I urge adoption of the proposed amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this project the committee was confronted with two principal problems.

The first problem is the pending litigation in the Supreme Court.

The second problem concerns the alternate proposals for storing water for protection of the city of Pittsburgh and other downstream locations.

Dr. A. E. Morgan, an engineer of international reputation, has proposed a storage system which would eliminate the objections of the Indian tribes involved. His cost estimates for this plan are approximately $35 million less than the estimates of the Corps of Engineers for the Kinzua Dam which they are advocating. In this particular instance, the committee has had before it two alternate plans advocated by extremely reputable engineers and is without the technical competence to fully evaluate the two proposals. Before proceeding with the more expensive proposal of the Corps of Engineers, the committee feels that a thoroughly competent and impartial engineering and economic analysis of this plan and the less expensive alternate is necessary.

It is the committees' purpose to preclude any construction activities until it can obtain such an evaluation and until

the litigation is cleared up. Should the litigation be resolved in favor of the Federal Government and the independent evaluation being undertaken show that the Kinzua project is the preferable project in every respect, the committee would be happy to approve the allocation of existing available funds to begin construction at Kinzua or consider a supplemental request if such funds are not at that time available.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin: On page 4, before the colon at the end of line 7, insert: ", and in addition $75,000 for planning for the Eau Galle River project, Wisconsin."

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned because the Eau Galle River flood control project for the Ninth District of Wisconsin has not been included in the 1960 public works appropriation bill. I have an amendment to that bill to provide $75,000, part of what is needed for planning a retarding reservoir above Spring Valley, levees, channel, and control works on the two creeks which feed the Eau Galle River. This work would not only provide nearly complete flood protection at the damage center, Spring Valley, but would also greatly reduce flood damages farther downstream to the farmers and the city of Elmwood.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Chief of Engineers which reads as follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1599.

Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: This is in reply to your letter of January 27, 1959, concerning the Eau Galle River, Wis., flood control project.

The Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate adopted a resolution, on October 28, 1941, requesting a review of the report on the Chippewa River, Wis., and tributaries. An interim report on the Eau Galle River was submitted to the chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate on May 16, 1955. The project was authorized in accordance with this report by the Flood Control Act of 1958.

The current estimated Federal cost of the project is $7,250,000. This estimate includes $700,000 for planning required prior to initiation of construction, of which $80,000 has been spent for preauthorization (survey) studies. No funds have been appropriated for this project since authorization. When funds for this project become available, we will make every effort to expedite its planning.

In response to your telephone request of Colonel Nauman of my staff on January 29, 1959, as to the amount of funds we could use on this project in fiscal year 1960, I wish to furnish you the following information concerning our capability. From the strictly engineering standpoint, considering this project by itself without reference to our overall program, our overall capability, or fiscal considerations, an amount of $150,000 could be utilized for the Eau Galle River project in fiscal year 1960. As you know, no funds for this project are included in the President's budget, so that no funds can be utilized for this project in view of overall budgetary consideration.

I trust the above information will serve your present needs.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. PERSON,
Brigadier General, USA, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. Chairman, the Corps of Engineers has estimated that a sum of $150,000 would be sufficient for planning the Eau Galle project.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that the Federal Government has already invested and spent $80,000 on this project. It is pennywise and pound-foolish not to continue. I am wondering what dollar estimate anyone can put on human lives. I also wonder if the cost of human life and suffering has not risen as other costs have climbed since the 1930's. In a letter dated June 24, 1954, the Assistant Secretary of the Army wrote:

The Chief of Engineers believes that a high degree of protection should be provided because of the potential hazard to life in this community due to floods. The estimated costs and benefits for the recommended project appear to be conservative. When intangible benefits are also considered it is believed that the project is more meritorious than the current tangible benefit-cost ratio of 1.17 would indicate.

We cannot jeopardize the lives of people of Spring Valley because action on this project was not taken when the benefit-cost ratio was more favorable.

This project has been pending since 1941, over 17½ years ago. The Corps of Engineers started working on it in an overall river project in 1942, but World War II stopped all work on civil works projects. Later the Corps of Engineers approved the Eau Galle River as a separate project. Since I came to Congress in 1953, the project, fully approved by the Budget Bureau, the Corps of Engineers, and all other interested agencies, has been held up by Presidential veto. It was finally approved in last year's omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

The people in Spring Valley, Elmwood, and vicinity have lived in fear of rising water and flash floods too long. Since 1901 Spring Valley has been devastated by seven major floods. Two of these floods resulted in three deaths. Many smaller floods have caused untold damage and heartache.

The worst flood occurred in 1942. The residents of the Eau Galle Valley had hardly recovered from the May crippling flood when on the night of September 17, 1942, the river deluged them again. The elevation of the river, which at flood stage is 915, rose to a record high of 926 feet. Few buildings in Spring Valley escaped as the flood wave moved through the community at a height of about 9 feet above the elevation of the main business street. Nearly everything was damaged in about an hour's time.

Sixteen residences and nineteen business buildings were destroyed completely. The average damaged homes and public buildings could not be reoccupied for about 30 days and many business establishments could not be operated for a much longer period. The Red Cross was called in to help, and their relief expenditures totaled about $25,000. Federal aid amounted to about $7,000.

Spring Valley did recover. With real community spirit, they cleaned up, rebuilding streets, homes, business shops, and beautifying the town. They worked so well that 6 years later the town was cited as one of the Nation's cleanest towns. The citizens won a national award for their accomplishments.

In June of 1956 another flood hit Spring Valley, causing damages totaling about $100,000, including losses due to flooding of basements, erosion of bridge abutments and streets. But most of the damage was done to the retaining walls of the two creeks, which overflowed and spilled their waters through the streets of the town.

The people of Spring Valley do not want to give up their town and move to a safer location The Army Engineers in their survey went thoroughly into the matter of relocating the village, but costs of relocation are more expensive than flood-protection measures. Furthermore, moving one town would not prevent flood dangers to Elmwood and the rest of the valley, both residential and agricultural.

The flood-control project is desperately wanted. At the time hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Public Works Committee, over 1,000 signatures on petitions were sent to me urging the project. Spring Valley has complied with all the stipulations set up by the U.S. Corps of Engineers as conditions for the participation of the Federal Government in the project. They have even agreed to purchase the land for the reservoir. I am told by the Corps of Engineers that this is not the customary procedure. Usually the Federal Government bears this cost. However, the people of Spring Valley are so anxious to do everything possible to carry out this project that they readily agreed to do this. The mayor of Spring Valley wrote me on April 4 as follows:

Let me state that all the recommendations and specifications of the Corps of Engineers have been fulfilled. Also, the agreed items and obligations of the village are in the process of being fulfilled.

Mr. Chairman, Spring Valley is a town small in numbers, but big in spirit. They have shown in the past that they can rise above hardship, but it is not right that they should live in continuous fear of disastrous floods.

I sincerely hope there will be no more floods and loss of life in the Spring Valley area before the proposed corrective measures can be taken. I hope you will join me in supporting this amendment for $75,000 to get the project under way.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by

my distinguished colleague and good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

This amendment is very important to the people of Eau Galle Valley. Their peace of mind, and their very lives, are dependent upon it. The people of that valley have been plagued by floods for many years. Their homes were repeatedly wiped out, their farms and other property heavily damaged.

I personally remember the great flood of 1942, which brought staggering destruction to the people of Spring Valley, a town located in the Eau Galle Valley. A 16-foot wall of water swept down upon the community one September night, leaving death, tragedy, and destruction in its wake. Many people thought that Spring Valley would never recover from that blow. But the people of that town would not give up. They went ahead, rebuilt their homes, and their city stands today as a monument to their courage and determination.

I do not believe that we should allow these flood hazards to continue. The Eau Galle Valley project has been considered by the Congress for almost 2 decades. It has been authorized on two separate occasions. It is high time that the relatively small amount proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] be provided to commence work on this project.

I commend my colleague and sincerely hope that his amendment will be approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment starts a project that would cost, according to the figures of the Army Engineers, $7,270,000. The thing that bothers me about the project is this: It has no benefit-cost ratio that amounts to anything. It says here that it has a benefit-cost ratio of 1.1 to 1. Now, I cannot see our authorizing and starting on a project which does not do enough good to justify it. We all know that there will be a 20-percent increase in cost above what the original estimates are. That is the way they run. That means that whatever benefit there is will be wiped out by the increased cost.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see why we should embark upon this kind of a project.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I think you will find that the information you are giving us is incorrect. I was trying to find a telegram that I received from the Corps of Engineers yesterday from St. Paul, but I do not have it with me. But, if I am correctly informed the information that the gentleman gave to the Public Works Subcommittee is not the same as I received from the Corps of Engineers by telegram yesterday afternoon. The benefit ratio is higher than the cost.

Mr. TABER. I think that I have yielded long enough. If I had received that telegram, I would have brought it with me, if I were the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the actual situation is that these Engineers, who are watering at the mouth for every project that they can get, could not make out a better case than they had to present, and I think we ought to reject the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are very familiar with this project. It had been before the Committee on Public Works for some time and when it came up in the last flood control omnibus bill we gave it very careful consideration.

The point raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the cost-benefit ratio is rather close, is a good point. It varied from 1.3 to 1, down to 1.1 to 1. But how close is close? Or how close do you have to be to be close enough? Anything over 1, anything over parity is accepted as an economically justified project.

But the gentleman does raise a good point and I acknowledge it. The chances are perhaps there will be some increase in the cost of construction of the project which may lessen slightly the benefit-cost ratio. But I say the chances are just as good that once these people have some assurance that they will receive protection, that those who have left will return, and the benefits will rise.

In the flood of September 1942, there was a $6 million loss, which resulted in the departure of many energetic citizens. In spite of that devastating flood, the worst in history, those people that stayed on, worked and cleaned up their town; and in March 1950, the Lion's International in an article entitled "The Town That Would Not Be Licked" told about the determination with which these citizens and this community cleaned up their town, and decided to stay, after a $6 million loss.

So I do hope the project will be approved. I know the area. These people have really exerted themselves all out. The cost-benefit ratio is still above parity. We have every reason to believe that once the project is undertaken people will come back. Those who, under dire economic pressure, had to go, will come back and the benefits will be increased, which would offset any increase in the cost of construction.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I think, also, the people of the community have agreed to pay over $500,000 toward the project. Most of that money has already been spent on improvements as suggested by the Corps of Engineers; is not that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is correct.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND THE WEEK OF JUNE 8

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

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week and for next week. I make this inquiry at this time because quite a few Members are here and I am sure they would like to be informed as to what is the prospect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I assume we will dispose of this bill today. If so, we shall go over until Monday. If not, there will be further conferences.

As to next week: Monday is District Day. There are seven bills.

H.R. 3735, death benefits, police, firemen, and U.S. Secret Service.

H.R. 3030, assignment of Police Band.

H.R. 4283, exemption of certain officials, District of Columbia income tax.

H.R. 6662, D.C. Hospital Center, extending the time for appropriation.

H.R. 6378, use of property, American Society of International Law.

S. 643, a bill relating to notice of service.

S. 949, a bill relating to the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

H.R. 7523, 1-year extension of the corporate and excise tax rates.

It has been agreed that any rollcalls on Monday will go over until Tuesday with the exception, of course, of any rollcall on a rule.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it there is a rule on the bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; there is a rule on that.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, the program is as follows:

First there is the unfinished business, the motion to recommit on the water pollution bill.

S. 1901, the tobacco price support bill.

H.R. 7246, wheat program for 1960 and 1961.

H.R. 6596, Coal Research and Development Commission.

H.R. 4957, admission of evidence in courts. As I remember, that is concerning the Mallory decision.

S. 1120, a bill relating to the Federal Reserve Act, reserves.

H.R. 3, rules of interpretation, State laws.

Mr. HALLECK. It looks like we will have rather a busy week next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and from now on, of course. We have had a very good week this week and I think the House is to be congratulated.

There is the usual reservation, that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. I rise not to ask something for myself or for my district, but 300 miles to the north of my district in an area of wooded hills and green meadows, represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], is the little town of Spring Valley on the Eau Galle River. I know $75,000 is a lot of money, but if you could come with me to Spring Valley and see the signs of the devastating floods that they have had and if you could see the sound and constructive proposals they have for flood control, and if you could see the self-reliant manner in which they have wanted to participate themselves, I think you would agree that the expenditure of $75,000 should back up the authorization which Congress has voted for this flood control project would be

money well spent. I ask the Members to consider favorably the Johnson amendment.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to make a few short references to the Red River Valley. I think generally the committee is doing a good job in reference to the development of the Red River Valley and we appreciate it. We have had, however, three major floods in the last 3 years, and I think I would be making a mistake if I did not at least say something on this occasion. The Bureau of the Budget recommended for bank stabilization in that area the sum of $700,000. That amount has been reduced to the sum of $400,000. So in an area which has been devastated by major floods, three of them in the last 3 years, we are in a retrenchment program dropping from $700,000 down to $400,000. I do not know what the future holds as to whether we are going to have a flood next year or not, but I do not want the RECORD to be silent on this point in reference to the fact that there has been a cutback in the amount allowed by this committee for the bank stabilization program, which program covers Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, and the northwestern part of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, the action of the committee in failing to provide full budget request for funds for bank stabilization work on Red River below Denison Dam will greatly slow up the needed work along this river. The Bureau of the Budget requested a total of $700,000 for this work and I am informed by the Corps of Engineers that the amount needed is at least $700,000. Actually, Mr. Chairman, the figure of $1 million is more realistic when you consider the amount of work to be performed to help stabilize the banks of the Red River and for channel improvement work.

The Corps of Engineers over the years have been making great strides in harnessing this meandering stream, thereby giving it some stability and saving the landowners along its banks millions and millions of dollars in damages which would have otherwise been unused due to the caving banks. These banks along the river have been caving at an increasing rate due to the swift water which pours through northwest Louisiana from Arkansas, Oklahoma and Texas.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that most of the land lost each year is rich, alluvial farmland in the valley which is one of the most productive valleys in all the world. Many of our large cities are also placed in danger and we need continued protection in the form of bank stabilization work to keep many people from being washed away downriver by this caving action.

Also, the Corps of Engineers have worked hard to replace many of the works which have been destroyed or damaged in the three great floods which were visited upon our area over the past 2½ years. The Corps of Engineers have not as yet been able to complete this much needed work due to recurring high water which severely hampers this work.

Heretofore, the Engineers have requested only those funds which they feel they could justly and economically use within the fiscal year they were appropriated. We feel that the Engineers are the best qualified agency of this Government to determine the minimum funds required for this work. The Bureau of the Budget must have agreed also with the Engineers inasmuch as the President's budget asked for $700,000 for this stabilization work.

This is important work which should be done during this next year; fortunately this year a major flood did not occur in our area. This fact will permit the Corps of Engineers to accomplish overdue repair work and new construction to stabilize the channel and banks of this major stream. This is resulting in a low water level permitting work to be started.

To cut this appropriation back to $400,000 as requested by the committee to "continue this program at the 1959 level of financing" as is stated in the committee report, is to endanger the lives and property of the people of the Red River Valley. I say that this surely is not the intent of the committee and that it would not want this done. In failing to provide the engineers with sufficient funds with which to accomplish this much-needed work the committee is doing just that.

This next fall and spring, should a major flood occur in the valley similar to the three we have recently experienced, heavy damage to property in the valley together with the attendent possibility of loss of life, would be the probable outcome. Unless we are able to protect our banks and control these waters, the responsibility must lie with this body for not having provided our people with proper protection.

It is extremely difficult to understand the reason for cutting these funds, yet, Mr. Chairman, within a few days we will be called upon to vote on a foreign aid bill which will give away billions, not millions, not thousands as is in discussion here, but billions of dollars to foreign countries to be used in building flood-control projects in many foreign countries. And if the past is any indication of the future, the bill will pass this House, yet we would deny our own people flood control and bank stabilization work which cost only a few thousand dollars. The sum of money represented in this request could not, by any stretch of the imagination, throw the budget out of balance when viewed in light of the foreign aid bill, but it can provide thousands of our own people with flood protection which could save them many millions of dollars in property damage, and if this resulted in saving only one life it would be money well spent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the increase of funds in this bill to the figure requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget to $700,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure to serve on the House Committee on Appropriations for several years under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I am appreciative of the difficulties the committee faces. Last year the House of Representatives with the other body concurring passed the public works appropriation bill. That bill was approved by the President of the United States and became statutory law. Included in that bill was an appropriation of $500,000 for the construction of a new project or for the continuation of an existing project, whichever interpretation is placed upon it. The project to be built, known as the Burns Creek project, is to control the flows of an existing Federal dam so that when the releases from the dam are so great that they would wash out the downstream irrigation works that this proposed secondary construction would complete the project by controlling that water and releasing it in a manner which would not cause the downstream damage. If it is not built, the existing Federal project can never achieve the benefits otherwise possible. We are in this item in a most peculiar position and I think it is unique and should be called to the attention of the House because it is most unusual. That money was approved by the Congress. It is a part of an existing statute. The bill we are considering contains no money for the project and makes no reference to it. There is nothing before the House in this bill for the project. However, in the committee report, and I assume inadvertently, there is a sentence which says that it is intended to eliminate the already appropriated funds which are part of an existing Federal statute. I doubt very seriously that the appropriations committee or any other committee of this House would claim that by a committee report it can repeal an existing statute or that it can repeal a portion of an existing statute. Certainly, when I had the privilege of serving upon the Committee on Appropriations, I never heard any such claim made for that great and powerful committee nor have I heard it made for any other committee of the House of Representatives.

The pertinent paragraph of the existing statute (Public Law 85–863, 72 Stat. 1575), is as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $146,015,000, of which $85 million shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers: *Provided further,*

That any portion of this or prior appropriations available for the construction of extensions to the distribution system of the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District may be expended without regard to the land certification requirement under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1953 (60 Stat. 445), after the execution and approval of a contract which obligates the entire district to repay the cost of such facilities: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customers: *Provided futher*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Palisades Reregulating Dam and Powerplant (Burns Creek, Idaho) project until it is authorized: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir (Washoe project, California-Nevada) until the enactment into law of S. 4009, or similar legislation: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the construction of the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir (Glendo unit, Missouri River Basin project) until said dam and reservoir are specifically authorized.

The present status of the funds appropriated is as set forth in the following letter addressed to me by the Secretary of the Interior:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1959.

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BUDGE: This is in response to your inquiry regarding the status of the $500,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1959 for the Burns Creek project, Idaho. As you know, the appropriations was made contingent upon the Congress authorizing the project. Accordingly, when this appropriation was made, $100,000 of this amount was scheduled for obligation in the latter part of this fiscal year on the premise that the project would be authorized early in this session of the Congress.

Since the appropriation is available until expended, the balance of $400,000 has been placed in reserve for use in fiscal year 1960 as the anticipated late start in fiscal year 1959 would preclude the use of that amount until next fiscal year.

The Department considers the specific language contained in the appropriation for fiscal year 1959 with regard to this project pertinent to the use of the funds carried over into fiscal year 1960. Accordingly, the language provision was proposed for deletion as having served its purpose and is no longer required.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant,
Secretary of the Interior.

It is my position that the language in the committee report is a nullity. If that position is not valid and concurred in by the committee, I assume someone will correct me. However, in order that there may be no question I shall at the proper time offer an amendment to this bill which will not increase the money to be spent.

I repeat, there is no reference to Burns Creek in this bill. There is no way I can reach the report to eliminate the offending language because the report is not before the House. But I submit to the House that we should clarify this most unique situation which arose, I believe, through inadvertence in the preparation of the committee report. As it reads the committee report attempts to repeal a statute enacted by the House of Representatives, by the other body, and signed by the President. I submit to you that if we permit any such proceeding as this, next week the House Judiciary Committee in a report could repeal the laws on sedition. Endless questions would arise and such a procedure in addition to being illegal, does not begin to conform to the rules of the House itself.

I would have no quarrel as to the inclusion of a statement in the report of the Committee on Appropriations, or any other committee as to matter which is currently before the House and on which the House can work its will. In this instance, however, there is no parliamentary way in which I can attempt to repeal the language of this report, because an amendment to the report is not in order.

I hope the Appropriations Committee will accept the amendment when it is offered at the proper section of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to add my words in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. This unfortunate situation over in Wisconsin is not far removed from my district and I am well versed with and well aware of the damage the people have had to contend with in that river valley over the years from floods.

I was in hopes that I could stay with the committee in holding to the line on this appropriation bill, but apparently Pennsylvania had a good story to tell here, and Louisiana likewise had a good story to tell. I hope and trust that Louisiana and Pennsylvania will join with us this afternoon in helping the people in the Wisconsin River Valley in their effort to eliminate the ever-increasing flood damage in that area. The situation is just as serious there as in Pennsylvania and Louisiana, yet the funds involved are very much less.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Wisconsin for their support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am becoming concerned the way things are going that there is not going to be enough money left for the foreign giveaway program when it comes up next week; and I am especially concerned that there be some money left for the United Nations and Paul Hoffman and the Mekong River project in Asia.

Yes, I just want to express my concern over the fact that the bill has been dented by the Pennsylvania and Louisiana delegations, and hope there will be enough left for the foreigners next week.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 64, noes 49.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 51.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 4, line 16, strike out the period, add a semicolon and the words "*Provided further*, That the improvement of the Escambra River, Fla., according to authorized specification may be undertaken with any available unallocated funds contained in this act."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that this is a project which was authorized in Public Law 500 of the 85th Congress. The project as authorized calls for an expenditure of $95,000. However, Mr. Chairman, I do not ask for any money now. I do not ask for any money in this amendment. I simply ask that any available unallocated funds may be used for this project.

I ask that, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that this is a needed and justifiable project. It has a benefit ratio of 5.71 to 1. This obviously is one of the highest benefit ratios you will find in any project submitted to the Congress.

A wider and a deeper channel has been authorized and is needed as the result of heavy barge traffic to industrial plants which have in the past few years been located on the river in that particular area. There are 3 of these, 1 of which employs more than 5,000 people. It is the largest single employer of personnel in one plant in the State of Florida. Each of the three is a major industrial plant.

I would like to point out that these industrial concerns from their own funds spent the money which originally made this channel usable. They are not asking for this money to be returned. There is no effort here to reimburse them. But, the project needs additional work, and if there is any available unallocated money in this bill, I am asking that you make it possible for us to use it for this important project which has a benefit ratio, please remember, of 5.71 to 1, and which would cost only $95,000.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will vote for this project.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amend-

ment that it changes existing law. It attempts to control funds that have been appropriated in previous acts in a way that is different from the way those acts now stand and as those old appropriations stood.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to be informed as to whether or not the particular project referred to in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is authorized by law.

Mr. TABER. That I do not know.

Mr. SIKES. May I respectfully state, Mr. Chairman, that the project is authorized by law. It was carried in the last rivers and harbors omnibus bill, which was signed by the President, and I am informed the number of that law is 500 of the 85th Congress. I further point out that this is permissive and as such would not constitute legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. The previous act carried a provision "to remain available until expended." This particular amendment would mean that they would be using it for something that was not in the original bill, and that would result in a change in existing law. That is the idea that I had in making the point of order.

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

Apparently the gentleman from New York is not making the point of order on whether or not the project is authorized. The Chair has been informed by the gentleman from Florida that the project is authorized by law.

Insofar as the point of order made by the gentleman from New York is concerned, the Chair overrules the point of order because this language is quite specific in that it makes available unallocated funds contained in this act, the act now being debated before the committee, and does not affect heretofore made appropriations.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 33, noes 41.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. SIKES.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 37, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAMPLER: On page 4, line 7, after the word "expended" strike out "$658,300,100" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,352,100."

(Mr. WAMPLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. Has not this figure which the gentleman seeks to amend already been amended?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. It was amended by the Passman amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, then, that the amendment is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOGGS). The point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address myself to the language of the committee report, on page 15, dealing with the Sacramento deepwater channel. I note that the committee states in the report:

The committee feels that it would be wholly appropriate for the local interests to increase their contribution to the project if they wish to achieve the advantages of a speedup in the construction schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the tenor of that language is that the people of my district have not delivered on the assurances executed with the Army Corps of Engineers.

In December of 1947 the Sacramento Port Authority entered into an agreement with the Corps of Engineers. The agreement provided for three principal requirements.

I would ask the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee if he can cite any instance wherein the people of the Sacramento Port Authority have failed to deliver on any one point of the requirements of the agreement of assurance entered into with the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. RABAUT. The answer is no; you have met your requirements. The committee thinks, in view of the tremendous sums of money going into California, that the action we took was reasonable.

Mr. MOSS. I would point out to the chairman that the State of California on the Pacific coast extends down that coast for a distance of over 1,100 miles. Applying that same mileage on the east coast it would encompass a considerable number of States.

Centainly I recognize that the committee has been most generous in treating with the problems in California and I am not taking exception to that. But the tenor of this report is that my people failed to deliver on the assurances they gave and that is not the case.

There is a further implication that only the Federal cost of this project has increased. Certainly the Federal cost has increased substantially, and I submit that a great part of that increase comes about because of the prolonged period of construction since the project was originally authorized. But I also point out that the people of my district have had to pay substantial increases as a result of the drag-out on construction.

My people today have expended—and I shall put the details in the RECORD—$3,804,000 on this project. Originally it was figured that $3,750,000 would fill the requirements for every dollar of district contribution. We find now that in order to keep our assurances to the Engineers we will be faced with an additional $8 million to construct the terminal facilities required under the agreement of assurance. The State of California has been put to the expense of $4,030,000. With that $8 million additional required by my district and with the $4,030,000 there is over $12 million of additional local contribution. Local interests already have expended almost $4 million for a total of close to $16 million. Now that is not reflected in the language of the committee report. I think in justice to the people I represent that this record should be very clear.

Now I will be very pleased to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to read one sentence:

The total cost is now estimated at $49,030,000 of which the direct contribution by the local beneficiaries is only $3,090,000.

