HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 22: 5: *Our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded.*

Almighty God, under the canopy and shelter of Thy kind and gracious providence we assemble in faith and fellowship, lifting our thoughts to Thee in praise and petition.

Thou hast given to our age and generation the wisdom and skill to discover the wonders of Thy handiwork and hast revealed unto man those vast and mysterious powers which we earnestly pray may not be used for selfish and unworthy purposes but for Thy glory and the welfare of humanity.

Take from us all indifference to the great commanding obligation to help in tempering the minds of men with a finer essence of mutual trust and may we never have any misgivings as to the power and primacy of love and righteousness.

May we be eager to make the peace of the world our personal concern for we dare not stand idly by and allow our civilization, our freedom, and respect for law to go down in defeat.

Inspire us to use every ability and resource at our disposal to bring an intelligent, vigilant, and articulate public opinion to dedicate itself with a daring and courageous spirit to the service of peace on earth.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGowan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1425. An act for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek;

H.R. 2346. An act for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro; and

H.R. 6845. An act to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4130. An act to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal Services to the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin.

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. CHURCH, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 48. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

S. 49. An act to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 82. An act for the relief of Naoko Ishiwatari White;

S. 85. An act for the relief of Mario Rosario Barrena-Villachica, Maria Dolores Villar Salinas, Angela Casanova Cabello, Carmen Guenaga Anchustegui, and Flora Casals Pons;

S. 172. An act for the relief of Chew Chi Yan;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 242. An act for the relief of Mary Dawn Polson (Emmy Lou Kim) and Joseph King Polson (Sung Sang Moon);

S. 263. An act for the relief of Guisseppe Glorioso;

S. 266. An act for the relief of Georgios Laskaris Tgotgolas;

S. 316. An act for the relief of Min-sun Chen;

S. 331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle;

S. 373. An act for the relief of Myung Ja Kim;

S. 435. An act for the relief of Knud Erik Didriksen;

S. 592. An act for the relief of Nishan Der Simonian;

S. 606. An act to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.;

S. 650. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder;

S. 674. An act for the relief of Roman Dackow;

S. 700. An act for the relief of Fung Wan (Mrs. Jung Gum Goon);

S. 722. An act for the relief of Aideh Kobler;

S. 805. An act for the relief of Yu Liao;

S. 817. An act for the relief of Octavio Jiminez Marquez;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Yeannakopoulos;

S. 848. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.;

S. 866. An act for the relief of Jose Erasmo Reina (Lajara);

S. 942. An act for the relief of Dr. Perkins P. K. Chang (Chang Peng-Keng);

S. 944. An act for the relief of Mr. Najm Boulos Rihani;

S. 1040. An act to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and for other purposes;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hoisery Co., of Henderson, N.C.;

S. 1373. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Lanza Lascuola;

S. 1440. An act to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), relating to the establishment of a register in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle operators' licenses;

S. 1668. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields; and

S. 1931. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (REPT. No. 469)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Continenal Army Command

"(First Army)

"Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $626,000.

"(Second Army)

"Camp A. P. Hill, Virginia: Training facilities, $284,000.

"Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $492,000.

"Fort Meade, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,211,000.

"Camp Pickett, Virginia: Training facilities, $396,000.

"Fort Richie, Maryland: Troop housing, $305,000.

"(Third Army)

"Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, $10,524,000.

"Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $521,000.

"Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $618,000.

"Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,571,000.

"Fort Stewart, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,240,000.

"(Fourth Army)

"Fort Bliss, Texas: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $455,000.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

"Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $3,054,000.

"Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities, $8,695,000.

"(Fifth Army)

"Fort Riley, Kansas: Troop housing, $99,000.

"Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,081,000.

"(Sixth Army)

"Camp Irwin, California: Family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,810,000.

"Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $524,000.

"Fort Ord, California: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,357,000.

"Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $388,000.

"Technical Services Facilities

"(Chemical Corps)

"Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $4,029,000.

"(Corps of Engineers)

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, research development, and test facilities, and maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,499,000.

"(Ordnance Corps)

"Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Utilities, $472,000.

"Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Research, development, and test facilities, $5,038,000.

"Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Utilities, $382,000.

"(Quartermaster Corps)

"Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $231,000.

"Columbus General Depot, Ohio: Administrative facilities, $419,000.

"Fort Lee, Virginia: Utilities, $84,000.

"Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $3,812,000.

"Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Virginia: Administrative facilities and community facilities, $600,000.

"Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational and training facilities, $202,000.

"(Signal Corps)

"Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, $2,228,000.

"Lexington Signal Depot, Kentucky: Utilities, $33,000.

"(Medical Service)

"Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Medical facilities, $45,000.

"(Transportation Corps)

"Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,253,000.

"United States Military Academy

"United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, $4,222,000.

"Defense Atomic Support Agency

"Clarksville Base, Tennessee: Utilities, $238,000.

"Sandia Base, New Mexico: Operational facilities and community facilities, $1,744,000.

"Army Component Commands

"(United States Army Air Defense Command)

"Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,417,000.

"(Alaska Command Area)

"Various locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $5,951,000.

"(Pacific Command Area)

"Aliamanu Military Reservation, Hawaii: Utilities, $36,000.

"Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $918,000.

"Various locations: Operational facilities, $814,000.

"Outside the United States

"(Ordnance Corps)

"Kwajalein Island: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $1,546,000.

"(Army Security Agency)

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $7,765,000.

"Army Component Commands

"(Pacific Command Area)

"Korea: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $10,635,000.

"Fort Buckner, Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, $6,676,000.

"Camp Tomlinson, Japan: Operational facilities, $50,000.

"Guam: Real estate, $80,000.

"(European Command Area)

"Germany: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $6,423,000.

"Classified locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $3,105,000.

"(Caribbean Command Area)

"Fort Allen, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $381,000.

"Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Community facilities and utilities, $582,000.

"SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $6,245,000.

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

"SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES', in section 101 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sixth Army Area)', with respect to Fort Lewis, Washington, strike out '$1,085,000' and insert in place thereof '$1,257,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts '$110,625,000' and '$310,535,000' and inserting in place thereof '$110,797,000' and '$310,707,000', respectively.

"SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES', in section 101 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)', with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out '$532,000' and insert in place thereof '$600,000'.

"(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102 the amount '$81,830,000' and inserting in place thereof '$83,876,000'.

"(c) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts '$73,652,100,' '$81,830,000', and '$189,692,100' and inserting in place thereof '$73,720,100', '$83,876,000', and '$191,806,100', respectively.

"SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' in section 101 as follows:

"Under the subheading 'FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)' with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out '$9,087,000' and insert in place thereof '$11,731,000'.

"(b) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 '$76,631,000' and '$143,561,000' and inserting in place thereof '$79,275,000' and '$146,205,000', respectively.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Shipyard Facilities

"Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $700,000.

"Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Delaware: Family housing, and utilities, $519,000.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Family housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,460,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia; Maintenance facilities, $211,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,774,000.

"Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, California: Operational facilities, $417,000.

"Fleet Base Facilities

"Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Family housing, and utilities, $3,460,000.

"Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,951,000.

"Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Operational facilities and utilities, $720,000.

"Naval Station, Mayport, Florida; Family housing, medical facilities, utilities, and real estate, $2,992,000.

"Naval Weapons Facilities

"(Training Stations)

"Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Training facilities, $639,000.

"Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Community facilities, $94,000.

"(Field Support Stations)

"Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Supply facilities, $309,000.

"Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, $211,000.

"Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, $68,000.

"Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Utilities, $772,000.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Supply facilities, family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,739,000.

"Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,591,000.

"Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $435,000.

"Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $1,480,000.

"Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $161,000.

"(Marine Corps Air Stations)

"Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $190,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,703,000.

"Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $463,000.

"Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,731,000.

"(Fleet Readiness Stations)

"Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Research, development and test facilities, $345,000.

"Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Supply facilities, $460,000.

"(Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Stations)

"Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Utilities, $1,086,000.

"Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $1,628,000.

"Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Utilities; at Point Arguello, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, on San Nicholas Island, operational facilities, research development and test facilities, and utilities, $2,791,000.

"Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $240,000.

"Supply Facilities

"Military Industrial Supply Agency, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $825,000.

"Marine Corps Facilities

"Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $6,101,000.

"Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Administrative facilities, $118,000.

"Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Hospital facilities, $1,100,000.

"Service School Facilities

"Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, $9,687,000.

"Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,952,000.

"Naval Schools, Mare Island, Vallejo, California: Training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,213,000.

"Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California: Training facilities, $2,463,000.

"Atlantic Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Tactical School, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $868,000.

"Medical Facilities

"Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Hospital facilities, $60,000.

"Communication Facilities

"Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational facilities, $900,000.

"Naval Security Group Detachment, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, $240,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Maryland: Operational facilities, $151,000.

"Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Troop housing, $165,000.

"Naval Communication Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $77,000.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Family housing, and utilities, $519,000.

"Yards and Docks Facilities

"Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Family housing, and utilities, $3,460,000.

"Outside the United States

"Naval Weapons Facilities

"Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain: Utilities, $115,000.

"Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,527,000.

"Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,375,000.

"Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Maintenance facilities, $1,791,000.

"Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $90,000.

"Marine Corps Facilities

"Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa: Operational facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,238,000.

"SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $40,969,000.

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

"SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, '$93,101,000', and inserting in place thereof '$129,701,000'.

"(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts '$93,101,000' and '$351,294,000', and inserting respectively in place thereof '$129,701,000', and '$387,894,000'.

"SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended in section 201 under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'SHIPYARD FACILITIES', with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, by striking out the amount '$14,855,000', and inserting in place thereof '$17,955,000'.

"(b) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502, the amounts '$83,975,000' and '$127,566,000', and inserting respectively in place thereof '$87,075,000' and '$130,666,000'.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

"Inside the United States

"Air Defense Command

"Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $888,000.

"K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,468,000.

"Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, $1,256,000.

"McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $404,000.

"Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,677,000.

"NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $12,400,000.

"Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $373,000.

"Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Real estate, $43,000.

"Air Materiel Command

"Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio: Administrative facilities, $420,000.

"Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational facilities, $160,000.

"Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, and utilities, $7,010,000.

"McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,280,000.

"Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,639,000.

"Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,107,000.

"Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $881,000.

"Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $1,653,000.

"Air Research and Development Command

"Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, $18,500,000.

"Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $1,885,000.

"Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, $345,000.

"Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,819,000.

"Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities and community facilities, $630,000.

"Various locations, Atlantic Missile Range: Operational facilities, and research development, and test facilities, $10,006,000.

"Air Training Command

"Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Community facilities, $296,000.

"Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop housing, $342,000.

"James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Community facilities and utilities, $427,000.

"Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Medical facilities and community facilities, $693,000.

"Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,040,000.

"Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Medical facilities, $371,000.

"Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,075,000.

"Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Supply facilities, $203,000.

"Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, $1,256,000.

"Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational facilities, $135,000.

"Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Troop housing and utilities, $553,000.

"Air University

"Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Community facilities, $86,000.

"Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,413,000.

"Alaskan Air Command

"Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Community facilities, $354,000.

"Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $240,000.

"King Salmon Airport, Naknek, Alaska: Operational facilities, $684,000.

"Various locations, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,837,000.

"Headquarters Command

"Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,692,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Maintenance facilities, $145,000.

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $125,000.

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Maintenance facilities and medical facilities, $441,000.

"Pacific Air Forces

"Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $122,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $1,217,000.

"Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $373,000.

"Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $74,000.

"Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational facilities and community facilities, $475,000.

"Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $411,000.

"Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $236,000.

"Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational facilities, $72,000.

"Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, $193,000.

"Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Community facilities, $197,000.

"Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $828,000.

"Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $568,000.

"Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, community facilities and utilities, $762,000.

"Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Hospital facilities, $2,050,000.

"Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $2,716,000.

"Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities and troop housing, $509,000.

"Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Supply facilities and medical facilities, $360,000.

"Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $934,000.

"Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Hospital facilities, $1,900,000.

"Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational facilities, $67,000.

"Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $72,000.

"March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, $6,280,000.

"McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, $66,000.

"McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $163,000.

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate. $541,000.

"Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, $172,000.

"Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, $415,000.

"Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $490,000.

"Tampa Fuel Annex, Tampa, Florida: Utilities, $48,000.

"Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia; Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $3,481,000.

"Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $466,000.

"Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Utilities, $100,000.

"Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, $8,677,000.

"Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Community facilities and utilities, $458,000.

"Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, $2,240,000.

"Tactical Air Command

"Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,544,000.

"Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,441,000.

"Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $98,000.

"Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $2,433,000.

"Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $512,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $16,129,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational facilities, $142,000.

"Transportable Family Housing

"Various locations: Family housing, $3,584,000.

"Outside the United States

"Caribbean Air Command

"Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, $117,000.

"Military Air Transport Service

"Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $977,000.

"Pacific Air Forces

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $9,468,000.

"Strategic Air Command

"Anderson Air Force Base, Guam: Operational facilities, $181,000.

"Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $80,000.

"Various locations: Operational facilities, $1,988,000.

"United States Air Forces in Europe

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $10,004,000.

"United States Air Force Security Service

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,059,000.

"Aircraft Control and Warning System

"Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,768,000.

"Special Facilities

"Various locations: Operational facilities, $651,000.

"SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $285,300,000.

"SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, util-

ities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

"SEC. 304. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure '$139,797,000' and inserting in place thereof the figure '$141,797,000'.

"SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended in section 301 under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND', with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, by striking out '$110,000' and inserting in place thereof '$169,000'.

"(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts of '$299,576,800' and '$850,175,800' and inserting in place thereof '$299,635,800' and '$850,234,800', respectively.

"SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended in section 301 under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND', with respect to Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, by striking out '$10,500,000' and inserting in place thereof '$11,800,000'.

"(b) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts of '$204,735,000' and '$727,305,000' and inserting in place thereof '$206,035,000' and '$728,605,000', respectively.

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. In addition to the family housing units authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to construct not more than 500 family housing units with necessary utilities at locations and in numbers specified by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee.

"SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,650,000 to carry out the purposes of this title.

"TITLE V

"SEC. 501. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense the sum of $27,000,000 for the construction and adjustment of support and technical facilities for missiles and space systems projects. The Secretary of Defense shall allocate funds appropriated pursuant to the provisions of this section to the military departments on such basis as he determines to be necessary in the interest of the National Defense.

"TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

"(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $76,918,000; outside the United States, $37,243,000; section 102, $6,245,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $130,406,000.

"(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $79,239,000; outside the United States, $8,136,000; section 202, $40,969,000, section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $138,344,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $146,868,000; outside the United States, $32,293,000; section 302, $285,300,000; section 303, $10,000,000; or a total of $474,461,000.

"(4) for title IV: $8,650,000.

"(5) for title V: $27,000,000.

"SEC. 603. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

"SEC. 604. Whenever—

"(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

"(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

"SEC. 605. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

"SEC. 606. As of July 1, 1962, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 11, 1959, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

"(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

"(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1962, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

"(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

"(4) notwithstanding the provisions of section 506 of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 184), the authorization for—

"(a) administrative facilities in the amount of $5,666,000 at Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)' of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636);

"(b) troop housing and utilities in the amount of $3,749,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (First Army Area)' of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

"(c) troop housing in the amount of $584,000 at Fort Benning, Georgia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)' of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

"(d) administrative facilities and troop housing in the amount of $2,839,000 at Fort Hood, Texas, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)' of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

"(e) troop housing in the amount of $713,000 at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)' of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

"(f) medical facilities in the amount of $4,136,000 for Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, under the heading 'CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES' and the subheading 'AIR DEFENSE COMMAND' that is contained in title III, section 301, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 338), as amended;

"(g) operational facilities, and real estate in the amount of $4,352,000 for Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, under the heading 'INSIDE THE UNITED STATES' and subheading 'AVIATION FACILITIES (MARINE CORPS AIR STATION)' of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 643).

"SEC. 607. (a) Section 803(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*And provided further*, That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after October 1, 1962, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than twenty-eight thousand family units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date.'

"(b) The military departments are hereby authorized to contract for the construction of three thousand housing units under section 803 of the National Housing Act, as amended, at such locations as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, except that three hundred of such three thousand units shall be designated for Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia.

"SEC. 608. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1964, the Secretaries of the

Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near tactical military installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit.'

"SEC. 609. Effective July 1, 1961, no family housing unit may be rehabilitated at a cost in excess of that established by section 109 of Public Law 86-630 as a limitation on the cost of construction of family housing units, except where the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, has notified the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives prior to such rehabilitation: *Provided*, That no family housing unit may be rehabilitated at a cost in excess of $20,000.

"SEC. 610. Section 407 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words 'July 1, 1961' in subsection (e) and inserting 'July 1, 1962' in lieu thereof; and (2) by striking out the words 'July 1, 1962' from subsection (g) and inserting 'July 1, 1965' in lieu thereof.

"SEC. 611. Section 409 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is repealed.

"SEC. 612. None of the authority contained in title I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

"(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

"(2) $8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

"(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

"(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters;

unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

"SEC. 613. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the 'Military Construction Act of 1961.'

"TITLE VII—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

"SEC. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for Reserve Forces:

"(1) For Department of the Army:

"Army National Guard of the United States (Armory)

"Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $158,000.

"Altavista, Virginia: Training facilities, $134,000.

"Altus, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $152,000.

"Anacortes, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

"Atchison, Kansas: Training facilities, $93,000.

"Austin, Minnesota: Training facilities, $210,000.

"Baltimore, Maryland: Training facilities, $300,000.

"Baraboo, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $171,000.

"Batavia, New York: Training facilities, $234,000.

"Baxley, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

"Bay Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, $72,000.

"Beaufort, South Carolina: Training facilities, $96,000.

"Beaver, Utah: Training facilities, $111,000.

"Bedford, Indiana: Training facilities conversion, $52,000.

"Bluefield, West Virginia: Training facilities, $225,000.

"Bonham, Texas: Training facilities, $87,000.

"Boone, Iowa: Training facilities, $225,000.

"Boston (West Roxbury), Massachusetts: Training facilities, $249,000.

"Brantley, Alabama: Training facilities, $72,000.

"Bridgeport, Alabama: Training facilities, $72,000.

"Brooklyn, New York: Training facilities conversion, $50,000.

"Caldwell, Idaho: Training facilities, $125,000.

"Campbellsville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

"Chadron, Nebraska: Training facilities, $43,250.

"Charleston, South Carolina: Training facilities, $128,000.

"Charleston, South Carolina: Training facilities, $96,000.

"Clackamas, Oregon: Training facilities expansion, $150,000.

"Columbia, South Carolina: Training facilities, $400,000.

"Columbus, Ohio: Training facilities, $540,000.

"Dallas (number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

"Decatur, Mississippi: Training facilities, $72,000.

"Deer Lodge, Montana: Training facilities, $69,000.

"Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

"Devils Lake, North Dakota: Training facilities, $135,000.

"East Providence, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $266,000.

"Eau Claire, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $240,000.

"Edgeley, North Dakota: Training facilities, $150,000.

"Elizabethtown, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

"Enfield-Thompsonville, Connecticut: Training facilities, $169,000.

"Fairmont, West Virginia: Training facilities, $210,000.

"Fallon, Nevada: Training facilities, $101,000.

"Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $171,000.

"Geneseo, New York: Training facilities, $233,000.

"Glasgow, Kentucky: Training facilities, $136,000.

"Glasgow, Montana: Training facilities, $69,000.

"Glennville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

"Great Bend, Kansas: Training facilities, $93,000.

"Green Bay, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $205,000.

"Hamlet, North Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

"Harlingen, Texas: Training facilities, $118,000.

"Hinesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

"Holly Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

"Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $282,000.

"Hopkinsville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $134,000.

"Huntington, West Virginia: Training facilities, $250,000.

"Jesup, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

"Kerens, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

"Kingwood, West Virginia: Training facilities, $170,000.

"Lake Village, Arkansas: Training facilities, $54,000.

"Lincoln, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

"Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $156,000.

"Marion, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

"Mercedes, Texas: Training facilities, $104,000.

"Mexia, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

"Mission, Texas: Training facilities $74,000.

"Monroe, Louisiana: Training facilities, $191,000.

"Monticello, Indiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

"Monticello, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

"Morehead City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $101,250.

"Morgantown, West Virginia: Training facilities, $198,000.

"Moultrie, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

"Mount Holly, New Jersey: Training facilities, $169,000.

"Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Training facilities, $87,000.

"Newark, New Jersey: Training facilities rehabilitation, $234,000.

"Newton, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

"Newport, Vermont: Training facilities, $136,000.

"Nogales, Arizona: Training facilities, $83,000.

"North Vernon, Indiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

"Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, $117,000.

"O'Neil, Nebraska: Training facilities, $43,250.

"Palmetto, Florida: Training facilities, $120,000.

"Panama City, Florida: Training facilities, $120,000.

"Parsons, Tennessee: Training facilities, $102,000.

"Philadelphia, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

"Phillipsburg, Kansas: Training facilities, $92,000.

"Phoenixville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $125,000.

"Portage, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $150,000.

"Port Gibson, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

"Pueblo, Colorado: Training facilities, $135,000.

"Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $102,000.

"Raleigh, North Carolina: Training facilities, $431,000.

"Raleigh-Durham Airport, North Carolina: Training facilities, $158,000.

"Richmond, Virginia: Training facilities, $700,000.

"Roseville, California: Training facilities, $150,000.

"Rupert, Idaho: Training facilities, $75,000.

"Saint Albans, West Virginia: Training facilities, $190,000.

"Saint George, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

"Saint Louis or Saint Louis County, Missouri: Training facilities, $122,000.

"Seguin, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

"Sparta, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

"Spartanburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, $186,000.

"Spindale-Forest City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $113,000.

"Starkville, Mississippi: Training facilities, $120,000.

"Stockton, California: Training facilities, $254,000.

"Tamaqua, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $210,000.

"Tifton, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

"Truth or Consequences, New Mexico: Training facilities, $67,000.

"Turlock, California: Training facilities, $115,000.

"Van Nuys, California: Training facilities, $202,000.

"Wagner, South Dakota: Training facilities, $165,000.

"Warrenton, Missouri: Training facilities, $150,000.

"Waterville, Maine: Training facilities, $257,000.

"Wayne, Nebraska: Training facilities, $116,000.

"West Orange, New Jersey: Training facilities rehabilitation, $243,000.

"Wheatland, Wyoming: Training facilities, $109,000.

"Winston-Salem, North Carolina: Training facilities, $135,000.

"Woonsocket, South Dakota: Training facilities, $128,000.

"Worcester, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $328,000.

"Various locations: Training facilities, minor conversions and additions, $150,000.

"Army National Guard of the United States (non-armory)

"Camp Blanding, Florida: Supply facilities, $177,000.

"Camp Grafton, North Dakota: Troop housing, $263,000.

"Camp Grayling, Michigan: Troop housing, $900,000.

"Camp Ripley, Minnesota: Troop housing, $300,000.

"Camp Roberts, California: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

"Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Troop housing, $800,000.

"Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, $800,000.

"Fort William H. Harrison, Montana: Troop housing, $258,000.

"Montgomery, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and supply facilities, $582,000.

"Point Pleasant, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $340,000.

"Santa Fe, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and supply facilities, $546,000.

"Various locations: Minor projects, $110,000.

"Army Reserve

"Brownsville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $190,000.

"Burlington, Vermont: Acquisition and rehabilitation of training facilities, $79,000.

"Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $185,000.

"Chicago (number 4), Illinois: Training facilities, $778,000.

"Cincinnati (number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $601,000.

"Durham, North Carolina: Training facilities addition, $58,000.

"Erie, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $323,000.

"Fall River, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $386,000.

"Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, $393,000.

"Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Training facilities, $321,000.

"Gulfport, Mississippi: Training facilities, $321,000.

"Huntington, West Virginia: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

"Jamaica, Long Island, New York: Training facilities expansion, $237,000.

"Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities, $465,000.

"Kalamazoo, Michigan: Training facilities, $389,000.

"Kansas City, Kansas: Training facilities, $572,000.

"Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities expansion, $202,000.

"Little Rock (Adams Field), Arkansas: Training facilities addition, $48,000.

"Lynchburg, Virginia: Training facilities, $218,000.

"Martinsburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

"McAllen, Texas: Training facilities expansion, $197,000.

"Morgantown, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

"New Martinsville, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

"Ontario-LaVerne-Rialto Area, California: Training facilities, $372,000.

"Paris, Texas: Training facilities, $166,000.

"Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, $572,000.

"Pleasant Grove, Utah: Training facilities, $181,000.

"South Charleston, West Virginia: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

"Springfield, Massachusetts: Training facilities, expansion, $111,000.

"Terminal, Texas: Training facilities, $273,000.

"Terre Haute, Indiana: Training facilities addition, $67,000.

"Waycross, Georgia: Training facilities, $163,000.

Yakima, Washington: Training facilities, $236,000.

"Yauco, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $226,000.

"Various locations: Training facilities, minor additions, and rehabilitation, $3,038,000.

"Land acquisition: Training facilities, $466,000.

"(2) For Department of the Navy:

"Naval Reserve (Aviation)

"Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

"Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Maintenance facilities, $54,000.

"Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities, $575,000.

"Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, $347,000.

"Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $200,000.

"Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Utilities, $100,000.

"Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $392,000.

"Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, troop housing, and maintenance facilities, $841,000.

"Naval Reserve (Surface)

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Belleville, Texas: Acquisition and rehabilitation of training facilities, $47,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Brooklyn, New York: Training facilities rehabilitation, $50,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Erie, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $622,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, $62,000.

"Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Midland-Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $55,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Mobile, Alabama: Training facilities, $550,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $648,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Training facilities, $364,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Vallejo, California: Training facilities rehabilitation, $151,000.

"Naval Reserve Master Control Radio Station and Electronics Facility, Waukegan, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, $96,000.

"Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Training facilities addition, $91,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve (ground)

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Midland-Odessa, Texas: Training facilities and land acquisition, $373,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Mobile, Alabama: Training facilities, $207,000.

"Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $237,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Bruno, California: Training facilities rehabilitation, $107,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tallahassee, Florida: Training facilities addition, $200,000.

"Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Waukegan, Illinois: Training facilities, $140,000.

"(3) For Department of the Air Force:

"Air National Guard of the United States

"Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $588,000.

"Berry Field, Nashville, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

"Congaree Air Base, Columbia, South Carolina: Operational, training and maintenance facilities, $1,830,000.

"Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational facilities, $770,000.

"Foss Field, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Operational facilities rehabilitation, $516,000.

"Fresno Airport, Fresno, California: Operational facilities, $794,000.

"General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $923,000.

"Grenier Field, Manchester Municipal Airport, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, $400,000.

"Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $372,000.

"Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Supply facilities, $252,000.

"Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $287,000.

"Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $888,000.

"Imeson Municipal Airport, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities, $1,027,000.

"Kulis Air National Guard Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational, training and maintenance facilities, $678,000.

"Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Utilities, $200,000.

"Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and utilities, $1,965,000.

"New Castle County Airport, New Castle, Delaware: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

"O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $774,000.

"Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

"Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California: Operational facilities, $1,426,000.

"Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational facilities rehabilitation, $360,000.

"Salt Lake Municipal Airport, Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

"Schenectady County Airport, Schenectady, New York: Operational facilities, $620,000.

"Toledo Express Airport, Toledo, Ohio: Operational facilities, $654,000.

"Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $526,000.

"Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, rehabilitation, $300,000.

"Tulsa Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $360,000.

"Volk Field, Camp Williams, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $536,000.

"Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $360,000.

"Air Force Reserve

"Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Supply facilities, $138,000.

"Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Supply facilities, $185,000.

"Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $619,000.

"Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $992,000.

"Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $908,000.

"Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $350,000.

"March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Maintenance facilities, $350,000.

"Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, $608,000.

"Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $715,000.

"(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

"SEC. 702. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading 'ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NON-ARMORY)' in clause (3) of section 601 with respect to Camp Butner, North Carolina, by striking out 'Camp Butner' and inserting in place thereof 'Camp Butner or Raleigh'.

"(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended under the heading 'ARMY RESERVE' in clause (1) of section 501 with respect to Chicago Heights, Illinois, by striking out 'Chicago Heights' and inserting in place thereof 'Harvey', and by striking out '$302,000' and inserting in place thereof '$375,000'.

"(c) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended in clause (2) of section 501 as follows;

"(1) Under the heading 'NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)' with respect to Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts, strike out '$76,000' and insert in place thereof '$170,000'.

"(2) Under the heading 'NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)' with respect to Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas, strike out '$204,000' and insert in place thereof '$262,000'.

"(d) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended under the heading 'AIR FORCE RESERVE' in clause (3) of section 501 with respect to General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, by striking out '$43,000' and inserting in place thereof '$72,000'.

"(e) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1)(a) of section 504 '$21,457,000' and inserting in place thereof '$21,530,000', by striking out in clause (2) of section 504 '$8,300,000' and inserting in place thereof '$8,452,000', and by striking out in clause (3)(a) of section 504 '$4,093,000' and inserting in place thereof '$4,122,000'.

"(f) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading 'ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)' in clause 1 of section 601 as follows:

"(1) With respect to Clear Lake, South Dakota, strike out '$63,000' and insert in place thereof '$72,000'.

"(2) With respect to Riverdale, New Jersey, strike out '$171,000' and insert in place thereof '$190,000'.

"(3) Strike out the following:

" 'Carmichael, California: Training facilities, $115,000'.

" 'Spartanburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, $134,000'.

"(g) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading 'ARMY RESERVE' in clause (1) of section 601 with respect to Pittsburg, California, by striking out 'Pittsburg' and inserting in place thereof 'Concord'.

"(h) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading 'AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES' in clause (3) of section 601 with respect to Foss Field, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, by striking out '$675,000' and inserting in place thereof '$1,038,000'.

"(i) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause 1(a) of section 604 '$18,226,000' and inserting in place thereof '$18,005,000', and by striking out in clause (3)(a) of section 604 '$13,797,000' and inserting in place thereof '$14,160,000'.

"SEC. 703. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

"SEC. 704. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 701 for the respective reserve components of the Armed Forces may not exceed—

"(1) for the Department of the Army:

"(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $22,682,750.

"(b) Army Reserve, $12,505,000.

"(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $7,794,000.

"(3) for Department of the Air Force:

"(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $18,606,000.

"(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,865,000.

"SEC. 705. Any of the amounts named in section 701 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost for all projects authorized for the Army National Guard of the United States, the Army Reserve, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force Reserve, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a) and (3)(b) of section 704 respectively.

"SEC. 706. As of July 1, 1962, all authorizations for specific facilities for reserve forces to be accomplished by the Secretary of Defense, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization, are repealed, except the authorizations for facilities for the reserve forces as to which appropriated funds have been obligated in whole or in part before July 1, 1962, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

"SEC. 707. This title may be cited as the 'Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1961'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
L. H. GAVIN,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN STENNIS,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On March 23, 1961, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 5000, which was the fiscal year 1962 military construction authorization for the Department of Defense, and the Reserve components. On May 9, 1961, the Senate considered the legislation and amended it by striking all language after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill.

MAJOR ITEMS IN CONTROVERSY

Military family housing

Perhaps the most significant differences existing in the House and Senate versions of H.R. 5000 were concerned with the subject of military housing.

Under the provisions of the House passed bill, the military departments and the Department of Defense were authorized:

(a) to build a total of 7,074 new family housing units under the so-called Capehart program at various specified locations.

(b) to proceed with the construction of 5,000 additional units of family housing previously authorized to be accomplished under the Capehart program. (The departments have been unable to construct approximately 6,280 units of Capehart housing because of the application of a statutory ceiling which established an overall ceiling of 25,000 on the total number of Capehart units which could be contracted for after June 30, 1959.)

In summary, therefore, the House action would have extended the Capehart program for another year, until October 1, 1962, and would have permitted the military departments to proceed with the construction of a total of 12,074 units of family housing.

The Senate concurred with the House as to the need for additional military family housing but was of the opinion that the Capehart program was not the most economical or practical method of satisfying this requirement.

The Senate therefore refused to extend the Capehart program beyond its present terminal date of October 1, 1961, and accordingly failed to approve any new Capehart authorizations or an increase in the ceiling in previously authorized Capehart housing.

The Senate, in lieu of authorizing the Capehart housing units approved by the House, substituted 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing at an average cost of $16,500 per unit.

After considerable discussion, both the House and Senate agreed to recede from their respective positions as outlined above and

agreed to a compromise position which is as follows:

(a) the 7,074 new Capehart authorization contained in the House-passed bill was deleted from the bill.

(b) the Capehart program was extended until October 1, 1962, along with an increase in the existing statutory ceiling on authorized Capehart construction from 25,000 to 28,000.

(c) the conferees in raising the existing statutory ceiling (see section 607) by 3,000 units agreed to permit the Secretary of Defense to designate the locations of the units to be built from among those units previously authorized, or any other locations which require military family housing. However, the conferees included a provision which required that 300 of these units of military family housing be constructed at the U.S. Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.

(d) the 2,000 appropriated fund units of family housing inserted by the Senate were approved except that the unit cost was increased from $16,500 to $17,300 to accommodate additional costs involved in site acquisition, offsite utilities, etc.

Summary: The action taken by the conferees results in the following authorized additions to military family housing:

Capehart units	3,000
Appropriated funds units	2,000
Total	5,000

Hospitals

A number of medical facilities requested by the individual military departments were not approved by the conferees. Certain of these medical facilities were denied authorization because of a serious question as to their relative priority in the Defense Establishment. Therefore, the conferees requested the Department of Defense to make a thorough study of hospital facilities of the Armed Forces, especially in those areas where new hospitals, or substantial additions to existing hospitals, were required to determine the respective priorities for fulfilling the essential needs for hospital facilities for individuals entitled to medical care at Armed Forces medical facilities. These stated priorities should then be reflected in the departmental requests for medical facilities in the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1963.

Quartermaster Food and Container Institute

Another item of special interest was that relating to the location of the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center at Natick, Mass. The House bill denied authorization requested by the Department of the Army for this construction and substituted a provision (sec. 108) which authorized the Secretary of the Army to make additional studies relative to the location of this proposed facility.

A study relative to relocating the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute and supporting the justification for construction of these facilities at Natick, Mass., was submitted to the House Armed Services Committee by the Secretary of the Army on April 7, 1961.

The Senate did not concur with the House action and approved the authorization requested by the Department of the Army for the new facility at Natick, Mass.

House conferees urged the Senate conferees to reconsider their action and recommended a substitute provision which would have established a Quartermaster Food and Container Institute Site Location Commission. The function of this Commission was to objectively assess the problem and recommend to the Secretary of the Army as promptly as possible a new site for the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute.

The Senate conferees rejected the substitute provision and remained adamant in their position. The House conferees, therefore, recede from their position and accept the Senate position of authorizing the relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute at Natick, Mass.

Special authorization

Another item of controversy involved the utilization of the so-called "emergency authorization" contained in each annual military construction authorization bill.

The House approved 4 line items for authorized additional construction and adjustments to technical facilities requested by the Department of the Army in connection with the development of the Nike-Zeus system.

These items were:

White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.	$2,000,000
Kwajalein Island	5,488,000
Ascension Island	1,000,000
Point Mugu	100,000
Total	8,588,000

The Senate deleted these authorizations in their entirety since details of the additional construction and adjustments to technical facilities had not been finalized. Therefore, the Senate proposed that the Department of the Army utilize the "emergency authorization" provided in section 103 to develop these facilities after it had finalized its specific requirements.

In accordance with this position, the emergency authorization in section 103 of the bill was increased by $5 million above the House approved $10 million figure.

The House conferees objected to this action of the Senate since it represented a departure from the original purpose for which the "emergency authorization" was created. The emergency authorization provided in each year's annual military construction bill provides the Secretaries of the individual services with "emergency construction authority" made necessary by changes in service: "missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization act would be inconsistent with interests of national security."

Thus, in short, this authority is provided for emergency use only and is not intended to be utilized for construction projects which can properly be anticipated and therefore authorized by line items.

However, the House conferees recognized the unusual circumstances which prompted the Senate action in respect to these items.

In addition, the Senate has taken a similar position in respect to $12 million of classified construction authorization approved by the House in section 302 for the Department of the Air Force and directed that this construction be similarly covered by the "emergency authorization" provided the Air Force in section 303 of the bill. The Senate therefore increased the emergency authorization provided the Air Force by $5 million over the $10 million approved by the House in order to compensate for their change.

Subsequent to House and Senate action on H.R. 5000, the Committees on Armed Services of both the House and Senate received a request from the Secretary of Defense to provide an additional $12 million for the Department of the Air Force for construction of test facilities for a large, solid-propellant booster to be used in connection with our Nation's space effort. This project was included by the President in his address to the Congress on May 25, 1961, in which he stressed the importance he attached to increased effort in our space program.