That tells the whole story.

Mr. MOSS. That language, Mr. Chairman, the direct contribution is that required by the agreement of assurance, as I understand it.

Mr. RABAUT. And we think it is too low.

Mr. MOSS. The direct contribution is that required by the agreement of assurance. The gentleman is referring only to the payments so far for the rights-of-way or easements and relocations of utilities. Now I believe I am correct in my statement and that the total local contribution will reflect the construction of wharfs and terminals which will add at least another $8 million.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is in error. This is the direct contribution and it includes everything they gave which is $3,090,000, as related to the Federal cost.

Mr. MOSS. The agreement of assurance entered into, and I have a copy of it here which I will be happy to put into the RECORD:

DEEPWATER CHANNEL, SACRAMENTO RIVER, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., AGREEMENT OF ASSURANCE TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session, approved on July 24, 1946, did authorize the construction of that certain Deepwater Channel on the Sacramento River, near Sacramento, in the State of California, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 142, 79th Congress, 2d session, and did also require that local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will (a) furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when and as required and to make all necessary utility changes; (b) construct, operate, and maintain at the Washington Lake Basin an adequate public terminal as approved by the Chief of Engineers with necessary utilities and rail and highway connections open to all on equal terms; and (c) hold and save the United States free from any damages which may arise from construction, operation, and maintenance of the improvements; and

Whereas the qualified electors of the counties of Sacramento and Yolo, State of California, at a special election, duly authorized and called according to law, and held on the 15th day of April 1947, did create and establish the Sacramento-Yolo Port District in the State of California; and

Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the State of California of 1947 did, by senate bill 730, now known as chapter 1152, 1957 Statutes of the State of California, which was approved July 7, 1947, authorize and empower the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif., to give such assurance to the Secretary of the Army:

Now, therefore, the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif., duly created and authorized by law does hereby give assurance to the Secretary of the Army that it will (a) furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when and as required and to make all necessary utility changes; (b) construct, operate, and maintain at the Washington Lake Basin an adequate public terminal, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, with necessary utilities and rail and highway connections open to all on equal terms; and (c) hold and save the United States free from any damages which may arise from construction, operation, and maintenance of the improvement.

In witness whereof, the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif., in meeting assembled, has caused this instrument to be executed this 24th day of December 1947, at Sacramento, Calif.

SACRAMENTO-YOLO PORT DISTRICT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
W. G. STONE, *Port Director*,
IVORY J. RODDA, *Secretary*.

Mr. RABAUT. What does it entail?

Mr. MOSS. It entails that the district will furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when, and as required, to make all the necessary utility changes. That is the portion which is reflected here.

Mr. RABAUT. I agree with all of that but that is to benefit the locality. We do not include wharfs and other things that you mention there. We are talking about rights-of-way and certain facilities under the basic law which amounts to $3,090,000.

Mr. MOSS. I want to point out to the gentleman this agreement then continues——

Mr. RABAUT. I understand the agreement. The gentleman showed it to me the other day.

Mr. MOSS. The local contribution is the totality of that required by the agreement.

Mr. RABAUT. Would it be in the totality of it, if you include the flagpole?

Mr. MOSS. Certainly, if it is part of the project itself. The agreement governs, Mr. Chairman. We cannot say that only part of that which is contained in the agreement is required. The entire amount is required.

Mr. RABAUT. There have been funds supplied to this project by transfer. It is odd to hear a complaint like this on this project. This project has been treated so well. It is nice enough to say, "I like to rub your back" and all this and that, but we have been so nice to this project and so overwhelmingly nice to the State of California that it really shocks me to hear a complaint.

Mr. MOSS. You have my every respect, sir, and I did not in any way indicate to the contrary. I said I wanted to deal specifically with the language of this report which left the implication that my people have not fulfilled the requirements imposed upon us.

Mr. RABAUT. The relationship is too small.

Mr. MOSS. There are no precedents for any other treatment of the matter.

Mr. RABAUT. As I say, the relationship is too small. It is $3,090,000 as compared to the Federal Government's share of $49,030,000.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, have my people violated their agreement in any way?

Mr. RABAUT. We are not claiming that your people have violated any agreement, but we still think it is out of line and that they should be paying more into the proposition.

Mr. MOSS. There is no way either of us can do anything about that.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from California is the one who is talking about this and all I have been doing is speaking about the Federal Government's part of the transaction.

Mr. MOSS. All I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, is that part of the report and I am pointing out that we are dealing here with a matter that is not governed by whim but governed by an agreemen. and on the face of that agreement in spirit and to the letter, my people have in every respect lived up to it.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OSMERS: On page 4, line 7, immediately before the colon insert the following: ", plus an additional $50,000 for the survey of streams, river basins, and areas in New York and New Jersey authorized by section 206 of the Flood Control Act of 1958."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered provides for an additional $50,000 to begin the survey authorized by Congress last year of the streams, river basins, and areas in New York and New Jersey for flood control, major drainage, navigation, channel improvement, and land reclamation, as follows: Hackensack River, Passaic River, Raritan River, Arthur Kill, and Kill Van Kull, including the portions of these river basins in Bergen, Hudson, Essex, Middlesex, Passaic, Union and Monmouth Counties, N.J.

Simply stated, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to provide for a start on the survey by the Army engineers of that immensely valuable area of 30,000 acres in North Jersey, known as the Jersey Meadows. For over 300 years, this area has challenged the imagination of all who have viewed it. Even Alexander Hamilton predicted that the Jersey Meadows would become the site of a great shipping and industrial center. I would like to quote here, Mr. Chairman, extracts from my testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, which I gave on April 28, 1959:

Except for some minor filling and industrial development around the fringes, and slender ribbons of highways and railroads, this area remains as it did when the Dutch settled north Jersey 300 years ago.

It has accurately been described as the most potentially valuable piece of real estate in the world.

It is fair to ask why this area has never been developed by local county or State initiative. The answer is simple. Even though the Jersey Meadows reach into seven counties, and probably as many as 50 municipalities, and yet it cannot be called a statewide problem.

The varying objectives of the counties and municipalities involved, complicated by substantial private holdings within the area, have brought about an impasse difficult, if not impossible, to overcome by strictly local means.

What is needed here is a complete survey by the Corps of Engineers to determine the most expeditious and economical way of reclaiming all of the meadowlands.

Much has been done in recent years at the local and regional level. Five communities, namely Rutherford, East Rutherford, Carlstadt, Lyndhurst, and North Arlington have joined together, under the outstanding leadership of Fairleigh S. Dickinson, Jr., to plan the future of 8,000 of the 30,000 acres involved.

At private expense, several engineers from the Netherlands have examined the area and most emphatically have stated that reclamation is possible and practical.

Col. S. E. Smith, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works for the Eastern Divisions, has informed me that the total cost of this survey would be in the neighborhood of $500,000. To me, this figure may be high in view of studies that have been made which may not yet be available to the Corps of Engineers.

Colonel Smith has suggested that a figure of $25,000 would be the amount that should be included in the coming budget, bearing in mind other commitments by the Corps of Engineers and budget restrictions.

It seems to me that double this amount would be much more fitting considering the overall size of the survey.

Mr. Chairman, there is no project in or out of the bill that has the same future economic significance as reclamation of this area. It is all too true that the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area has a well-earned reputation for working out solutions to its problems without Federal aid or subsidy. It is also true that no area in the United States makes as high a contribution in Federal taxes in proportion to the amount of Federal money spent within its boundaries. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the very small amount of $50,000 which is asked for to begin this survey should be approved unanimously. The Federal revenue that will be realized from the orderly development of this significant area for business and industry, and, for homes and apartments will make this particular appropriation one of the best investments ever made by the Federal Government.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard in support of the amendment for a couple of minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS]. We have offered testimony before the committee as to the potential of this great land development in the heart of New Jersey. You all are familiar with the old George M. Cohan refrain "Forty-five Minutes From

Broadway"; this area is only 5 minutes from Broadway, and comprises 35,000 acres of swampland in the heart of the most invaluable industrial property in the metropolitan area.

I state, as did my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS], that the amount of Federal taxes that would flow to the Government is in inverse proportion to the cost of surveying and reclaiming this area.

I earnestly ask the support of the committee and the House in the passage of this very important amendment for what has been a chronically depressed area. This legislation could easily be the most beneficial this area has had in many, many years.

I have proposed and appeared before the House Appropriations Committee on May 1, to urge support of this project.

I am including my statement before this committee in my remarks:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER OF NEW JERSEY BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 1, 1959

The refrain from George M. Cohan's old song made a great point in being only 45 minutes from Broadway. Broadway points up the fact that New York City is perhaps the world's most expensive piece of real estate. The heart of the New Jersey meadowlands is not 45 minutes from Broadway; it is but 5 minutes away.

This close to the world's largest city lie upwards of 35,000 acres of barren swamps that challenge the imagination of city and industrial planners and engineers who see in these wasted acres land upon which could be built great industrial and transportation facilities which are needed for the future development of metropolitan New York as the world's greatest manufacturing and shipping city.

Indeed, the challenge has captured the imagination of some of our youthful student engineers, several of whom have developed plans in which they envision beautiful and extensive residential housing standing on reclaimed meadowlands. One such student has fully developed comprehensive plans for construction of vast apartments which would house some 600,000 people. Imagine what relief such a project would bring to the desperately overcrowded residents of New York City.

The Port of New York Authority is aware of the great potential of the meadowlands and they have appropriated large sums for piecemeal reclamation of certain areas. But their entire planning considers eventual development of only a very small portion of this total of wasted acres.

This tremendous area of swamp, surrounded by some of the world's most valuable real estate is a huge cancer in the world's greatest shipping and industrial area. It is a vast tract sodden with raw sewage, this garbage and refuse of the cities, which produces nothing for man, but a few bales of salt grass.

The reclamation of this tract, which extends for some 20 miles or more and is from 2 to 8 miles wide, would provide a badly needed backup area for the operation of the great port of New York, including the hundreds of piers on both sides of the Hudson River and, the waterfront shipping and industrial plants as far south as Elizabeth, N.J.

The full reclamation of this wasted meadowlands, or reclamation of even a substantial portion is too staggering a project for any group of interested municipalities, counties or the State of New Jersey. All of the communities bordering on the meadowlands and Bergen and Hudson Counties, however, have made joint studies reaching back many years.

Reclamation and development of any sizable portion of the New Jersey meadow is too great an undertaking for even the big Port of New York Authority. The leadership is so vast and challenging, an undertaking must come from the Federal Government, and this is just, considering that the benefits that would be derived would accrue not alone to the communities in the area and business and industry of New York, but would benefit the commercial and industrial development of the entire eastern seaboard.

The metropolitan area of New York and New Jersey has long suffered while great attention has been given to other areas of our Nation. Down through the years the amount of Federal assistance for this area has been one of inverse proportion to the amount of Federal taxes paid. The higher the Federal contributions from the metropolitan area has been, so inversely has the amount of Federal assistance decreased in this area.

The area that I represent has long been considered a distressed labor district.

Reclaiming the New Jersey meadowlands would completely revitalize New Jersey. It would create thousands of jobs, reduce local taxes by creating new ratables. It would greatly increase Federal income by stimulating our entire economy in this area.

I sincerely feel that no investment by the Federal Government could reap greater returns for the Federal Government and the people of the metropolitan area.

Once the reclamation is a reality there would be a thousandfold return to the Federal Government for every dollar that went into making it possible.

I am sure the committee is aware that although substantial public funds are required to get a full scale reclamation and development project underway, there would follow tremendous private investments in the building of the great industrial plants, storage facilities and shipping terminals—and even the vast residential apartments which our young and inspired student engineers envision.

The whole idea of reclaiming this vast tract of swamp and making of it a useful and productive area, is too vast a project to be discussed before this learned committee in any detail. The possibilities are almost beyond the imagination of man.

I urge the distinguished members of this committee to favorably consider the proposal that there be included in the fiscal year 1960 appropritaions bill funds to get started an engineering study that will lead to the realization of a full reclamation and development of the New Jersey meadowlands.

I wish to express my thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other members of this committee for the privilege of presenting my views.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is offered to the wrong section of the bill. It should have been offered under the section dealing with investigations instead of under the section dealing with construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment should have been offered under the section of the bill dealing with general investigations and not the section dealing with construction. The amendment is not germane to this part of the bill.

The point of order is sustained.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAMPLER: On page 21, line 7, after the amount shown add the following: "And in addition $52,000 for the following projects: Sugar Creek, West Terre Haute, Clinton, and Conover Levee."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language has been once amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York must have misunderstood the reading of the amendment, because it follows the amount and does not alter the amount.

The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. WAMPLER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may insert his statement in the RECORD immediately following mine.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to provide the sum of $52,000 in preconstruction planning funds for the following flood control projects in amounts which the Army Corps of Engineers has stated it has the engineering capabilities to utilize during the fiscal year 1960:

First. West Terre Haute, Ind., local protection project, $30,000 to complete preconstruction planning.

Second. Sugar Creek, Ind., levee, $15,000 to initiate preconstruction planning and bring the planning to 50 percent of completion.

Third. Clinton, Ind., levee, $5,000 to enable the Army Corps of Engineers to restudy the project.

Fourth. Conover, Ind., levee, a Terre Haute, Ind., local protection project, $2,000 to enable the Army Corps of Engineers to restudy the project.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment actually is no more than a request for the completion of a three-reservoir flood control pattern which is already provided for in the bill presently before us. At this point, I wish to extend my appreciation to and express my admiration for the very distinguished House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, its chairman and its members, for the quite timely and realistic consideration given the State of Indiana and the constantly flooded Wabash Valley area by the inclusion in this fiscal year 1960 public works appropriations measure advance planning funds for the Huntington, Mississinewa and Salamonie Reservoirs which will ultimately be constructed in the upper reaches of the Wabash River. These three reservoirs form the basic element in the master plan proposed by the Army Corps of Engineers for controlling the flood waters of the Wabash River and its tributaries. However, one master-plan component of signal importance has been overlooked under the terms of this public works appropriations bill. That

overlooked and acutely necessary component is the construction of a system of reservoir-supporting levees along the lower Wabash in the southwestern region of Indiana. This amendment which would provide the sum of $52,000 in design and planning funds would bring the West Terre Haute, Sugar Creek, Clinton and Conover levee projects to a point of engineering completion sufficiently advanced to contemplate actual construction. This levee pattern could then become the necessary but presently missing integral flood-control component, thereby contributing materially to reducing the vast flood devastation in the area that during the February 1959, flood alone caused damage of almost $10 million. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the eventual total construction costs of all four of these levees is estimated by the Army Corps of Engineers at approximately $3.5 million, which obviously is only a mere fraction of the dollar damage, waste and devastation experienced in the single February flood of this year.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, for the information of my colleagues, that the February 1959 flood, to which I have referred, was preceded by 22 major Wabash River floodings, 9 of which occurred within the last 12 years. In addition, during the last 5 years, Wabash Valley floodings have caused at least 11 deaths and that during the last 15 years, from 1943 to 1958, area damage as a result of flooding has amounted to the absolutely staggering total of $62 million.

I should like to make it clear that I am not asking for the start of any new projects. I am merely asking for the completion of planning on projects which already have been authorized and as a matter of fact have been in that authorized status in excess of 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we must provide this additional $52,000 for the 4 levee projects in the lower reaches of the Wabash River in order to effectively complement the $325,000 already provided for in the bill for the three northern Indiana reservoirs if the Army Corps of Engineers master flood control plan for the Wabash Valley is to be successful. Were not the four local protection levees pushed to completion, I believe the northern Indiana reservoirs when constructed would be virtually ineffective in my area of the lower Wabash River. The completion of construction of only the three reservoirs would have the total effect along the lower Wabash, so I am informed by the Army Corps of Engineers, of lowering flood levels by a mere 1 foot. That 1-foot reduction would be sufficient only to prevent the possibility of local water contamination in some communities in my area of Indiana, Mr. Chairman. These local levees for which I am asking $52,000 in planning and design money must be constructed to act in tandem with the Huntington, Mississinewa and Salamonie Reservoirs if any appreciable relief from constant flooding is to be effected in the area. I urge every Member of this body who can in the least appreciate the extent of the tragedy and suffering and devastation which the people in my district and surrounding districts have experienced year after year after year to vote for the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. WAMPLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Would the gentleman settle for Sugar Creek?

Mr. WAMPLER. Would I settle for Sugar Creek?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes or no.

Mr. WAMPLER. I will settle for Sugar Creek.

Mr. RABAUT. As far as I am concerned, I will accept Sugar Creek.

Mr. JENSEN. How much is Sugar Creek going to cost?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires some information. Has a settlement been reached?

Mr. RABAUT. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I asked the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. RABAUT. The total is $70,000.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the project?

Mr. RABAUT. He has three projects.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the project?

Mr RABAUT. The Sugar Creek levee.

Mr. JENSEN. What is Sugar Creek levee going to do?

Mr. RABAUT. He just got through telling the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. There are three projects.

Mr. WAMPLER. This Sugar Creek levee will augment, it will support, the channeling of the water which lowers the Wabash River one foot at Terre Haute. It will tend to move it into banks and protect the city of Terre Haute.

Mr. JENSEN. I am in no position to accept the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. I cannot accept it for anyone except myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAMPLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER), there were—ayes 42, noes 39.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] 100 Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. WAMPLER.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 43, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, not to offer an amendment to the present bill, for I know the hard work the committee has put in and the trying conditions under which the members of the Committee on Appropriations bring out a bill of this type. Yet there is a matter that I think should be called to the attention of the House. That is the Dismal Swamp Canal, which is a part of the inland waterway from Maine to Florida. This canal was promoted by General Washington and built by Patrick Henry. It is of great economic and historical value. It is the safest route north and south on the inland waterway for yachts. No one will dispute that. There are 1,400 or 1,500 yachts a year that use this route.

The Corps of Engineers or the budget proposed closing this segment of the inland waterway and sending the traffic around through Currituck Sound, N.C. Only a bar of sand divides Currituck Sound from the Atlantic Ocean. It is an exposed route. It is an unsafe route and is not preferred by one of the greatest industries in America, the yachting public of today. And bear in mind, the building of yachts and the operation of private boats is one of the biggest and one of the fastest growing businesses in America today.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to offer an amendment. I merely want to ask a question of the members of the Committee on Appropriations in light of a letter that has been written to the chairman [Mr. CANNON], which contradicts the testimony that was given to the committee under date of May 25, this letter being dated June 5.

Mr. Chairman, I went with the Chief of Engineers when we had a meeting in the Senate and with several members of my delegation pointed out to General Itschner that this report was unfair, that it was loaded against the operation of this part of the inland waterway.

Today this letter comes back and admits that we are right; that there is no weight whatever in the original report given to the 1,400 yachts that use this part of the inland waterway.

I merely want to ask this question. The Engineers tell me that with the amount of money in this bill they will operate this for the fiscal year 1960. Under ordinary conditions they would close in December of this year. But they will reduce a set of lock masters and with the present funds operate the canal throughout 1960 and give further study to the matter and report back to Congress for the next year.

Were they to close this canal they would have to keep the lock operators there because if they did not, they would drain Lake Drummond which lies in Virginia and the Dismal Swamp Canal, which is the general area, and cause the greatest fire hazard to eastern North Carolina, eastern Virginia, the city of Norfolk, and other adjacent towns that could be created under any possible conditions.

With the testimony and the facts which can be substantiated by these two letters, I am merely asking the committee if it would permit the operation of this canal through the fiscal year 1960 with the funds now in the appropriation bill to operate it up to December of this year.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking

minority member of this committee, if that would meet his approval?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not know much about it. But the Engineers made a bad report on this project.

Mr. BONNER. Yes; the report was loaded against the project.

Mr. TABER. And the committee could do nothing except leave it out. As to what would develop, I have not gone over the points made in the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has expired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any great objection to having it run 1 year, and postpone final consideration in that way.

Mr. BONNER. With the moneys now in the bill. We are asking for no additional money.

Mr. TABER. I do not see any great objection to that, to postpone it for 1 year. If the chairman felt that way about it, I would not feel too bad about it.

Mr. BONNER. I will read the statement from General Itschner's letter dated today to the chairman of the committee:

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington D.C., June 5, 1959.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Events of the past few days indicate the possibility that my memorandum to you dated May 25, 1959, should be supplemented to remove any misunderstanding. The purpose of that memorandum was to present to your committee all the available facts pertaining to the matter of continuing the Dismal Swamp Canal in operation, as well as to point out that continuing maintenance of the canal cannot be justified solely on the economics of commercial traffic. There are other important and significant considerations that Congress may desire to take into account in making its decision in the light of the appeals of local interests that this canal be maintained.

As discussed with you in your office some time ago, the Dismal Swamp Canal route is much safer in foul weather than the Chesapeake and Albemarle Canal route, because of the open water in Carrituck Sound and North River. The greater safety inherent in the Dismal Swamp Canal route is due to the fact that it is a sheltered channel. A narrow and well-defined route is especially important to the many small recreational craft that traverse the waterway. Often these vessels are piloted by inexperienced operators with their families on board. There exists the possibility of more accidents and the loss of life in navigating the more hazardous alternate route.

Another advantage of the Dismal Swamp route is its great natural beauty and the romance associated with its name. The history of the canal goes back to the early days of our Nation. I am certain that an appreciable proportion of the more than 1,400 recreational craft that use this waterway each year do so because they enjoy the beauty of the primitive area adjacent to the canal. The remainder probably use it for safety reasons, as indicated in the previous paragraph. During this period when much consideration is being given to the establishment of a national park along the old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, Congress may desire to consider retaining for the same reasons another canal, equally historic and beautiful, already owned by the Federal Government.

Elizabeth City is so located that traffic using the Chesapeake and Albemarle Canal route would not likely put into Elizabeth City for repairs and servicing unless the Dismal Swamp Canal route were open. It would involve about a 50-mile roundtrip to Elizabeth City from the Chesapeake and Albemarle Canal route. There can be no question that closing the Dismal Swamp Canal would cause a serious economic loss to Elizabeth City and other smaller communities along the route. This is especially true of a rather large boatbuilding and repair yard in Elizabeth City, which would be deprived of a substantial amount of business. This boatyard had important contracts to construct small vessels in World War II. The closing of two Federal installations in the immediate vicinity of Elizabeth City has had a serious adverse effect upon the economy of this area, and the closing of the canal would be a third blow.

There also may be some misunderstanding as to the import of the table of costs given in paragraph 12, "Rehabilitation," attached to my memorandum. I was impressed during my inspection that the bulkheads which line long reaches of the canal are in different stages of deterioration. The estimate of $500,000 for bulkhead repairs and replacements appears reasonable, but this work can, and probably should, be spread over perhaps 10 years. Some of it, especially where U.S. Highway 17 runs immediately alongside of the canal, should be started as soon as funds can be obtained, in order to protect the highway, which is already threatened in some places. This highway protection work would be required if the canal were closed and the banks continue to erode.

I trust that the above information clarifies my earlier memorandum on this subject. I am, of course, available at any time you desire to discuss the matter.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Major General, USA Chief of Engineers.

That is something to think about. Would the gentleman from Missouri agree that this project be continued through 1960 with the funds now in the bill? We are asking for no additional appropriations. In other words, the lock masters and the lock attendants are going to be there. They have to keep them. This only says that you can tend the locks and let the boats through. That is all it does.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the gentleman, I might say there is $130,000 already available without any action by the Congress which will carry it through December.

Mr. BONNER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. And that is without any action on the part of the Congress and without any commitment from the committee.

Mr. BONNER. Would you be agreeable to carrying it on through the fiscal year 1960 with the funds now available?

Mr. CANNON. I have no choice. They have the money there.

Mr. BONNER. You would have no objection?

Mr. CANNON. I can only express my personal opinion. I cannot speak for the committee.

Mr. BONNER. I am not asking for additional money. That the Engineers be permitted to operate this fiscal 1960 with the funds provided in this bill, I am asking and the Engineers point out this can be done with certain changes in the lock shift. That is a discontinuance of one shift and rearrangement of the other two.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman already has the money available, the $130,000.

Mr. BONNER. And it is all right then to operate the canal through 1960 with this money?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. BONNER. It would be agreeable to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], I am sure.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no objection.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I learned the old and wise saying when I was brought up that when you are trying a lawsuit, when you had won your case, you should stop.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate that sound advice and yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. I am glad the gentleman from North Carolina has brought this matter up. We have worked together closely and I fully subscribe to the statements he has made. I am delighted too that members of the committee have expressed themselves. We can now look forward to uninterrupted operation of this canal.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend this committee. They have always been very courteous to me and to the other people who have appeared before them. Their job is a very tedious and difficult one. I do not envy them their task. Iowa has been very fortunate through the years to have a Member on this subcommittee. He has done a wonderful job representing us and the rest of the people of the Nation. In the little time I have been here, I have become very fond of Chairman CANNON. His district joins mine and I am going to be talking about it. Of course, his every wish is my command. But I take this time in an effort to correct a grossly inaccurate picture that has been painted to the subcommittee over a period of time concerning the Rathbun Reservoir in Appanoose County 7 miles north of Centerville, Iowa. First, I would like to read from a letter I received in January from Gen. Keith R. Barney, Division Engineer, Missouri River Division, concerning this project. He states:

The Rathbun project was authorized in the Flood Control Act approved September 3, 1954, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 561, 81st Congress. The project provides for construction of an earthfill dam and appurtenant structures located about 7 miles north of Centerville, Iowa. The project, together with existing downstream channel works and presently authorized improvements, would provide a high degree of protection to agricultural areas along the Chariton River and would

assist in reducing flood flows along the Missouri River, and would also provide conservation storage capacity.

From the strictly engineering standpoint, considering this project by itself without reference to our overall program, our overall capability or fiscal considerations, an amount of $130,000 could be utilized in fiscal year 1960 for the Rathbun project for continuation of planning.

There has already been spent on this project about $85,000. It is not an expensive project as these projects go. The cost-benefit is 1.52 to 1.