This authorization would permit the design, site preparation, and the first increment of construction of test facilities related to the development of a large, solid-propellant rocket motor, having a thrust in the order of 2 to 3 million pounds.

Preliminary studies indicate that construction required to support this program will be phased over several years at a cost currently estimated in the range of $60 million to $100 million. It is understood that when these rocket motors are successfully developed, they will be made available to NASA for a moon vehicle and for such Department of Defense requirements as may evolve.

Allocation of this project to the Department of the Air Force is consonant with current policy which has directed that NASA effort will concentrate on improvement of their large, liquid-propelled booster while the Department of Defense effort, because of previous experience, will concurrently be directed toward the development of the large, solid-propellant motor.

In view of the additional authorization requested to support this project and because of the unusual circumstances involved in the projects previously discussed as approved by the House, the House and Senate conferees agreed to recede from their respective positions and substituted the following completely new section in title V of the bill. This section reads as follows:

"SEC. 501. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense the sum of $27,000,000 for the construction and adjustment of support and technical facilities for missiles and space systems projects. The Secretary of Defense shall allocate funds appropriated pursuant to the provisions of this section to the military departments on such basis as he determines to be necessary in the interest of the national defense."

This new section will be utilized by the Secretary of Defense to provide the necessary construction authorization to permit the accomplishment of projects presently included within the $8,588,000 requested by the Department of the Army; $12 million requested by the Department of the Air Force in section 302 of the House bill; and the additional $12 million requested by the Secretary of Defense for support of the space program.

In this connection, the conferees wish to call attention to the fact that the $12 million authorization especially requested by the Secretary of Defense for the construction of facilities necessary for the testing of solid fuel propellants should preclude the development of similar type facilities requested by the Air Force at the Hill Air Force Range, Utah, which appear to be basically for the same purpose.

It is to be noted that the total authorization provided in this new section, $27 million, is less than the total ($32,588,000) of the projects against which this authority will be applied. Nonetheless, the conferees were of the opinion that the total of $27 million would be adequate to fund the most urgent of those projects included within these programs.

In view of the foregoing changes, the emergency authorization sections, 103, 203, and 303, were reduced to the original House figure of $10 million.

TITLE I—ARMY

In addition to the items in controversy previously discussed, numerous other items were in disagreement in this title of the bill. These items were resolved as follows:

Fort Myer, Va.: An item authorizing $2,120,000 which would have permitted the construction of troop housing and utilities was deleted by the Senate. The Senate conferees insisted that this proposed construction required additional study within the Department of Defense to establish a long-term

program for efficiently housing military personnel and support activities in the Washington area. The House recedes from its position.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: The House had authorized construction in the amount of $5,038,000 for research, development, and test facilities at this location. However, the Senate had deleted this authorization in its entirety on the basis that it was not essential to the immediate needs of the Department of the Army. House conferees pointed out that deferral of the project will hamper planned programs and that the Office of the Secretary of Defense considers this project to be extremely urgent for support of the Army missile program. The Senate, therefore, receded from its position.

Columbus General Depot, Ohio: The House approved this item in the amount of $988,000, whereas the Senate deleted this item in its entirety. The Department of Defense advised that it required $419,000 of this authorization to complete construction at this location. The House and Senate conferees receded from their positions and amended this item to provide authorization in the amount of $419,000.

Army Security Agency (oversea locations): The Department of the Army had originally requested $7,765,000 for the Army Security Agency. However, the House reduced this authorization to $2,586,000, since the balance was not scheduled for funding. The Senate was subsequently advised that this item would be funded and, accordingly, this item was authorized by the Senate in the amount of $7,765,000. Since this item is now scheduled for funding the House conferees agreed to recede and accept the Senate change.

Various locations: In addition to the foregoing changes, the Senate position in respect to: Fort Belvoir, Va.; Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.; Korea; France; and Germany prevailed and the House receded from its position.

TITLE II—NAVY

In this title of the bill, the items in disagreement were resolved as follows:

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.: The House authorized $4 million for the construction of maintenance facilities which would have permitted the development of a nuclear submarine overhaul and repair facility at the Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia. This item was not requested by the Department of Defense nor was it supported by the Department of the Navy. The position of the Department of the Navy was that shipyards now capable of overhauling nuclear submarines combined with those already scheduled for phasing into the program in the near future have sufficient capacity to meet both today's requirements and those anticipated over the next several years.

On the basis of the Navy's position in this matter, the Senate failed to approve this item.

It was agreed by the conferees that there existed a very substantial question as to whether or not the Navy has properly programed for the development of nuclear overhaul facilities at existing naval shipyards. Notwithstanding this fact, the Senate conferees remained adamant in their position in opposition to providing this authorization requested for the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, without further inquiry into the matter.

The House conferees pointed out that a special subcommittee had been established by the House Armed Services Committee to make a complete study into the utilization of naval shipyard facilities. This subcommittee, composed of Mr. RIVERS, Mr. HARDY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. VAN ZANDT, and Mr. BATES, proposes to inquire into every facet of this problem for the purpose of developing recommendations as to the future utilization of these facilities. This inquiry will include a review of the present and future mobilization potential of every existing naval shipyard with special emphasis on possible development of a yard capability to meet the accelerated overhaul requirement for naval vessels having a nuclear-propulsion plant.

The study to be made by this subcommittee will include a review of the following shipyards:

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H.

Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.

New York Naval Shipyard, Naval Base, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Naval Base, Philadelphia, Pa.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.

Charleston Naval Shipyard, Naval Base, Charleston, S.C.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.

San Francisco Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, Calif.

In view of the adamant position of the Senate conferees on this item, the House reluctantly receded from its position. However, House conferees, ARENDS, GAVIN, VAN ZANDT, and BATES disagreed with this action of the conferees and requested that this be noted in the conference report.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.: The House denied an authorization request for supply facilities in the amount of $309,000 since it was not scheduled for funding. The Senate approved this authorization and the House recedes.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C.: The House approved this item in the amount of $4,864,000, whereas the Senate reduced this amount by $161,000. The deletion would deny approval of the construction of an equipment maintenance shop on the theory that existing facilities are adequate for the present. The House receded from its position and accepted the Senate reduction.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: The House authorized construction at this site in the amount of $9,687,000. The Senate reduced this figure to $7,730,000. This reduction would have precluded the construction of enlisted personnel barracks amounting to $1,779,000, and an operations building amounting to $178,000. The Senate recedes from its position and accepts the House amount.

Naval Station, District of Columbia: The House approved construction for this activity amounting to $6 million. This construction would have provided personnel facilities necessary for support of naval personnel in the Washington area. However, the Senate deleted this project since it was of the opinion that similar requirements existed for all three services and therefore the Department of Defense should develop a consolidated program to provide these personnel support facilities at a single location which would result in greater economy in construction and maintenance support cost. In view of this position of the Senate, the House receded from its position and the authorization was deleted from the bill.

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, Calif.: The House approved hospital facilities at this location in the amount of $8,763,000. The Senate denied this project since it was of the opinion that construction of this facility could be delayed for another year. After considerable discussion, the House conferees receded from their position.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: The House approved the construction at this site in the amount of $3,165,000. The Senate deleted this item on the theory that the Navy could operate adequately using existing facilities for another year. The Senate conferees prevailed and the House receded from its position.

Section 202: As approved by the House, this section provided authorization in the amount of $30,719,000 for the development of classified naval installations and facilities. The Senate added $10,250,000 to the authorization provided by this section. The addition reflects a supplemental authorization request made by the administration to the Senate after completion of House hearings. The House recedes from its position and accepts the Senate change.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

In addition to the items in controversy previously discussed, numerous other items were in disagreement in this title of the bill. These items were resolved as follows:

Atlantic Missile Range, various locations: The Senate restored $1,024,000 to the authorization which had been reduced by the House to $8,982,000. The House receded from its position and accepted the Senate figure of $10,006,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.: The Senate deleted $181,000 from the authorization provided by the House for a base photographic laboratory. The House receded from its position and accepted the authorization provided by the Senate in the amount of $2,240,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Va.: The House bill authorized construction of a hospital facility in the amount of $3,150,000. This item was deleted by the Senate because it was felt that there are adequate medical facilities of the Army and Navy in the area which could be used by the personnel at Langley AFB. The House recedes from its position and the item was deleted.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nev.: The House bill provided $2,433,000 of construction authority for this location. The Senate increased this authorization by $2,230,000 to provide for a composite medical facility. The House conferees objected to this addition since the medical facility was not scheduled for funding during fiscal year 1962. The House position prevailed and the Senate receded.

A.C. & W. Systems, various locations: The House approved $3,159,000 for construction in connection with our aircraft control and warning system. Subsequent to the House hearings, the administration requested a $13 million addition to this item in order to enhance the capability of our continental defense and warning system as recommended by the President. The Senate approved this addition to the previous amount approved by the House. However, the Senate deleted an item of $30,000 for land acquisition at Cherry Point, N.C. This latter authorization was not required because of the availability of Government-owned land. The final Senate figure was $16,129,000. The House recedes and accepts the Senate authorization.

Miscellaneous changes: The Senate deleted authorization requested by the Department of the Air Force for new and improved runway and apron lighting facilities at various installations as follows: Castle AFB, Calif.; Dow Air Force Base, Maine; Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak.; Larson AFB, Wash.; Pease AFB, N.H.; Plattsburgh AFB, N.Y.; Schilling AFB, Kans.; Walker AFB, N. Mex.; and Westover AFB, Mass. The House receded from its position and accepted the Senate deletions at these locations.

Transportable family housing: The House had rejected the Department of the Air Force request for transportable family housing amounting to $3,584,000. The Senate approved this item in the amount requested by the Department. The House recedes from its position.

U.S. Air Forces in Europe, various locations: The House approved construction of

various facilities in the amount of $9,800,000. The Senate approved a figure of $10,508,000. Both the House and Senate receded from their position and adjusted this figure to a new authorization amounting to $10,004,000.

U.S. Air Force Security Service, various locations: The House approved construction authorization in the amount of $5,949,000. The Senate increased this figure to $6,059,000 to provide essential recreation facilities at oversea locations. The House receded from its position.

A.C. & W. System, overseas: The House approved construction authorization in the amount of $1,768,000. The Senate added $1 million to this figure which was requested by the President subsequent to completion of the House hearings. The House receded.

Section 302: The House approved $251,900,000 for the construction of facilities at classified military installations. Subsequent to the House hearings, the administration requested an increase and adjustment in the authorization amounting to $45,400,000. This change, among other things, provides for the acceleration of the Minuteman program. The House receded from its position and accepted the Senate authorization of $285,300,000.

Deficiency authorizations: The House approved all the deficiency authorizations originally requested by the Department of Defense. The Senate subsequently concurred in the House action, with some minor adjustments. The Senate also added a new authorization providing an increase of $1,300,000 for the Arnold Engineering Center, Tullahoma, Tenn., requested by the Department of Defense subsequent to the House hearings. The House concurred in the Senate changes.

TITLE IV

As discussed earlier in this report, the conferees approved title IV as contained in the Senate bill which related to appropriated fund military family housing.

TITLE V

Title V is an entirely new section added by the conferees which provides the Secretary of Defense with authorization in the amount of $27 million to construct military facilities in support of the missile and space programs of the armed services. This section was explained in detail under the heading "Special Authorization" earlier in this report.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Most of the general provisions are identical to those which have appeared in military construction authorization laws for the last several years. With respect to these, there was no disagreement between the Senate and House versions of the bill. The only variation in the general provisions between the two versions of the bill not previously covered in this report occurred as follows:

Section 609: This section was added by the Senate. It limits the amount of funds that can be spent on rehabilitating family housing units to a cost not in excess of that established for the construction of new housing by section 109 of Public Law 86–630, and in no instance can such costs exceed $20,000.

The House conferees had no objection to this section: however, for the purpose of clarifying the application of this section, insisted that language be added indicating its effective date as July 1, 1961. The Senate conferees accepted this modification and the section, as amended, was agreed to.

Section 610: This section is identical in purpose to section 409 of the House bill and relates to the elimination of substandard, or inadequate, family housing from the inventories of the military departments. The House version would have required elimination of this housing from the inventory of the military no later than July 1, 1963; whereas, the Senate version extended this exemption period for 2 additional years to July 1, 1965. The House recedes from its position and accepts the Senate version.

TITLE VII—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Title VII of H.R. 5000 contains the authorization required to carry forward during fiscal year 1962 the facilities program of all the Reserve components for the Armed Forces.

The authorizations provided by the House were all approved by the Senate. In addition, the Senate provided authorization for construction of Reserve facilities at a number of sites not acted upon by the House. The House conferees accepted the Senate additions with adjustments to the total which increased the figure approved by the Senate by $296,000.

The House and Senate conferees were unanimous in their agreement that beginning with fiscal year 1963, the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate propose to revert to the method of authorizing for all Reserve facilities followed prior to fiscal year 1959. This method was prescribed by the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, and provides for a specific authorization to the Secretary of Defense for use of the Reserve components after consultation with the respective Armed Services Committees of Congress. The procedure inaugurated in the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization bill of authorizing for these facilities on a line item basis has proven unsatisfactory.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Differences in dollar authorizations

As the bill passed the House, the total authorities granted in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Department of Defense, and Reserve components titles totaled $808,375,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version of the bill totaled $879,684,750, or $71,309,750 more than the House version. The total agreed to by the conferees for titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VII is $893,947,750. This latter sum is $85,572,750 more than the House version and $14,263,000 more than the Senate version.

CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
L. H. GAVIN,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, House debate on H.R. 5000 was largely confined to the controversial question of military family housing. Therefore, it is my intention to explain to the Members of the House the action taken by the conferees with respect to this matter.

Under the provisions of the House-passed bill, the military departments were authorized to build a total of 7,074 new family housing units under the so-called Capehart program at various specified locations, and to proceed with the construction of an additional 5,000 units of family housing previously authorized under the Capehart program.

In summary therefore, the House action would have extended the Capehart program for another year, until October 1, 1962, and would have permitted the military departments to proceed with the construction of a total of 12,074 units of family housing.

Some Members of the House urged that the Capehart program be discontinued and recommended that the military departments attempt to satisfy their family housing requirements by way of direct appropriated fund housing.

However, despite this opposition to the Capehart program, the House approved a continuation of the program for another year and authorized the construction of 12,074 family housing units under the Capehart program.

The Senate concurred with the House as to the critical need for additional military family housing, but was of the opinion that the Capehart program was not the most economical or practical method of satifying this requirement.

Our discussion with the Senate conferees concerning the comparative cost of Capehart housing as opposed to appropriated fund housing was not conclusive. However, it was generally agreed that a family housing unit built under the Capehart program would, over a 25-year period, cost approximately $1,900 more than a comparable unit built with appropriated funds.

Notwithstanding this apparent cost differential between appropriated fund housing and Capehart housing, I have, as Members of the House are aware, supported the Capehart program since it has proven itself to be a reliable and satisfactory method of satisfying our military family housing requirements.

However, I have in years gone by, recommended construction of military family housing by direct appropriation. Unfortunately, this request for appropriated fund housing authority has, in many instances, not been given approval by this body.

For example, during the 2d session of the 81st Congress, the House Committee on Armed Services reported a bill to the House which would have authorized the construction of appropriated fund housing in the amount of $152 million.

This provision was deleted from the bill by subsequent floor action at the suggestion of the Rules Committee. At that time, certain members of the Rules Committee urged the Committee on Armed Services to attempt to satisfy military family housing through the operation of the so-called Wherry program. This recommendation was based on the theory that military family housing can best be built through private financing, with a consequent reduction in the use of Government funds.

The Committee on Armed Services heeded the advice of the Rules Committee and the Members of the House, and have, since that time, attempted to satisfy the bulk of military family housing through both the Wherry program and the Capehart program. These programs have provided the Armed Services with almost 200,000 units of family housing since their inception.

Now, however, it appears that times have changed and many Members of the Senate agree with certain Members of the House that we should now return to appropriated family housing.

As a consequence, the Senate refused to endorse the House action in respect to the Capehart program and elected to

build military family housing by direct appropriation.

In accordance with this decision, H.R. 5000 as amended by the Senate deleted the Capehart program in its entirety and substituted 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing, at an average cost of $16,500 per unit. Thus, the conferees were faced with a situation in which the House had endorsed the Capehart program and authorized the building of 12,074 units of family housing, whereas the Senate had rejected the Capehart program entirely and substituted 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing.

The Senate-House conferees discussed the relative merits of the two approaches to military family housing at great length and in great detail. As a result, the conferees agreed on a compromise position which, briefly stated will:

First. Extend the Capehart program for 1 additional year until October 1, 1962, and then let the law die;

Second. Raise the existing statutory ceiling contained in the Capehart law to permit the construction of 3,000 units of military housing under the Capehart program; and

Third. Authorize the construction of 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing as originally approved by the Senate. However, the unit cost of this housing was increased from $16,500 to $17,300 to accommodate additional costs involved in site acquisition, off-site utilities, and so forth.

In summary, the action taken by the conferees results in providing 5,000 units of military family housing—3,000 units to be constructed under the Capehart program, and 2,000 to be constructed and financed by direct appropriations.

In connection with those units authorized for construction under the Capehart program, I wish to point out that except for 300 units which were designated as to their location, the balance may be located at whatever site the Secretary of Defense considers to be most urgently in need of family housing. Thus, the Secretary of Defense may authorize the construction of these 2,700 units of Capehart housing entirely within those units designated in previous military construction authorization acts, or at any new location not heretofore specifically identified in a military construction authorization law. The only guideline provided the Secretary is the requirement that these housing units be constructed at permanent military installations.

The Capehart program which provides military family housing will therefore die on October 1, 1962. However, I feel it important to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this program has conributed tremendously to the morale of our military family, and has, at the same time, permitted the Government an opportunity to acquire substantial real property without expending huge sums of money.

The Capehart program has been effective since 1956. It will expire in 1962. During that interval, approximately 114,000 family housing units will have been built under this program.

The value of these 114,000 Capehart houses will be approximately $2 billion. This housing involved the use of only $120 million of appropriated funds, the balance of the cost of the housing being provided through private financing.

Thus, putting it another way, we have over the past 6 years provided an average of 19,000 units of housing, with an annual direct appropriation of less than $20 million. If this housing had been direct appropriated fund housing, it would have required an annual appropriation of well over $310 million.

Now, the balance of the cost of this privately financed housing amounts to approximately $1.8 billion, amortized over a 25-year period. This cost will be paid for by the Government through the quarters allowance ordinarily provided military personnel who occupy this housing.

As you know, military personnel with dependents are entitled by law to a quarters allowance, which varies in amount depending on the grade of the individual. However, generally speaking, this quarters allowance amounts to approximately $100 per month, and is paid directly to the individual service member when he is not occupying public quarters.

Thus, the quarters allowance requires an appropriation by the Government in any event. However, when personnel occupy public quarters, they forfeit this quarters allowance and, in the case of Capehart housing, permits the amortization of the cost of this housing at no additional cost to the Government.

Despite these advantages of the Capehart program, it is apparently the sense of Congress that it be abandoned. I concur in this action but feel it necessary to acknowledge the fact that the Capehart program has served a most useful purpose over the past 6 years.

I trust we will continue to meet our responsibility to our military families in the future by providing this housing through direct appropriated funds, or through some alternate approach to financing now being studied by Secretary McNamara and the Bureau of the Budget.

In addition to the foregoing, the conferees approved an item authorizing $3,584,000 for the procurement and construction of transportable family housing for the Department of the Air Force. This authorization will provide 256 units of transportable family housing to be located at various remote aircraft control and warning sites.

The conferees expressed the hope that this type of housing will prove to be a satisfactory solution to the problem of providing adequate housing for our military families who are located at these installations which, by their very nature, cannot be considered permanent military installations. In the future, when technological advancements and other circumstances preclude the continued operation of these A.C. & W. sites, the Government will be able to relocate this housing at other sites with a minimum of loss.

In connection with the subject of housing, the conferees added a provision which limits the amount of funds that can be spent on rehabilitating existing family housing units. This provision limits rehabilitation costs to a maximum of $20,000, and should thus preclude some of the abuses which have previously existed in this area.

This change is principally designed to prevent the costly rehabilitation of large, outmoded family housing built many years ago on military installations. The military departments have spent as much as $60,000 remodeling some of these old houses. This provision will prevent such uneconomic action.

DIFFERENCES IN DOLLAR AUTHORIZATIONS

As the bill passed the House, the total authority granted the various military departments amounted to $808,375,000. The corresponding authority granted in the Senate version of the bill amounted to $879,684,750, or $71,309,750 more than the House version.

As pointed out in the conference report, the final total agreed upon by the conferees was $14,263,000 more than the Senate version, and $85,572,750 more than the House version.

Although this difference of approximately $85 million between the original House version and the amount agreed upon by the conferees appears unusually large, it should be borne in mind that subsequent to the House hearings, the administration forwarded a supplemental request to the Senate requesting authorizations in the amount of $69,650,000.

Also, subsequent to the Senate action on the bill, the administration and the President in his address to the Congress on May 25, 1961, requested an additional $12 million critically required for acceleration of our space program. These two supplemental requests alone amounted to approximately $82 million, and largely represent the difference between the House-passed bill and the bill as reported out by the conferees.

The conferees had 120 differences in line items to be resolved. The resolution of these changes, therefore, accounts for the remaining $3 million difference between the original House bill and the bill as reported out by the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for what it may be worth, I certainly agree with the gentleman with respect to future housing for the military.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will my chairman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well if the gentleman would tell the House what we expect to do in the future with reference to Reserve Forces facilities. As the gentleman knows, that has been a problem for many of us. We think it has been wholly and completely unsatisfactory in the past the way we have been proceeding. We hope to change that policy for the future.

Mr. VINSON. I should be glad to have the gentleman make a statement on that at this point.

Mr. ARENDS. It is mentioned right in the report.

The House and Senate conferees were unanimous in their agreement that beginning with fiscal year 1963, the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate propose to revert to the method on authorizing for all Reserve facilities followed prior to fiscal year 1959. This method was prescribed by the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, and provides for a specific authorization to the Secretary of Defense for use of the Reserve components after consultation with the respective Armed Services Committees of Congress. The procedure inaugurated in the fiscal year 1959 military construction authorization bill of authorizing for these facilities on a line item basis has proven unsatisfactory.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, this conference report approves authorization of funds to transfer the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute from Chicago, Ill. to Natick, Mass. It was this transfer which I fought in the House when this bill was first debated and it was this transfer which the House refused to approve. At that time I offered an amendment to strike the funds from the bill and to authorize a study by the Secretary of the Army of the feasibility of relocating the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute either in Chicago, Ill. or in any other location in the country.

The Secretary of the Army purported to undertake the study which had been authorized by the House and had it been conducted fairly I would not now be here protesting the action of this conference. The fact is, however, that the study by the Secretary of the Army was grossly unfair and inadequate. Apparently the Secretary of the Army had already decided, regardless of what the House intended in its last amendment, that the Food and Container Institute should be transferred to Natick, Mass., and that is all there was to it.

The amendment which the House had accepted authorized a review of the matter by the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. That review was undertaken by a task group of the Council with a time limit imposed by the Secretary of the Army of less than a week. The chairman of the task group had told me himself only a week before that a detailed study of the question would require at least 30 days. Yet 30 days was not given. Nor did the Secretary of the Army pay any attention to our request that we be furnished with the Army's requirements as to land, buildings, and personnel—military and civilian—for a relocated installation in Chicago. The conclusions reached by the Secretary of the Army, in fact all the studies in this matter, are predicated on the Army's requirements for the installation at Natick, Mass., and a comparison with the present Institute's inefficient operation on 39th Street in Chicago. Even now, that information has not been made available.

In spite of our repeated declaration that this type of approach was unfair, and that a proper comparison would place the proposed Natick installation against a new installation in Chicago, this question was never investigated. It was totally ignored, and I fear quite deliberately by the Department of the Army, which continued to insist that operating economies justified the move. The fact that there was no basis for computing such economies because its comparison with the existing installation was improper did not bother the Department of the Army at all. In letters to the Secretary of Defense and to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, I insisted that the study was rigged. I still feel it was rigged, that it was unfair and that a new study should have been ordered, one which would give the information which the Congress needs to make up its mind in an intelligent manner.

Had such a study been made, Mr. Speaker, I would not be here today to oppose the conferees' agreement. Inasmuch as the conferees on the part of the House have receded from the House's position and agreed with the conferees on the Senate, the parliamentary situation precludes my demanding a separate vote on this item. I could only endeavor to defeat the entire conference report, of which this item is only a minor part, an action which would be unreasonable. In view of the conferees' action, I have no choice except to continue to contest the matter before the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain correspondence pertaining to this matter, as well as a copy of the transcript of the hearings held by the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council.

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

There was no objection.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, MEETING ON THE PROPOSED RELOCATION OF THE FOOD AND CONTAINER INSTITUTE

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION, MARCH 31, 1961

The meeting on the proposed relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces by the National Research Council convened at 10:05 o'clock in private dining room 5, Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., with Dr. Allen Abrams (the chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ALLEN ABRAMS. Gentlemen, we thought we would start off as indicated the other day by having the presentation by the Food and Container people and Natick people first. The general would like to say a few words first, so we will call on you, General Tribe.

Brig. Gen. MERRILL L. TRIBE. Mr. Chairman, I am General Tribe, commanding general of the Research and Engineering Command at Natick, Mass. Dr. Seiling, Scientific Director, Mr. Addelson, Mr. Allen from Natick, will assist in presentations which we have. We also have Mr. Joe Ecsi from the Office of the Quartermaster General who will make a short presentation. Also present today is Col. James Littlejohn, commandant of the Food and Container Institute, Chicago, and the Scientific Director of the same Institute, Dr. Mehrlich.

We welcome this opportunity to make this presentation, and assist in answering any questions which you might have regarding the move of the Food and Container Institute to the Research and Engineering Command Headquarters, Natick, Mass.

Dr. Seiling will present the scientific benefits to be gained from such a move. He will be followed by Mr. Addelson who will discuss the other benefits which will accrue as a result of the proposed move. He will be followed by Mr. Ecsi, and then Colonel Littlejohn and Dr. Mehrlich are available to assist in answering any questions which the committee may have. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ABRAMS. Thank you, General. May I say this. I think it will be best to have the presentation and the questions after. May I throw in also, since this is a confidential matter, if we are approached by anyone from the press, make no statement whatsoever. We have already had one approach. We don't want this to get into the papers at this time.

Dr. Seiling, would you start off?

Dr. DALE H. SEILING. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. My mission here is to explain to you gentlemen what we consider to be the advantages from a technical and scientific standpoint that would accrue as a result of moving of the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick. At Natick we have the major fundamental science divisions and engineering division. We have here the pioneering research division in which research in chemistry, biochemistry, biology and physics is conducted. We have the chemicals and plastics division in which work in microbiology, bacteriology, applied chemistry, rubber research, plastics research and some work on armoring of clothing is conducted.

We have the environmental protection division where human and environmental research is carried out, and also where the new research on geography, meteorology and related subjects is carried out. We have a mechanical engineering division in which the basic information on petroleum handling, on materials handling and refrigeration, heating devices and other mechanical equipment are researched and developed. We have also the textile clothing and footwears division where work along the lines of textile development, fiber research, materials research, shoe and leather research are carried out.

These divisions are all staffed with a good group of scientists, technologists, and engineers, and each of the divisions have programs that are related either directly or indirectly to our mission in the Food and Container Institute in Chicago.

Since the Natick installation is relatively new, quite a number of pieces of sophisticated and complex equipment have been installed there to be used in these various research programs.

For example, we have a mass spectrograph, time and flight spectrograph, an ultracentrifuge electrophoresis apparatus, two or three gas chromatographs, a number of other electronic devices that are used in measurements. We have the solar furnace which is used in some of our work in packaging and other things of this nature. We have an engineering shop that is complete in most of the details of the equipment that would be used in these various studies. So that actually, we have also there at Natick the scientific library, the printing and reproduction equipment and things of this nature which are necessary for carrying out the total program. So that actually we have augmenting disciplines at Natick that we consider would be quite valuable in supporting the scientific research and development programs that are carried out in foods, food radiation and container development in the Food and Container Institute.

I know that you can recognize that if we have the food and container scientists associating with these basic research scientists

at Natick, that a considerable amount of exchange of information and cooperation on research projects will result.

During the past few years our pioneering research division has carried on a number of research projects on food flavors, color, texture, and other properties which are of importance in ration development because they are fundamental. It creates fundamental information that is necessary to do the best job of applied food research.

Then we have a number of other things that happen at Natick that are of importance in the food program. The environmental programs are carried out on work capability, on the food and clothing required to maintain humans under various stress conditions such as heat or cold. All of these can be carried out more effectively when you have people working together in one location.

Now the Quartermaster Corps has certain missions, and we have a large number of end items for which the Quartermaster General is responsible, but actually our research and development activities are restricted pretty generally to about six or seven areas. We have food, containers, textiles and clothing, pioneering research, aerial delivery, materials handling, and environmental research.

These areas are not really large enough—each one of them is not large enough to require its own research establishment if you are going to get the greatest effectiveness because all of these things must be integrated together, because they relate to the man and his environment. In other words, the food research is related to the clothing research in that the clothing required for a person depends on the kind of energy consumption he makes. Also, the packaging of food is important because the soldier may be required to carry this packaged food on his person. Therefore, the materials or the various kinds of pockets that he has in his clothing or the harnesses that he wears to carry items have to be related to the packages that he has to carry, and in general, I would say that the research and development program of the Quartermaster is one that lends itself to integration and work at one location for the most effective results.

I could give you many more examples of the things that would result from this consolidation, and I think maybe some of these might be developed further by questions from you at a later time, but in general, we believe that the work at Natick will be improved by having the Food and Container Institute located there.

We also believe that the food and container program will be improved by being located at Natick. That concludes my statement, and I will be happy to answer any questions that any members of the committee may wish to present.

Chairman ABRAMS. Perhaps we should get the full presentation, if it is agreeable to you, and then we can go back. Who do you want next, General?

Mr. Addelson. Then we will ask you to continue.

Mr. ARTHUR ADDELSON. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the proposed relocation of the Institute, we have considered the usual site selection factors of importance to the siting of a laboratory. I would like to go through those very hurriedly in some cases.

In the case of housing, the plan is to site the Institute in a suburban area where there is a plentitude of housing and all ranges in desirable residential neighborhoods from 5 to 10 minutes' distance from the laboratory. We are informed by a local realtor that there is an availability of approximately 1,000 houses in the greater Natick areas.

In the case of educational facilities and schools, I will just make a brief statement. The greater Boston area has an extensive number of educational institutions and some outstanding, and the school systems are rated superior.

In the case of community facilities, the greater Boston area in both cultural, recreational and community facilities, we feel, is comparable to any other large metropolitan area in the country.

In the case of a labor market, the professional personnel that are employed at the Institute are trained in the disciplines of chemistry, food technology, biology and engineering. There are an extensive number of schools in the greater Boston area and in the eastern seaboard area that provide programs in these areas for undergraduate and graduate programs, and we at Natick have never experienced any difficulty in the recruitment of qualified professional personnel.

We also did review with some of our friends in the industrial food laboratories, the distribution of laboratory and requirements for professional personnel. We also checked the National Research Council study which has indicated to us that in the eastern area within a 300-mile radius of Boston there are 147 laboratories engaged in food research which have a total complement of over 5,000 personnel. In our checks with some of the industrial food laboratories they told us there was no difficulty or any recruitment problems for professional personnel.

Also, in connection with this labor market problem, we are, of course, concerned as to the number of personnel who would or would not accompany their jobs if there were a relocation. We did go back to our statistical experience in 1952–53 at Natick when the elements of the Quartermaster Corps were assembled and transferred to Natick at that time. It was indicated that all our professional personnel in grade 14 and above accompanied their positions to Natick at that time. Our grade 14 and above are those that are the project leaders and program directors, who have the primary responsibility for the technical direction of the programs.

Our senior scientific personnel grades 12 and 13, at that time, 75 percent accompanied the transfer of their positions to Natick. A lesser percentage in the grades 5 to 11, which are, if you are not familiar with the Government rating system, the entrance grades for professional personnel with a bachelor's or master's or doctorate degree.

Chairman ABRAMS. What is the pay range in 5 to 11?

Mr. ADDELSON. Do you have that schedule?

Dr. SEILING. Five will be about $4,000 and 11 will be $9,000, I think. Is that right?

Mr. JOSEPH ECSI. I think it is less.

Mr. SEILING. It is around that range, though. Eleven may be $8,000.

Mr. ADDELSON. I have it here. Five is an entrance rate of $4,300, but this is a little deceptive. The Government is permitted to give a maximum rate in some of these lower grades, so perhaps five should be listed as an entrance rate of $5,300.

Chairman ABRAMS. $5,300.

Mr. ADDELSON. Seven is an entrance rate at $6,300.

Chairman ABRAMS. Let's take 11.

Mr. ADDELSON. Eleven would be an entrance rate of $7,500.

Another area we have considered is our construction costs. At Natick we already have the land available. We have approximately 50 acres of 100 acres at the Natick site that would be adequate for expansion and for further development as required. The design work on the Natick site has been entirely completed, and a quarter of a million dollars has been spent, as we mentioned the other day, and the Corps of Engineers have stated that they could solicit bids within 2 weeks from the date, if the money were appropriated.

A considerable part of these plans, of course, would have to be discarded, as Dr. Seiling pointed out at that time, because these plans were tailored to the architectural pattern at Natick.

The site of QM is complete at Natick with all the amenities of a laboratory site, and most of you people have been there. We also have all the related utilities at Natick including our tie-in for requirements of fire protection and central heating plant and so forth. The new construction will merely require tie-ins in the given utilities.

The building costs that we have asked Congress for at Natick are $3.8 million for 97,000 square feet of construction plus additional conversion of space which Dr. Seiling previously mentioned, the conversion of office space to laboratory space. We believe that the costs of construction are relatively standard in accordance to building specifications in most areas with minor regional variations, and that the building costs on a square foot basis would be approximately the same in Chicago as here.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you have those figures as to what the square foot basis would be?

Mr. ADDELSON. I was going to expand on that.

We are planning 97,000 square feet, sir, of construction at Natick, which did not provide for a self-sufficient installation. We did not provide for a cafeteria, for an auditorium, for a warehouse, for shop areas, and administrative areas for service personnel. Inasmuch as all of these facilities are currently available at Natick and operate at Natick, we provided only for the laboratory and heavy lab areas that would be required.

Chairman ABRAMS. That is $3.8 million for 97,000 square feet.

Mr. ADDELSON. Plus approximately 20,000 square feet of conversion.

That, sir, includes equipment, both the procurement of new equipment and the rehabilitation of existing equipment.

The design plans at Natick were based pretty much on the consolidation of many of the administrative units and technical support units that are currently being supported both at Chicago and at Natick. For example, we have two libraries; one at the Institute, and one at Natick, and that will be consolidated into one library. We have two instrument shops and two photographic laboratories, and so forth, and the design plan as presently developed provides for some augmentation in the areas occupied by these elements at Natick to accommodate the additional workload in the Institute were relocated, but not separate or additional units.

In evaluating our requirements for a self-sufficient Institute, if it were not relocated at Natick, we estimate an additional 60,000 square feet of construction will be required.

Chairman ABRAMS. Additional 60,000.

Mr. ADDELSON. For what we have planned.

Chairman ABRAMS. Over and above this 97,000?

Mr. ADDELSON. Approximately 150,000.

Chairman ABRAMS. What will that 60,000 cover again?

Mr. ADDELSON. That will cover the elements we did not provide for at Natick, namely, the shop area, the auditorium, conference rooms, library areas, technical support areas, and administrative areas for service personnel.

We estimate the additional cost based on our present design plans at $25 a square foot, another million and a half dollars.

Chairman ABRAMS. I want to get this straight. This is the 3.8?

Mr. ADDELSON. I do want to state here, our plan, of course, envisions three separate buildings in keeping with the architectural pattern at Natick. This is an additional 60,000 square feet if added to that plan at $25 a square foot as a separate building would be another million and a half dollars. If the whole thing were redesigned, it might be some other.

Dr. ALBERT ELDER. If you are going to be able to use this shop and other facilities at Natick, it must apply they are not being used effectively at the present time.

Mr. ADDELSON. No, sir, we plan out of this new construction to use 10,000 square feet of this new construction for augmentation.

Chairman ABRAMS. A little later, I think, when we get to it, Larry, it is all right. I would like to hear this whole cost thing again. We are not entirely clear. Shall we finish this?