According to the most recent survey made by the Corps of Army Engineers the total cost of the project is $20 million. The damage to this area by the floods of 1947 that initiated the work which later led to the authorization of the dam, the total damage in this area alone was $7,522,000. After that, and for a period of about 3 years, there was a drought. My purpose this afternoon is to bring especially to the attention of the committee the facts as to what has happened concerning this particular project.

It has come to my attention that one of the reasons for not continuing the authorization was that there was considerable opposition to the dam. During this period of drought it was possible for two men who were largely the backbone of the opposition to stir up considerable opposition to it. One of them is an engineer who had been fired by the city of Centerville and on his own has spent a lot of money to take revenge on this town and this area and has come back here time after time and testified to things that were exactly contrary to the testimony of the Army engineers. The question is, who are we to believe, this former city engineer of Centerville, who has an ax to grind, or the Army Corps of Engineers, who has no ax to grind?

The other gentleman who is in opposition is a farmer who harvests the slew grass up and down the river, about the only thing that will grow on the overflow land. He can get this grass from the farmers very reasonably by offering a small amount of money per acre to each farmer. This gentleman can harvest the slew grass and sell it at a very nice profit to stockyards who prize it very highly as a type of bedding that is superior for stock, because it is not so slick. As the dam is constructed, this very private business will be lost by the gentleman, and no one can blame him for opposing the construction of this dam.

Those, in addition to these stated, who have real reason to oppose the dam are the people who own homes or are farmers in the area that will be inundated by the water from the dam. These people deserve our every sympathy. In all projects of this kind these are the folks who oppose the project, and we cannot blame them. However, if they are reassured that the United States of America will not take their land from them without paying them its fair value and will help them in the problem of relocation in every way possible, then I am certain that it will alleviate a great deal of the suffering that comes from giving up homes, which they and their families have occupied for generations.

As I have stated, there was a period of drought from 1953 to 1955. During this period a part of this area was declared a disaster area by the Department of Agriculture, and, human nature being what it is, it was only natural that they should forget the disastrous years when they were flooded.

This year the floods have started again, and I should like to place in the RECORD at this point an article from the Centerville Iowegian, dated May 22, 1959, which is headlined "Old Man Chariton Goes on Rampage."

OLD MAN CHARITON GOES ON RAMPAGE

The Chariton River in southern Iowa and northern Missouri was either out of banks, or it was on the way to flood stage shortly before noon Friday.

The river was rising at the east river gage Friday at the rate of 1 foot per hour at 12 noon. Ray Kerschner, who makes the gage readings, said that at 11:30 a.m. the reading was 1½ feet above flood level or at the 21.5-foot level on the gage.

RECORD IN 1946

Kerschner said that the record flood level was recorded on the gage east of Centerville in June 1946, when it read 24.37 feet. The river started its rapid rise east of town at 5:30 a.m. Friday, and was showing no sign of leveling, having maintained a steady 1-foot-per-hour rise throughout the morning hours.

Further north, the river was out over wide sections of the bottom land. This flood originated in the upper reaches of the Chariton drainage system and is a result of the heavy rainfall received Wednesday night during the tornado weather that prevailed to the north and west of Centerville. Some areas reported 5-inch local rainfalls.

OUT DEAN-SEDAN

The river was out in the Dean-Sedan area inundating thousands of crop acres. One thing contributing to the flood is the fact that the ground is well saturated with moisture, and a good share of the rainfall now results in runoff.

There have been several floods on the Chariton this spring, mostly affecting the low-lying areas. This includes the hard-hit Dean-Sedan vicinity. However, this time the flood has all the aspects of being general in nature and if the rise continues Friday afternoon all areas up and down the river will be flooded.

May of 1950 was the last time that the Chariton had a general flooding, but it was a minor flood compared to many. In 1950 the river gage east of town reached the 21.95 feet stage.

A trip up and down the river reveals that thousands of acres of land have already been flooded, and that more will go under water as the rise continues.

RATHBUN DAM

It is speculated that a flood of this nature would have been largely avoided downstream if the Rathbun Dam were in service. This flood originated upstream in the upper reaches of the Chariton.

The Rathbun Dam fight is an old and familiar local battle. Those who oppose the project point out that no local flood of major consequences has occurred on the Chariton since 1947, 12 years ago. That period was a dry cycle. This year may mark the beginning of a wet cycle which might result in frequent Chariton flooding. No one knows the answer to that for sure.

The fields north of town on Highway No. 60 were under water early Friday morning. But on Highway No. 2, east of Centerville, the river was in banks until at least 11 o'clock except for low-lying areas.

PICNIC AREA

The roadside picnic area east of town near the Chariton was still dry at 10:30 a.m., though water was starting to surround it. This is one area that goes under during any severe Chariton flooding.

The Chariton Valley Development Association stated Friday morning that they would like to see the Rathbun Dam so that floods like this could be avoided. The Upper Chariton River Landowners Association vigorously opposes the dam on the basis that its cost-to-benefit ratio is not justifiable, that conservation practices could achieve flood control, and that the dam represents what they term a waste of public funds.

Pictures were taken and published in that same newspaper and these pictures graphically portray the tremendous flood damage that is being caused at this time. The floods this year have already destroyed the productivity of over 7,000 acres of cropland in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa alone.

The testimony before this committee by the Corps of Engineers has indicated that 70 percent of the damage caused by this present flood and the 1947 flood would have been prevented if the Rathbun Dam had been constructed. Clearly the cost-benefit ratio of 1.52:1 is justified, and very likely, in the next few years they will increase this ratio.

The need for such projects as the Rathbun Reservoir in Southern Iowa and Northern Missouri has, in recent years, become almost compelling. It is only through works such as these that a hitherto solely agricultural area and one of declining population can achieve the diversification necessary for continued economic stability in both industry and agriculture, not to mention the prevention of property loss in our river valleys due to flooding.

Rainfall is the major source of usable water in Iowa. There is water deep down in Iowa, but this supply, though abundant, is nearly always mineralized and is expensive to develop and refine. So, for the foreseeable future, Iowa must depend upon rainfall for the water supply. Fortunately, if we can make more of the rainfall stay in Iowa, we shall have enough for some time to come. The average rainfall in Iowa for the last 50 years is 31 inches. Presently, 6 inches of this 31 inches runs off, sometimes in the form of disastrous floods, and accounts for the streamflow which is carried from my State, sometimes to inflict damage upon Missouri to the south. Twenty to twenty-two inches of the annual rainfall is used in the growing of crops, and seven-tenths of an inch is used for all other purposes. But this "other purposes" use is increasing very fast and probably will double within the next 10 years.

It takes 6,000 gallons of water to produce one kilowatt hour of electricity. It takes 600,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of synthetic rubber at the Firestone Plant in Des Moines. It takes 10,000 gallons of water to produce a bushel of corn and 200,000 gallons to produce a ton of alfalfa hay. All of this often adds up to more water than we have got and shows up in a water shortage somewhere in Iowa nearly every year.

There are lots of other figures that could be quoted, none of which, however, are a source of comfort to people like myself concerned with this problem of water conservation.

The danger is plain to be seen, and if our States are going to exploit their resources to the fullest, conservation of our water resources must receive more and more attention. Clearly, any gain to be made must be made in the control of runoff, and runoff begins where the rain falls, which is from the land.

The possibilities of irrigated farmlands, wildlife conservation reserves, recreational facilities, and water supplies to support new industries, represents the highest hope for the future of the people of our area. Federal appropriations, even partial ones, at this time, will give renewed meaning to the efforts of those in my district who have worked unselfishly in behalf of these projects for as long as a decade.

There is not anyone who is more greatly in favor of a balanced budget than I am. I have been brought up to a way of thrift in my personal life, and, of course, this dictates my approach to the use of public funds. Still the budget in the first place must be sensible before it can be said to be good sense that we balance such a budget.

The Presidential budget left the project out completely even though it is not a new start. I want to commend the committee for having adopted a rule against the administration's false arguments that there should be no new starts.

This project is one of the projects that fit into the category of building America. I want to be on record in support of spending money that will build America, but at the same time, I oppose the expenditure of taxpayers' money that goes down a rathole and is wasted. It is the duty of this Congress to discern between the two and to assume the expenditure for the one and prevent the expenditure of the other.

I have not offered an amendment this afternoon because I am very certain that the appropriations for this project will be included and legislation passed by the other body; and it was my purpose to here correct the evidence in order that the members of the Committee on Appropriations from the House of Representatives, who are to represent the House of Representatives in the conference committee, will allow the appropriations to stand in the final bill to be passed by both Houses.

I hope and pray that you will see the wisdom of my request. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read subject to points of order and open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the chairman of the committee or the ranking minority member have any point of order to the remainder of the bill? If not, the Chair will recognize Members to offer amendments.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 8, line 5, strike out "$128,473,239" and insert "$128,973,239."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I submit the point of order comes too late. The Chair inquired if there were any points of order against the remainder of the bill, and then opened the bill for amendment.

Mr. CANNON. The amendment has just been read and I am reserving a point of order to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Missouri state his point of order?

Mr. CANNON. The point of order is that the project is unauthorized.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOGGS). The Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order without further discussion, because the amendment simply changes the amount of the bill without specific reference to any project.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in this form, because it is the only way by which the House can affirmatively do anything to correct the situation to which I have previously referred and to which no one has taken exception. I am not seeking to increase the money in this bill. I am simply seeking to further clarify the legislative situation arising as a result of the inadvertent language of the report. This bill does not contain any language which affects the project or the funds previously appropriated or has reference to them in anyway.

The report of the Appropriations Committee contains a sentence which states that the funds are eliminated because of the very condition imposed in the existing law passed last year. I submit, as I have previously said, that you cannot repeal statutory law in this fashion, and I do not feel that any member of the Appropriations Committee would contend that by a committee report they could repeal an existing statute. It is basic and seems to be conceded that the only way to repeal existing law is to have legislative action by both Houses of Congress and approval by the President which, when the process is complete, results in statutory law.

I certainly hope the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the other members of the committee will simply leave this appropriated item in status quo and not attempt by language in a committee report to change existing law. If we get into that practice I can see that it would hapen all over the Capitol with every committee on both sides of the building.

If there were money in this bill for this project, if the Bureau of the Budget had requested money or if I had requested money and the subcommittee on which I used to serve—and I know it is an arduous, difficult task to serve on this committee—if I had been denied I would not be here making this appeal at this hour of the day. But I am attempting to further correct the record to show that existing law cannot be changed by language in a committee report.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I hope that the Committee will accept the amendment.

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

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I must agree completely with the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]. He explained the situation to me shortly after the report came out. Certainly his contention must be approved by the Committee because of the very fact which he has brought out.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] is not in the habit of spending money recklessly. He has served on the Committee on Appropriations with great distinction, and he would be the last Member of the House to ask that something be done which was not completely right and justified.

Mr. BUDGE. I am indebted to the gentleman from Iowa for his remarks. I may say that if this were a personal plea for me or for my area, I would not be here in the well of the House at this late hour of the evening when most Members are not on the floor. I do feel it is a very fundamental thing, and the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States must insist that statutes and portions of statutes be repealed or amended by complete congressional action, including action by both Houses, and approval by the President of the United States. I sincerely hope that any question which there may be will be resolved by the adoption of this amendment. I know of no other way I can submit the question so that it can be corrected affirmatively. There is, as you know, no opportunity to move against the language in the report, and I certainly hope that the gentleman from Missouri and the Members present will feel affirmative action should be taken.

Should the amendment be defeated, however, I would most certainly not construe such action as negating the fundamental concept that an existing law can be amended or repealed only by legislation passed by both Houses and approved by the President. So far as I am aware, no one, in or out of the Congress, disagrees.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 45, noes 50.

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

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

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BUDGE and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 45, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I did want to announce that I had intended to offer an amendment to the bill, the amendment which I spoke earlier about in the day, but I have now decided to not offer that amendment at this time but to offer it in a motion to recommit on next Tuesday.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, there is a most urgent project which has been authorized by previous Congresses for the opening and widening of the Calumet Union Drainage Ditch, which serves communities in south Cook County, Ill.

My distinguished predecessor, the Honorable William E. McVey, worked diligently to obtain the authorization and had worked unsuccessfully to obtain the funds.

I am well aware of the need for establishing priority as well as the time which customarily passes before a project is funded; however, in view of the recent growth of communities in the area of the Calumet Union Drainage Ditch, specifically the city of Harvey, I feel that this project should assume a high priority rating. It is with a good deal of disappointment that the policy of "no new starts" made as a result of budget restrictions prohibited your subcommittee from approving my request for $716,000 for this project.

For the record, and for your further and, I hope, speedy consideration, I urge you to study the obvious needs and the value of this project which has the utmost local cooperation awaiting its commencement. Your consideration to my request would mean that you would be allocating funds in a most practical manner.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that H.R. 5709 contains provision for funds for the Dillon Dam and the Roseville flood-control projects in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio. The committee's action approving construction funds for both of these projects is most gratifying to the people of southeastern Ohio, who have for many years so sorely needed the flood protection they will provide.

A large and heavily populated area anxiously awaits the completion of the Dillon Dam on the Licking River above the city of Zanesville. This is the last major link in the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Muskingum River Valley. Without it, metropolitan Zanesville and the valley area south to the Ohio River at Marietta is exposed to the danger of periodic flood disaster which has been demonstrated with tragic consequences in the past.

Last January, as heavy rainfall swept across Ohio, the Licking River rose out of its banks and swept to its confluence with the Muskingum in the heart of Zanesville. Hundreds of families were evacuated from their homes, leaving their possessions behind to be destroyed by the muddy waters. I have been advised by the Corps of Engineers that had the Dillon Dam been completed and operating during this flood, essentially all of the $800,000 damage experienced in the Muskingum Valley below the mouth of the Licking would have been prevented.

Since I have been in Congress, I have fought to resume construction of the Dillon Dam, which had been virtually abandoned for a number of years. Since the first funds were provided a few years ago, work on the project has been rapid and each year the Congress has restated its faith in the value of the project by approving the full amount of the budget request. With the $5.16 million approved by the committee this year, the project will be brought to within 89 percent of completion during the 1960 fiscal year. This will be a long stride forward in banishing the specter of floods in the Muskingum Valley.

The Roseville project is for the purpose of local flood control of Moxahala Creek in the area of Roseville, Ohio. This work, authorized in 1938, has been justified fully by the floods visited upon this community, the consequences of which have been emblazoned in newspaper headlines throughout the country in years past. This year, the committee has approved $284,000 which would augment funds already appropriated to permit the completion of the project in the next 12 months.

Southeastern Ohio is grateful to the President and Congress for the interest and attention given to these two projects.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that H.R. 5709 does not provide any advance planning funds for the Belleville lock and dam on the Ohio River in fiscal 1960. This project is part of the Corps of Engineers' long-term plan to modernize existing locks and dams on the Ohio to facilitate navigation on the river.

The Belleville Dam has now reached a stage of development where advance planning funds could be effectively utilized. It is probably the next project to receive attention in the series of 15 replacement dams which the program contemplates. Six of these dams are already in the process of construction with completion dates scheduled for 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964. It seems logical that if the program is to be properly phased, preconstruction planning must be forthcoming at Belleville. Since there is no provision for such work in this bill, it must be delayed.

It is my earnest hope that the Department of Defense and the committee will see fit to recommend funds at an early date to assure that the Ohio River navigation can obtain the physical means of playing its full part in the economic development of the Nation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to the support of a Bureau of Reclamation transmission line in western Iowa which is provided for in the public works appropriations bill as reported out by the Appropriations Committee. This line will not serve my district. However, it will render such an essential service to western Iowa and is so sorely needed by that area that I urge its support.

There are five REA cooperatives in my district. Each one has gone on record urging the appropriations of funds for the construction of the line.

The making available of the low-cost power from the Missouri River to the cooperatives and municipalities of western Iowa cannot help but have a beneficial effect upon the rates which the cooperatives in my area will have to pay for the power they purchase at wholesale. I am informed by my cooperatives that the cooperatives and municipalities served by the proposed Bureau line will save in excess of $2¼ million in their cost of electric energy as a result of having Missouri River power made available to them by this line.

The great boon which will result to the economy of western Iowa from the availability of low cost power cannot help but strengthen the overall economy of the rest of the State.

Fortunately this line will be especially beneficial to the farmers affected. Our farm economy is in such sorry shape at the present time that I jump at the opportunity to cooperate in any action which might tend to improve it. Here is a chance to take action which will directly benefit the pocketbooks of a vast number of farm families without burdening the taxpayers at all. I have seen a Bureau of Reclamation study which shows that the preference customers who will buy power off this line will fully reimburse the Government for the cost of the line plus interest. In addition, the study shows that the line will make a profit for the Government of more than $12,000 per year.

Speaking for myself and the cooperatives in my district, I strongly urge the passage of the public works appropriations bill containing funds for this line.

I include my statement before the House Public Works Subcomimttee of the House Appropriations Committee in behalf of appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation transmission line into the Iowa marketing area, April 30, 1959:

Mr. Chairman: The 12 counties in eastern Iowa which I represent lie too far to the east to benefit directly from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines that are proposed for extension into western and northern Iowa. In spite of this, I would like to express my unqualified support of the proposal to bring Missouri River power into Iowa over Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines.

Between 1934 and 1959 the percent of Iowa farms receiving central station electric power has jumped from 14.4 to more than 93. This is a phenomenal accomplishment, but the job of REA and other suppliers of rural electric power, is not finished. Power use on our farms and in our cities is increasing rapidly and this calls for an ever greater supply of firm power.

At this time when the allocation of Missouri River Basin power is still in a formative stage, it would be a great injustice to the people and institutions of Iowa, which is bounded on the West by the Missouri River, if the power from that river basin cannot be made available to them.

It is my understanding that more than 350,000 Iowans would benefit directly if this low-cost power becomes available to about 30 municipal electric power systems and many rural electric cooperative systems in the area which would be served. Many more people would benefit from power that would be fed into the lines of the private facilities in the served area.

I am told that if the allocation of Missouri River power to Iowa were delivered to private utilities for transmission and distribution the benefits to the people would be greatly reduced. The costs of power to preference users (municipals, and rural electric systems) would be considerably higher than if brought in by the Bureau of Reclamation. The power companies would be unable to serve large areas which are envisaged by the Bureau of Reclamation proposal. Bureau lines would provide more capacity and greater flexibility for proper long-range planning. Committee studies of costs and service have shown that the Bureau of Reclamation lines are economically feasible.

As I stated in the beginning, my district will not benefit directly from the proposed transmission of power. I firmly believe, however, that if the Bureau of Reclamation lines are constructed, greater flexibility will result which will make it possible to firm up and provide peaking power when needed in the entire electric grid system in the State. Our cities, farms and industries need the guarantee of reliable power that the Bureau of Reclamation can provide.

Thank you for the opportunity of meeting with the subcommittee to present this statement.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a vital bill for the public safety and welfare of the Nation.

It embraces a wide range of projects designed to prevent disastrous floods, improve conditions in our river basins and harbors, and provide for the conservation and betterment of many of our national resources.

The committee has labored over a long period of time, has expended painstaking effort and has demonstrated a fine brand of statesmanship in reconciling many urgent national needs with the necessary demands of budgetary economy.

While the bill goes beyond the estimates of the executive budget, it does so in areas where the national interest and the interests of many States and communities require speedy action to insure the protection of human life and property from the ravages of periodic destructive, natural disasters.

On previous occasions in the House I have been prompted to express my deep and warm appreciation to the committee for the sincere concern it has displayed in providing in these annual bills for flood control and protection in my district, State, and area.

As chairman of the Massachusetts congressional delegation subcommittee on flood control it has been my duty and privilege to appear before the committee on numerous occasions in support of various parts of the great, comprehensive program of flood control which we found it imperative to formulate following the extremely costly floods affecting our region in 1955.

Our tasks in this emergency touched upon rehabilitation of afflicted areas and people as well as flood control.

In this urgent and extensive work many agencies, officials and individuals were enlisted all of which are entitled to our very sincere gratitude, in fact I have endeavored all too inadequately, I fear, at other times, to convey to all those who helped us in any way our sense of profound appreciation.

To the Army engineers, that great, efficient, well-conducted arm of our national defense working so effectively in this field we owe a very real debt.

To this committee which has not only so completely evaluated our desperate plight, but has moved with so fine a spirit of sympathetic understanding and effective support and cooperation to extend us relief and protection, I desire this time once more to emphasize our gratitude.

I sincerely believe that, in providing for new starts this year and thus eliminating the unfortunate Bureau of the Budget policy against them, the committee has shown wisdom and courage. It has also shown foresight and a truer apprehension of the real meaning of economy because few things could initiate against intelligent economy or be more calculated to promote and expand much heavier costs and expenditures in the future than the neglect now and deferral to a later date of projects that by every sound appraisal should be started now and in the interest of human life and property should be completed with maximum expedition.

I hope the bill will be promptly enacted by the House, and commend and thank the committee for the splendid job it has done on the bill.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the Appropriations Committee and its able chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], on the bill which they have brought before us and to urge its enactment.

It is exceedingly difficult to evaluate the flood control and reclamation needs of our great Nation, but I believe the committee has done an excellent and impartial job of meeting those needs without increasing the appropriations requested by the executive branch.

The people of the 14th California District, which I have the honor of representing, have an interest in a number of projects contained in the bill which we are considering. Two of the most important items are appropriations of $5,500,000 to finance the continuation of construction of Terminus Dam and $4 million for Success Dam, which also is in process of being built. These two flood control projects, both located in Tulare County, will provide protection for thousands of our citizens who in the past have been threatened with the loss of life and property every few years when the Kaweah and Tule Rivers overflow their banks.

The Terminus Reservoir, to be located on the Kaweah, will protect the city of Visalia from further flood damage, as well as countless other persons farther downstream. Success Reservoir will curb the Tule, which in the past has flooded the city of Porterville and an extremely large adjacent area.

I am also keenly interested in an item of $4,384,000 for the Saucelito Irrigation District under the loan program of the Bureau of Reclamation. These funds would be used for a loan to the Saucelito District to permit the construction of a distribution system which will dispense Central Valley project water to the district's irrigators. It should be emphasized that this loan will be completely repaid to the Government under the terms of a contract already agreed to between the Interior Department and the district.

The Saucelito District, located in Tulare County, has endeavored for a number of years to establish this distribution system. Our Appropriations Committee is to be commended for recognizing the compelling necessity for this appropriation and for including it in the bill.

Under Bureau of Reclamation Construction and Rehabilitation there is contained a line item of $42,150,000 for Central Valley project, California. I urge the approval of this item. Among other things, certain of these funds are earmarked for use in constructing distribution systems for the Teapot Dome Water District and the Stone Corral Irrigation District, both in Tulare County. The amount of $1,008,100 would be allocated to Teapot Dome and $300,000 to Stone Corral. In both cases the ditch systems would be built by the Bureau of Reclamation project costs of $1,800,000.

Also under the Bureau of Reclamation there is an item of $4,349,261 for general investigations. Of this amount, some $550,000 is scheduled to be used for continuation of feasibility studies on the proposed new East Side division of the Central Valley project. These studies seek to determine the most feasible means of transporting additional northern California water down the east side of the San Joaquin Valley to meet the pressing needs of water-deficient areas of Kern, Kings, and Tulare Counties. The water needs of the southern Central Valley become more critical daily and early relief is an absolute necessity.

I would also urge the retention of $1,500 which is made available in the bill for operation and maintenance of Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River.

H.R. 7509 is of great importance to the 14th California District as well as the entire United States and I urge its approval.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the public works appropriations bill for 1960 and I congratulate the chairman and the members of the committee for the manner in which they have completed a difficult job. I want particularly to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], for their interest in the New England projects in general, and the projects in my district in particular.

I am happy that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to include in this

bill substantial planning funds for the construction of two badly needed flood control dams in my district.

One of these is on the Mad River at Winsted and the other is on Hall Meadow Brook in Torrington.

In the disastrous floods of 1955, the tragic picture of the ravaged Main Street of Winsted was sent all over the country and is undoubtedly imprinted on the minds of many of the Members of this House.

From an industrial standpoint of view, the damage in Torrington was equally as great as the commercial and private damage in Winsted.

The two projects in question will be a guarantee that flood damage such as was visited upon my district in 1955 will never be possible again. Since this district from Derby to Winsted is an integral part of the American industrial arsenal both in war and in peace, the preservation of its economic health is a matter of national concern.

I must emphasize that the two projects scheduled to begin in 1960 are only part of a general plan which must be completed for the proper protection of the entire district. Other projects already approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors will have to be promptly completed to give the area the complete protection which it needs. I am working industriously to see that these new projects are promptly brought to completion.

In the meantime, however, the projects included in this bill constitute a substantial forward step in the completion of the overall plan. I am happy that they have been included and I know that the people of my district will appreciate to the fullest the interest in the economic and social stability of western Connecticut, which this House will demonstrate by the passage of the 1960 appropriations bill.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that I consider myself privileged to have taken a part, as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, in writing this bill under the able and patient leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. The work of this subcommittee is always voluminous and this year it was especially so as is evident from the 4 volumes and 4,222 pages of printed hearings. Your subcommittee sat many days hearing the requests of these various agencies as well as of the approximately 1,150 outside witnesses which included 243 Members of Congress. It was through the able and experienced leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that the subcommittee was able to complete this enormous task so expeditiously. It has been a pleasure to be associated with all the members of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on the majority side; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] on the minority side.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today is a good bill, a realistic bill and a measure that faces up not only to the present needs of our Nation for the development of our water resources, but also looks to, and prepares for, the future.

It is a bill that insures that this great program of water resources development which we have had underway for the past 25 years will continue in an orderly and uninterrupted program.

It is a bill with a truly national point of view which recognizes the needs of every area of our country and the different types of programs needed in the different regions, but establishes a program that is truly in the interest of the entire Nation.

It is a well-balanced bill which gives proper consideration to the needs for flood control, navigation, irrigation, harbor improvements, power production, and distribution, and all the other aspects of water resources utilization and development.

I realize that this bill does not have all the projects that all of us would like to have included. We cannot get this entire job done in 1 year or even in a decade. However, the bill as it is reported has distributed the available funds as widely as they can be utilized efficiently and within the overall budget limitations.

I want to associate myself very clearly with the decision of the subcommittee to appropriate funds for the 24 unbudgeted general investigations and for the 49 unbudgeted construction and planning starts in this bill. I do not go along with those who apparently believe that the principal function of the public works program is to provide employment in poor times, and that we should delay vital projects until economic necessity makes them necessary. We must look at our water resources program in a much larger perspective—as a positive program to develop the resources of our country and to lay a foundation for the continued growth of every region of our country. It is true that in times of recession, such as we experienced a year ago, we can and should accelerate civil works to provide a needed stimulus for economic conditions; and on the other hand, that during a period of economic upturn we can remove these accelerating factors. But, we cannot run a water resource development program on a "stop and go" basis. We must have an orderly and well planned continuing program of surveys, of planning and construction. On this basis our country can go forward on a more economical and sound basis.

The "no new starts" policy with which your Appropriations Committee was faced when the budget was submitted to the Congress by the President is both unwise and unrealistic. As the committee report points out, if it were continued it would lead to a drying up of the water resources program of the Nation. It bespeaks a lack of conviction about our water resources policy which we have previously seen evidenced in many other ways—the so-called partnership policy, the cutting off of appropriations for the TVA and Bonneville, the vetoing of authorization bills, and the lack of enthusiasm for the REA program and water resource development in general.

Even more unrealistic was the policy restricting surveys and planning of new projects. It takes many years to make and complete intelligent and prudent surveys, and additional years for making plans for efficient projects. Stopping surveys and planning might very well lead us into a position where in a sudden emergency we would be forced into hurried surveys and planning where the possibilities for costly mistakes and errors would be greatly multiplied.

Last year when we were called upon to increase our public works programs we had a lesson in the value of having well-planned projects on the shelf that could be placed under construction on an accelerated basis, but without wastefully hurried planning. The amounts budgeted for new surveys and planning in this bill this year are modest indeed, and insure a continuation of construction on an orderly basis.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill, I am pleased to say that our four great Federal power agencies, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Southeast Power Administration and the Bonneville Power Administration, will be enabled to go forward with their excellent programs and continue to make their fine contributions in the public interest of the entire Nation.

In connection with the TVA, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that recently we debated on this floor the matter of congressional review of the TVA's corporate budget in connection with the passage of the TVA self-financing bill. I would like to call attention to the fact that the committee this year, as every year, has carefully considered not only the TVA's request for appropriations but also its entire obligation program, including the corporate budget—the expenditures it is making with the receipts from its power revenues. As a result of this consideration, the committee has expressed the opinion, as stated in the report on page 27, that the obligation program submitted in the justifications of both directly appropriated funds and corporate funds represents a well-balanced and reasonable program for the Authority in the coming fiscal year. Those who have read the hearings on the TVA will note that this opinion is based on a very thorough interrogation of the officials of the TVA on both the appropriation and the corporate budget.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this is a truly national bill which gives full consideration to the problems of every State and every region and successfully relates them to the public interest of the entire Nation. I urge my colleagues to accept the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee and vote this bill as reported.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sun-

dry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments 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. BOGGS, 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. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Passman amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Johnson amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out "$658,300,100" and insert "$658,800,100."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. Must I submit my motion to recommit, which I just spoke of, today, in order that it will be in order when we come to a vote next Tuesday?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot offer it until after the bill has been ordered to be engrossed and that would be after these amendments had been voted on.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that, but I wanted the information now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has it.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until next Tuesday.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader if Tuesday of each week has now become the voting day each week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman got an explanation from the distinguished majority leader yesterday as to the reason for yesterday and today. I think that is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. GROSS. Then I would not be right in assuming that from here on we are going to vote on Tuesday of each week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I would not admit that there is any justification for any assumption, but I can assure the gentleman that his personal assumption would be correct, that it will not be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 7509.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOW ABOUT ADOPTING A SENSIBLE DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICY RATHER THAN CONTINUALLY RAISING INTEREST RATES?

Mr. REUSS. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is about to ask Congress to raise the 4¼ percent interest ceiling on new issues of marketable Treasury bonds which has been on the statute books since 1918. This is entirely consistent with the administration's one-track economic policy of constantly hiking interest rates on the national debt, and on everything else.

I yesterday introduced House Concurrent Resolution 196. This morning's Wall Street Journal carries a story which both describes House Concurrent Resolution 196, and sets forth President Eisenhower's views on debt management policy:

The President's latest effort on behalf of the still officially secret legislative proposals came yesterday before a conference of business magazine editors. He coupled his plug for greater Treasury freedom with a sharp attack on a Democratic counterproposal attempts to force the Federal Reserve System to keep interest rates low by buying Government securities. Such a scheme was introduced in the House yesterday by a leading liberal Democrat, Representative REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

Mr. Eisenhower declared, "If the U.S. Government is not to be in a position to compete with every business and every worthwhile economic activity in managing our $285 billion debt, we are going to be in trouble, particularly if we are denied the right to bid on a business basis—that is at realistic interest rates. We cannot resort to artificial forced methods and still keep our own confidence and the confidence of the world in the American dollar."

"There is one method which is too often advocated for keeping the bonds at a nominal par (face) value. That is to force them upon a central bank—make the central bank purchase them. Well, that's a very fine system if you can make it work. But since the effect of the buying of our bonds by the central bank (the Federal Reserve) increases the amount of credit, the result is inflationary. No country ever has made such a plan work over a long period."

The President began his campaign for legislation revising the interest rate ceiling at a secret White House session last Monday night. He called in, along with Treasury Secretary Anderson, financial and political leaders of both the House and Senate to lay the problem before them. Since then, it's understood, Mr. Anderson has been working quietly behind the scenes with key lawmakers in an effort to smooth the way before making specific proposals public. Mr. Eisenhower opened his public drive at his press conference on Wednesday.

The first concrete sign of the Democratic counterattack came yesterday with the Reuss resolution. His proposal states that whenever the Federal Reserve felt an expansion in the money supply is needed, it should, to the maximum extent possible, achieve this through the purchase of Government securities, rather than a lowering of member bank reserve requirements. Reserve requirements are the percentage of their deposits that FRB member banks are required to keep on hand and govern the amount of credit they can extend.

The President's central defense of his monetary policy is contained in his key sentence:

Since the effect of the buying of our bonds by the central bank (the Federal Reserve) increases the amount of credit, the result is inflationary.

The President is apparently unaware that the Federal Reserve has just been solemnly assuring the Congress that this country needs an expansion of credit, to take care of an expanding economy at a rate of around 3 percent a year—some of us think it should be at a rate of 4 or 5 percent, but that is beside the point here—and that this needed expansion of credit should be obtained by lowering member bank reserve requirements, thus giving them a greater credit-creating capacity. The Fed rejects the method advocated by House Concurrent Resolution 196 of expanding credit, where it needs to be expanded, by Federal Reserve purchases of U.S. securities.

Both methods are identical in their monetary effect. One is not one whit more inflationary than the other. On the Fed's assumption—which happens to be correct—that we need to expand our money supply, neither is inflationary at all.

The big difference is that the administration's method of expanding credit—by lowering bank reserve requirements—has as its sole justification increasing the earnings and dividends of member banks. The Federal Reserve not only admits that this is its position, but it glories in it.

The method of creating needed increases in bank credit advocated by House Concurrent Resolution 196 is through Federal Reserve purchases, consistent with a sound monetary policy, of Government securities. This method

prevents undue downward fluctuations in the prices of Government securities, and thus adds to their attractiveness to investors. It can save uncounted millions of dollars to the taxpayer in the carrying charges of the national debt. And it minimizes the strain on the Treasury suffered by attrition—where a U.S. security holder refuses to take a refunding security, and demands cash.

This business of interest rates and bank credit and monetary management and reserve requirements is so complicated for Members of Congress, including myself, that the temptation is to sweep it under the rug and ignore it. If you are a Democrat, the easiest way out is to holler about tight money. If you are a Republican, the easiest way out is to talk like Ike and claim that it is inflationary for the Federal Reserve to do anything constructive about how we manage the national debt.

It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we all buckled down to the hard task of seeing whether there is not a way to practice sound monetary policy and at the same time do what we can to make our national debt manageable. House Concurrent Resolution 196 seeks to do this. I hope that it will be considered on its merits, not only by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, to which it has been referred, but as an amendment to the administration's escapist proposals to solve everything by paying higher and higher interest rates.

STARVATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the starvation of public school education is a national crime. A shocking statement? Yes, because millions of Americans have not yet faced up to the fact that education is the orphan of American society, shunted aside and neglected because of our preference for materal comforts and luxuries.

There are many clear thinking and conscientious local school boards—but not as many as there should be—that know this to be true. "But where are we going to get the money to save our schools?" they ask. On this point, they are right. The limited sources of local revenue are not equal to the task. As a result, both the facilities and the standards of elementary and secondary education are steadily deteriorating.

The communities and the States ask the Federal Government to cooperate in meeting this problem, by providing the extra money that is needed. They have reached the end of their rope.

Basically, the people of the United States are to blame for the serious predicament of our public school system. We want good schools, but we will not dig down to support them. Other things come first. We think nothing of going into debt to the tune of tens of millions of dollars, stretching and straining our credit to buy adult toys and to satisfy every passing whim, to be paid for through future earnings.

But when it comes to education, we become immediate converts to the doctrine of austerity. "Where is the money now?" we ask. "Perhaps there is some room where we could economize." Soon after, with gay abandon, we manage to find money for such necessities as stock-market speculation, among others.

The haste and confusion and distractions of American life may help to explain why the warnings have gone unheeded in the past. They do not excuse further indifference now that the National Education Association, the AFL–CIO, and many Senators and Representatives are demanding action.

This problem is far ahead of many communities and their limited financial resources. It is now up to the Federal Government.

The malnutrition of our educational system is starkly revealed in the following facts:

First. There is a classroom shortage of 140,000 units in the United States today. On the basis of 30 pupils to a classroom, this means that 4,200,000 youngsters are being denied the proper facilities for their education.

Second. There is a teacher shortage of 135,000 because trained and qualified young men and women see no hope in this honorable profession that has been impoverished by substandard salaries.

We, in the Congress, have the opportunity, and the duty, to save our public schools, which are the foundation of our freedoms and our progress.

H.R. 22 provides the authorization and the formula that, over a period of 4 years will close the educational gap and thereafter enable our schools to keep up with the expanding school population.

This bill guarantees that there shall be no Federal intervention in schools, the curriculum, and the instructional program. Federal funds will supplement, rather than replace, current expenditudes by States and local school districts.

At the present time, the Federal Government contributes only 4 cents out of every dollar of revenue for the support of public schools below college level.

The starvation of public school education is not a condition that can be remedied by looking the other way. Unless and until it is corrected, it is a national crime.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago today and tomorrow occurred an event that changed the history of the world. Fifteen years ago today many senior Members of the House were well aware of this impending event. Fifteen years ago tomorrow, as the House assembled, the tickers and radio were telling the world, "A landing was made on Normandy Beach this morning." Some Members now in the House no doubt clustered about in the cloakroom, asking about the latest reports on the landing. To what event do I refer? The D-Day landings on Normandy Beach, the mightiest invasion armada in the history of the world. This invading force under General Eisenhower was making the long hoped for invasion across the English Channel to destroy Hitler's domination of Europe. Normandy Beach landing had been talked of for months, even by the soldiers in the ranks. The question discussed was this, "Can an invasion be made of Hitler's Europe across the English Channel?"

The crossing of the stormy Channel and the opening of the front on European shores had been in the planning stage by English and American top staffs for over 2 years. Immense stocks of shipping, aircraft, and tanks had been assembled and placed at various ports of England. These top planners finally selected 50 miles of coastline on the northwestern Normandy coast of France from the Vire River to the Orne. By June 1944 a million and one-half American men in the Armed Forces were stationed in England. There were over 2,500,000 tons of Army supplies ready for the grand invasion across the Channel. This whole operation's code name was Neptune.

Today, most military experts now say such an invasion could not possibly happen again because one well-placed H-bomb could wipe out any such attempt.

For months preparations had been going on in England by the assembling of forces and materiels. The country roadsides throughout rural England were stockpiled with ammunition and aerial bombs of all shapes and sizes. American troops were in every village and hamlet. Everyone in the Army knew this Channel crossing was coming but when and where was the question. From the warm days of April on every little extra movement of troops or materiel was the cause of much speculation, with the open remark "Maybe this is it." Then came the orders and schooling on how to prepare your vehicles for "wading water." Long additional exhaust pipes were issued for the wading. With the coming of May 1944, troop stations seemed to be gradually shifting southward and southeastward toward the eastern and southern coast of England.

Then officers from higher headquarters began to make their visits more often to the troop areas. These visiting officers would come up and ask of officers who commanded battalions, groups or regiments, "Are you bigoted?" If you answered "Yes" they stayed and talked, if you said "No" they left. "Bigot" was the code word for those officers who were to be told of the preliminary plans of the invasion.

Later, some 10 days in advance of D-day, officers holding "bigot" cards were assembled quietly in a beat-up theater in Plymouth, England. As we went in through the door, an American colonel said, "There will be no coughing, this is General Montgomery's order."

There was no coughing. Monty, the beret-wearing field commander of all allied forces making the landing, had spoken. He told us what we were expected to do, but no hint was given as to where we would land.

A week before D-day all invasion troops were sealed in their camps. No one was allowed in or out, mail was stopped, we just waited; then began the movement to the embarkation point quietly, silently; soldiers, waterproofed guns, trucks and rolling equipment were put on LST's and other landing craft; then the troops just waited on board their landing-type vessels for the final movement across the English Channel.

On the 4th of June, the anchor chains began to groan, ships began to move away from the docks and place of anchorage. Ships were soon outside the Plymouth Harbor and began to move into the formation of one long line. About noon there was a sudden slowness in the movement of the ships; they stopped, finally turned around; the air of expectancy on board the ships of this channel armada vanished; men said with a disgusted air, "Just another dry run."

But early next day, June 5, the ships again put out to sea; the weather was clear and toward evening the low scudding clouds filled the sky and more and more iron gray naval ships made their appearance in countless slow-moving lines of ships that stretched across the horizon.

As night settled down the men knew they were closer to the shores of France than England. The common word now was, "This is it." Not many men slept in these packed jammed ships of men, vehicles, and supplies of war.

Men and officers had been briefed on their part of the impending invasion, after they were on board ship. Code names were used to indicate the various units' positions on their approach to the beach. The names used were not the storybook kind of names we used to read in our histories. The Normandy Beach where these men were to land was called Omaha and it was divided up into sections called Dog Green, Dog Red, Fox Red, and Fox Green. Men never before died on battlefields with such common and lurid names.

With the coming of the dawn and June 6 light, every man aboard the ships knew this was no dry run because guns from hundreds of Navy ships started pounding the shoreline. Planes overhead started dropping wave after wave of bombs. As the landing craft approached the shoreline to unload men and cargo no other word or phrase is adequate to describe what happened except to say "All Hell Broke Loose." All up and down this beachline geysers of water spouted up. Black smoke filled the air, noise that only thousands of guns of all calibers that are all being fired at once filled the air, along with smoke, shrapnel, and a light mist picked up by a breeze as the receding tidal water was churned by landing craft, bombs, and shrapnel.

Into this indescribable area of confusion, first on the water, then on sandy beaches filled with land mines and every conceivable kind of a device to keep soldiers from coming ashore, waded American soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, this is not spoken as a detailed history of the Normandy invasion, neither is it written to describe the Omaha Beach landings on Red Dog, or Dog Green sections. It is spoken by one who was there. I just want to pay tribute to the men who made this landing on Omaha Beach; and particularly to pay homage, tribute, and honor those men who still remain in a cemetery of St.-Laurent-sur-Mer, just above this Omaha Beach line in long rows marked by the white headstones of fallen American soldiers.

The boys who wore the Big Red 1—1st U.S. Division—of the 16th Infantry were the first to rush into this churning sea and onto the beach line. This division fabled in World War I as the Big Red 1 Division was again carrying the American flag proudly into battle on the Normandy Beach line. The Big Red 1 Division proudly attested and as soldiers are prone to do, boasted, "When they want a job done they call on the Big Red 1 Division to do the job so that others can follow." The division commander, Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Huebner, was a notable and distinguished soldier, not of West Point but from the ranks. Probably no other division commander in American military annals has ever served in all the ranks from private to major general within the division, yet General Huebner was in command of this division as it made the initial assault on this so-called impregnable battleline—Omaha Beach.

The units along with the 16th Infantry making this assault were the 18th Infantry, 26th Infantry, 116th Regimental Combat Team, and the 115th Infantry from the 29th Division. This strength in men was 34,142 and 3,306 vehicles. This gently sloping beach offered no protection to anyone or anything until the high bluffs some 400 yards away were reached. Over this perfect field of fire to the defenders, men and officers of the 16th Infantry made their notable effort. At four points along Omaha Beach small wooded valleys slope back inland and provided an exit from the beach. These indenting valleys were the key to getting off the beach and getting into the heart of the enemy defense.

Into these little valleys leading back to the small villages of Vierville, St. Laurent, and Colleville, the 1st Division—Big Red 1—finally reached their objectives. But in all this action the assaulting troops pressed forward. The 16th Infantry suffered 25 percent casualties in this action. But the Big Red 1 Division had again led the way for the American Army to help conquer Hitler's Europe. This division had led the way in World War I in a dozen breakthrough battles. From the Normandy Beach the division went through France, Belgium, and on into Germany—always leading the way. The Big Red 1 had been in the first American division to land in France in World War I and it has led the invasion in Africa in World War II.

The speaker was close by when the first American deaths in action occurred in World War I. They were Gresham and Hay of the 16th Infantry.

Tomorrow a monument will be erected up above Omaha Beach to the men who gave their all to this country. This is being erected in memory of the 29th Infantry Division, 116th Infantry.

Mr. Speaker, again may I say I have no other purpose but to stand here in this House of Representatives and pay tribute to the men of the Big Red 1 Division—1st Infantry Division—now stationed at Fort Riley, Kans.; and to the men of the 635th T.D. Battalion and to all those American soldiers who clambered up the deadly Normandy Beach just 15 years ago tomorrow, June 6, and who for the next 2 weeks knew only the smell of stinking gas-preventive clothing, K-rations, wet soggy blankets, and a steel helmet for a pillow, but through it all could smile and say, "On to Berlin."

Long live the spirit of the Big Red 1 Division. As warfare changes and new weapons are added, may the spirit and determination that always inspired the Big Red 1 Division be always present in our new Army; and may those who change our Army's weapons always remember that the spirit and esprit de corps of the man who pulls the trigger is still most important in winning any war.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CIVIL WORKS ACTIVITIES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, this entire legislative day has been spent considering H.R. 7509, the 1960 appropriations bill for public works. To me it is one of the most important bills that will be considered by the House during the current session. It is an important bill because, in reality, the projects for which funds are appropriated therein are investments in the future of this great country.

One of the most important provisions of the bill is that provision concerning the civil works activities of the Corps of Engineers. The projects contained in this provision of the bill, as well as other provisions of the bill, demonstrate

clearly that the United States of America refuses to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Instead, the cost of each of these projects will be repaid to the Treasury of this Government many times over by the prevention of the loss of hundreds of lives, severe property damage, and an expanding economy made possible by such projects as harbor improvements.

As an example of why we should act now to lessen the loss of the future, I point to one small item contained in the public works appropriations bill. I refer to the item which appropriates $10,000 for a survey of the Chagrin River which empties into Lake Erie near Eastlake, Ohio, and which river is located mostly within the boundaries of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to serve in this body.

Each year the Chagrin River overflows its banks and causes great damage to the inhabitants of the Chagrin River Valley. This river runs through an area which is perhaps one of the most rapidly growing areas in this Nation. Within a short distance of the Chagrin, thousands of people are locating their homes and industries are locating so as to be near the transportation facilities of the area. This section of Ohio is no longer farmland but is a booming industrial and residential district. If the Chagrin River is not controlled the damage in its valley will grow each year because of this increase in use.

The damaging effects of flooding by the Chagrin River were demonstrated even more vividly this past January when a sudden thaw prompted an unusually severe flood which resulted in the loss of five lives and property damage in the amount of $911,000.

This continuing annual flooding condition will only be eliminated when the Federal Government initiates a program of flood control in the Chagrin River Basin.

The amount of $10,000 is not large; however, the problem of this area cannot be solved without the original survey by the Corps of Engineers, so it becomes an absolute necessity to have the funds appropriated for the survey as soon as possible. This survey was authorized in 1952, but earlier efforts to secure the needed funds have not succeeded. The thousands of people affected by the Chagrin River join with me in thanking the House Appropriations Committee and the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee for including in this year's bill the sum of $10,000, which will finally bring about the beginning of the elimination of the dangers of floods caused by the Chagrin River.

If the legislation is favorably acted upon by both Houses of Congress, and signed by the President, I am sure that this survey will show an excellent cost-benefit ratio and that the corps will approve the project. If the survey is approved, I intend to do all I can as a member of the Public Works Committee and as a Member of this House to bring about the eventual construction of the necessary flood control project in the Chagrin River Basin.

I wish to extend my sincere thanks for the help of all those public officials and private citizens of the 11th Congressional District who have worked hard and will continue working hard to solve the problem of a flooding Chagrin River. I especially thank the mayors of Eastlake, Willoughby Hills and Willoughby for the hard work they have done in connection with this project.

I realize this is but one of the many worthwhile projects included in this year's bill and is only an example of one of the many fields covered by H.R. 7509, but it clearly demonstrates that the funds contained in this appropriations bill are investments in the future of the United States.

PHONY INFLATION SCARE USED TO DIVERT PUBLIC ATTENTION FROM BIGGEST CONSPIRACY OF BIG BANKERS AND BIG BUSINESS IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FLYNN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday while the Democrats were seeking, through debate, to appropriate money to prevent water pollution and to aid small communities in building sanitary districts and disposal plants throughout the country, the Republican whip bitterly denounced the Democrats as spenders and as a group of fiscally unsound people whose actions were causing inflation with all its dire consequences, to ruin our country and our economy.

Identical charges, varied as to wording and presentation, are being oft repeated by Republicans, the Republican press, the Manufacturers Association, the chambers of commerce, and other groups whose membership stands to benefit financially from Republican manipulation of our Nation's finances, public debt, interest rate, and foreign trade concessions. They also stand to gain from the actions of a congressionally uncontrolled Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve banks and the fact that they are secure in the knowledge that the occupant of the White House will not interfere with or crack down upon the private bank dominated group which controls the policies of the Federal Reserve Board and which is establishing the rate of interest on money and the value of money and bonds.

These charges about the Democrats are not true, but these false charges have been made so widely and so often that they have caused many thousands of our citizens to believe that the Democrats are dedicated to a spending program which will devalue the dollar through an inflationary spiral, and bring ruin to our economy.

While the public mind is in a state of alarm, worry and distress, and fear over these utterly false charges, and while it is thus diverted from the machinations of the Republican high command in conjunction with big finance and big business—this trio has callously pursued policies which are fallacious, ruinous, and so economically unsound and unfeasible that they make one wonder whether they have any knowledge at all of what they are doing to our beloved country.

PRESIDENTIAL FAILURE TO CONTROL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN has explained in recent weeks to the Members of this House that former President Truman called the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve bank to the White House and negotiated an arrangement whereby the Federal Reserve bank, which is owned by the people of this country, would support the public debt of this country as bonds were periodically offered for sale by the Treasury of the United States. These bonds sold at from 1 to 2½ percent interest. This policy was continued until the waning days of the Truman administration when his influence was not as great as earlier. While this policy continued, the interest rate on the debt of this Nation did not exceed 2½ percent; public bonds retained their full value of 100 cents on the dollar. Private money was available in our banks at from 4 to 5 percent and mortgage money could be secured without payment of points to the lending institutions at 4 and 4½ percent. There was no such thing as financial institutions demanding and collecting on FHA or VA loans, guaranteed by the U.S. Government from 5 to 12 points—5 to 12 percent of the loan—for the making of the loan.

When President Eisenhower entered the White House and even before he got there, when it became apparent that there would be a new man in the White House in 1952, the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve bank went on strike against the people of this country and refused to support the bond market of this Nation. When bonds were offered for sale at the going rate of interest, the Federal Reserve bank, through its various manipulations, forced up the rate of interest on the public debt by approximately 2 percent. This has been the most costly strike in the history of the United States. Yet not one word is said about the financial strike of the Federal Reserve bank against the people of the country. The Federal Reserve bank is owned by the Government. It was created in 1913 and is in effect an arm of the Government to whom it appears Congress has delegated its constitutional duty of regulating and controlling the value of money. If Government bonds are sound and secure, as I believe they are, and in a stable and expanding economy, as we had before the Federal Reserve bank strike, I know of no justifiable excuse or reason for the Federal Reserve bank and its members to refuse to support the Government bond market at the rate of interest formerly carried by said bonds. I charge that their action was designed to force the Government to increase the interest rate in order to increase the profits of the bankers. The effect on this country has been that we are this year paying an additional interest over what we formerly paid of approximately $5 billion. This is in addition to the normal interest of approximately $4½ billion. Thus, the payment of this huge additional sum of money by the tax-

payers, for which they get nothing in return, has an inflationary effect upon our economy. This was not brought on by Democratic policies but by the refusal of a Republican President to act in the interest of the people.

The further effect of the Federal Reserve bank strike was that it forced the value of Government bonds down. They now are as low as $82 on the $100, and the longer before maturity the less the value. The top rate that the Government is permitted to pay for interest on Government bonds is 4¼ percent. Government bonds are either selling at or reaching that limit today and the Republican administration, as expressed by the Republican whip on the floor of the House of Representatives yesterday, and as reported generally in the press, is demanding that the interest rates be increased. I am certain that the Democrats will never agree to such an increase in interest.