Mr. ADDELSON. As I mentioned previously, there is an area at Natick available for expansion. In the area of management the mission of a command covers a wide range of research and development activity requiring a multitude of scientific disciplines to accomplish it. In order to evaluate this factor in its proper focus, I wish to recall that the primary motivation for the original construction of the consolidated laboratories at Natick was to bring together in creative collaboration scientific and technical talents that were previously scattered. To the extent that this consolidation has been accomplished, there has been a relatable increase in efficiency of operations and management.

There are a number of joint interest projects in the areas of effort which exist between the operating divisions at Natick and the Institute, and their separation does deprive the scientists of both locations of the opportunity to work together in close collaboration. This separation increases our management problems of communication, coordination, and makes difficult creative collaboration for the development of supplies and equipment into integrated systems.

Chairman ABRAMS. Does that cover yours? Thank you very much, sir.

Go on, Mr. Ecsi.

Mr. JOSEPH ECSI. Mr. Poor called me last night, Mr. Chairman, and expressed his regrets that he couldn't come. He had planned to come. He invites any member of the Board to visit with him and with Mr. Morse if any of the members happen to be in Washington.

We are very grateful for your participation and the accelerated manner in which you grabbed the problem here.

My name is Ecsi, and my title in the office of the Quartermaster General is production manager. The program that my division manages is to provide the facilities in which the Quartermaster General can accomplish his total missions efficiently and economically.

The "economically" has become a very pressing point in the last number of years with repeated budget cuts. The Quartermaster General has had to close five of his network of installations in the past 4 years. Chicago is one of these five. The Chicago Administrative Center. This is what makes the relocation of the Food and Container Institute a pressing issue at the present time.

The Chicago Administrative Center was originally built for the Quartermaster General as a warehouse. It is a six-story, three-building, relatively low ceiling, primarily designed for warehouse operation. Warehousing in a multistoried building in recent years became an uneconomical operation in that you could not stack material to certain heights, and as a result, the Quartermaster General discontinued the use of the facility for storage missions. The storage occupied most of the space. Since that point there has been minor conversion of warehouse space to administrative space to house some quartermaster missions and any other Government agency that desired to occupy space at the CAC. CAC is Chicago Administrative Center.

As a result of last year's analysis by the General Accounting Office, the Quartermaster General decided that the time had come to not merely wait for the authorization of the construction cost to relocate the Food and Container Institute, because this is the only item that is holding up our evacuation of the building at the present time. All other missions can be transferred to existing space with no delay, but the Food and Container requires this $3.8 million construction and requires a new facility somewhere.

Our plan is at Natick—the Quartermaster General decided he would turn the CAC installation over to GSA on July 1, 1961. As of that date the GSA will be guardian of the facility and will provide limited administrative support, and the Quartermaster General's responsibility will be limited to providing only the administrative support required by our own Quartermaster missions on that date.

The GSA assumed these facilities on the assumption that the Secretary of the Army had agreed to relocate his missions, and this was so stated, and the reason GSA classified that assumption was that they did not want to operate the CAC on a long-range basis, but had intended to take it over from the Quartermaster and operate it as long as it was necessary to have missions there until we could relocate a new facility.

We in the Quartermaster Corps are interested in successful mission accomplishment, but we have found we are spending a tremendous amount of our resources on facility management.

We have quite a network of facilities, depots, the research and development center at Natick, that you know about, training commands and things of that sort, and all of this expenditure on facility accomplishes only one thing. It reduces the resources that are basically available for mission accomplishment, and, therefore, we have classified facility maintenance as a secondary priority within our requirements because our first priority is to accomplish our missions.

This is what presses the urgency on the CAC. We have, I believe, successfully presented our economy aspects here to satisfy the special subcommittee that was designated by Mr. VINSON, the copies of which I left you on our last meeting, and if you have read that report, you will see that Mr. VAN ZANDT from Pennsylvania and Mr. DOYLE from California, who really have no interests in this particular location of this mission, since one comes from California, the other from Pennsylvania, neither has any Chicago nor Natick interest, have concluded that there are substantial economies. They estimated over $900,000 in their report as printed by Congress.

We urge that you give our case consideration.

Chairman ABRAMS. Those were operating economies?

Mr. ECSI. They are a combination, sir, of savings within the Food and Container Institute due to merger of technical and scientific administration which accounts for somewhere in the neighborhood of the Army figures of about $300,000, and then the overhead savings of about $800,000 is how the Army has justified this is a $1.1 million Army savings.

Chairman ABRAMS. It has no relation to capital investment.

Mr. ECSI. No, sir.

Chairman ABRAMS. So it is really operating.

Mr. ECSI. In this line we in the Army do not compute capital value of facilities in any of our savings for this reason. When the Army declares a facility excess, it is not then disposed of, but it is turned over through the Corps of Engineers to the GSA, and at some later date it may or may not be disposed of. The capital facility you referred to of CAC has been estimated to have a fair market value of $4.8 million of sale at the present time. If we were using this, you can see the economy of this thing would be pretty clear toward the construction of new laboratories.

I would prefer from here on in to answer any specific questions that you have on the overall facet. I believe, as I said before, this is a sound approach on the part of the Army. We have stood up under detailed scrutiny of many sources, and we would like to move this mission to Natick.

Chairman ABRAMS. You mean, Mr. Ecsi, this is your presentation now?

Mr. ECSI. Yes.

Chairman ABRAMS. Thank you.

Are there more, General?

General TRIBE. No more formal presentations. I think what you want might best be developed by questions.

Chairman ABRAMS. All right, gentlemen, have you questions you would like to ask any of these men?

Dr. ELDER. Regarding the possibility of losing the technical personnel, you consider the conditions in 1952 and 1961 comparable? I am asking from this angle. The housing situation in Chicago is such that there is at the present time in the entire Chicago area—I believe no one will challenge my statement at all—a great surplus of houses with the result that these people that you are talking about moving to Natick may have no trouble buying a place there, but they are probably going to have considerable difficulty in selling any place that they have in the Chicago area.

Now is that going to affect them at this time in terms of the number of those who will look for positions in the Chicago area rather than going with you, because I cannot swallow the statement that it is easy to get people in the field of food technology to go to work for you today. It just isn't true. That is all there is to it.

It is a tough job to find people. I know from my own experience in trying to hire them. I know from the fact that some other companies are trying to pirate them away from me out of my own organization, so there can be no question but what there is a problem there. I am asking. I would like to ask how serious you really think this will be.

Dr. SEILING. I don't really know, Dr. Elder, how many of the people will elect to not go to Natick if the move is made. We have not asked, run any poll, or gotten any information because we felt that until the decision was made, a man really could not give you an unequivocal answer.

As far as recruiting people who are specifically food technologists, I agree that these are hard to find, and I don't know whether we would be hard put to get people in the Natick area or not. There are a number of people that have indicated an interest in food technology employment if the Institute were moved to Natick, and I mean by that, that they have written me at Natick and said: "Whenever the Food and Container Institute get there, let me know, because I would like to work at the Food and Container Institute if it were at Natick."

Now I don't know whether one of those will be there to be counted when the time comes or not, but as you know, the northeastern area does have a number of outstanding food technology schools. MIT, Cornell, the University of Massachusetts, Maryland, Rutgers, are I think, quite well recognized in this field.

Of course, we do have a number of people in nutrition, biochemistry, from the New York-Boston area that are not directly associated with food, but who might be induced to come into this field if they are provisionally oriented to the New England area.

I think we can get people. I don't know whether we can get enough or not, but I think that if some of the people do not elect or elect not to go, that we might have some

difficulty in filling some of their positions, but I think eventually we will get the job done.

Chairman ABRAMS. The Chicago people of the Food and Container Institute are pretty well aware of this possibility of moving to Natick, I assume.

Dr. SEILING. They certianly know about it. I think they have been, we will say, emotionally upset.

Chairman ABRAMS. Have they expressed any opinions?

Dr. SEILING. Not to me.

Chairman ABRAMS. Has anybody asked any opinions of the people here in Chicago as to whether they would move?

Dr. SEILING. Dr. Mehrlich is here from the Institute.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you know about that, Dr. Mehrlich?

Dr. FERDINAND P. MEHRLICH. To my knowledge nobody has asked them. I think it would be rather a futile gesture anyhow because it is a hypothetical situation. I think the percentage who might or might not would depend a great deal upon the circumstances of the market at the time the move might be contemplated.

Chairman ABRAMS. Going back to what Dr. Elder brought up, do you feel that this might be a difficulty, the fact they can't sell their housing here at a reasonable price, that that might influence their move?

Dr. SEILING. I presume each person will have to evaluate that on his own, and I really don't know. I know this would be one of the factors. I know that family associations, community associations, church associations and other things will all be a factor, but as Mr. Addelson pointed out, our experience earlier, about 8 years earlier, in fact, was that the key people all moved in the other move. Even though I understand that there was about the same kind of guessing about it prior to that move and rather crisp statements made that people wouldn't move, but when the clutch came, as it were, they did move. Now whether that has anything to do with now, I don't know.

General TRIBE. With reference to difficulty in selling houses in the Chicago area, perhaps Colonel Littlejohn would add something to that because we have military people who come into an area, are not able to get housing, have to buy housing, are in it for a period, 1, 2, or 3 years, and then are forced to sell. A year ago when Colonel Shaughnessy left the area, he sold his house at no loss, but what the current situation is, Colonel Littlejohn might be able to answer that question.

Colonel JAMES P. LITTLEJOHN. I might add that the location of the house and the size and cost, and all those things are factors in the moving of real estate. This is the first time I ever bought a house, and I am a little nervous about getting out from under the contract here, but I walked into this with the knowledge that I would be here on a normal term of perhaps 3 years, and would have to go through that. I don't have any real knowledge of the real estate situation other than seeing "For Sale" signs along the street.

Dr. PRESTON HOFF. I presume the Government has not had to follow industry's practice of offsetting some of the financial losses involved in the sale of property.

Dr. ELDER. In our own company the last man we moved to New York, we have had to pick up deficits on the sale of every single house in the Chicago area, but that is a company policy. We won't allow a man to take a loss when he is transferred to another plant. That is just how bad it is.

Chairman ABRAMS. What happens if he makes a little dough?

Dr. ELDER. That is his.

Dr. HOFF. Some companies say: "All right. What is the fair market value of the house? That is what we will allow you." At least you get rid of it.

Chairman ABRAMS. I would like to return to this matter of costs. I am not clear about this. Do I understand there are two separate items here if the move is made? One which will be 3,800,000 and another a million and a half.

Mr. ADDELSON. No, sir, that is our projection of an additional 60,000 square feet if the Institute would be set up elsewhere on a self-sufficient basis.

Chairman ABRAMS. You mean elsewhere than Natick?

Mr. ADDELSON. Yes, sir.

Dr. HOFF. That doesn't include purchase of land.

Mr. ADDELSON. No, sir; it does not.

Chairman ABRAMS. What you are saying, if it is put any place except Natick, it will run $5.3 million as opposed to $3.8 million.

Mr. ADDELSON. Based upon our present plans, if you had it in three buildings. Whether one building might alter that projection somewhat, I don't know.

Dr. HOFF. To that would have to be added the cost of the land.

Chairman ABRAMS. Yes.

Mr. ADDELSON. And, of course, the design cost. A quarter of a million dollars has been spent.

Chairman ABRAMS. Strictly speaking, on a strict accounting basis you ought to include the cost of the land at Natick in any program that belongs to Uncle Sam, that is true, but a certain amount is allocated to this.

Mr. ADDELSON. I think we got it for a nominal fee, didn't we, General, because of its being State land?

Mr. JACK ALLEN. The total 100 acres cost the Government about $100,000.

Chairman ABRAMS. You gentlemen feel that the cost of this is the paramount factor in it, the savings?

Dr. SEILING. Well, not in my opinion.

Chairman ABRAMS. What do you think?

Dr. SEILING. My opinion is the increased effectiveness of the program would be the greatest gain.

Chairman ABRAMS. You mean because of the close location of the IIT with it?

Dr. SEILING. Bringing the people at Chicago who are working in the food and container areas into the same campus with the people who are doing the things that are related to their problem will really bring about, I think, a great synergistic effect for both groups. Now if we were going up to a laboratory of 10,000 people, I would say the opposite, but we are still talking in terms of what I would call a moderate-size installation. We are talking about total scientific and support complement of around 1,600 people, of which we now have 1,250, and there are about 350 total for military.

Mr. ADDELSON. 250 civilian and 57 military.

Dr. SEILING. We actually believe that the fact that they will be working with the chemists and the bacteriologists and micrologists and biochemists and the physicists and engineers on the same post, the same campus, that this is going to be something that will create a big payoff, but which you can't put any dollar value on. You can guess at it, but I don't know what it is. I think it is quite significant, though.

Chairman ABRAMS. Let's take the other side of that. The very close location and coordination and perhaps synergism between the local industry right in the Chicago area and the present Food and Container group, will that be equal? Will you have an equal arrangement in the Natick area?

Dr. SEILING. You will have a continuation of this, but probably not with the same people. It is my estimate that most of the work in which the cooperation of industry is of greatest impact is in the applications engineering or in the development area and not in the research. I think the research thing is communication largely between scientists and not between operators, and therefore, the end item development and the applications engineering or the constant improvement of those things of the end items would be probably the most important result from a liaison with industry. Now some of this liaison would continue at a remoter distance, we will say. On the other hand, there are food industries in New England. They are not as numerous as they are in the Chicago area, but I feel that there are others. The educational institutions and the research institutions that are in the Boston area would be equivalent to or greater than. I would be greater in my opinion than the enhancement of the program from this liaison, intimate liaison with industry. Now this is just an opinion.

Chairman ABRAMS. Larry, do you want to comment?

Dr. ELDER. From what you said, I take it you would not be at all surprised if the Institute moves to Natick, if the Research and Development Associates which at times in the past, at least, have been a very cooperative arm to this Institute were to disband.

Dr. SEILING. I don't know what their reaction would be. I doubt whether they would disband. They might. At the annual meeting a year ago General McNamara made a speech, and the chairman assured him in the presence of all those assembled that the Food & Container Associates, Research Associates, would continue to support the Quartermaster General irrespective of where his research and development facility is located. I don't know whether he was speaking for everybody or just himself. I think that there would be a lot of people still working with the group, and I don't think this is entirely provincial because these people are from California, New York, Georgia, Louisiana, Wisconsin. I don't think that they have any fetish for saying that the only place they will cooperate with the Food and Container Institute is in Chicago.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think the logistics probably is the important thing here, the closeness of the people in the Chicago area here to the present or the proposed location of the Food and Container as opposed to Natick. You have shown within 300 miles that is true, but the intensity near Natick may be considerably lower.

Dr. HAROLD K. WORK. I had two or three questions. First, this question of centralization and combining the things in one spot. Would you say that represents a trend that is taking place now? I noticed in the university atmospheric research they make quite a point of bringing together in one spot so they can get expensive equipment that couldn't be available split up like in the case of atmospheric research there even with aircraft. Is there any element of this kind in this picture where you have large and expensive equipment that you wouldn't have to duplicate by bringing them together, computers, and that type of thing?

Dr. SEILING. I gave some of them when I was giving my prepared statement there. Most of these things I named are in the order of range of $50,000 each, and when you get a dozen of them that is $600,000 or $700,000. We already have them installed, and the point that Dr. Elder brought up, if you can put them to more use, they must not be used now. Well, this is not true. We simply say that any piece of equipment like this has to be programed, and that if you have a mass spectrograph, time and flight mass spectrograph, which costs around $60,000, you can probably keep it busy 24 hours a day. The fact that we are now using it on an 8-hour shift doesn't mean that we couldn't get more work done by certain programing even within the 8-hour shift, but I feel certain that this bringing together of the group here will give the advantage of a saving in scientific equipment and technology. In other words, a lot of these disciplines, we would have one man at Natick

who was a specialist in the mass spectrograph, we will say. He can operate this and do work for foods or rubber or clothing or any of the other areas, but if you set up another mass spectrograph, another location, you have to set up all the supporting personnel that goes with it, so really, the duplication costs are pretty expensive.

Dr. WORK. There is another aspect to the location problem that I thought would be worth talking about a little bit. You have the problem here of the Chicago center with the food industry around it, and you have Natick which is less strong in that respect, but there is also another difference. The difference between an urban and a suburban area, and we have been going through that kind of a problem ourselves in New York. The terrific cost of building in New York City, which I believe is about the same as Chicago, has forced the university to move out into the country. We have a research place of 1,000 acres. The university valley that we are just starting to develop. The roads aren't put in yet, but the thinking behind that, it seems to me, also applies to this. It hasn't been brought out. I am sure construction costs would be cheaper outside the major metropolitan area. At least that has been our experience, that the tie-up by the various situations that develop in a big city tend to run the costs up.

We think, for instance, out in the university valley there would be an appreciable saving in building cost. I would think there would be something of that sort here.

Now there is another question I wanted to speak to just for a minute, and that is this question of Chicago being the center of the food industry. Being located in New York, I looked up a few of the figures for the New York area. I noticed even in these presentations that the number of laboratories in the New York-New Jersey complex was 120 as compared with 100 for the Chicago area. Add them together. In our own advisory committee and research division of the college of engineering over the last 5 years we had these people: I am not sure that I remember all the names, but we had C. G. King, the president, Nutrition Foundation; Arnold Johnson, president of National Dairy Laboratory; Charles Frey, who used to head the Standard Brands Laboratory; Roy Walters, who used to be vice president of General Foods; Roger Lueek, vice president of American Can; Emil Ott, vice president of Food Machinery & Chemical Co.; Foster D. Snell, who runs the laboratory, development animals in New York State; and Ernest Reid, president, Corn Products Refining Co.; so it would seem to me if you are making a comparison, if you were talking about other locations in the United States, that you should even look at the New York area. This, I think, boils down to a question of time and economics. You will lose a couple of years apparently if you make the change in your plans. I don't know whether I have resolved some things, but I have put some more questions in.

Chairman ABRAMS. You have raised questions. I was going to say this. I have never seen an organization in which there wasn't a difference of opinion. Since we have the gentlemen from Chicago here, I thought perhaps we might give them an opportunity to express themselves. I hope they will be completely free to say what is on their minds.

Colonel Littlejohn, perhaps you would like to express your thoughts on this.

I don't believe you will be court-martialed for anything you might say.