This rather tricky plan of the bankers in controlling the Federal Reserve bank, has resulted in huge profits to the bankers, and has made it possible for the 13,000 banks of our country, in most cases and if they so desire, to completely and entirely avoid the payment of Federal income taxes. It works this way: The bank at the end of the year determines the amount of Federal taxes it will owe, and sells enough Government bonds at the going rate of—say $82 on $100—to create a capital loss equal to the taxes due. The loss offsets the tax and the bank ends up by getting rid of its low yielding bonds and entirely avoiding taxes. The bank then reinvests the money received from the sale of the bonds in 4¼ percent bonds and over the next 10-year period reaps a profit in addition to the taxes saved of over 100 percent in excess of what the taxes were, so that if the bank owed $20,000 in taxes it would end up the 10-year period without paying any taxes for the year involved, and with a net amount of close to $50,000 in profit. Let me give you the following example as to bank A and bank B: One of the banks paid his taxes and the other took advantage, as most banks are doing, of the Republican-sponsored bankers "steal":

BANK A	BANK B
1. Bank A owns $1,500,000,000 in Government bonds at 2¼ percent.	1. Bank B owns $1,500,000,000 in Government bonds at 2¼ percent.
2. Bank A owes Federal income taxes for the year 1959 from commerical operations on the sum of $180,000.	2. Bank B owes Federal income taxes for the year 1959 from commercial operations on the sum of $180,000.
3. Bank A has 2¼ percent Government bonds with 10 years to run before maturity which have dropped to market value of $82 to $100.	3. Bank B has 2¼ percent Government bonds with 10 years to run before maturity which have dropped to market value of $82 on $100.
4. Bank A sells $1 million worth of its bonds at $82 receiving $820,000; thus taking a capital loss of $180,000.[1]	4. Bank B sells no bonds.
5. The above sale made it possible for bank A to set the capital loss off in full against its profit and thus avoid completely the payment of any income taxes on 1959 earnings.	5. Bank B paid on $180,000 in taxes to the U.S. Government.
6. Bank A reinvested the $820,000 in 4¼ percent Government bonds due in 10 years. Bank A also invested the money saved on taxes which was about $90,000—thereby owning $910,000 worth of 4¼ percent bonds due in 10 years.	6. Bank B continued to hold its bonds and continued to receive 2¼ percent interest thereon for the next 10 years.
7. Bank A received $38,670 interest on these bonds—in 10 years, received $386,700 in interest and at maturity received the principal of $910,000 plus the interest of $386,700 for a total of $1,296,700—and paid no taxes in 1959.	7. Bank B collected $22,500 per year in interest on its $1 million worth of bonds—in 10 years, $225,000. It also received back its principal so that during the 10-year period, it received $1,225. Bank B, however, had had to subtract the taxes paid in 1959 on the sum of $180,000 and thus ended up with a net balance of $1,135,000.

8. If you subtract the difference between interest received by bank A and bank B:

Bank A	$1,296,700
Bank B	1,135,000
Profit to bank A	161,700

You can see that by bank A taking advantage of the Republican sponsored bank steal, it has avoided taxes in 1959 and over a 10-year period has, as a result of this manipulation, earned $161,700 more than the bank which paid its just taxes to the Government.

9. This sum of $161,700 can be multiplied by the big banks, by every $180,000 worth of taxable income that they owe.

10. All of the savings made by the thousands of banks in the country taking advantage of Republican boondoggling are doing so at the expense of the taxpayer and the policy has a definite inflationary effect upon the economy.

[1] Banks are one exception to the 50-percent rule on deductions of capital losses.

The above boondoggling, tax avoidance scheme, was made possible by policies inaugurated by the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Bank, by the strike of that bank against the Government, by the ratification, approval, and support of the policies by the President of the United States and his top Republican advisers. All of these people with a straight face said we must keep the dollar sound. We must protect the public from the spendthrift policies of the Democrats. While doing this, they inflicted on the American people the obligation of paying the extra $7 billion in interest on the public debt, to make the bankers wealthy. They caused the American people to suffer loss in value on all Government bonds which the private citizens were holding, and to suffer from the inflationary effects that were caused by this Government being forced to pay, not only one year, but years to come, this additional $5 to $7 billion in added interest.

The bankers and the Republican administration, while perpetrating this heinous action on the American people, have continuously attempted to divert the public mind from what was happening and to do so have used every known device at their command. They have engaged in a propaganda campaign accusing the Democrats of big spending and inflationary tactics. They apparently hope by so doing to be able to blame the Democrats for their action and to secure the vote of a deceived John Q. Taxpayer in 1960.

Just what spending do the Republicans say the Democrats are guilty of. So far in this session, the Republicans have accused the Democrats in the House of spending $300 million more on the housing bill, which includes urban renewal, slum clearance, college dormitories, homes for the aged, nursing homes, and so forth, than the Republicans proposed and $200 million on an airport development bill more than the Republicans proposed. They fear that there may be a few more such bills before the session is over—let us concede that there may and that the total of these bills may exceed the Republican proposals by $1 billion. Let us remember that these bills are all bills going for the benefit of the great majority of the American people. Does anyone believe that $1 billion in the budget could possibly be ruinous to the American economy? Of course it could not. This $1 billion would be as of nothing if it were not for the wastrel, unsound giveaway programs of the Republican administration which is costing this country billions upon billions of dollars. If we can afford to spend $4 billion in foreign aid, can we not afford to invest $1 billion in the welfare of the people of America and in the development and improvement of our country?

Let me also remind you that in this session of Congress, the Democrats have already reduced the President's budget proposals by over $1 billion and that in the last 6 Republican years, the Democrats have reduced the budget recommendations of the Republican administration over $12 billion. Let me also remind you that in 6 years under Harry

Truman, this country met its obligations and paid its own way, and in addition thereto reduced the public debt by $3½ billion. While, under the first 6 years of the Eisenhower administration, we have failed to live within our income, even though the people, during said period, have paid in taxes to their Government $150 billion more than they paid during the comparable 6 years that Harry Truman was in office. In addition to this, the Republicans have spent all of this money and have run us into debt $19 billion and will charge up at the end of this month for the current fiscal year an additional sum of approximately $13 billion, and will, if our estimates are correct, on the basis of the current budget presented by the Republican administration, mark up another deficit at the end of the next fiscal year of approximately $12 billion. This means that under 8 years of Republican rule, 8 years of high income, and 8 years of peace, this Nation will have gone into debt approximately $44 billion. Let me remind you also that in the 10 years of the Roosevelt administration—from 1932 to 1942; years when the Democrats were charged with trying to spend themselves out of a depression, and years when the national income was only in the neighborhood of $4 billion as compared with the present national income of $77 billion—that this Nation only went into debt during these entire 10 depression years in the sum of $29 billion. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does it sound to you as if the Democrats have been fiscally unsound, spenders, and wastrels or unmindful of their obligation to the public? Does it sound to you as if the Democrats have or are betraying the public trust or the public confidence? Does it sound as if the Republicans are sincere in their constant plaintive cries of "Wolf" "Wolf" or does it sound as if the Republicans are diverting the public's attention while they tamper with the economics of the Nation and either foster or permit situations to develop that just happen to be of great financial benefit and profit to the banking fraternity of this Nation, who are predominantly Republican, and who aid greatly in the financing of the Republican campaigns?

If you will add the $5 billion of wasted Republican interest that this Nation is paying this year, to the billions that the Republicans are absolutely squandering through the maladministration of the Agriculture Department by a Secretary of Agriculture, who in his term is spending far more money than has been spent by the Department of Agriculture from the beginning of this country to the date that Secretary Benson assumed office as Secretary of Agriculture, you will have a huge sum of tax money, each dollar of which can be termed a Republican inflationary dollar. If you will add to this sum such money out of the foreign aid funds as may have been squandered or wasted in the administration thereof, and if you will add the approximately $4 million that the President is spending to run the White House, more than was spent by any other occupant thereof, you will see how Republican boondoggling, spending, and poor administration is responsible for the inflation which they say is upsetting and ruining the country and the economy.

If you will, in addition to this, consider the particular effect that the hard-money policy has had upon the business interests of this country, both large and small, and if you will consider how the small merchant has been forced by the thousands into bankruptcy in recent months because of this policy and how profits have been taken out of business, for the small businessman, and if you consider how the recession of 1957–58 brought on by the hard-money policies threw millions of men and women out of work for a long period of time; if you will consider how the small homeowner was denied the opportunity to secure a 30-year mortgage at 4-percent interest; or a VA mortgage, either with or without points paid to the banker, or even to be eligible for an FHA-insured mortgage, can you see how costly has been the Republican experiment into hard money and what a devious effect the banker-proposed and administration-approved current money policy of this Nation has had?

CURRENT REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL TO GIVE BANKERS $15 BILLION THROUGH ATTEMPT TO PASS THE VAULT CASH BILL IN THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker, if the above record of financial infidelity by the Republican administration were not enough to cause the red blood of every American man and woman to boil, then let me mention the issue which the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, is trying so hard to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Nation—I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the so-called vault cash bill which has already passed the U.S. Senate and which has been voted out of committee in the House, according to information which I have received, with only one dissenting vote. This bill, Mr. Speaker, will have the effect, according to many Members of this body, of giving $15 billion of the public's money, currently being held by the Federal Reserve bank, to the less than 7,000 member banks of the Federal Reserve System. This is nearly enough to give every man, woman, and child in the country the sum of $90 apiece. The only reason for doing this is to permit the banks to make more money. Is that a sound reason for giving away this huge amount of public assets? This money is invested in Government bonds and in lieu of the fact that the money is not needed by the Federal Reserve bank to stabilize the monetary system, these bonds should be turned back to the U.S. Treasury for cancellation, and we will then have retired $15 billion of the public debt, and we will save the interest thereon.

INFLATIONARY EFFECT OF VAULT CASH BILL

Mr. Speaker, let me also remind you that the net effect of reducing the reserves of member banks in the Federal Reserve System by $15 billion through the vault cash bill is to free billions of dollars for the banks, which will have the effect of permitting the banks to issue new bank credit of many billions of dollars. This is exactly what the administration states they have been trying to avoid. They state they can only curb inflation through increasing the interest rate of the Federal Reserve bank, and through increasing the reserve of member banks so as to cut down the supply of money. By passing the bill and permitting the increase of money supplied to the extent of many billions, they will be engaging in the most inflationary tactics that have been suggested by any individual or agency. This, Mr. Speaker, should prove to the country that the Republican administration is not concerned about inflation, and it should show that they do not believe the country is suffering from inflation, but rather that they are well aware of the fact that the Consumer Price Index has remained fairly stationary for the past 2 years and that the only trouble with the economy is manipulation and tinkering for the benefit of special private interests, both banks and other interests.

Mr. Speaker, I state at this time that I feel there is little that this Congress can do to force the executive branch of the Government to pursue a set of policies that are economically sound. It appears that the only hope is an informed and aroused electorate who will not be fooled by the pious statements of chambers of commerce and manufacturers associations officers, by the Republican Party or the bankers association—to the effect that we are engaged in an inflationary spiral brought on by wasteful spending on the part of Democrats—or that the small difference between what the administration proposes to spend in the interests of the people and what the Democrats propose to spend in the interests of the people could have any real effect on the economy—or that it could produce inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I state that if we can secure a Democratic President in 1960, backed by a large enough majority in Congress to support his program, we will be able to force back the interest rate to a reasonable figure; we will be able to quit giving away the public assets to private interest; and we will return to a program of sanity where we both tax and spend reasonably and moderately, and where the administration in power will stand or fall on the basis of the affirmative record it makes in the interests of the people, as it did during the days of Roosevelt and Truman—and not on the basis of a negative program, by spreading fear and propaganda against the opposition party.

Mr. Speaker, before closing let me say further that this administration is sponsoring a "Buy European" program and is encouraging American business to set up branches in foreign countries. I warn that this program and these policies can be and are now being carried far beyond a reasonable limit. In the department stores of this Nation today, a large part of all the merchandise on the shelves carries a ticket, "Made in Germany," "Made in Japan," or in some other country. The administration proposes that 12,000 fishing vessels be purchased from foreign shipyards. The Fairbanks-Morse Co. in my district makes the majority of the powerplants

which go into these fishing vessels. This "Buy European" program would be abhorrent to the people and to the industry of most congressional districts in the Nation. I do not say that we must not have free trade, or that we must not buy in Europe if we expect to sell in Europe—neither do I ask for a high protective tariff—but I do ask that quotas be established in order that Finnish and Danish cheese may not flood the American market at the expense of farmers in my district without any limit thereon; and that similar European products should flood the market in competition with the industries located in this or any other congressional district, without some reasonable limitation being placed on the size of these imports, is beyond a reasonable limit. Can we not have independently negotiated trade pacts which will guarantee a fair balance of trade with the United States permitting European nations to ship reasonable amounts of produce to this country and creating a friendly trade atmosphere between us and the rest of the world without ruining numerous American industries and without ruining the entire American economy?

Mr. Speaker, I state that if we are going to "tax American," then this country, which is presently a large consumer in almost every field, is going to have to "buy American." Let us remember also that our Government is a partner with every individual and corporation to the extent of some 20 to 50 percent or more, and when we send our business to Europe the Government, as a partner, is losing its share. So what will happen to our national income?

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to plead with the Members of this House, Members of the greatest lawmaking body on the face of the earth, to open both their minds and their hearts to the common, the ordinary, American citizen and taxpayer. Let us remember the little man—let us remember the farmer—the small businessman—and the laborer. Let us remember the teacher—the white collar worker—the widows and the orphans. Remember the trust funds and the guardianship funds of the Nation that were set up as security devices to protect the weak, the sick, and the aged. Let us think about permitting big business to make a reasonable profit, for no one, Mr. Speaker, is opposed to big business, but they are all opposed to a government dedicated, controlled, and operated by, for, and on behalf of big business or of big banking. Let us in closing think about America and the maxim of the Golden Rule here in this body by "doing for others what we would have them do for us." Let us strive to do all we can to reduce the interest rate, to prevent the passage of the vault cash bill, to get the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Bank to realize the responsibilities of its position—and if this Committee will not think and act for all Americans let this Congress, which is charged under the American Constitution with the duty of establishing the value of money, admit that the Federal Reserve System is not fulfilling the purpose for which it was originally designed—and let the Congress then take back unto itself the power of negotiating the value of money within these United States. Let us, Mr. Speaker, before it is too late, and regardless of which party we may belong to, act and act now in the best interests of all Americans.

RELIGION IN RUSSIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and have printed in the RECORD a highly significant story taken from the Catholic Standard of May 29, 1959. This story is based on an interview given by Matthew J. Kane, national councilman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Matthew Kane, a veteran of rugged submarine warfare, came out of the service like so many of our men with a sense of solemn dedication to the ideals for which our country fought: Freedom in all lands for all men of good will—freedom with due respect for the rights and dignity of every man; freedom, under God, with a deep sense of responsibility implanted in every man's heart to consider his brother's welfare; freedom with peace everlasting.

His military task completed, Matthew Kane, like millions of others returned to his home and his responsibilities as a civilian citizen. He married a charming, lovely girl. They have three beautiful, bright children. As a prominent businessman of Washington, Mr. Kane is noted for his services in the Washington area, working actively in veterans' organizations for the welfare of veterans and their dependents and the entire community. However, he was ever conscious of a menacing shadow, the threat of another world war. He hoped and prayed for peace—but daily he read in the newspapers of the Communist threat to world peace. No matter how ardently we desired peace, we could not preserve peace if the Communists made war.

He felt—as we all do—that America's defenses must be maintained—strong military defenses; strong economic defenses; strong spiritual defenses. We are aware of the spiritual significance of world peace. Why, he reasoned, should not folks on the other side also appreciate it?

With a deeply sincere faith in God's works, he believed that, if we could only talk face to face to those men in Russia—the men with whom we had fought shoulder to shoulder against Hitler—we might find a spiritual light to guide us together for our common good.

The great opportunity to test his theory came, so he thought, last year when a group of Russian veterans toured the country. Matt Kane was one of the American veterans invited to return the call. Hopefully he reembarked on his trip, trusting that a basis might be found on which to build an understanding—a program of peaceful cooperation. Surely he would be able to reach the hearts and the minds of others who, like himself, had experienced the horror and futility of modern warfare.

He has returned a saddened man. He had found a people spiritually frustrated. He found men who had lost their God. He found a nation that placed every possible barrier in the way of those who sought to find God. He found a materialistic, mechanized nation, "soul quenched" as Edwin Markham would have said, a people with no inner self remaining. His only hope today is his conviction that in God's kingdom men and nations cannot forever be denied a touch of heaven.

Matthew Kane tells us, simply but graphically, of the barren land—materially wealthy, but very poor indeed.

The article follows:

SEES SOVIETS STARVING OUT ALL RELIGION

Religion will be dead in Russia within 50 years, according to a Washingtonian who recently returned from a 2-week visit to the Soviet Union. His visit included a 1-hour-and-15-minute interview with Premier Khrushchev.

Matthew J. Kane of St. Matthew's parish said his opinion is based on the fact that church attendance in Russia is limited to elderly persons. "I went to mass at two of the four Catholic churches in Russia," he said, "and no one in the congregation was under 65 years old. The young people aren't allowed to go to church. They're weaned away from religion very early in life.

"So when these old people die, where will the new congregations come from? The answer is, there won't be any new ones."

Mr. Kane accompanied six American veterans of the 1945 Elbe linkup with Soviet troops. He himself was not involved in the linkup—he was in the submarine service in World War II—but he met the Russian veterans who came to the United States last year to commemorate the event, and was extended a formal invitation to accompany the American delegation this year.

He arrived in the Soviet Union on April 28, on the same plane with British Field Marshal Montgomery. One of the first sights he looked for was Moscow's only Catholic Church, St. Louis of the French.

HARD TO FIND

"It wasn't easy to find," he stated. "Imagine walking out of one of the best hotels in Moscow, where there were about 15 cabs lined up in front, and not one of the drivers knew where the Catholic church was. But we finally found it."

The church is small and in a rundown condition, Mr. Kane reported, adding that the repairs in evidence were obviously makeshift. He said that when he first visited the church, on a weekday afternoon, a service was in progress attended by about 25 people.

But the church was filled for Sunday mass, he said. "And nobody came late." Following the mass, he added, there was benediction, a litany, and a sermon by the pastor, a Polish priest in his forties. "The entire service lasted nearly 2 hours, and nobody left until at least 15 minutes after it was over."

The congregation was made up almost entirely of elderly women, he said. "About the only men I saw were the two altar men who served mass. They were not 'altar boys.' They were men in their seventies."

The attitude of the congregation was exceptionally devout, he declared. Most of those present received communion, and those who had prayerbooks obviously had used them for a great many years. The books were dog-eared and some were almost falling apart, he said. "It's impossible, of

course, to have books of this sort printed in Russia."

"There are two Sunday masses," Mr. Kane said. "And I understand the other one was as crowded as the one I attended. It's not easy to be a Catholic in Russia, and the people appreciate whatever small chance they're given to practice their religion."

Mr. Kane also visited Stalingrad, which has no Catholic church, and Leningrad, where the Catholic church is bigger and in better condition than the one in Moscow. The Leningrad church has two priests, compared to only one at the Moscow church.

The congregations were about the same at both churches.

Mr. Kane also visited the Jewish synagogue with a friend, and here again the congregation was made up almost entirely of old people. His schedule did not permit him to visit the other two Catholic churches in Russia—in Odessa in the south and in Tiflis in the Caucasus. But he did attend mass at the apartment of Father Louis F. Dion, A.A., who serves as chaplain to Catholic embassy personnel in the Soviet capital.

"The Soviet rulers know that these old people who go to church will die off soon," he said. "So why should they lay themselves open to criticism by shutting down all the churches? They're not in any hurry. They can wait."

He emphasized that religion is barely tolerated in Russia, and is permitted only on a sharply limited scale. "They talk about freedom of religion, but there's none there," he said. "For example, the priest has to have permission from the Minister of Cults to say mass or offer any service."

Mr. Kane said that the interview he and the other visitors had with Khrushchev was mostly chit-chat. He talked mostly about the census figures that were due to be released in a few days, and about the horrors of war, and how he was looking forward to Vice President NIXON's visit. There was no mention of religion.

Mr. Kane came back to the United States with one overwhelming impression: That the Soviet leaders are waging an unremitting, skillful, and at least partly successful propaganda campaign to lull America into a false sense of security.

"They're trying awfully hard to get across the idea that they're a peace-loving nation," he said. "By hammering on this point all the time, they hope to get us to lower our guard, to be indifferent to a very serious threat. But keep in mind that they never make a move that isn't calculated to help their own plans—and that includes cultural exchanges.

"The motto, 'Speak softly and carry a big stick' is a good one for us to remember today."

Mr. Kane discounted any hope of an internal revolt. "The people there are contented because they're better off than they were 40 years ago. But they don't get news of the outside world. I used several radios in Moscow and couldn't get anything except Moscow stations and jamming noises."

Mr. Kane, owner of Kane's Guest House, 1123 13th Street NW., has no wish to return to Russia. "Why go back"? he said. "It's not a friendly nation. And there's nothing there that we don't have here, and better."

Mr. Kane is department commander of the Irish War Veterans and a national councilman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TOLLEFSON, for 1 week beginning June 8, 1959, on account of committee hearings necessitating his presence in California.

Mr BARING, from Friday, June 5 to June 15, on account of official business.

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. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, on Monday, June 8, vacating his special order for today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and include a statement on the DAV services in Ohio.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include a eulogy of the late John Foster Dulles by Vice President NIXON.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include addenda.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLYNN.

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri), to include extraneous matter in his extension of remarks today during debate under the 5-minute rule.

(At the request of Mr. ROBISON and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mrs. DWYER.

(At the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri, the following Members to revise and extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5805. An act 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

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 8, 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:

1073. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed appropriation for the fiscal year 1960 in the amount of $10,500,000 for transitional grants to Alaska (H. Doc. No. 170); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1074. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 2, 1958, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Tahchevah Creek, Whitewater River Basin, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 171); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1075. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a report of the Bureau of Accounts covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to the act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 648), 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1076. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of Sakihara Koki"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1077. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 284. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6596, a bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 285. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7246, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and Public Law 74, 77th Congress, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 286. Resolution for consideration of S. 1901, an act to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the act of July 28, 1945, to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 7500. A bill to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7523, a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3, a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 443. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 7583. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7584. 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. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 7585. A bill to authorize an increased program of research in forestry and forest products and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 7586. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Cumberland, Allegany County, Md., in honor of George Washington; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 7587. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7588. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of copyright royalties for purposes of the personal holding company tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7589. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7590. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7591. A bill to amend section 701(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to limit the use of Civil Aeronautics Board reports and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7592. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit certain practices regarding passenger ticket sales and reservations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7593. A bill to amend sections 101 and 401(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7594. A bill to provide for the filing with the head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, the State of legal residence or domicile of all civilian and military officers and employees of the United States serving with such department, agency, or instrumentality; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7595. A bill to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7596. A bill to amend section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7597. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 7598. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7599. A bill to amend sections 901(a) and 902(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases; and to increase the monetary amount of fines for violation of the criminal provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 7600. A bill to amend sections 901(a) and 902(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases; and to increase the monetary amount of fines for violation of the criminal provisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 7601. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide further requirements for applicants for and contractors under operating-differential subsidy contracts; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 7602. A bill to revise, extend, and otherwise improve the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) to bring into focus and more proper perspective that section of the law governing political broadcasts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 7603. A bill to authorize the establishment of Washington's Western Lands National Monument in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7604. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 7605. A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 7606. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by civilian agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7607. A bill to provide disability retirement benefits for civilian employees of the Government in certain additional cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution designating President's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 417. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require every appropriation measure to be accompanied either by a revenue-producing measure, or a certification that revenues will be produced to cover the cost of the appropriation measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HALEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress to provide sufficient funds for commencement of construction of the West Coast Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla., at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Military Pay Act of 1958 to equalize the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant Federal loans to needy students for graduate studies and provide for repayment over 20 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska (by request):

H.R. 7608. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carmela Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7609. A bill for the relief of Raul J. Hermitte and Ginette N. Hermitte; 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:

207. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. J. J. McLaughlin, chairman, Defenders of American Education, Tucson, Ariz., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the recognition of Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

208. Also, petition of Chester Phillips, secretary, Highland County Farmers Union, Greenfield, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the late Honorable James G. Polk; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sweden: Freedom and the Good Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 6, is celebrated in Sweden as Constitution and Flag Day.

Sweden throughout her history has stood for the ideals most cherished by Americans. Hers is a tradition of freedom, of courage, of respect for religion with tolerance, of education, progress, of high regard for the individual, and, in modern history, of peaceful cooperation.

The Swedish tradition of freedom dates from earliest history. Mention is made by Tacitus of the separate, Suiones people, from whom Sweden derived its name. The Viking ships are believed to date from the Roman era. The tales of the Viking era—from about 700 to 1000 A.D.—stir our imagination and command our respect. Courage and a capacity for organization was their legacy wherever these sea kings made a permanent landing. Characteristic, above all, was, and has ever been, a love of freedom and respect for individual liberty.

As early as the Middle Ages, Christianity triumphed in the center of the old heathen realm, the land of the Valkyrie. It has flourished significantly in Sweden ever since. Soon after Luther, the Lutheran church became the church of Sweden. More than 90 percent of the Swedes are baptized and married by the clergy of that church to this day. Because of the tolerance acquired during the centuries since its foundation, however, this figure actually covers many nonconformists and those indifferent to all but certain customs of the church.