Colonel LITTLEJOHN. Actually, I am sitting in kind of a neutral position here. I hear comments about people at Natick, but I have not been involved in doing the planning, so I am not close to the details there. If you have any specific thing that I might answer, perhaps it would be better than just general conversation.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you see any good reason why the laboratory should be in Chicago versus Natick or vice versa?

Colonel LITTLEJOHN. Sir, there are merits to all the statements that have been made, and I think you can make whatever you want to out of it to prove an argument. As I said here, the position has been taken after the study, and I am sitting there sort of in the middle.

Chairman ABRAMS. Dr. Mehrlich, how about you?

Dr. FERDINAND MEHRLICH. Well, the point of view I might express is that I think the important thing is not where the Institute is, but what it is, and I think that one ought to take into account in considering moving or staying what the future of the Institute might be, what its mission is, and whether it should be constituted as it now is or whether it would better be changed in some degree. It is a fact that the radiation work which now is centered in the Institute will have facilities at Natick very soon. It is my conviction that for the food program to be meaningful, it must be very closely linked with nutritional research. We don't have nearly enough of it in my estimation. Where that could be best carried out is moot, so I feel that in many locations as is evident by the distribution of food research all over the country that one can carry it out. I think it is more important what is going to be, what its mission is going to be.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you think the environment of Natick would be preferable to that of Chicago, the scientific as related directly to the Quartermaster work?

Dr. MEHRLICH. I think the way to answer that would be what degree of the work would be of the nature to benefit from such relationships as opposed to more pragmatic approaches.

Chairman ABRAMS. You have no direct opinions on these?

Dr. MEHRLICH. I would say the position has been taken, and I feel that very definitely I have lived all over the world personally, and I have been productive wherever I have been, I think, and I really feel that the important thing is what is the mission, what is the setup going to be wherever it is.

Chairman ABRAMS. Well, you are probably as familiar with that as anybody, I should think, what the future program is going to be. Have you any thoughts as to where it could be carried out better?

Dr. MEHRLICH. I don't know what the program is going to be, and I don't know. I say except for the very near future, and I have no strong opinion one way or the other very candidly. I have seen research done in South America where people said it couldn't be done. I have seen it done in Africa, and it certainly is done all over the United States now. So that I think that it is more important to get a decision to where we are going to be and what we are going to be, than it is to decide that Natick is superior or Chicago is superior.

Chairman ABRAMS. Then you say, in effect, that you would not like to make that decision until you know more about what is to be done?

Dr. MEHRLICH. I would say I personally have made no study, and I think that a tremendous amount of study has been carried out. The individuals who gave testimony or presentations here today have been participants in the study, and the Department of the Army has a position based upon a very extensive activity, endeavor, and so have the people at Natick, and I think that, and my own opinion is that the die is cast.

Chairman ABRAMS. For Natick, you mean?

Dr. MEHRLICH. I feel it is. Decisions have been made, that actions have been taken, and that one should be very studious about determining the desirability of taking any action counter to it. What would be gained? What are the relative merits and the positive attributes and the negative attributes of the situation?

Chairman ABRAMS. General, if it is a fair question, do you feel the long-term program is pretty well laid out for the research and development, and that on that basis Natick has been selected? Is that a fair statement?

General TRIBE. I feel the long-range program, when we are speaking up through about 1964 and into 1965 is pretty well cast. That dosen't mean that the program can't be changed with reference to the research in specific areas. It will be done. I honestly and actually feel that when we get all the children together of the family, we will find it somewhat easier to raise the family. We have a testing operation which we hope ultimately to move to Maynard, which is 12 miles away on a 3,000-acre tract. It is not now located there.

I see many more advantages to be gained by moving it to Natick than leaving it in Chicago. Meetings with industry will be held generally where the greatest number of people can be reached. The Research Associates certainly do not confine all of their meetings to Chicago. The staff can be made available certainly within the limits of travel funds which vary from year to year to come to any meeting where industry may be consulted.

With reference to the specifications, when we go into particularly difficult problems, we call industry advisory committees together to get advice and information before we move out on many of our specifications. Certainly those meetings could be held wherever we could get the greatest number of people together.

Dr. HOFF. You spoke of a testing facility to be relocated at Maynard. Where is that now?

General TRIBE. It is at Fort Lee now.

Dr. HOFF. I wanted to clear that up because anyone not familiar with the situation might think you meant a testing facility at Natick.

General TRIBE. We call it Field Evaluation Agency. It is principally military where we have to do our field evaluations with troops. It doesn't do us very much good to take the project officer and have him run his own test. The project officer frequently is biased. It is up to us to find some way to make the soldier perfect.

Chairman ABRAMS. Mr. Allen, would you like to add anything to this?

Mr. JACK ALLEN. I have a few comments I might make. One, I think it might be noted that the total R. & D., research and development budget, that the Quartermaster gets is not too large; $12 to $13 million, so that any appreciable saving percentagewise, I think, would be quite important to the Quartermaster Corps. The only other comment I think of in relation to the presentations that were made when Dr. Seiling mentioned briefly the field of the types of equipment that are worked on by the mechanical engineering division, for example, that includes food service equipment and is a definite part.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you get the impression here the decision has been made for Natick, and it is merely being held off because of some congressional activity? You spent a quarter of a million dollars on plans. When were those authorized and why?

Dr. SEILING. The proposal was first made in the spring of 1959, and the legislation for construction of these facilities at Natick went through all the hearings, the Department of Quartermaster General, the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and was heard at all the congressional committees last year. It went to a conference between the House and the Senate, and the House,

after having made this study by Congressmen DOYLE and VAN ZANDT apparently wished to hold back, and so the Senate which has passed the bill both at the appropriations and the authorization level, "receded" and the conference report was not in favor of the construction. However, they put in the word to the Department of Defense, or in their report, that they requested the Department of Defense to return the item at the next annual session. That is about correct.

Mr. ECSI. This is correct. The Senate receded on the assumption that the Department of the Army would resubmit the construction requirements in the fiscal year 1962 budget, and that it would be supported by the House at that time. This is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Chairman ABRAMS. Why did they have to recede on this? There was first agreement, I assume, that this facility was necessary. It was a question of where it was to be located. Now is that the thing that held it up because the location was not clear enough in their minds?

Mr. ECSI. Mr. Chairman, many actions take place in Congress based on politics.

Chairman ABRAMS. I understand that, but I am trying to cut through.

Mr. ECSI. This is probably one of those actions, the details of which we in the Army are unaware of as to what transpired among the Members themselves. We can read what is in the RECORD, but I think many things that are done are not in the RECORD that determine the decisions of Congress.

Chairman ABRAMS. Who originally said we will spend a quarter of a million dollars now?

Mr. ECSI. I will give you a little background on that. Actually, when the Secretary of the Army has made a decision, because unless he makes a decision, you cannot submit a construction order, so he has made a decision that he was going to close this place and relocate the Food and Container Institute. This required a construction item of $3.8 million to go into a construction budget. The Secretary of the Army then from funds made available in fiscal year 1960, made available the quarter of a million dollars that is being talked of here for a preliminary engineering design so our cost estimates could be based on more than just vague estimates but on more specifics. The Corps of Engineers actually came out to Chicago, made detailed examination of all of the equipment insofar as how it could be relocated to the facilities that were planned, what equipment here could be actually relocated, and which would be uneconomical to relocate, and which would require replacement. All of this is included in this quarter of a million dollars that we mentioned.

This was approved by the Secretary of the Army as a grant from what we refer to as minor construction money which is under the control of the Secretary of the Army without congressional limitation on any individual items.

Chairman ABRAMS. Are there other questions you gentlemen would like to ask?

Dr. ELDER. I would like to ask Dr. Mehrlich in connection with the radiation facilities at Natick, do you consider that to be a factor of any significance at all in connection with this move?

Dr. MEHRLICH. I think it must be. It is a part of the Institute.

Dr. HOFF. I would like to ask whether the initiation for bringing the Chicago facility to Natick was originated by the military or by your predecessor for the civilian side of the research program?

Dr. SEILING. I was not there. I don't know.

Mr. ECSI. I think I can answer that. In 1959 the Quartermaster General called a meeting of his key advisers in Washington and said: "I believe we can increase the efficiency of the Quartermaster Research and Engineering program by putting the Food and Container Institute in Natick," and he asked the staff to prepare a study as to what economies would develop within the Army if this action were taken, so that he could justify the requirement for new construction to Congress. So I believe the decision to relocate the Food and Container was prefaced not primarily on dollar savings, but on the mission improvement that the Quartermaster General saw of bringing together, as the General referred to, the children of this small family. This is very important.

We have a small research and development family. Now consolidation is good to a certain extent, but if you have got a $100 or $200 million research program, you can't consolidate that in one place, but with an $11 million program, I mean, we have gotten to the point where we can't afford to support two or three different sites within that $11 million and still have dollars left to do research, so I would say the decision was prefaced primarily on the improvement within the program and the economy was developed to justify the relocation and the additional cost that would be required from Congress.

Chairman ABRAMS. Was that study made in both Natick and Chicago so that all sides were fully considered?

Mr. ECSI. General Tribe and the Washington people—I say General Tribe being the commanding general of the command, participated in detail in the development. The exact personnel within the command, I believe General Tribe can answer best.

Chairman ABRAMS. What I mean, was there enough agreement from the Food and Container Institute to say that overall there wasn't quite agreement that the move to Natick was justified, or was the study made primarily in Natick?

Mr. ECSI. We have a peculiar situation in the Army in this sense of the word. There are regulations which preclude our discussing a relocation with the people that are affected prior to the time that the Secretary of the Army has made a decision and there has been a release of this to Congress, because the moment we violate that regulation, a person goes to his Congressman, and the Congressman immediately bombards the Secretary of the Army with a lot of inquiries, and the Secretary of the Army has not made a decision yet, so the amount of contact that is made generally within the detail of the people that are affected in many Army actions is limited, sir.

Chairman ABRAMS. What I am getting at is, I am curious to know how the decision was made without the supporting evidence.

Mr. ECSI. Evidence can be gotten without talking to the direct people that are affected because the people that are affected, it is difficult for them to be objective. If I lived in the city of Chicago, I could never make as objective a study on this thing as I could if I were not personally affected in the relocation because I would have personal interest. My children would be going to school. I would own real estate, as you pointed out, and these would tend to prejudice an objective evaluation.

Chairman ABRAMS. There has to be a certain amount of subjectivity in this, too. We can't do it just on dollars and cents, and this plot versus this plot. There is a lot that enters in about the human beings that are engaged in this activity.

Dr. WORK. There is one question I would like to ask that goes back into history. Why was the Quartermaster Corps laboratory originally located at Natick? Was there any problem of closeness to raw materials, clothing, and anything of that sort?

Dr. SEILING. This was a Site Selection Committee that was specified in the original legislation and was headed by the president of Georgia Institute of Technology and six other people, I believe.

Mr. ALLEN. Approximately.

Dr. SEILING. They were given various site locations that had been proposed for this construction. They, as a working committee, went around and made a study. This is all in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I know it only by reading it and having heard people discuss it. They selected Natick as the site, and after Pennsylvania and Indiana, and I don't know what other places. I don't remember the other places, but they selected it on the basis of the location. I have reason to believe that it had something to do with the educational research atmosphere in the Boston area.

Chairman ABRAMS. Did the Congress have a committee to review this and decide whether Natick was right?

Dr. SEILING. You said it was right in the legislation.

Mr. ALLEN. I believe the way it was finally passed by the Congress with the various parts of the country asking for the location was that the legislation was passed with a rider or a comment that the location would be as determined by the Site Selection Committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense.

Chairman ABRAMS. Congress was willing to accept that then?

Mr. ALLEN. At that time they were.

Chairman ABRAMS. That is very interesting.

Dr. HOFF. As I recall it, there were repercussions afterwards, the same sort of—

Chairman ABRAMS. Jockeying.

Dr. HOFF. —jockeying that is now going on with this.

Chairman ABRAMS. The Food and Container Institute started what, is about 1930-some, was it not?

Mr. ALLEN. 1936, I think, according to what we saw in that IIT study.

Chairman ABRAMS. How did that originate? I have forgotten on that.

Colonel LITTLEJOHN. May I add a word there? The original setup here was approximately 1920 on the basis of a year, or at least 10-month school of mostly officers, and only one or two civilians. The military officer at that time was attempting to collect data necessary to improve military feeding. From that small beginning then the purpose of the Institute was continued, went into an intermediate stage which was called laboratories, and then finally I think in 1937 became what you can see today, but the basic purpose there was in analyzing and developing foods that would be suitable for military application.

General TRIBE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say, however, that even prior to World War II there was comparatively little research done in the Army as we know it today. The Army prior to World War II was less than 125,000 men by an act of Congress of 1920. There were fewer than 125,000 men in the Army. The civilian employment was likewise very small. So this great impetus did not come until we started to get ready for World War II, and by 1941, December, the move came.

Now all of this research that we have gone into since that time really started in 1942, and it wasn't until we were well into it that we could see when we got results from the use of some of our equipment. The fact we knew we had to do a good deal more work than we had ever done before. So I think that really the birth of this Food and Container Institute, as we know it today, is after the beginning of World War II.

Chairman ABRAMS. How do you expect the recommendations of this Board, if any, to be implemented or used?

General TRIBE. After the committee's report is prepared, it will be submitted to the Secretary of the Army. The Secretary of the Army will make such recommendations as he sees fit. It will be transmitted then to both the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee for consideration, we hope, in the Senate this session.

Chairman ABRAMS. Gentlemen, have you more questions you would like to ask?

(Off the record discussion.)

Chairman ABRAMS. Are there any other questions, gentlemen, or other things you may wish to offer at this time?

Dr. SEILING. Are you perfectly clear as to how the decision was made, and why it was made, and that under our present situation the request for appropriation would only fit the Natick site, and could not have Natick stricken and put Chicago or Podunk or any place else in the place of Natick and have that mean anything except chaos because the plans are for Natick. The augmentation from space that is available for administrative services are at Natick. Anything else would require a completely new draft of specifications. The location, all other studies would have to be completed and made in detail, and our estimate is that this would cost in the neighborhood of 40 percent more than it would at Natick primarily because of the need for administrative support for the research and development program.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think that is clear. Your plans and specifications are such that you could immediately get bids. Is that correct?

Dr. SEILING. Two weeks, says the district engineer.

Chairman ABRAMS. Does the Army do all this building?

Mr. ADDELSON. The Corps of Engineers supervises it. They give out a contract.

Dr. SEILING. The plans were drawn by one of the best architectural firms in Boston, Perry Hepburn & Shaw, which has a world reputation for this kind of construction. They are a very reputable outfit. They have built places in Massachusetts, MIT, and other places. I suppose they have at your place.

Chairman ABRAMS. We will have lunch together, after which we will have the Illinois Institute people here, and then I assume you would like to speak further with these men after the Illinois Institute people.

Dr. W. GEORGE PARKS. If it is the wish of the group. Do you think you will have questions in the rebuttal that somebody should be around?

Chairman ABRAMS. I think it might be desirable to have at least a couple of these gentlemen here.

Do you have plans for leaving?

General TRIBE. We have plans for leaving at 5:45.

Chairman ABRAMS. If you don't mind waiting here.

General TRIBE. We would be pleased to wait.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think that would be very good. Does that seem all right?

Dr. PARKS. Certainly.

We have a few minutes yet if there are any other questions anyone else would like to discuss.

Mr. ALLEN. You might talk about what material has been assembled here that the committee might want.

Mr. ADDELSON. If the committee is interested, I could briefly go over the back history material here. Are you interested in that?

Chairman ABRAMS. You mean the history of this whole project? Do you gentlemen feel that you are sufficiently acquainted, or would you like to have more?

Dr. HOFF. I have one specific question. I don't know to whom to direct it, but in reading over the material that was available, I came across the MSSA.

Mr. ALLEN. Which means Military Subsistence Supply Agency.

Dr. HOFF. What importance does that have to the Quartermaster research program, and is it located only in Chicago?

Mr. ECSI. The Military Subsistence Supply Agency is the supply management agency for subsistence. It has 10 large centers, 1 of which is located in Chicago, the other 1 in New York, 1 in San Francisco, Los Angeles. Requirements, determining and purchasing. The headquarters of the command is located in Chicago, also.

Dr. HOFF. It is not important to this problem.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think I would have this suggestion then. If these gentlemen would let us get together for a short time now prior to lunch, we could meet for lunch at say about 12 o'clock.

Dr. PARKS. We should be prompt for lunch because we have the IIT people coming at 1.

General TRIBE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ABRAMS. Thank you, General.

(The meeting recessed at 11:40 o'clock.)

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, MARCH 31, 1961

The meeting reconvened at 1:10 o'clock with Dr. Abrams (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ABRAMS. Gentlemen, I think you know something about what this is all about.

Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES. I do. I put you in business.

Let me suggest I have been in conference with the gentlemen who were here with me, three of whom are from the Illinois Institute of Technology, as you see here, and Mr. Peden, who is associated with the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. Frankly, after talking to them, we don't know just how to proceed at this hearing in this respect.

As I pointed out in my discussions both with Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee and my argument on the floor of the Ninth District of Illinois, it is very difficult to offer a proposition in the abstract without knowing what the requirements of the Quartermaster Corps are.

Presumably the Army does have some knowledge of the type of the building it wants. It has requested the Congress for an appropriation of 3 million 8, I think. This is predicated on some kind of plan or some kind of specifications, some kind of a building that is known to the Army, and which presently is unknown to us.

We have tried in every way we know how to obtain from the Army its requirements for a building. The proposal that was put forward by ITT last year was based upon what it thought was a building that had the square footage of the present Container Institute at 39th Street which obviously isn't in point at all.

What they have here today really is a picture of a building they have just put up on their campus. They are just going to show you a picture of a chemistry building which they have just put up, and on the basis of which they think they can build a building for the Army much more cheaply, much more economically than is contained in the Army's presentation, or what would seem to be the Army's presentation to the Congress.

Did you have a copy of that picture with you? I will show you what they have in mind.

Mr. W. M. COUSINS Jr. Yes.

(The picture of the building was shown.)

Congressman YATES. This is a building they have built on the campus. This is a building that is on the campus of Illinois Tech which contains 150,000 square feet. The cost of it, I think, was approximately—What was the cost of this building?

Mr. COUSINS. Just over 20—22.

Congressman YATES. What does that mean?

Mr. COUSINS. Three and a half million dollars.