The people of Sweden have long been taught to think for themselves. The Swedish press boasts of having the oldest legally protected guarantees of press freedom in the world. A newspaper established in 1645 still appears regularly. Greater knowledge, more extensive schooling are the basis of the vigorous and alert democracy that exists in Sweden.

Sweden has been a leader in social reform. Her progress in social security has served as a model for many features of the American system. Observers from England have compared Sweden's measures favorably with those of their own country, New Zealand, and Australia. For nearly two centuries, Sweden's communities have cared for their aged, infirm, and otherwise needy people. Workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and compulsory health insurance are part of the national scheme of social welfare, which has been for over 70 years in the process of revision and improvement. The general aim is to protect the life and health of each citizen.

The Swedes are good neighbors abroad as well as at home. Renowned neutrality, maintaining peace for nearly 150 years, has not prevented Sweden from joining in the Council of Europe, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the United Nations, as well as many other international organizations—with all that participation implies. In joining the U.N. Sweden did specifically declare her intention to maintain her traditional freedom from military alliances, while protecting with a strong defense her independence and democratic institutions. The world's respect for her stand is clearly evident in the choice of Dag Hammerskjöld as its leader in the United Nations.

Sweden's high standard of living is reflected in a comparatively high level of stability in national politics. Communists have played a very small role there. The two-party system, which prevailed in the era of formulation of the Swedish parliamentary democracy, inspired a stanza which strikes a responsive note in our own day. In the 18th century, the Swedish poet Jacob Wallenstein wrote of party politics by popular name:

Let Hats and Caps fight on, let discord's thunder rumble;
An oak which now and then is shaken by a blast,
Below the ground holds firm and fast.
When Rome its squabbles ceased she had begun to tumble,
And England gains her peak amid disputes and strife.
Free states from party feuds draw life.

The free states of the world and we in America, join in a salute to Sweden's freedom and good life.

Retirement of Vice Adm. John M. Will, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the retirement on June 30 with rank of full admiral of Vice Adm. John M. Will, United States Navy, most recently commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

Admiral Will's relief has already been announced to be Vice Adm. Roy A. Gano, an able and gracious gentleman well-known in naval and commercial shipping circles, and a most wise choice to take over the worldwide complexities of Military Sea Transportation Service. He has already served a tour as deputy commander of Military Sea Transportation Service before moving on to command amphibious group 2 in the Mediterranean.

"Dutch" Will, as he is admiringly known to his friends in the Navy and in maritime circles, is an admiral's admiral. His career was colorful in the combat days of World War II, and most recently vastly productive in an operational way during the years which followed—brush-fire outbreaks of hostilities and the troubled crises which mark our times.

Above all things, "Dutch" Will is a man who believes in getting around and seeing things for himself. His pace is relentless and the scope of his journeys throughout the world have left younger and lesser men bobbing in his wake. He expects and demands the highest degree of performance in his staff, and of himself he demands even more—and produces it.

An axiom at his headquarters in Washington, borne out by distraught commanders in the field on the occasion of unannounced field trips, is "If the old man asks you a question, you'd better blankety blank well have the answer or know where you can get the information he wants."

Yet the retiring commander of Military Sea Transportation Service is no martinet. He runs a mighty taut ship and he gets the results he wants, but when a member of his staff—top civilian or stenographer; officer or enlisted man—gets a promotion or is recognized for his accomplishments, personal congratulations come from Admiral Will—if he is not in Tokyo, Thule, or Timbuctoo—almost as soon as he gets it from his boss.

"Dutch" Will is synonymous with Military Sea Transportation Service. Think of one and you automatically think of the other.

Keenly appreciative of the importance of smooth public relations, his judgment and decisions concerning MSTS have done astonishing things to bring about good will and admiration for the service which for years was thought of by maritime labor and management alike as a Federal agency competing against private industry.

MSTS still has its critics, and many are mighty outspoken, but few have anything but respect for the man at the helm, "Dutch" Will.

A year ago he was awarded the Robert L. Hague Trophy of the American Legion on behalf of the entire maritime industry, recognizing him as the single individual who had done more for the American merchant marine in that year than anyone else.

This year's fiscal report of MSTS shows a significant statistic, and one which even its harshest critics find difficult to refute. Out of MSTS' entire operating funds—$425 million—78 percent went to private industry: ship repair facilities, shipyards, steamship companies, new construction, and what have you.

The thinking of top people at MSTS is constructive and progressive. "Dutch" Will insists upon it. MSTS, he feels, is an agency whose functions should include tests and experiments which will benefit private industry as well as MSTS' own ship operations.

MSTS has led the way in ship design; cargo handling methods; safety and training practices ashore and afloat; exploration and development of remote operating areas which include the discovery of a deepwater northwest passage in the Canadian Arctic; the further development of ice freeing devices which kept extreme northerly harbors open for shipping long after the termination of the normal navigation season and a full-ahead participation in this country's oceanographic research program.

MSTS, under "Dutch" Will, conceived the ice-strengthened cargo ships and tankers which have proved themselves year after year in polar operations. In the field of rollon, rolloff transportation, MSTS' prototype vehicle carrier U.S.N.S. *Comet* and her recently acquired running mate U.S.N.S. *Taurus* are under the scrutiny of industry and their effect is already being felt in new ship designs.

When the Maritime Administration converted two Liberty ships to gas-turbine and free-piston propulsion, MSTS put them to use.

The accomplishments of MSTS are varied and impressive. Statistics of passenger lifts, evacuation of refugees from troubled lands, the transportation of military cargoes, and the supply of petroleum products throughout the world by this vastly complex, yet highly efficient, organization are available for all to see.

It has been geared with emergencies in mind—Korea and Lebanon, to name but two. In such a successful manner is MSTS run that its ships were loaded and operating with units of the fleet within hours of the announcement of the existence of the emergency.

Its record for saving lives at sea is unequaled by any organization, with the obvious exception of the U.S. Coast Guard, which is in the lifesaving business and performs its task with great distinction, devotion, and magnificent seamanship.

The high standards and the very high degree of excellence of MSTS throughout its worldwide activities are, of course, not the result of any one man's inspiration, but of many thousands of dedicated people whom he encouraged.

Admiral Will has served two separate tours—as commander, Atlantic area, and most recently as overall commander. MSTS was there when he reported aboard each time. But each time he was assigned to MSTS the wheels turned even faster than before.

The Navy is losing a talented and courageous officer. Whatever segment of private industry has the foresight to grab him will be fortunate indeed.

The four-star flag "Dutch" Will will receive at the retirement ceremonies at the Naval Gun Factory on June 30 is the Navy's own way of showing the boy from Perth Amboy, N.J., that it, too, recognized his inherent ability and leadership. Forty years ago this month, Midshipman "Dutch" Will bent on his ensign's shoulderboards for the first time, and steadied on the course which has brought him, after a long and eventful voyage, to the destination he knew lay over the horizon of his youth.

Yet the voyage is only half over. A second career is at hand. The experience of many commands, the mellowness and judgment that comes with this experience and the insatiable drive to tackle baffling problems are qualifications which most surely will be sought out by the very industry which at first held "Dutch" Will in suspicion, and within a few short years regarded him with great respect.

The four-star flag they will give him at his retirement may never fly at the truck, but the man who earned it will be at the conn in a controversy involving the "men who go down to the sea in ships and have business in the great waters."

As a member of the House Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Armed Services, I am certain that I speak for my colleagues on these committees when I say that in our dealings with the top officers of the Navy few men stand out as does "Dutch" Will for dedication and devotion to duty—qualities he seeks in others and demands from himself.

As a private citizen, may I speak for myself when I say that my admiration and respect for the man I am proud to call my friend is very great indeed.

Vice President Nixon Writes About Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of Life magazine contains several pages of photographs covering the recent funeral ceremonies of our late great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, as well as pictures setting forth the highlights of his illustrious career. Accompanying this pictorial study is a brief but moving article by Vice President NIXON about the character and quality of this great man whose passing was indeed a loss to the entire free world.

It is a pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to this article and, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, to include it with them, not only for the information of my colleagues in Congress but with the expressed hope that it will be given wide circulation throughout the entire country.

It is a fitting tribute to a very great man from another great man who was closely associated with Mr. Dulles in both his work and his thinking regarding foreign policy and the dangers of international communism:

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON WRITES ABOUT DULLES

(By RICHARD M. NIXON)

I have had the privilege of knowing and working with John Foster Dulles since the time I first met him in 1948. And it was my great fortune that since the fall of 1955 the association between us was particularly close.

In a city where a political leader learns that the number of his friends goes up and down with his standing in the public opinion polls, I found Mr. Dulles' loyalty to his friends was no more affected by the latest poll than was his adherence to his own policies.

He was not unaware of his unique abilities. But he was one of those rare individuals who could accept—and even demand—from his friends constant critical examination of both his policies and his leadership. He was never guilty of that most deadly sin—unreasoned pride and conceit.

I recall at least four occasions when he was under attack when he asked for my advice. His question was not as to his policies, which he believed to be right (a view I shared), but whether he, himself, might have become too controversial to be the best spokesman for those policies.

"I never want to be a burden on the President," he often used to say to me. "As a friend, I want you to tell me whenever you believe that I have become a burden, either politically or otherwise."

He recognized the fundamental truth that a public man must never forget—that he loses his usefulness when he as an individual, rather than his policy, becomes the issue.

This trait was most in evidence on his last arduous journey to Europe when he had to call into play all his superb diplomatic talents in order to help unify the Western position on Berlin. There was seldom a moment on this trip when he was without pain. He was unable to keep down a single meal.

I asked him how he was able to carry on.

He answered, "I told my associates that they were to watch me carefully and that they were to inform me immediately whenever it appeared that my physical condition in any way impaired my ability to carry on the negotiations in which we were participating." But he was never better at the negotiating table than at this most difficult period of his life.

He afterward told me, "I never felt any pain while the negotiating was taking place. Then at the end of the day it would come down on me like a crushing weight."

So much for the quality of the man. His policies will be judged not by his dedication or his skill at the conference table but by what happens in the years ahead, when men like Christian Herter build on the foundations Mr. Dulles erected.

But whatever happens there are certain great principles which he advocated which will forever stand as a monument to his memory.

He believed that those who are called to positions of leadership in a democracy have the responsibility to lead, not just to follow public opinion. During the crisis over Quemoy and Matsu, the mail, the polls, and the opinionmakers seemed to be overwhelmingly against the position he advocated. He told me that we had to try to change public opinion by informing the people of facts of which they might not be aware. If, after they learned the facts, the people held the same opinion, theirs of course should be the final judgment. But in this instance, his leadership helped to convince the people and thereby averted a Communist victory that could have destroyed the free world position in Asia.

History will also record that the inflexibility and brinkmanship for which he was criticized in truth represented basic principles of the highest order.

At a time when the political and intellectual climate in the West appeared to be moving slowly but steadily toward advocacy of shortsighted, opportunistic arrangements

with the Soviets, Mr. Dulles' stubborn constancy sometimes appeared like an anachronism. Yet he made an unchallengeable argument for firmness where fundamentals were involved. Speaking before the National Council of Churches of Christ last November, Mr. Dulles said: "Communism is stubborn for the wrong; let us be steadfast for the right. A capacity to change is indispensable. Equally indispensable is the capacity to hold fast to that which is good. So it is that while we seek to adapt our policies to the inevitability of change, we resist aspects of change which counter the enduring principles of moral law."

When he was attacked for brinkmanship Mr. Dulles stood on an ancient and honorable principle—that by looking a great danger in the face we may avert it and lesser perils. He was simply taking the same position which Winston Churchill saw so well in 1939: "If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival."

But it is in a third area in which Mr. Dulles leaves to the free world perhaps his most lasting and valuable legacy. Some of his critics have scoffed at his advocacy of peaceful liberation of the Communist-dominated peoples and at his often reiterated faith in the eventual collapse of communism.

Yet, what other tenable position can self-respecting free peoples take? The Communists have no hesitancy in proclaiming their faith in the eventual domination of the world by dictators. Can we be less determined in our dedication to the cause of freedom from tyranny for all people?

If we want a foreign policy and a national attitude that bends before every Communist breeze, if we have come to the point where liberty is not worth our lives, if we are becoming convinced that the future is in the hands of dictators rather than in those of free men, then we no longer need the Dulleses or their legacy. But while American greatness and American hope endure, John Foster Dulles will be remembered as one of their most effective and eloquent champions.

DAV Services in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Ohio citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly, and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veterans' organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Ohio, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it during time of war.

DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. The national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; the national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and the national director of employment relations, John W. Burris, located at the DAV national service headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. I am especially proud of the fact that Ohio, my home State, has led all States in membership in the DAV for the past 22 years, having about 25,000 members in its 126 chapters.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veterans' organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veterans' organization of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and its central office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given the DAV their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

SERVICE FACILITIES IN OHIO

The DAV national service officers in Cincinnati are Mr. Bernard Southard, Mr. Charles A. Burger, Mr. John Kirch, Mr. Thomas G. Ryan, and Mr. Ralph F. Schwamberger, located at the VA regional office, 209 East Sixth Street. Mr. Garrett J. Bowman, Mr. Pasquale B. Gervace, Mr. Albert Nigoff, and Mr. Verne Nygaard are located at the VA regional office, 234–235 Williamson Building, Cleveland.

The national headquarters of the DAV is at 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, where the national service officer, John Delaney, is on duty. National officers for this year from Ohio are Mr. Joe Smith, 225 West Harrison, Alliance, and Mr. Joe Stefan, 864 Berghoff Street, Akron, who are the national executive committeeman and alternate, respectively, from the seventh district.

The DAV department commander of Ohio is Mr. Sam Rothenberg, 4511 Shirley Drive, South Euclid, and the department adjutant-treasurer is my long-time personal friend, Mr. A. L. Daniels, 105–07 Wyandotte Building, Columbus.

The VA hospitals coming under the jurisdiction of these offices are: A 2,116-bed NP hospital at Chillicothe, a 463-bed GM hospital at Cincinnati, a 1,013-bed GM hospital at Dayton, a 2,138-bed DOM hospital at Dayton, a 324-bed TB hospital at Brecksville, and a 852-bed GM hospital at Cleveland.

The DAV representatives with the VA Voluntary Services are Mr. George Sriner, of 1040 South Roosevelt Avenue, Columbus, at the Chillicothe NP Hospital; Mr. Joseph M. Zapatony, Post Office Box 55, North Dayton Station, Dayton, at the DOM Hospital at Dayton; Mr. George Meyers, 5868 Layor Drive, Parma Heights, at the GM Hospital at Cleveland; Mr. Robert Silva, 559 Virgil, Cincinnati, at the GM Hospital at Cincinnati; and Mr. Robert R. Boyle, 3729 West 33d Street, Cleveland, at the TB Hospital at Brecksville.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $82,890,666 for its veterans' program in Ohio, including disability compensation to its 116,642 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Ohio furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

The DAV of Ohio renders a most outstanding service to the wars' disabled and their dependents—as proven by the following facts and figures—for the last 10 fiscal years:

Claimants contacted (estimated)	411,054
Claims folders reviewed	352,545
Appearances before rating boards	176,533
Compensation increases obtained	13,959
Service connections obtained	6,022
Nonservice pensions	9,012
Death benefits obtained	2,002
Total monetary benefits obtained	$8,758,921.74

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Ohio veterans, their dependents, and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans, their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others, at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 5 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Ohio with a consequent loss of about $1,568,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veterans' organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Ohio to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veterans' organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project, thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in donations, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 40,712 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Ohio residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to a fellow citizen, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers, from the DAV Service Foundation, its separately incorporated trustee, incorporated in Ohio in 1931, incidentally, when I was Ohio's secretary of state. Its reserves having thus been nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $5 per DAV member. Benefactors from 29 States have, up to this time, become enrolled on the memorial honor roll.

Inasmuch as only the interest earnings from special donations will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its national service officer program in the State of residence of each such benefactor, this is an excellent objective also for Ohio. Each such special benefactor is enrolled on a permanent memorial honor roll which, updated, is then included in the annual report of the DAV and of its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, to the U.S. Congress.

Each claimant who has received any such free rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue this excellent rehabilitation service for other distressed disabled veterans and their dependents in Ohio by sending donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every "serviced" claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal-year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations—the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Amvets, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Disabled American Veterans—all of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV. If eligible, I would certainly be proud to be a life member of the service-giving Disabled American Veterans.

Mail by Guided Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me, I

am including a statement made by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield concerning an experimental exploration of a new technique in communication. The statement of General Summerfield is most interesting:

MAIL BY GUIDED MISSILE

The United States today began experimental exploration of a major new technique of communication that is of historic significance to the peoples of the entire world.

A guided missile, on a routine training flight at approximately the speed of sound from an American guided missile submarine at sea, landed successfully on our east coast with a shipment of U.S. missile mail.

This peacetime employment of a guided missile for the important and practical purpose of carrying mail is the first known official use of missiles by any post office department of any nation. An unofficial test flight of a singular Regulus I on the Pacific coast was made several months ago.

These developments are a reaffirmation by the United States of its humanitarian aims, as eloquently emphasized by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, that the scientific achievements of our people shall be used as a rich legacy of progress for mankind.

Today's shipment of mail by missile has given us extremely valuable information of far-reaching importance to the future of the U.S. mail service, namely:

1. The use of compartments built into missiles to carry considerable shipments of mail appears highly practical.

2. Significant quantities of mail can be loaded quickly and efficiently into missiles.

3. Missiles can be developed to carry mail safely and swiftly.

4. The relative lightness of letters and the small space they occupy makes them ideal users of missile technology.

5. Guided missiles may ultimately provide a solution to problems of swifter mail delivery for international mails, for isolated areas where other transportation is infrequent, as well as a supplementary high-priority service to big population centers.

The first U.S. Post Office Department official missile mail experiment, delivering approximately 3,000 letters, was loaded aboard the guided missile submarine U.S.S. *Barbero* (SSG–317) at Norfolk, Va., shortly before departure on a regular training mission. A branch post office was established on the *Barbero* by my official orders at that time.

This morning the crew of the *Barbero*, while in the international waters of the Atlantic Ocean, dispatched this historic shipment of U.S. mail on a Regulus I training guided missile, flying the missile successfully to its destination at the Naval Auxiliary Air Station at Mayport, Fla., near Jacksonville, where it landed safely a few minutes ago.

The first missile mail was carried in two metal compartments, painted in the Post Office Department's official mail-box colors of red, white, and blue.

As our studies proceed on the effective utilization of guided missile techniques for mail delivery, we can expect further experiments to develop the feasibility of our plans and add to our store of knowledge of what we informally call our "Pony Express II Missile Mail Project."

The successful missile mail experiment today was possible only because of the close cooperation of Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy, the fine personnel of the Department of Defense, and the Navy, and our own dedicated Post Office Department people, all working closely together. The Post Office Department is also deeply indebted to Lt. Commander Carlos Dew, USN, commanding officer of the *Barbero*, and the other officers and members of its capable crew.

The letters which arrived via the Regulus I flight at Mayport, are being processed now in the Jacksonville, Fla., Post Office for regular dispatch to officials and leading citizens who have contributed to, or shown special interest in the postal progress of recent years, including: The President, the Vice President, Members of the Cabinet, other top Federal officials, Members of Congress, Justices of the Supreme Court, Governors of the States, including Alaska and Hawaii, the Smithsonian Institution, the postmasters general of the 99 other member nations of the Universal Postal Union, members of groups associated with the postal service, such as the Post Office Department Advisory Board, and the officers and crew of the *Barbero*.

The envelope used was my official one with a pictorial cachet of the Regulus I bearing the wording "First Official Missile Mail—U.S. Post Office Department" placed to the left. A cancellation reading "USS *Barbero*" with the date and approximate time of launching of the Regulus I from the submarine was used on the cover. The letters were appropriately franked with the red, white, and blue 4-cent American Flag Commemorative Stamp issue of 1957. On the reverse side of the envelope a backstamp was applied showing the approximate time of the receipt of the mail at the Jacksonville, Fla., Post Office prior to its dispatch throughout the world.

Each missile mail envelope carries a letter from me, as Postmaster General. I would like to emphasize now what I said in the letter: that the great progress being made in guided missilry will be utilized in every practical way by the Post Office Department.

I believe we will see missile mail developed to a significant degree before man has reached the moon.

Today's experiment with missile mail is in line with the finest traditions of the Post Office Department in pioneering with new means of transportation to speed the delivery of the mails.

In colonial days Benjamin Franklin took the mails from horseback and put it on coaches; in 1831 the Post Office Department was the first to use the new fangled trains; in 1858 the Post Office linked the Nation with the famous Overland Mail stage service to be followed in 1860 with the even faster Pony Express. In 1918, when most people still thought the airplane was an unworkable contraption, the Post Office Department demonstrated its practical peacetime uses with the first regular air mails.

Today's missile mail will go down in history as another saga of progress and achievement in our national heritage.

The Mary D. Bradford High School Band of Kenosha, Wis., Plays Concert on the Capitol Steps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, we were honored today by a visit here at the Nation's Capitol from the band of the Mary D. Bradford High School in Kenosha, Wis. This band is one of the outstanding bands in southern Wisconsin and has for several years been under the able leadership of Ralph J. Houghton. Mr. Houghton, who is recognized throughout the State of Wisconsin as one of the most able organizers of musical composition, has personally guided the band since its inception. The band now consists of 85 boys and girls, all of high school age, and most of whom are accomplished musicians in their own right. The band members were resplendent in red and white West Point uniforms with tails. The group has won many awards especially for its herald trumpet effect, and so forth.

The band from the Mary D. Bradford High School is presently on its way to New York to participate in the activities of the Lions International convention which is being held there. They will parade in a 7-hour parade down 42d Street and compete with bands from several nations. The annual parade at the Lions' convention is one of the most colorful of all the conventions in the country and this year will take from 7 to 8 hours to pass the reviewing stand. The Mary D. Bradford High School band in making the trip to New York is paying special honor to a Wisconsin citizen who has been selected as the international head of the Lions organization for the coming year. I know that the Members of Congress who had the privilege and opportunity of hearing the concert played by the Mary D. Bradford Band on the House steps of the Capitol this morning will testify to the excellence of their performance.

The members of the band of the Mary D. Bradford High School of Kenosha, Wis., are: Lee Aiello, Don Anderson, Joy Anderson, Kay Anderson, Kent Anderson, Irene Andrade, Roger Andreoli, Tom Asboth, Charles Ashley, George Bagdon, Larry Benefiel, Sherrill Block, James Buss, Pat Calvert, Connie Cassidy, Barbara Christian, Pat Christian, Marilyn Copen, Don Deeder, Larry Eils, Jerry Fenske, James Firchow, Pete Gallo, Gary Garcia, Pete Gentile, Judy Gentz, Sheryl Glinski, Gail Hansen, Jim Hendrickson, Robert Hockney, Alice Jackson, Ron Jensen, Eric Johnson, Edith Jornt, Ken Kastman, Nancy Kemp, Mike Kempainen, Elaine Kirk, Carol Klitzke, Gary Laba, Lynn Langenbach, Bruce Larsen, Jim Lemke, Marjorie Leppanen, Shelby Leschinsky, David Linn, Marsha Mathews, Gene Mentink, Joan Metten, Marilynn Milaux, David Mink, Terry McNeil, Kathy Neil, Don Neau, Carol Norman, Pat Navoichik, Sue Odelberg, Lynn Paulsen, Kay Paulsen, Jerry Perona, Kent Peterson, John Petzke, Sandra Ponzio, Robert Richards, Marilynn Rosemann, Dennis Roseth, Joe Ruffalo, Virginia Schenk, Sue Schmelling, Carol Schnell, Lowell Schroeder, John Steddick, Judy Stewart, Jim Szantor, Veronica Szeliga, Lucille Turco, Doug Vacarello, Bill Van Caster, Ken Wermeling, and William Yankus.

These fine boys and girls, in their trip to Washington and New York, were under the supervision of their bandmaster, Ralph J. Houghton, and a number of parents and friends of the band, as follows: Mrs. Ralph Houghton, Mr. and Mrs. D. Hale, Mr. and Mrs. G. Hendrickson, Mr. and Mrs. T. Eils, Mr. and Mrs. G. Schmelling, Mr. and Mrs. G. Metten, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Anderson, Mrs. Benefiel, Mrs. E. Wermeling, Mrs. F. Schnell, Mrs. A. Anderson, Mike Szelgia, Mrs. F. Perona, Mr. and Mrs. W. Van

Caster, John Houghton, David Houghton and Roger Wermeling.

I join with the other Members of Congress in expressing our thanks to this fine band for the concert they played for us on the Capitol steps.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the Joint Subcommittee on Labor Reform Legislation of the Committee on Education and Labor on yesterday and because many of my colleagues have expressed an interest in my testimony I am having it included in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, JUNE 4, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity given to me to testify before this Joint Subcommittee on Labor Reform Legislation.

First, let me read into the record an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on May 19, 1959, entitled "A Stronger Labor Bill." This editorial expresses my views on this subject in a more forceful way than I can. Furthermore, I believe it expresses pretty generally the viewpoint of the citizens of the St. Louis community, including the views of the rank-and-file union members, their families, and, I might add, many local labor leaders.

I do not believe that I need to call the attention of this subcommittee to the general philosophy of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It is regarded as one of the leading liberal newspapers of the country. I say this with full knowledge of the lack of definiteness today of the adjective "liberal," but also with the knowledge that in congressional circles the term is descriptive of a particular political philosophy. I suggest to the liberal members of this subcommittee, who are by numbers in such strong control of it, when a newspaper like the Post-Dispatch writes editorials like the one I am about to read, it is time for them to take heed. The people of this country expect real labor-reform legislation, and if they don't get it they are going to hold this Congress and the leaders who control it in both Houses by almost a 2-to-1 majority responsible.

"A STRONGER LABOR BILL

"A House labor subcommittee has begun hearings on the Senate labor bill, and already is under intense pressure from the unions to water it down. Far from being watered down, the Senate version of this much-needed legislation ought to be strengthened.