Congressman YATES. Three and a half million dollars, approximately $20 a square foot. As you can see, it is a very handsome building. It is in the center of an outstanding research institution. We think we have a much stronger case to present in support of retaining the Food and Container Institute in Chicago than they have for Natick, Mass., but here we are talking in the abstract. We don't know what kind of a building the Army wants. We don't know what their limitations of cost are. We don't know how many square feet they want. In addition to that, we want to have the opportunity to present to you, I think probably gentlemen, you gentlemen being experts as you are, not only the geographical values of having this Institute in Chicago, but also to show why it is essential in the interest of our country.

Chairman ABRAMS. Congressman, we are interested not only in the building, but in a lot of other things that go with it.

Congressman YATES. Good. That is what we want to find out from you, Mr. Chairman. That is what we want you to tell us.

Chairman ABRAMS. We felt probably the focal points had been presented in the report by the Illinois Institute of Technology, and therefore, felt that if we brought them in, and they gave us again a briefing on what they had presented, and we asked questions concerning it, in that way we would get a pretty good idea of what is involved in this.

Congressman YATES. Mr. Chairman, how is it possible for them to give you any kind of an adequate presentation in the absence of knowing what the requirements of the Army are?

Chairman ABRAMS. I think you had better call the General in at this point, Frank.

Congressman YATES. Doesn't that make sense to you?

Chairman ABRAMS. You are saying in effect, the costs of building here are probably the same as building in Natick.

Congressman YATES. I am not saying that at all.

Chairman ABRAMS. We will ask that as a question then.

Congressman YATES. I don't know the answer to that now.

Chairman ABRAMS. We are going to try to get the General here.

Congressman YATES. We can bring experts in to testify as to that, Mr. Chairman. We don't know what the Army wants. I don't know whether you know what the Army wants.

Chairman ABRAMS. We have a pretty good idea of what they are proposing, at least, for Natick.

Congressman YATES. Maybe if you tell us we can tell you whether we can duplicate it or beat it.

Chairman ABRAMS. I would rather have the General answer it.

Congressman YATES. Is it top secret?

Chairman ABRAMS. Not so far as I am concerned.

Congressman YATES. We are not trying to be contemptuous. We are not trying to hold this up. As you well know, we have a vital interest in it to the point of where we have conducted a major campaign to get our interest presented to the Army.

Chairman ABRAMS. Our one interest is where this work can best be done for the interest of the country.

Congressman YATES. Mr. Chairman, as you will recall the wording of my own amendment was to the effect to have the study conducted to determine whether it should be relocated in Chicago or somewhere else in the country.

Chairman ABRAMS. That is exactly what we are trying to find out.

Congressman YATES. That is what we are interested in, too.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Chairman, have the members of the committee seen the short résumé we prepared of the long report? This is about seven or eight pages. I have copies here.

Congressman YATES. We should say, too, the long report prepared by IIT, is not the entire case we propose to make. We think

you would be interested in a survey which we want to prepare for your benefit to be made by members of the food industry, for example.

Chairman ABRAMS. Let me ask you, is there any truth in the editorial in the "Chicago Tribune"?

Congressman YATES. There was no truth at all.

Chairman ABRAMS. None at all? That is absolutely not true.

Congressman YATES. Not the slightest bit of truth in it, and I am saying that for the record.

Chairman ABRAMS. We don't want to get into political implications. This is beyond this committee.

Congressman YATES. You asked me a question, and I answered it.

How did you come to know about the editorial in the Chicago Tribune?

Chairman ABRAMS. I cut it out.

Congressman YATES. You read the Tribune assiduously?

Chairman ABRAMS. I didn't say assiduously. I read quite a bit of it. It's the world's greatest paper, you know.

Yes, we have this résumé here. Would you like to use it as a basis of this presentation of it?

Congressman YATES. I am speaking for myself as a representative of the congressional delegation, but I would think that what we would want is an opportunity to present our entire case. This study, both the long one and the summary and the picture of the building you have before you, are just a part of our case. As you well know, as I understand it, you told IIT to present its proposal. You called them on Wednesday, or somebody called them on Wednesday and said: "Tell you what you want to do on Friday. This really doesn't offer much time."

Chairman ABRAMS. I think you understand we haven't had much time given to us.

Congressman YATES. I didn't know. How much time have you had given to you?

Dr. WORK. April 4.

Congressman YATES. April 4. If that's the case, I will call up CARL VINSON, and I will protest against a rigged presentation.

Chairman ABRAMS. What time do you want?

Congressman YATES. Two weeks to present it.

Chairman ABRAMS. I don't think we need that much time.

Congressman YATES. You need to have 2 weeks to get a comparable figure on the construction of a building, don't you?

Chairman ABRAMS. I wouldn't know.

Congressman YATES. Of course, you do. You can't say we have an authorization for a building of this size and then expect this institution to give you an estimate on it immediately. I think it is something that you should know.

April 4, my God!

Dr. HOFF. Why do you think you are meeting here on Good Friday?

Congressman YATES. I think it's terrible. As soon as this General comes in, I am going to tell him I resent the fact trying to get this investigation through so quickly.

Mr. COUSINS. Which General is here, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman ABRAMS. General Tribe.

Dr. PARKS. General Tribe from Natick.

Congressman YATES. Unbiased witness.

Dr. PARKS. He is commanding officer up there at the moment.

Mr. COUSINS. How do you spell that?

Dr. PARKS. Just like the Indians—T-r-i-b-e. He has been there his second year.

Congressman YATES. When I spoke to you on the phone, Mr. Chairman, you indicated it would take you about 30 days to get a report up.

Chairman ABRAMS. To get a detailed report up. That is correct.

Congressman YATES. I think this type of a project is entitled to have a detailed report.

Chairman ABRAMS. Now, sir, we propose to give them a report based on the procedures that we are presently using. Whether that is satisfactory to them or not is up to them to determine.

Congressman YATES. I don't understand that. You propose to give them a report.

Chairman ABRAMS. There is a lot of evidence already prepared, as you know. As for example, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is evidence from your own report here. There is evidence of other studies. We are trying to consider all of those and see what we can get out of this evidence.

Congressman YATES. Now you indicated to me that you thought 30 days was necessary for a detailed report.

Chairman ABRAMS. I said for a detailed investigation. That is correct. Much of that has been done by your own congressional committee, sir.

Congressman YATES. All right, does this mean that you have altered your opinion? Do you no longer require 30 days for detailed investigation?

Chairman ABRAMS. It doesn't for a detailed investigation, it doesn't at all.

Congressman YATES. What I want to know is, you still need 30 days for detailed investigation?

Chairman ABRAMS. For detailed investigation. That is correct.

Congressman YATES. What does a detailed investigation cover?

Chairman ABRAMS. It covers bringing some individual or group to go over the same thing that has already been gone over by a congressional committee.

Congressman YATES. All right. I think your group is a group of experts. Isn't it considered to be a group of experts in the field?

Chairman ABRAMS. Well, if you define what an expert is.

Congressman YATES. Presumably, considered to be a group of experts.

Chairman ABRAMS. Intelligent, well educated people——

Congressman YATES. In this field.

Chairman ABRAMS. In research.

Congressman YATES. The Congress would want to have your detailed report.

Chairman ABRAMS. I am not sure.

Congressman YATES. I am quite sure they would. I think we ought to have at least 30 days for this.

Chairman ABRAMS. May I ask the basis on which the Illinois Institute report was made?

Mr. COUSINS. The basis on which the Illinois Institute report was made was to try and study the mission of the Food and Container Institute, and how we thought that mission could best be accomplished. Then we further went on and made an offer to work with the Quartermaster Corps to build the building for them and lease it to them if that would help their financial problems as far as their accomplishing their objectives, but we feel that we are in complete agreement with you, Mr. Chairman. That is, the objective here is only to get the best research and development program for the Quartermaster Corps.

Chairman ABRAMS. That is correct.

Mr. COUSINS. Our study indicated to us that that program could best be handled, based on our knowledge of both their program and our experience in research here in Chicago, because of its location and its relationship to the food and container industry, the industry councils and the other points that were made in that report. We further went on and pointed out how we had completed four buildings within the past 5 years of our own. That is just Armour Research. These are straight research buildings.

Illinois Tech has built a number of buildings in the same period, and on the basis of the figures, the actual cost of those buildings, we felt that we could build that building for less cost than they were talking about for Natick. If you will compare out figures, we talked about 150,000 square feet.

Chairman ABRAMS. What page is that on?

Mr. COUSINS. On page 2 of the short résumé. We estimated based on our own experience that a 150,000-square-foot building would cost three and a half million dollars.

Chairman ABRAMS. The building alone?

Mr. COUSINS. The building with furniture and fixtures. This compared with a figure of 3 million 8, as we understood it, from Natick.

Congressman YATES. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? From whom do your instructions come?

Chairman ABRAMS. I will ask my colleagues to explain them fully to you.

Dr. PARKS. I guess, Mr. Poor, Assistant Secretary of the Army Office, who was with us on Wednesday.

Congressman YATES. He told you to finish by April 4?

Dr. PARKS. Yes.

Congressman YATES. Did he know a detailed investigation would take 30 days?

Dr. PARKS. I don't know. I am not sure. That was not discussed at that time.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you object, sir, to our giving our opinion based on the information that is presented here?

Congressman YATES. Mr. Chairman, I object to a less than detailed investigation made.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you think there has not been enough investigation in the past?

Congressman YATES. I don't think you have facts upon which you can act because obviously the Quartermaster Corps hasn't made available to any institution, in spite of the fact that the institutions have requested it, the facts pertaining to the construction of an edifice in Chicago.

Chairman ABRAMS. So you are putting most of your emphasis then on the cost of the building?

Congressman YATES. No, I am not. You are putting words into my mouth.

Chairman ABRAMS. I am asking.

Congressman YATES. I am saying from the number of arguments that are made, namely, the geographical location of the city, the fact that it is in the agricultural heartland, the fact you have the greatest food industry in the country in this area as well as the container institution. I am saying that we want the opportunity to have an unhurried, an unbiased and unprejudiced investigation made, one that is not going to be rigged by—if that is a correct word to use—not going to be pushed through by the Army without having an opportunity to present our full case.

Chairman ABRAMS. What evidence do you not presently have that you would want to have?

Congressman YATES. We do not have——

Mr. COUSINS. I have some detailed examples of that. Would you like me?

Congressman YATES. I don't want that at the moment.

We don't have presently, we haven't had the opportunity to check with all the industries that are interested in keeping it in Chicago for one thing. We haven't had an opportunity to present, even to check, let alone present—we haven't had an opportunity to check with various educational institutions, universities in this area, to be able to present to you the data which you may not now have which we think may be pertinent to your study.

Chairman ABRAMS. Relating to what, sir?

Congressman YATES. To the advantages of having the Institute located in this town so that it can serve the needs of the Army and our country best in this city.

Dr. WORK. Do you include other areas, as for instance, the New York area?

Congressman YATES. My amendment said to relocate in Chicago or elsewhere in the country. For all we know, it might be some city in California that might be better than Natick or even Chicago. It might be a city in Iowa. I think that if you are just proposing to take a look at this thing in terms of trying to determine whether or not it is going to be Natick or Chicago, you aren't meeting the charge of that amendment, and I don't think the Army is meeting the charge of that amendment, and I don't think you are doing an adequate job if you are just comparing Chicago and Natick because we want to find the place that is best for the interest of your country as you yourself pointed out, and that is what the amendment says has to be done.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you feel, sir, we should take in a great many other areas and invite the Congressmen from those areas to come in as you are, sir, and present those points?

Congressman YATES. Sir, I would think that would be a desirable thing. Well, I have pride in Chicago. I did not limit the location of the new institution because we are talking about a new institution. The Army closed down the institution on Pershing Road. This Container Institute has got to be somewhere. You are going to invest a significant sum of money in a new institution. Why do you limit it to either Chicago or Natick? How do you know some other place in the country isn't better?

As a matter of fact, the impression I get here right now by the fact that your recommendations are returned by April 4 is that you can come to no other conclusion, to require you to report it back to Natick, Mass., without giving Chicago a fair break.

Dr. PARKS. We are not required.

Congressman YATES. The chairman just said he was.

Dr. PARKS. We are not required. It was suggested if they could have a report.

Congressman YATES. By April 4. According to what the chairman just indicated, he said they were bound to report this back by April 4.

Chairman ABRAMS. I don't think we said we were bound to.

Congressman YATES. We can go back to the record. I think the impression that was given was your report is going to be in to the Army by April 4.

Chairman ABRAMS. Requested to have it in by April 4.

Dr. WORK. Preliminary report.

Chairman ABRAMS. To give our best opinion on the evidence now available.

Congressman YATES. Obviously, I am not doing my own case any good by trying to create a hostile atmosphere, and I know that, and I don't want to create any kind of hostile atmosphere. I want a good report from this group. I have confidence in this group. That is why I named you specifically in my amendment, but I want this group to have an opportunity to think of this thing, to consider it, and to have all the facts at their disposal.

Chairman ABRAMS. To use congressional terms, my esteemed and beloved friend here, I think that we want to give as objective a report as we can on the thing we are asked to do.

Congressman YATES. Right.

Chairman ABRAMS. We have beeen asked to try to present to them the best information we can on what is presently available.

Congressman YATES. By April 4.

Chairman ABRAMS. By April 4. That is correct.

Congressman YATES. May I say to the chairman that this meeting is taking place in accordance with an amendment that I presented to the House of Representatives and which the House accepted. I know what the intent of that amendment was, and the intent of that amendment was not what the Army directed you to do. The intent of that amendment was to require the secretary to make study, but to let the study be made in as fair and impartial and as thorough a manner as is possible. If 30 days is necessary for an impartial report, I would think that that would be the minimum, and I would think that you would want to go over the testimony. You may want to take additional testimony. I would think that it is unconscionable to place a time limit of 1 week upon hearings on this important subject. Obviously, the mind of the Army is made up again. They are not paying any attention to what the House of Representatives has indicated.

The General isn't even here to tell us what the requirements of the Quartermaster are. The Colonel is here. Can you tell us what the requirements of the building are?

Dr. PARKS. No.

Congressman YATES. Don't you know?

Dr. PARKS. I know in general, in square feet and so on.

Congressman YATES. Why doesn't the Army take bids from various cities for this? Why doesn't it, inasmuch as it is spending this substantial amount of money—why doesn't it itself try to find the best way of doing this? Your mind is made up. This is just shadowboxing we are going through now.

Chairman ABRAMS. Would you be willing to take into that operating costs also?

Congressman YATES. Of course, I think that is a necessary part of it. I know that. That was in the report that the subcommittee of the House committee made, and I recognize the fact that the Quartermaster Corps is going to use this as a basis for moving to Natick, but Mr. Chairman, I merely point this out to you. As we walked in here, it was indicated this is a preliminary hearing we are going through here. I gained the impression as a result of what our conversation has been that it is not a preliminary hearing, that you feel bound to report by April 4.

Chairman ABRAMS. We have been requested to. That is correct.

Congressman YATES. You do feel bound to report?

Chairman ABRAMS. I think that is correct, yes.

Congressman YATES. That being true, I don't think that you giving this, you are not giving—I know you are not giving my amendment a fair trial. I know that you are not giving yourselves a fair opportunity to come to a reasoned and judicious opinion on this thing after consideration of all the facts that are pertinent. I know that you are not giving the people whom I represent, I mean the people of the city of Chicago, in this area—I know you are not giving them a chance to present their best case. When you call up Wednesday and say have the IIT proposal given to us on Friday, as though this were the sum total of the case that we could prepare, I think in some measure the case is being prejudged, and I think it is grossly unfair, and I want you to know that if you do report by April 4, that I will make this known to the Congress. I will tell the House, and I will tell the Senate, and I will tell the President of the United States that this has been a rigged mission. I will say so not because of this committee, but because of the Army, because they insist on cutting off the time that is necessary to do an adequate job here.

Chairman ABRAMS. Then you are saying, in effect, that to you there is no object in going ahead with this.

Congressman YATES. I am saying that I recognize what Dr. Fisher indicated, as we walked in, this was a preliminary hearing. I am saying to you that I want 2 weeks. Not "I want," but I think that you ought to give us a chance to prepare our case, and offer our case to you, because I think it will be helpful to you in coming to your conclusion. I think you ought to give us at least 2 weeks, which is what will be required, to present our case, and I think you ought to request, as I make the request now, to the Quartermaster Corps, to find out what their requirements are for a new building, if one is to be built in the city of Chicago.

Suppose you came to the conclusion this was not to be built in Natick, but the city of Chicago, wouldn't you want to know what kind of building was to be built here? Of course you would.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think I have a pretty good idea of the general type of building. There isn't too much difference in the general layout of research buildings as such. There are certain facilities, a certain type.

Congressman YATES. Is this going to be a one-story building, two-story building, three-story building? What does the Army want? The current tendency in industrial property and research property is to put it on one floor.

Argonne Laboratories are on one floor.

Chairman ABRAMS. If you will withhold any further discussion on that until the Illinois Institute of Technology has had an opportunity to present the report they have already made, I think then we might be able to discuss a little more.

Congressman YATES. Mr. Chairman, why don't you do this, if I may offer this suggestion. Why don't you set down for hearing, say, in 2 weeks? If you want it in Washington, fine. If you want it in Chicago, fine. This group was given $10,000, were allocated $10,000 for expenses to perform this survey, and that includes your travel costs. Why don't you give this group 2 weeks to present its case, and why don't you require the Army—you can't require the Army, but why don't you try to get from the Army what its requirements are for a building in the event it were constructed in the city of Chicago, and why don't you check around the rest of the country, as you should, in accordance with the amendment?

Chairman ABRAMS. If you check the rest of the country, you will have to allow a year for this because every chamber of commerce in the United States will have an interest in it.

Congressman YATES. Allow whatever time is necessary, but this is going to be built somewhere. If it going to be built in Natick, we are just going through shadowboxing, aren't we?

Dr. PARKS. I don't know that we know that. Truthfully, I don't know. I also say that I didn't know that there was such a lack of information on the part of IIT.

Congressman YATES. IIT says so here. It says so not only in the big report, but says so on page 2 of the little report. The exact specifications of the proposed new Natick facility have not been made available outside of the Quartermaster Corps.

They have asked for it. They have never been furnished anything by the Quartermaster Corps. We asked for it today. We been furnished anything by the Quarterter Corps. So I say to you that it looks to me as though the Quartermaster Corps isn't interested in giving anybody an opportunity to go outside of Natick.