"The public interest does not demand a union-busting bill, but it does demand a measure which effectively guarantees union democracy, makes union leaders more directly answerable to the rank and file, and corrects the abuses so impressively brought out by the McClellan investigation.

"Secretary Mitchell's proposed curb on certain secondary boycotts certainly should be written into the bill. The Senate left it out in favor of a limited hot cargo clause.

"Present law forbids a secondary boycott—that is, the application of union pressure against a firm which is not the primary party to a dispute—in certain circumstances. First, an objective of the union must be to compel one person to cease doing business with another and second, the means employed to achieve this objective must be a strike or some other concerted action of employees.

"As the Teamsters have found, however, it is easy to slap a secondary boycott on hot cargo or anything else simply by avoiding concerted action of employees. The pressure can be applied directly to an employer, or it can be applied through an individual employee. Secretary Mitchell's proposal would close these loopholes without going so far as to outlaw all secondary boycotts, some of which might be considered legitimate—for example, those against an employer who is performing farmed-out struck work.

"Similarly Secretary Mitchell's complete proposal for dealing with blackmail picketing ought to go into the bill, instead of the weaker version which the Senate adopted. Mr. Mitchell does not urge that all picketing for the purpose of union organization be barred. But he would bar such picketing where the employees clearly did not want to be represented by that union. Top-down organizing, in which the union aims its power at the employer instead of persuading his employees, is a demonstrated evil which the Mitchell proposal would effectively deal with.

"The Senate bill is defective on this point in several respects. Its language is loose, and subject to interpretations that would weaken its effectiveness. While the bill bars blackmail picketing where a plant representation election has been held during the preceding 9 months, it does not bar such picketing during the remaining 3 months before a new election, under present law, can be held. If the purpose is to bar blackmail picketing at plants where another union has won an election, why not bar it during the whole year between elections?

"The House committee also needs to take a close look at the enforcement powers behind the bill of rights which the Senate prescribed for union members. The Senate relied chiefly on authorizing a member to file civil suit in the courts. But how many union members could afford to hire a lawyer and pay for protracted litigation against a well-financed union? The enforcement power could be strengthened, either by making unions and their leaders liable for costs of successful suits against them, or by authorizing a union member to seek redress from the NLRB. When an employer violates a union member's rights, the case goes to the NLRB before it goes to the courts. Perhaps the same procedure could be followed if the member's rights were violated by a union.

"There are no doubt other respects in which the Senate bill could be improved without converting it into a union-busting measure. The secondary boycott, picketing, and bill-of-rights enforcement clauses seem to us the most important.

"We hope the House will tackle them courageously despite political pressure from the unions."

Now my purpose in asking to testify was primarily to discuss one aspect of labor reform legislation, a narrow aspect perhaps but a vital aspect. I want to discuss the enforcement power behind the bill of rights as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch terms it.

A RIGHT WITHOUT A REMEDY IS NO RIGHT

Under the Taft-Hartley Act and under many State statutes a union member has the right to an accounting from his union leaders of his union dues. Experience has shown this to be no right at all because the remedy is insufficient. As the Post-Dispatch editorial states: "how many union members could afford to hire a lawyer and pay for protracted litigation against a well-financed union?" What is more important, granted the premise that a union is racketeer ridden, how many union members dare go even to a prosecuting official, let alone a private lawyer to enforce their rights to an accounting of dues? This is no hypothetical case. This is the actual situation in Missouri where the right to an accounting of union dues has criminal sanctions set up by some State statute to enforce this right. No union member dare go to court to enforce his rights though these rights have been violated for years by many unions.

The sanction in the Taft-Hartley Act depriving a union that fails to grant an accounting of a member's dues of the right to use the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board has likewise proved to be inadequate. The racketeer ridden union officials couldn't care less about losing the use of the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board. Indeed, democracy in labor unions today is a bundle of rights without a remedy.

The same problem exists in trying to enforce any other provision of the union members' proposed bill of rights including the most essential and basic right of them all that of a secret ballot in periodic elections of union officials and of other important union actions.

I question very much if the criminal penalties imposed in some of the proposed labor reform bills, rigid as some of them are, will be of any greater practical use in enforcing democracy in union affairs than are the present remedies. They all hinge on an individual union member complaining to local authorities or to a far away tribunal in Washington, D.C. In both instances the complaining union member never knows for certain whether his name will be passed on to the racketeer against whom he is complaining. It is a brave man who complains in such climate.

However, there is an adequate remedy available and this remedy conforms to the theory of present law. Four of the bills before this subcommittee, H.R. 3540, introduced by Mr. KEARNS, pages 44–45, which contains to a large degree the administration recommendations; H.R. 4473, introduced by Mr. BARDEN, pages 41–42; S. 1137, introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN, pages 41 and 42; and S. 748, introduced by 15 Senators, page 45, include this enforcement provision. The provisions I refer to provide that a union which violates the bill of rights of its members loses the tax exempt status it presently enjoys under section 501(2) and (c)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended.

This is the subject which I wish to develop before this subcommittee. This subject matter, of course, is within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member. With my background I though it appropriate for me to come before this great subcommittee to testify and answer whatever questions this subcommittee might have on this provision.

First, let me state quite clearly that I do not believe in using the Internal Revenue laws as a method of enforcing other laws. On the other hand, when the proper enforcement of the Internal Revenue laws happens to coincide with the enforcement of other Federal laws, I think it is highly appropriate to call this matter to the attention of the Congress and the committees of the Congress who are concerned with the enforcement aspects of other Federal laws.

This is the case before us now. The proper enforcement of the section of our Internal Revenue Code which provides for "exemption from tax on corporations, certain trusts, etc." does so on the theory that these exempt organizations are within the public interest. I quote:

"Section 501(c) List of the exempt organizations." Sixteen categories are listed. Let

me read the title heads rapidly to give the committee an idea of the type of organizations Congress has felt should be tax exempt:

1. Government corporations.
2. Corporations which are purely holding companies for other organizations which are tax exempt.
3. Corporations, and any community chest, fund or foundation organized exclusively for religious, charitable, education, etc.
4. Civic leagues or organizations not organized for profit.
5. I quote in its entirety: "Labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations."
6. Again I quote in full for contrast: "Business leagues, chambers of commerce, real estate boards, or boards of trade, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."
7. Clubs not for profit or private benefit.
8. Fraternal beneficiary societies.
9. Voluntary employees' beneficiary associations.
10. Other type of voluntary beneficiary associations.
11. Teachers retirement fund associations.
12. Benevolent life insurance associations.
13. Cemetery associations (not for profit).
14. Credit unions (of certain types).
15. Mutual life insurance companies with assets under $75,000.
16. Certain kinds of agricultural co-ops.

It is apparent that the reason these organizations have been made tax exempt is because in the opinion of the Congress they are nonprofit and generally serve a desirable public purpose. Strangely enough this section written into the law in 1916 has remained largely unchanged. Yet there are only limited criteria which guide the Bureau of Internal Revenue in deciding what organizations will qualify under the various headings. And mark this. Limited as is the criteria set out in the statute to guide the Bureau in administering this statute there are absoutely no criteria whatsoever in respect to category (5) "Labor, agriculture, or horticultural organizations." Business leagues have some criteria set out, "not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual." Other categories have rather lengthy, although in my judgment inadequate, criteria set out.

From a standpoint of proper public policy the Congress certainly should set forth some standards which these tax exempt organizations should meet. I certainly believe one criteria which all of these organizations should meet is one which provides for the democratic control of the affairs of the organizations by its members and should include a requirement for an accounting to the members of the moneys coming into the organization hands.

Certainly if this subcommittee in its wisdom felt that it was desirous to establish additional standards which it felt any labor organization should meet if it were to qualify as being in the public interest I feel that the tax laws should reflect that judgment.

Now I want to point out the practical effect of establishing by law, certain standards which tax exempt organizations should meet, as it would relate to labor organizations, or indeed any other organization where management, as it were, might run away with the organization against the will of the membership. The enforcement of our tax laws does not require the individual complaint to do other than to call the question of a tax evasion to the attention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This can be done, as it is frequently done in other tax violations by an anonymous post card or telephone call to the local office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Bureau takes the matter from there to find out whether or not the allegation is well founded or not.

Consider the case of a racketeer ridden labor union. Any individual member of such a union could contact the local Bureau of Internal Revenue, anonymously if he wished, saying local, or national, Union X has not given its members an accounting of dues or has not given its members the right to a secret ballot in elections, or has not held periodic elections, or whatever. The Bureau of Internal Revenue of its own initiative will carry on, check with the union officials to verify or to disprove the allegation. If the allegation is verified in its opinion the union forthwith loses its tax exempt status, subject of course to an appeal to the tax courts by the union if it feels the charges are untrue.

Now I want to state that I do not agree with the manner in which the violation of internal revenue standards is set up in the four bills I referred to which utilize it as an enforcement provision. I believe the enforcement should be in the nature of a contempt citation rather than in the nature of penalty. In other words, instead of depriving a union of tax exempt status which would result in the collection of revenues for past violations, it should deprive the union of tax exempt status until such time as it purged itself of its violation, with a reasonable time allowed in which to purge itself. This conforms to the basic public purpose in granting tax exempt status in the first place and does not penalize the union members who have been the victims of the violations.

I think the power of the deprivation of tax exemption is sufficiently strong so that no union leader, however bull-necked he might be, about imposing his control over a union against the will of the union members, would long stand against it. This is particularly true when we consider that once the tax is to be imposed the Bureau of Internal Revenue will have to go over the union books to determine what the amount of the tax should be. What union racketeer even though he be willing to pay a penalty can afford to have his books looked into?

Though this amendment to the Internal Revenue Code may be made appropriately in a labor reform bill, and I hope this subcommittee will include it, nonetheless, I believe comprehensive legislation setting up proper and uniform standards for all tax exempt organizations, business, farm and labor, is needed. It would be helpful to the Ways and Means Committee in writing this comprehensive language if, in respect to labor unions, this subcommittee would set forth in this bill what criteria it would wish to see applied.

Finally, I would urge this subcommittee not to use the sanction of loss of tax exempt status to enforce any measures in the labor reform bill other than those which we might call a bill of rights ensuring control of union affairs in the hands of its members. I do not believe this public policy feature of tax exemption should go beyond this point. There may be those who would argue that any union found to violate other laws such as laws against blackmail, organizational picketing, or improper secondary boycotting, should not be tax exempt. However, I think that would be using our revenue laws to enforce matters which are outside the revenue field and therefore undesirable.

I might say in conclusion, however, that I believe once we insure democracy in the unions much of the abuse of power that we have seen by certain labor leaders will disappear. I have noted that those unions which are responsive to their membership seldom are those which have been the subject of the recent unfavorable publicity. Furthermore, I believe that those union leaders who are responsive to their membership are those who have done the most for their membership; not the czars who ride roughshod over their own membership, other union men, other workers, and the public.

The 110th Anniversary of the Danish Constitution of 1849

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, June 5 is the anniversary of the Danish Constitution of 1849. One hundred and ten years ago the evolution of democracy in Denmark began with the adoption of this great and forward-looking instrument of government.

Representative government first emerged in Denmark during an era of economic distress at home and republican protest throughout much of Europe. The Napoleonic Wars had left Denmark in a period of poverty and economic stagnation, during which the banking system failed, foreign trade precipitately declined, grain prices fell, and the Government's program of land reform came to a standstill. At the same time, strong opposition to the old European order of monarchical despotism emanated from the bourgeoisie and the growing working class.

Naturally, these conditions called forth criticism of Frederick VI's government. Furthermore, the principle of absolutism, itself, was attacked. Under the influence of the July revolution in France, King Frederick in 1834 established four provincial assemblies. While the function of these bodies was consultative rather than lawmaking, their origin marked the beginning of parliamentary practice and encouraged public discussion of political questions. A Liberal Party was formed with a program of substituting for the absolute authority of the monarch a new constitutional government which would be more representative of the people.

In 1848 the February revolution in France gave impetus to the liberal movement in Denmark and in many other centers of political protest in Europe. The ephemeral victory of liberalism in France encouraged the Danes to petition the new King, Frederick VII, for reforms. The King agreed to renounce absolute power and permitted the formation of a government responsible to representatives of the people. A national assembly convened and drafted the Constitution of June 5, 1849, which granted specific powers to a bicameral legislature.

Although the Constitution of 1849 was abrogated by a reactionary constitution in 1866, the principle of popular government embodied by the document of 1849 continued to inspire the advocates of true democracy. The Constitution of 1866 gave an overwhelming influence to the aristocracy in the upper chamber of Parliament, although the lower house continued to be popularly elected. In

1872 the group favoring an extension of land reform secured a majority in the lower house and insisted on a true parliamentary system by which the King would be obligated to select a cabinet from members of the majority party in the lower house. For about 30 years the struggle between the interests of property and reform in the upper and lower chambers, respectively, was bitter. The forces of reform steadily increased in strength until in 1901 King Christian IX requested that a government be constituted from members of the majority party in the lower house.

Then in 1915 a new constitution came into effect which abolished the privileged system enjoyed by the wealthy class in electing the upper chamber. By this new constitution, the conservatives accepted responsible cabinet government and political democracy. Important social legislation, including land reform and benefits to labor, soon followed.

The peaceful revolution by constitutional reform, which began with the adoption of the Constitution of June 5, 1849, was now accomplished. The principles of popular representation in the legislature and cabinet government by ministers responsible to the majority party were now so firmly established that the upper chamber of Parliament, once a powerful citadel of privileged and vested interests, was formally abolished by a constitutional amendment in 1953. The ability of the Danish people to resolve deep class conflicts by peaceful procedures has been unmistakably demonstrated by the past century of their political history.

For its exemplary accomplishments in the development of democratic ins'''ti-tions, the United States salutes the great nation of Denmark on the 110th anniversary of the adoption of the Danish Constitution of 1849.

Commuters Need Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 5, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a statement which I made before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of the bill, S. 1331, providing greater protection of the public interest in railroad passenger train discontinuance cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission:

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the subcommittee for this opportunity to appear in support of legislation to make more effective the Interstate Commerce Commission's new authority over the discontinuance of railroad passenger and ferry service.

I especially appreciate the chairman's generosity and sense of fair play in scheduling hearings on the two bills, S. 1331 and S. 1450, which are so critically important to the largest metropolitan region in the world, as well as to other areas of the country dependent on adequate railroad commuter service.

It is typical, I understand, of the chairman's willingness to see both sides of the question, and of his record on this subcommittee of recognizing not only the needs but also the responsibilities of the Nation's railroads.

If the committee is willing—in the interest of expediting testimony—I shall not read my entire statement, but simply highlight what I consider are the most important points, since the committee has the full statement available before it for the record.

Before discussing the need for and merits of S. 1331—which was introduced by my good friend and distinguished predecessor in the House, Senator CASE, and which I have the honor of sponsoring in the House—I should like to emphasize certain relevant characteristics about the New York metropolitan region that bear heavily on this bill.

This metropolitan region is the largest in the world. It embraces parts of three States and contains within its compact boundaries nearly 10 percent of the population of the United States and more than 40 percent of the Nation's railroad commuters. In this area, more than twice as many commuters—an estimated 208,000—depend on rail transportation than rely on automobiles, or did so, that is, until the current rash of discontinuances.

An adequate railroad passenger system is absolutely essential to the area, since our network of highways is already taxed to capacity and no practicable substitute for rails is available. For example, one reliable friend of mine has reported that he used to drive from Union County, N.J., to New York City in 20 minutes, whereas it now requires more than an hour, along the same route and at the same time of day.

It is virtually certain that these crowded conditions will increase in the next few years. The Harvard University study of the New York metropolitan region, which was just reported this week, predicts a likely population growth for the region of 4.5 million above the present 16 million by 1975, with an additional 3 million by 1985. The study also concludes that the population boom and the growth of the suburbs will put strenuous demands on suburban commuting facilities.

In the light of these facts, therefore, I would suggest that now is the time to strengthen and expand commuter transportation facilities, rather than encourage their further shrinkage.

I do recognize, nevertheless, that commuter railroads, especially in the East, have been harassed by the long-term failure of much commutation service to pay its own way. Costs have rather consistently outrun revenues, and thereby have tended to place a burden on entire railroad systems. This, of course, was the basis of the action recommended last year by this committee and approved by the Congress which authorized railroads to come to the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to discontinue unprofitable train and ferry service, both interstate and intrastate. In many other ways, too, the Transportation Act of 1958 aided the country's railroads at a time when they reflected the depths of our economic recession. That most of the railroads have displayed great powers of recovery during the first quarter of 1959—with average earnings about 428.8 percent higher than the same period last year—is due not only to the general improvement in the economy but also to the far-sighted wisdom of the authors of the Transportation Act of 1958.

As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee remarked earlier this year, the commuter problem is not a new one, and was not caused by the Transportation Act of 1958. As he observed at that time, the problem is a truly complex one. It is not solely a Federal responsibility, but requires that States and local communities also join in solving it. Fortunately, some at least of the many units of government involved are now accepting their responsibility. New York State, for example, has enacted a comprehensive program to help maintain needed railroad passenger service—a program including tax relief, help in obtaining rolling stock, and other advantages. Both New York and New Jersey have entered into a bistate transportation compact, which is now awaiting approval by the Congress. Other proposals are also under active consideration, including the possibility of local tax relief in New Jersey (a particularly burdensome problem for commuter railroads) and the practicability of enlisting Port of New York Authority participation in some form of regional commuter transit system.

As a practical matter, however, the Transportation Act of 1958 did complicate the commuter crisis—though at the same time it served to alert people that effective action could no longer be postponed. By adding a provision for Federal jurisdiction over discontinuance of trains and ferries, section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Transportation Act in effect invited frustrated railroad managements to seek quicker, easier, and simpler discontinuance at the ICC than was often possible at State agencies. The response has been impressive.

As of June 3, the ICC has informed me, 39 notices have been filed under the 2 subsections of section 13a of the act, providing for the discontinuance of about 110 trains. Railroads have filed additional discontinuance petitions with various State agencies and have announced plans to discontinue still more trains. All of them may well end up as cases before the Commission under section 13a.

The results of this action in the New York-New Jersey region have already been drastic. Among others, the Putnam division and the West Shore division of the New York Central have discontinued passenger service. Much of the Lehigh Valley passenger service and all the Lackawanna electrified service either has gone or soon will disappear. In addition, the important suburban service of the Central of New Jersey and the Erie Railroads are gravely threatened.

Whether or not any or all of these discontinuance notices are justified, experience under the new section 13a makes it clear that the ICC cannot now give adequate consideration to the public need for the threatened commuter service under the limitations and restrictions of the act.

In its report to the House Commerce Committee on H.R. 5596—a bill I introduced which is identical to S. 1331—the Commission stated that "the time now provided is extremely short." It explained that the period within which it is required to rule on discontinuance cases makes it impracticable in some cases to complete the required Commission procedure.

In writing section 13a into the Interstate Commerce Act last year, Congress provided an entirely new method for handling train discontinuance cases. Formerly, all such cases were considered local in character and subject to the jurisdiction of State law or State agencies.

The objections underlying the proposed S. 1331 concern chiefly the procedure governing discontinuance of interstate trains; in its essentials, the procedure now governing discontinuance of intrastate trains is similar to the procedure in the proposed bill—a procedure which seems to me protects the public interest to a greater degree than the procedure in interstate cases.

Briefly, section 13a(2) now provides that:

(1) Discontinuance authorization may be granted only after a full hearing.

(2) No time limit is set within which the ICC must rule on petitions.

(3) The Commission must make positive findings that (a) public convenience and necessity permit of such discontinuance, and (b) without discontinuance, the continued service will constitute an unjust and undue burden on the interstate operations of the railroads or on interstate commerce.

Thus, the burden of proof is left where it belongs—on the petitioning carrier; the public interest is specifically protected; and the Commission is required to exercise its authority only after full consideration.

None of these vitally important conditions, however, are present in the procedure now governing discontinuance of interstate trains. On the contrary, section 13a(1) provides, among other things, that:

(1) No public hearings or any other consideration is required of the ICC in advance of train discontinuances.

(2) Railroads may discontinue service on their own volition 30 days after notice to the ICC if the Commission does not institute an investigation within 20 days after notice has been filed; the Commission, therefore, is required to make a preliminary finding in less than 3 weeks after it receives notice if discontinuance is to be halted even temporarily.

(3) After the initial 30-day period, the Commission may order service continued for a period of only 4 months, whether or not it has completed its investigation and consideration.

(4) The ICC may order service continued only after a hearing and investigation; thus the protection of the hearing and investigation procedure is accorded only to the carriers and not to the public's need for the service.

(5) Likewise, before it can require carriers to continue service, the Commission must make a finding that (a) the service is required by the public convenience and necessity, and (b) that continuation of the service will not unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce; this is the reverse of the findings required by subsection (2), and places the burden of proof on the Commission, not on the petitioners.

(6) In any event, the Commission cannot order continuation of the service for more than a year.

Under these circumstances, as recent experience indicates, the Commission is seriously handicapped in its obligation to protect the public interest in transportation. It cannot adequately consider the complex issues involved within the available time; and rulings which affect thousands of passengers dependent on railroad service may be necessarily based on an incomplete consideration of the facts.

The Case bill, S. 1331, is designed, as I understand it, to overcome these procedural limitations and encourage the ICC to give equal consideration to the needs of the public while it does justice to the needs of the railroads. The bill does not do violence to the constructive work of this committee in writing the Transportation Act of 1958; it does not restore jurisdiction over train discontinuances to the States; it does not hobble the ICC in granting necessary relief to the railroads. It simply reflects the experience of the past few months in the operation of section 13a(1) of the act and seeks to adjust the law to the realities of this experience.

It is highly significant, I believe, that the experienced Interstate Commerce Commission—an agency by no means hostile to the railroads—has at least tacitly agreed with most of the chief provisions of this bill. In fact, it seems to me the report of the Commission, which I understand is presently before the subcommittee, offers a very promising basis for a compromise solution.

Briefly, this is how the Case bill would amend the present provisions governing the discontinuance of interstate passenger train or ferry service:

(1) The relevant language would be inserted as a new paragraph 19 of section 1 of the act; instead of amending section 13a, that section would be deleted, with the technical change suggested by the Commission. The new language would thus follow present provisions governing the abandonment of railroad lines, to which it is closely related.

(2) The Case bill would require an affirmative authorization from the ICC or the appropriate State agency before passenger trains or ferries could be discontinued—rather than, as at present, permitting discontinuances without such specific authorizations. The Commission favors this change.

(3) The bill would thus close a loophole in the present law which permits a carrier to discontinue service at will if no State laws are applicable; the Commission has no objection to this result.

(4) While present law regarding discontinuance procedures applies to any train or ferry, the Case bill would apply only to passenger trains and ferries; the Commission has no objection to this provision.

(5) The proposed bill would require a public hearing in every discontinuance proceeding in which protests were received by the Commission, while under present law the Commission need not even institute an investigation. The Commission, however, proposes that it be left with a certain amount of discretion in determining whether a hearing should be held in particular cases. Since procedure respecting applications for abandonment in the present section 1(19) would apply under the proposed bill to discontinue applications, the Commission believes that this procedure would adequately protect the public interest.

It is my own view, however, that the requirement for public hearings in the bill is one of its principal purposes. With all due respect to the Commission's experience and good judgment, I would suggest it is important to make this concession to public opinion, especially since train discontinuance cases have always been a local matter in the past. I feel sure that hearing procedures could be devised in such a way that this requirement would not unduly delay the Commission's work. If the committee accepts this view, however, then appropriate changes in the present section 1(19) should be made in order to eliminate inconsistencies, as the Commission suggests.

(6) The provision in the Case bill requiring the Commission to consider in discontinuance proceedings the carrier's revenues from all freight and passenger traffic in the States in which the particular train is operated was intended to counterbalance an excessive reliance on the possible losses of the passenger train in question. Since a railroad operates under a public franchise, it has an obligation to serve the reasonable needs of that public. The fact that a particular train loses money should not, I believe, be the sole determinant in a discontinuance proceeding.

However, since the fact of a train's losses is not and would not be the only factor in considering whether the train should be discontinued, the Commission's fear that the proposed paragraph (c) of section 1(19) would be ambiguous and would invite litigation should be explored further, I believe.

(7) The Case bill would empower the Commission to attach whatever conditions it deemed in the public interest to certificates of passenger train discontinuance; this power is already provided the Commission in abandonment and unification cases. As the Commission points out, it does not possess this authority presently in regard to discontinuance proceedings under section 13a. It would seem logical that the Commission should have the power to impose necessary conditions in such an important matter, especially since it now has this authority in similar situations. The Commission has not objected to this provision.

(8) Among its most important provisions, the proposed bill would eliminate the present 30-day notice procedure and the 4-month time limit during which the Commission could require operations to be continued. The Commission strongly suggests it favors such a change.

(9) Similarly, under the proposed bill, the Commission would be enabled to require the continued operation of a train or ferry for whatever period it deemed necessary.

(10) Finally—and of major significance—the bill would clearly place the burden of proof upon a railroad to show that a proposed discontinuance is permitted by the public convenience and necessity; the Commission could issue a certificate of discontinuance only if such a finding of public convenience and necessity could be made on the basis of the record before it.

The Commission has stated that it favors this change.

The Commission has also proposed several technical changes in the Case bill and has suggested appropriate places in which to clear up possible inconsistencies or ambiguities.

I have tried to indicate in this statement, Mr. Chairman, that I am more concerned for the substance of S. 1331 than I am for all of its particulars. The committee, with its wealth of experience, can undoubtedly improve on the bill. I personally hope it does so.

I believe strongly, however, that its essentials should remain unimpaired. I believe it is of the greatest importance that the Commission be empowered to protect more effectively the public interest in railroad passenger transportation. This is vital to the health and welfare of the entire metropolitan New Jersey-New York-Connecticut region, as it is to other sections of the country.

This bill will not solve the commuter problem. But it is a key element to the overall effort by various levels of government and by private citizens and organizations to establish an effective and adequate commuter system, on a basis that is fair and just to the railroads and to the public which needs their services.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

Expansion of Food-for-the-Needy Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I presented to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on June 4, dealing with the problem of expanding our domestic food-for-the-needy programs, together with a memorandum, prepared by the Michigan State Supervisor of the Commodities Distribution Section indicating the operations of this program in Michigan during the last several years.

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

EXPANSION OF FOOD-FOR-THE-NEEDY PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to be having hearings on the various bills on expanding the use of our Nation's agricultural abundance for the well-being of the many Americans who are unable to have adequate

and sufficient food. I am hopeful that following the close of these hearings every effort can be made by those of us who are members of the Agriculture Committee to report to the Senate a sound and greatly expanded program for taking our surplus farm production and putting it on the tables of Americans who just are not able to buy the minimum food that they and their families need and must have. Congress must not adjourn this session until a new surplus food distribution program is law.

There is a growing realization that the difficulties accruing from our mounting farm surpluses are not going to be resolved simply by assuring all Americans an adequate diet. Even if we achieved a reasonably adequate diet for all our citizens, I do not believe this would be more than a partial step toward meeting the challenge of our surplus production.

So it is not with the hope that the bills before the subcommittee would miraculously eliminate our huge stockpiles that I support an expanded food distribution program for the needy. Rather, I believe that we in the Congress cannot morally justify a continuance of governmental programs which stimulate agricultural production and build surpluses while there are hungry children, older people, unemployed workers, and many others who have wholly inadequate diets week after week and year after year.

We must put farm surpluses to use because it is wrong for people to be hungry in the midst of abundance. We must expand food distribution programs to bring more adequate diets to the needy and the distressed if we are to obtain the necessary public support for the future recasting of a strong and sound agricultural economy in the United States.

The State of Michigan has been a beneficiary of the present limited food distribution program. During March 1959, 514,850 persons received federally donated surplus food in Michigan. Unlike many States, Michigan has been able to have almost all sections of the State participate in this Federal program. Seventy-four of our 83 counties are now participating. The city of Detroit has pioneered in administering a very sizable program.

There is need for the Congress to recognize this program for what it is—basically a welfare program designed to help people. This is one of the reasons I was pleased to join with Senator KENNEDY and many others of my colleagues in sponsoring S. 1884. I thought that the basic administration of the welfare aspects of the program were not compatible with the duties and responsibilities vested in the Department of Agriculture, but could be much more effectively administered in the Department of HEW. I would hope that such a transfer would alleviate some of the public confusion that results when nonfarm programs are being budgeted and charged to the Department of Agriculture.

Perhaps the $150 million authorized in the Kennedy bill will not be adequate to do all that is needed, so I would hope that your subcommittee would attempt to obtain the very best assessment of the true needs of our people and, if more funds are necessary, an increased authorization made in the bill.

There have been many letters coming to my office inquiring as to why more foods, such as edible oils, shortening, peanut butter, and other commodities presently held by the CCC, could not be processed and used to supplement the rather drab and limited food items now being distributed. I have been unable to find satisfactory answers as to what is preventing the Department of Agriculture, under present law, from expanding the range and variety of foods available. So I hope that your subcommittee will find where the roadblocks to these expanded programs may lie.

Last year, I understand, it was necessary for the Congress to enact special legislation to move edible oils in an oversea program for distribution by relief agencies. But today no edible oils are available for the domestic food-distribution programs, and this is a time when butter may be removed from the domestic program.

A transfer to the Department of HEW, as provided under the Kennedy bill, of the responsibilities for screening and supervising the standards of eligibility of persons coming under the program would result in alleviating some of the hardships and unfairnesses that now occur when arbitrary liquid-assets standards are applied. I would hope your subcommittee would develop testimony on this limiting part of the present program.

The Kennedy bill and the similar bills are not, of course, the only approaches to this basic problem of providing adequate diets to our families of very low income. I would only mention that there is pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a bill which I am cosponsoring with Senator SYMINGTON to establish a food stamp program. A food stamp program is not incompatible with these present proposals before the Agriculture Committee, and in fact I hope that, in the near future, hearings may be held on the various food stamp proposals so that this session of the Congress will have full data on every approach.

Mr. Chairman, later you will be hearing from experts from the State of Michigan—men who have been intimately associated with the workings of the existing program. They will represent retail food interests, the public agencies responsible for the program, and groups whose memberships have benefited. Much better than I, they will furnish firsthand data on the need for improving and expanding the existing food distribution programs of our Government. But, more important, you will hear of the really wonderful experiences there are in seeing families feeding their children milk and foods that they could not eat if we had not opened our storage warehouses. My plea today is that we open these warehouses wider, and that we of this Congress do it with a full understanding of how very fortunate our Nation is that we have these storehouses of abundance to which we can turn to feed our hungry and needy.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION,
Lansing, Mich., June 1, 1959.

From: Ralph J. Budd, State Supervisor, Commodities Distribution Section.

Subject: Comparison of statistical information concerning the certification and participation of various categories regarding the use of USDA surplus commodities. Also, the receipts and value of USDA commodities allocated to the State of Michigan during the fiscal year of 1957–58, as compared to the first 10 months of this current fiscal year, July 1, 1958 through April 30, 1959.

Certification

Category	Number of units		Number of eligibles	
	1958–59	1957–58	1958–59	1957–58
Schools	1,981	1,879	382,392	362,889
State institutions	29	26	33,460	32,235
Other institutions	273	259	29,912	28,263
Child care centers	16	20	236	355
Welfare (counties)	75	63	831,895	571,388
Total	2,374	2,247	1,277,895	995,130

Participation

	April 1959	April 1958
City of Detroit	164,419	114,375
Statewide, including Detroit	478,749	351,315

Receipts

	July 1, 1958, through Apr. 30, 1959	Fiscal year 1957–58
Number of cars received:		
Secs. 32 and 416	1,231	1,070¼
Sec. 6	121	57
Total	1,352	1,127¼
Value of cars received	$14,802,248.05	$11,383,034.11
Pounds received	69,395,304	48,444,350
Receipts: City of Detroit, Department of Public Welfare, value	$3,343,645.24	$1,376,269.97
Pounds received: City of Detroit, Department of Public Welfare	13,024,706	4,837,456

Distribution

Category	July 1, 1958, through Apr. 30, 1959		Fiscal year 1957–58	
	Value	Pounds	Value	Pounds
Public schools	$2,592,219.34	8,893,861	$2,420,802.40	7,646,433
Parochial schools	408,772.83	1,318,319	404,705.10	1,203,197
State institutions	720,965.72	3,964,718	768,301.24	4,447,648
Other institutions	525,641.16	2,178,041	583,482.15	2,603,955
Camps	78,451.90	265,073	131,753.97	476,299
Public welfare	10,465,856.95	49,164,170	5,070,399.37	26,244,542
Private welfare	20,401.23	98,157	19,393.02	110,471
Total	14,812,309.13	65,882,343	9,398,838.25	42,732,545

STATE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, PURCHASING DIVISION—COMMODITIES DISTRIBUTION SECTION, LANSING, MICH.

Commodities issued to public and private welfare, July 1, 1958, through Jan. 31, 1959 (7 months)

Commodity	Number of pounds	Value
Beans, dry	25,837	$2,583.70
Butter, print	4,157,413	2,577,596.06
Cheese, process	4,864,745¼	2,140,488.35
Cornmeal	6,228,130	373,687.80
Flour:		
All-purpose	297,530	29,753.00
Bread	6,950,690	695,069.00
Whole wheat	4,362,180	261,730.80
Milk, dry	4,895,820	1,370,829.60

Commodities issued to public and private welfare, July 1, 1958, through Jan. 31, 1959 (7 months)—Continued

Commodity	Number of pounds	Value
Rice	3,809,834	$419,081.74
Total	35,592,180¼	7,870,820.05

Total number of pounds of commodities issued to al. categories	47,182,701
Total number of pounds of commodities issued to welfare	[1] 35,592,180¼
Total value of commodities issued to all categories	$10,776,395.75
Total value of commodities issued to welfare	[2] $7,870,820.05

[1] Equals 75 percent. [2] Equals 73 percent.

State of Michigan, Department of Administration, Purchasing Division—Commodities Distribution Section, Lansing, Mich.

City or county	Unemployment compensation		Unemployed		Part-time employment		Low income	
	1957–58	July 1, 1958–Jan. 31, 1959	1957–58	July 1, 1958–Jan. 31, 1959	1957–58	July 1, 1958–Jan. 31, 1959	1957–58	July 1, 1958–Jan. 31, 1959
Detroit, city of	165,960	399,381	291	24,870	162	788	151,176	433,476
Genesee	57,540	107,327					9,006	23,106
Macomb	143,605	51,196		126,682				
Oakland	52,053	126,531					57,402	74,837
Wayne	66,653	152,562	7,915	31,252	2,348		41,214	6,171

NOTE.—Comparison of participation in the 4 categories, as shown above, in the use of U.S. Department of Agriculture surplus commodities in our welfare feeding program.

Commencement Address by Senator Thomas J. Dodd at St. Joseph's College, West Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 5, 1959

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Senator THOMAS J. DODD has made many great speeches in his brilliant and distinguished career. His final summation to the jury at the Molzahn spy case was a classic of its kind, and foreshadowed his magnificent address at the conclusion of the Nuremberg war crimes trials.

During his two terms in this body, his speeches on civil liberties, on the moral basis for foreign aid, and on negotiations with the Communists won national acclaim.

Those of us from Connecticut have watched TOM DODD'S career in the Senate with a great and growing pride. His maiden speech in the Senate on the Berlin crisis stirred the admiration and won the commendation of people throughout this country and the free world.

Earlier this week Senator DODD made what I consider to be one of his greatest speeches at a commencement address at St. Joseph College in West Hartford, Conn. I found in this speech some of the underlying sources of the idealism and passion of justice that have so marked the career of this great man. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the commencement address delivered on June 3, 1959, at St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn.:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, AT ST. JOSEPH COLLEGE, WEST HARTFORD, CONN.

When I accepted your generous invitation to deliver the commencement address it was my intention to try to distill from the experiences of a lifetime a few thoughts which I hoped would be appropriate and useful for the members of this graduating class.

I have not found it easy to do this. It is not easy to sift from the many changing currents of an active life a few simple words of advice to a new generation facing a new world. And when I was through, the advice seemed somewhat oldfashioned and out of touch with these sophisticated times. But it is, nonetheless, sound and true, and if it is out of step there is all the more reason why these things should be said.

This is your commencement day. If this class is anything like my own graduating class at Providence College, 29 years ago, you are probably thinking of this day as one that marks the end of a period of your life and your thoughts are dwelling nostalgically on the happy memories associated with St. Joseph College.

But commencement does not mean the end. It means what the word implies, the beginning. You are all just at the beginning of the search for knowledge.

And you are at the commencement of a tremendous set of responsibilities.

You have been the beneficiaries of years of devoted attention and selfless dedication by this wonderful group of sisters and by the other members of the faculty.

As the father of one of the graduating class, I am sure I speak for all the parents here today when I thank the sisters of St. Joseph and the lay faculty members from the depths of my heart for all that they have done.

This is a sentimental occasion for me. For it symbolizes that my daughter, Carolyn, who has been such a joy and comfort to Grace and me through the years, is about to step into a world of her own.

I am deeply grateful that she is better prepared for that world because of the sisters and teachers of St. Joseph's.

In you and in your future are wrapped up the hopes and dreams of your parents, of your teachers, of all who have sacrificed to see this day. And, in a larger sense, in your hands and in the hands of a thousand graduating classes across this great land, lies the future of our country and of the causes we uphold in the world.

If you have been faithful to your trust thus far, if you have taken full advantage of the opportunities you have had here, you now have the basic tools to make some imprint, some influence for good on your community, on your chosen profession and perhaps on the world itself.

But you will soon find, if you do not already know, that they are only the minimum tools.

You have an education. You have learned enough to know something of the extent of knowledge, and the extent of ignorance, something of the legacy of the past and the challenge of the future.

But this gift of knowledge, this opportunity for personal fulfillment carries with it tremendous obligations. I shall try to discuss today just a few of these obligations.

The first that comes to my mind is the obligation of continued self-improvement.

Each of us is unique. Each has different capacities and different aptitudes. Each has certain talents, and each has the obligation to develop those talents as much as the circumstances of life permit, and to use them for good purposes.

We live in a country that, from its founding has been built upon the proposition that man should have the greatest possible opportunity for personal development and personal fulfillment. The state exists for man, not man for the state. This is our creed. This was at the bottom of our struggle with nazism and fascism and it is at the root of our struggle with communism.

The opportunity freely given to you has been purchased and is kept alive at great cost. You can refuse to exercise this freedom by ceasing to develop your mind and your skills from this day forward. Or you can justify your privileges and the human sacrifices they represent by embarking today on a lifetime pursuit of intellectual excellence.

I urge you to continue your studies, whether formal or informal.

Continue on with what you have so well begun. If you plan to go on to graduate studies, so much the better. If you do not, develop the habit of private study.

There are many examples of wasted resources in this country but none is more appalling than the waste of those who abandon all intellectual inquiry as soon as they leave school.

We hear a lot these days about do-it-yourself programs. I hope you will all work out a do-it-yourself home educational program. Don't store your books away on some forgotten shelf to become dusty reminders of what might have been a fruitful and productive intellectual life.

This day will not have much real meaning in the long scheme of life unless it marks a beginning, and not an end, of broadening the horizons of the mind.

There is a second obligation which will weigh even more heavily upon you as you participate more and more in life.

You all know the difference between right and wrong. You all have learned the basic principles of morality in your homes and in your church. And here at St. Joseph's you have learned the higher refinements of these principles. You have a religious and ethical training that places a far heavier responsibility for right action upon you than that borne by others.

Alfred E. Smith, the self-educated boy from the sidewalks of New York who rose to become New York's greatest Governor, said this in the first speech he ever made to a women's group:

"I know what is right. If I ever do anything that is wrong, it will not be because I do not know it to be so, and you can mark it down as being willful and deliberate and hold me to account for it."

These words, spoken during an era of shameful social injustice and political corruption foreshadowed a career of remarkable achievement in advancing the public good.

And these words can be applied to everyone in this fine graduating class. You all know the difference between right and wrong, and you will surely be held to account for your actions.

We live at a time when crucial moral issues are at the heart of grave national and international problems. But there is always an attempt to deny the existence of the moral element in these questions, and these attempts often succeed in obscuring from many the path that we should follow as a Nation.

Powerful and influential leaders either cannot see the moral element in these questions or they deny its existence. For example:

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, during debate with me on the Senate floor over the Berlin crisis, deplored my statement that the struggle between communism and freedom is essentially a fight between good

and evil. He insisted that these concepts are relative and cannot be made the basis for diplomatic action.

Former Ambassador George Kennan denies that we have any moral obligation to assist underdeveloped peoples. He says it is just a practical matter and that our foreign aid should be based solely upon self-interest.

Professor Galbraith of Harvard, the eminent economist and author, says that there is no moral element involved in our responsibility to conserve our dwindling natural resources for the use of future generations, and he adds gratuitously that the injection of moral issues into practical problems is generally a source of endless trouble and confusion.

One of our leading jurists recently repeated the oft-heard, foot-dragging statement that we must proceed toward desegregation because the Supreme Court has made this the law of the land. But only rarely does one hear the truer statement that the Supreme Court has just made legally binding what was always morally binding and that we should take up this cause not reluctantly or legalistically, but rather with zeal and dedication.

Each of the men I have mentioned has great ability and has made important contributions to his field. How tragic, therefore, that they should overlook the central factor of our existence, and should thus mislead the people they seek to help.

The materialistic, secular attitude I speak of is sapping the moral strength of our country, and you have a very great obligation to carry into our community and national life the religious and ethical convictions that you cary away from St. Joseph College.

Every crucial question afflicting the Nation and the world is, at bottom, a question of right and wrong.

It is wrong to permit any Communist expansion that it is in our power to prevent. It is wrong to acquiesce even tacitly in permanent Communist control of its satellite empire.

It is wrong to refuse to the underprivileged peoples of the world the assistance they need and which we can well afford to offer.

It is wrong to wink an eye at corruption in organized labor, at immoral business practices, or at wrong-doing in Government.

It is wrong to practice racial discrimination whether it be in schools, in housing, in employment, or in any other activity. And we need not look to the South to find discrimination. It exists right here in Connecticut.

But a highly developed mind and a highly refined conscience will avail little unless there is also the great and redeeming quality of courage.

A multiplicity of fears seem to afflict this country and a fear complex threatens to become a national characteristic, in place of the buoyant optimism and indomitable confidence that characterized the national attitude of a century ago.

These fears and uncertainties are stunting the national growth and damaging our national posture.

We frequently hear of surveys of the aspirations of college graduates, young men and women who we would expect to be anxious for new challenges and new conquests. All too often the results reveal that they are interested primarily in security, in conformity, in a safe berth and an easy journey. Fear is at the bottom of this.

The advertising industry, expert as it is in judging our motivations, devotes much of its energy to exploiting the petty fears of everyday life.

In the home there is the fear that to moderately but adequately discipline the child would result in some terrible psychosis or personality problem.

The fear of national bankruptcy hinders the building of an adequate national defense.

Fear of radioactive fallout has convinced many that we should abandon our efforts at further nuclear development regardless of what the Russians do.

Fear is at the root of a hundred subtle influences which tempt us to surrender and appeasement in foreign affairs.

Of all the admirable qualities that are in short supply, courage is the one most needed by this generation.

Fear is the inevitable end result for those who try to face the uncertainties and incomprehensibilities of life without faith in God and belief in eternal life.

This Nation was founded, developed and preserved by men and women who faced the unknown with a courage born of a great faith. If our people ever lose those qualities the foundations of our national strength will crumble.

Surely there is no cause for the devout young women of this graduating class to approach life fearfully. For those who know the transitory nature of man's earthly existence, for those who truly believe in our eternal destiny, there should be no room for fear of the misfortunes of this life.

The qualities which I have mentioned thus far lead inescapably to another.

You will carry throughout your life an obligation to show a very special kind of loyalty to your country. In this sophisticated age it seems somewhat "corny" to speak of patriotism at an occasion of this sort.

In some quarters patriotism is scorned today. It has gone out of fashion. And there is even a fuzzy notion current that patriotism stands in the way of the development of an international order of peace and justice.

Those who talk of patriotism today run the risk of being thought naive or boorish by people who do not understand what patriotism really means.

When I speak of it I do not mean chauvinistic breast beating or flag waving, or the hollow veneration of mere symbols.

If this were all there was to it, then patriotism would indeed be an empty thing. Our loyalty is not to the symobls, but to the ideals and traditions of our country and to the great causes it represents.

Love of country is one of the deepest and most abiding of human instincts. Strange indeed is the man or woman who does not feel a special love for his homeland. As often as not, it is the most humble, the most abused, and the most misgoverned who will, in an hour of crisis, display the fiercest and most selfless loyalty to their country.

So it can be said that the instinct of patriotism is almost universal. John Foster Dulles called it, "One of the great and indispensable virtues" and the heroic example of his life and death provides perhaps the best answer to the scoffers of our time.

Americans have a special reason for a special kind of loyalty that goes far beyond the love of things that are familiar. I do not say this merely because our country has been able to give us more advantages and privileges than other lands.

I say it because our country, its institutions, its traditions, its strength today compose the sustaining force which preserves government based on human dignity and human decency.

Whatever may be the faults and weaknesses of our people as individuals, and they are many; whatever may be the mistakes and weaknesses of our Government, and they have been many, the United States of America as a nation has historically acted with honor, with courage, with charity, with justice, and with idealism.

Perhaps we are too close to the scene to appreciate the significance of the role of our country and of our generation. The new apostolic delegate from the Vatican to the United States, Archbishop Vagnozzi, had this to say 2 weeks ago in Washington:

"Washington has become the fountainhead of freedom. We may well say that the road of freedom, of democracy, of self-determination of peoples, and the respect for human personality leads today to and from Washington and it is to a large degree in the United States that the hopes for the survival of human freedoms rest."

No nation has ever carried such an awesome burden as this. I sometimes think that our entire history has prepared us for and guided us toward this crucial role that we now play.

Surely a sense of national mission and destiny has moved our country from its earliest days. The opening paragraph of the "Federalist" papers, pleading for the adoption of our Constitution, said:

"It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide whether societies of men are capable of establishing good government. Failure on their part would be the general misfortune of mankind."

What Longfellow said 100 years ago applies more to our generation than his:

"Sail on O ship of State,
Sail on O union strong and great,
Humanity with all its fears
With all the hopes of future years
Is hanging, breathless, on thy fate."

All of the forces that have shaped our history, all of the good fortune, all of the noble aspirations, all the blessings of material strength, have combined to give us the means and the obligation to preserve the temple of Christian civilization from the barbarism of first nazism and now communism.

Why do I say all this? I say it because our country and its ancient ideals are more in need of the loyalty, the devotion, the understanding, and the unselfish help of its young men and women than ever before. Never has a nation been so in need of a generation that recognizes its destiny, represents its ideals, and embraces its traditions.

Two thousands years ago Simon of Cyrene stood at a crossroads in Jerusalem and watched our Divine Saviour pass, carrying His cross to Calvary.

Simon had no real knowledge or special interest in what was going on. He was there by what seemed to him an accident. But because he was there, and because of his apparent strength, he was pulled from the crowd and given our Lord's cross to carry.

He shouldered his burden unwillingly and with a resentment that we can all understand. But as he trod in the footsteps of our Lord, as he began to recognize the significance of his action, the burden became lighter and the labor sweeter. He was fulfilling his destiny.

In this century the United States has stood at a great crossroads of history, at a time when morality and decency were being persecuted and crucified all over the world. We had just arrived on the world scene as an important power at the turn of this century. We were curious onlookers at the terrible tragedy that was beginning to unfold in Europe. Our people had no desire to become deeply involved in the problems of other nations.

But events drew us irresistibly to the vortex of the world crisis. Because of our strength, because of the logic of events, we took up the cross of preserving decency in

the world, without realizing the full significance of our act, without realizing that it was the fulfillment of our national mission.

If the destiny of a nation is to be fulfilled, each generation must renew its understanding of it.

Many of our countrymen today resent our role in the world because they do not understand it. There are mounting signs that our people are growing weary of the burden and wish to lay it down.

But our task is far from completed. Our country needs new strength, new zeal, new idealism. I believe that when the full realization dawns upon our people of the nobility of our role, of the meaning of our labors, then our burden—like that of Simon—will seem to grow light, the labor sweet.

Those who understand now the true nature of things, the duty and the privilege that has fallen to us, have a sacred obligation to lend their strength to the just cause and to help keep America ever young in its ideals, its courage, and its fervor for the right.

That is the full meaning of patriotism in our time.

My visit with the young women of St. Joseph College has strengthened my confidence in the future. I envy you the journey ahead. Good luck and Godspeed to each of you.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1959

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, pursuant to adjournment.

Msgr. William J. Awalt, assistant pastor, St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, in times past we have acknowledged our faith in You by inscribing Your name on our coins, on our monuments; we have written Your name in our Declaration of Independence; we sing Your name in our national anthem. We thank You for inspiring our forebears and Founding Fathers to make this public display of their faith in You.

We are now desirous of pleasing You the more by inscribing Your name in our hearts and by professing our belief in You by our actions. For this we beg Your help. Give this august body the light and the grace to imitate You, the Great Lawgiver, that the laws they enact may reflect Your justice in their equity, Your understanding in their fairness, Your wisdom in their safeguarding of our freedom and liberty. Help us, we implore You, to preserve and continue the great tradition of our country, as we invoke Your protection and providence. Amen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 5, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of the Committee on the District of Columbia, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Ponce chapter of the Council of Federal Employees, at Ponce, P.R., protesting against the enactment of House bill 5926, and Senate bill 2023, relating to the union of the United States and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint resolution adopted by both Houses of the Illinois State Legislature, supporting the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

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

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 26

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are now considering leigslation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and

Whereas among the most pressing and depressing problems of today are the rise in unemployment, rising relief costs, and increase of juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas it has been established that a Youth Conservation Corps would be a most important resource of combating all of these three undesirable phases of our national life; and

Whereas such a Youth Conservation Corps could achieve essential public improvements, worth more than the cost entailed; and

Whereas the work most needed to be done generally lies in national forests, in national parks, or in such projects as flood prevention and prevention of soil erosion, far removed from the cities or States where most of the youths enrolled for such program now reside; and

Whereas State and local governmental units, including Illinois, have camp programs for youths already under sentence by the courts, while the Federal Youth Conservation Corps should provide only for voluntary enrollment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we respectfully request and recommend that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States give favorable consideration to the passage of bills creating a Youth Conservation Corps which would provide aid and assistance to youths who are in need of such opportunities through the development of natural resources; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States, and to every member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the U.S. Senate, and of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Adopted by the house, April 21, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CLARENCE BOYLE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate, May 7, 1959.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDEZ,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think this is a most significant joint resolution. The Illinois House is controlled by the Democratic Party, and the State senate is controlled by the Republican Party. Both houses join in support of the Youth Conservation Corps bill which has been introduced in the Senate by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I believe it has been favorably reported by the subcommittee.

Public opinion is building up in support of this measure, which I think will greatly reduce juvenile delinquency and be a constructive step in providing better opportunities for our youth.

While I believe in economy, and believe very strongly in a balanced budget, I hope that this measure, which would not cost a great deal of money, comparatively speaking will not be opposed by the administration or by the coalition which unfortunately seems to control both Houses of Congress.

There is nothing more important than the youth of our Nation. We know that juvenile delinquency has been increasing. Life in the outdoors is the best corrective of juvenile delinquency. The bill of the Senator from Minnesota is deserving of popular support. I am happy that the Legislature of the State of Illinois, and apparently both political parties in the State, support it.

RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI HOUSE OR REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Sena-