I suggest to the people whom I represent—I leave it up to their good judgment. I know they are interested in getting a facility at IIT. As far as I am concerned, we may end up with a facility at the University of Chicago, where I was graduated, for example. They may come to this conclusion. Maybe the University of Chicago should make some kind of presentation. Maybe Northwestern University should. Why should this whole area be restricted in its presentation to what IIT is presenting? Why shouldn't the University of Chicago be

given that opportunity or any of the other educational institutions?

Chairman ABRAMS. We had assumed, perhaps wrongfully, in the Chicago location, the one that was presumably best was the one offered by the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Congressman YATES. Why did you come to that conclusion, because IIT had presented a proposal? Nobody else knows about the proposal in the city. We have splendid universities here. We have splendid locations for research institutions here. We are right in the agricultural heartland of the country, and we are restricting it. We are restricting it both by time and by lack of information.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, I was going to recommend to my people here that I think that they should make no presentation at this time. As a matter of fact, I don't think they are in a position to make any kind of presentation at the present time. They have made their presentation. They have given you the report. They have shown you a picture of the building they have constructed. They don't know what the Army wants. This is just a sham, but there are other institutions that may want to present cases on their own behalf. There may be other offers that are made available which will be of great value for your consideration. So I would say to you, I say that the least you can do, I think there are no questions that they ought to answer. I think we ought to be given an opportunity to present our case, give you copies of our studies and our presentations ahead of time, let them come in and answer the questions that you want to ask them. In that way you are presenting a logical, a reasoned case.

Dr. WORK. On this question of costs, you mentioned all the buildings that were built over there at Illinois Tech. You have a pretty clear figure as to what the variation in the cost is, haven't you? I mean, buildings don't differ so much, these types of buildings.

Congressman YATES. May I point out to you in this study there are two possibilities that are available. One is the construction by the Army on land that is available to them. The second is the construction by this institution of a building under a lease arrangement. They don't know quite which one is available. They do know that square footage costs amount to about $20 a foot on this sort of basis. As far as a building of that type is concerned, maybe they won't have a fancy building. Maybe they will have a less expensive building, so that we are talking in generalities. We have nothing specific to go on.

Dr. WORK. Yes, but on your figure, $20 a square foot, is that pretty much a standard figure around here in the city of Chicago?

Mr. COUSINS. No; it is a little higher than 20. It is around 23 or 24.

We took the only figures we could get, and this was by reading reports and calling people, and so forth. They were talking about a figure of 3 million 8 for Natick. We didn't know until after our report had been sent in that that was for 121,000 square feet. If you will notice in our report, we just pulled the figure of 150,000 square feet a little bit out of the air based on what they have now, and so forth, and making an estimate of that we came up, based on our own experience, with a figure of 3 million 5 for 150,000 square feet down at Technology Center.

Chairman ABRAMS. You understand that if it were put up here, it would have to be a larger building than in Natick because of the overhead that would be required here that is presently available in Natick?

Mr. M. C. BECK. This hasn't been explored.

Congressman YATES. We don't know that.

Chairman ABRAMS. I can tell you that is about right.

Congressman YATES. We don't know that because nobody has ever told us what the requirements for the building are.

Chairman ABRAMS. Over what period do you amortize your building?

Mr. COUSINS. Over what period do we amortize our own building? Fifty years.

Chairman ABRAMS. So if there is a difference of a half million dollars here, it would be at the rate of 50.

Mr. COUSINS. It doesn't work that way.

Chairman ABRAMS. Why not?

Mr. COUSINS. The concern to the Quartermaster Corps is cost. That is part of the concern, that if they are going to build it themselves, it is straight cost. Is that correct?

Chairman ABRAMS. Right.

Mr. COUSINS. If they are not going to build it themselves, then it becomes an annual charge that they have to charge.

Chairman ABRAMS. Right.

Mr. COUSINS. This is a decision that I don't know how to make, that the Treasury of the United States has to make or the Bureau of the Budget, or the Congress as to how they want to spend the money. What we have said is, based on the limited information we have, we think we can build a building of 150,000 square feet for $3½ million as compared to the 121,000 square feet for $3,800,000, which is the total cost aspect.

In addition to that, we are willing to put up the building and lease it to the Quartermaster Corps on a reasonable long-term lease arrangement, if that is better for their needs. We will go either way, but we have not been able to firm this up because we don't have any specifications of the building or any details.

Let me give you another example: Assistant Secretary Morse called Dr. Rettaliata last week and he said: "Your proposal is illegal. It can't be done."

Well, as a matter of fact, he is partially right. The law, and we have checked this out with GSA, says that the Army cannot make more than a 1-year lease on property that they occupy. However, GSA can delegate to the Army the right to make long-term leases for a specialized facility. They can go up to 20-year leases. This is what the law says which was passed in 1959, so GSA tells me. There are at least two examples of that that I am aware of. One is the Judge Advocate General School at the University of Virginia, and another one is at Duke.

Dr. WORK. That is Ordnance.

Mr. COUSINS. My understanding is it is Ordnance at Duke.

Dr. PARKS. Army Research Office now.

Mr. COUSINS. They changed the name. You are right.

Dr. PARKS. Took the whole thing down there, ARO.

Congressman YATES. Which shows it can be done.

Mr. COUSINS. So the point is, as we see it, we think these things can be done, that there is enough information in our minds that it can be done. Yet, to come up with a specific proposal, and now coming up with the amount of land required, we could do that, and we go on with the location at 30th and Michigan which can be procured as we have said in our report, but as far as the specific building is concerned, and what kind of laboratory they want in it, and all of that, that goes with it, we have no information on that, so we had to take our chemistry building, feeling that was closest to food and container type research, and extrapolate from there.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think that is probably a fair basis on which to do it.

Congressman YATES. I don't. I don't think that is adequate at all.

Chairman ABRAMS. Sir, have you built many research buildings?

Congressman YATES. I have not built many research buildings, but I don't think you can say this is an adequate research building without knowing what the requirements of the building are.

Chairman ABRAMS. In going from one part of the country to the other, exchanging information on research buildings, it is usually based on so much per square foot, that certain type of building, that fits well for research building.

Congressman YATES. I happen to sit on the Research Subcommittee for the GSA and National Science Foundation. I sit there and listen to testimony by the hour as to the cost of construction and types of research buildings that are being built all over the country, air-conditioned space, two-story space, one-story space, so that I have a little bit of knowledge about it.

Chairman ABRAMS. How much difference do you find per square foot?

Congressman YATES. There is a distinct difference in cost per square foot depending upon location, depending upon type of construction, depending upon air conditioning, depending upon the specific requirements of the building itself in terms of the research that is going to be conducted there, and in the absence of knowing what the Army wants, you cannot say that this is a fair square foot price.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that the figure that the Army is talking about for construction at Natick is 121,000 square feet for $3,800,000?

Chairman ABRAMS. I don't know if that is correct. Is it? I have the exact figure here.

Mr. COUSINS. We do not have that figure officially.

Congressman YATES. It includes the animal hospital, troop barracks.

Mr. BECK. There are endless unknowns in this. We have heard much about radiation facility at Natick. We have no idea what this facility will be like, and whether we can approximate it, or even improve it in view of the nearness of certain facilities we have here.

Congressman YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one thing clear at this time. I am going to insist upon getting a copy of the record, too. I am sure you have no objection.

Chairman ABRAMS. I should say no. Certainly not, sir. I think you come in, shall I say, as rather a biased witness also.

Congressman YATES. What do you mean by "also"?

Chairman ABRAMS. The question is, we are biased.

Congressman YATES. On the contrary. I didn't say you were biased. There is an old French expression "honi soit qui mal y pense." Only the Army is biased.

Mr. COUSINS. Let me give you an example of something you were talking about earlier. In our large report, on page 103 we listed the major laboratories and institutes and so forth located in the Chicago area. These are obviously the laboratories and institutes that are interested in the same field as the Quartermaster Corps. One of the reasons that we reached our conclusion that Chicago was the best location was because of the location of all of these other associated facilities in this area. To go back to a point that you made earlier, would it not be well from your committee's standpoint, your Board standpoint, to contact the major institutes with whom the Quartermaster Corps, the Food and Container Institute is closely associated to find out from them how they have the best association with the Food and Container Institute?

Chairman ABRAMS. Not only in this area, but in the other area, the Natick area.

Mr. COUSINS. Yes.

Chairman ABRAMS. I would think that would be a fair mission, yes.

Mr. COUSINS. I will be quite frank with you. We want to be objective about this.

Chairman ABRAMS. I understand.

Mr. COUSINS. If the location came up somewhere other than Chicago, we would not be offended as long as we felt that it had been looked at carefully. I will give you an example. Your Board is set up to advise the Quartermaster Corps on this type of thing.

Chairman ABRAMS. That is correct.

Mr. COUSINS. Yet, this was never referred to you until this week. We have to say we don't understand that, and that is where we have these questions in our mind about the objectivity of this whole program. They have another figure that was put out by the New England Council. I am sure you probably saw that report where they take their total onetime cost of $4,200,000 and subtract from that the cost of needed modernization and improvements in Chicago. To me this is completely irrelevant. Everyone has agreed that they can't stay in the present facility.

Congressman YATES. As a matter of fact, the Army is moving them out of the present facility. They closed it down.

Mr. COUSINS. To subtract that and talk about a net, onetime cost of $3,200,000 is a figure that just has not basis in fact.

Dr. WORK. You have given this a lot of thought, and if you were to look at other places in the country besides Chicago and Natick, what places would you name offhand as places you should look at in addition to these two?

Mr. COUSINS. That is a possibility.

Congressman YATES. Madison, Wis., where Dr. Abrams comes from.

Chairman ABRAMS. I don't come from Madison, Wis.

Congressman YATES. Wisconsin is one of the fine agricultural States of the country. You have a fine agricultural school up there. Iowa is another possibility—California.

Dr. WORK. New York.

Mr. COUSINS. Yes. I think, and I don't want to presume here at all, that one of the important things is to list the criteria for how do they get the best research done, the Quartermaster Corps. The cost is certainly most important.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think you have listed a good many of them right in here.

Mr. COUSINS. We think we have, too.

Congressman YATES. Have you any others they should turn their attention to?

Chairman ABRAMS. I think you have gone pretty well into the scientific atmosphere which is one of the most important.

Mr. COUSINS. We feel strongly about that.

Mr. BECK. They considered this overhead cost very important. We haven't the slightest idea how they get at their overhead cost or comparing overhead cost of Chicago and Natick. We would like to know a great deal more about this, so we would know whether our proposal would hold water.

Dr. FRANK R. FISHER. May I suggest we turn into an executive session and consider the Congressman's suggestion?

Chairman ABRAMS. We would do that.

Congressman YATES. I didn't hear what you said.

Dr. FISHER. I suggested we go into executive session to consider your suggestion previously.

Congressman YATES. About giving us 2 weeks?

Dr. FISHER. Giving it more consideration.

Congressman YATES. Very good. May I also say, Mr. Chairman, I understood you to tell me before, you are going to make available to me a copy of the record.

Chairman ABRAMS. Yes, sir.

Congressman YATES. The raw record before correction in it. I would like to have the raw record. I don't care about the language.

Chairman ABRAMS. You will have all the information.

Congressman YATES. I want to have it before the Army gets it.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Chairman, we will be happy to answer any questions or supply any information that we know how. As I said, we try to look at some of the criteria and give our analysis of it. When we got into the building question, we tried to extrapolate the best we could. This is a rather hard way to do it when you don't have the specifications to talk about, but I am authorized to say by Dr. Rettaliata that we would be willing to work out financing arrangements with the building. We have talked with GSA, and they indicate that they legally have the authority to delegate to the Army to work out this program, but we have difficulty in doing it without having any specifications or any way to really tie it down and know exactly what we are talking about.

Congressman YATES. This is the point, this is the deadline, I would think, you would start the 2 weeks from, namely, when we received the requirements as stated by the Army for the construction of a Food and Container Institute laboratory in another location than Natick, plus an idea as to the type of overhead that the building will carry.

Chairman ABRAMS. Did you specify Chicago and other areas?

Congressman YATES. I said Chicago or elsewhere in the country.

Chairman ABRAMS. If you really want to cover that, Congressman, you will have to extend your appropriation very considerably, and we will have to extend our time very considerably.

Congressman YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you that this is an amendment that was accepted by the House, and I just assume you can operate within the scope of this appropriation to the extent that you have the appropriation.

Chairman ABRAMS. You mean if we used this appropriation and came back with the answers we have acquired in that time, that would satisfy you?

Congressman YATES. I don't know what you mean by that.

Chairman ABRAMS. I mean if you want to cover the whole country, we can't do it.

Congressman YATES. I was told it was adequate for the purpose.

Chairman ABRAMS. Who told you that?

Congressman YATES. I was told this was adequate by clerks of the Armed Services Committee. As a matter of fact, I was told you wouldn't even have to use the $10,000 appropriation.

Chairman ABRAMS. Sir, where did they get the information?

Congressman YATES. Wherever the Armed Services Committee gets it.

Chairman ABRAMS. I will ask my colleagues here if we can cover the United States with the available locations and do it for the sum that is allowed here.

Congressman YATES. How much do you want? How much do you think would be needed?

Chairman ABRAMS. I would have my own idea.

Dr. WORK. We would need 2 weeks for this to find out what the estimates would be.

Congressman YATES. Do you not agree with this, if this information, if this institution or any institution, the University of Chicago, the University of Wisconsin were to try to make a proposal for the construction of a building which would serve the needs of the Army, that there should be made available to them by the Army what the Army's requirements are, and what the overhead costs are likely to be?

Chairman ABRAMS. This would be a very oblique answer. If I felt Congress was as careful with some of the hundred million investigations. I would be happy about it.

Congressman YATES. That is very oblique, and I don't think it answers my question.

Chairman ABRAMS. It is oblique.

Congressman YATES. It is oblique. It doesn't answer my question.

Chairman ABRAMS. If you want an exact answer of what it would cost in terms of money and time, I would rather sit down with these gentlemen.

Congressman YATES. I haven't asked that question.

Chairman ABRAMS. Let me ask you again, sir, if we spent the $10,000 as well as we could and acquired the information available from that and came back with an answer, would you be satisfied?

Congressman YATES. If it were in the judgment of this group, the detailed report that you say the group should make.

Chairman ABRAMS. Covering the area we are able to cover under it.

Congressman YATES. Right.

Chairman ABRAMS. You would be satisfied?

Congressman YATES. Either that, or I want you to tell me you need more money for the survey. I would get you the money. I think this survey is essential. I want to ask you the question again that I asked before I got the oblique reply. Do you not consider as essential for any kind of a fair and objective presentation to be made by an institution other than the Army that it be furnished with the information as to what the Army's needs are in terms of actual physical project, land and buildings and also what the overhead requirements are likely to be?

Chairman ABRAMS. To come up with a good estimate on it. I think that is correct.

Congressman YATES. I would like the record to show that I have made a request of the colonel, the Quartermaster Corps, that we be furnished with that information so that we can give this group estimates, give this group a proposal such as we think is necessary, such as is necessary in order for this group to come to a conclusion.

Dr. WORK. That would be available to other institutions?

Congressman YATES. Sure; let it go out to the general public. Why, of course, not only for Natick, not only for Chicago, but the amendment itself covers Chicago or elsewhere, and let's lay this thing out. This is what the Army needs. These are the Army's requirements physically. Now what can you do this for, for the Army? I think this is it in essence.

Mr. COUSINS. To bring this down to manageable propositions. You asked us the question. Obviously you people are well experienced in this. It would seem to me from a practical standpoint, you would pick whatever areas based on your knowledge were reasonably expected to be able to make a contribution here.

Chairman ABRAMS. Certainly.

Mr. COUSINS. There aren't too many, I think.

Dr. WORK. There aren't too many.

Congressman YATES. Within the $10,000 budget. If you can't, I will get you some more money.

Mr. COUSINS. You have Boston and maybe New York. I don't know about New York. That is a little bit low on my list.

Dr. WORK. I come from there. I think very high of it myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. COUSINS. This is fine [laughter], or you have got perhaps Madison. You have perhaps California.

Chairman ABRAMS. Have you actually made some preliminaries on it yourself?

Mr. COUSINS. No, sir; we have not. The only thing we have studied was the comparison of Chicago, on which we have pretty good information, and Natick, on which we had some less good information. That is all we have done in our study.

Dr. ELDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if IIT, attempting to get this information from the Army regarding size of buildings and so forth, was that request in writing and ignored or by telephone and ignored, or what?

Mr. COUSINS. To be quite frank with you, it was on a kind of cum se, cum sa basis. Up until recently, when Mr. Peden wrote very specifically and requested the information, and he has not had a reply.

Chairman ABRAMS. How long ago was that?

Mr. PEDEN. I would say 3 weeks.

Chairman ABRAMS. How much?

Mr. PEDEN. Two or three weeks.

Chairman ABRAMS. You had no acknowledgment?

Mr. PEDEN. No, sir.

Chairman ABRAMS. To whom was it directed?

Mr. PEDEN. I can't be specific. I think to the Quartermaster General.

Congressman YATES. The Secretary of War, Secretary of the Quartermaster Corps, or what? May we cover that for the record?

Chairman ABRAMS. Could you find that out? If you gentlemen would give us 15 minutes—is the other room available there next door?

Congressman YATES. I have no feud with this group obviously because I included this group into my amendment. I have the greatest esteem and highest respect for this group.

Chairman ABRAMS. Thank you, sir.

Congressman YATES. I only want this group not to be proscribed and limited unreasonably by a mandate from the Army itself, and I think you have been proscribed and limited. I knew nothing about this April 4 date. I think it is ridiculous—just ridiculous.

(At this time Congressman YATES and the people from the Illinois Institute of Technology were excused.)

(The meeting recessed, after which the representatives from the IIT returned.)

Chairman ABRAMS. We thought we could reconvene and see if you gentlemen had anything further you would like to offer or to ask.

Mr. COUSINS. I think the major thing that we need to ask is, Is there any possibility of our getting these specifications so that we can submit a more intelligent proposal and more specific proposal?

Chairman ABRAMS. We will give you a definite answer on that later.

Dr. WORK. They are not ours to give, really.

Chairman ABRAMS. That is what I say, really.

Dr. PARKS. We can only make a recommendation.

Mr. COUSINS. I see. And, of course, that includes the information on overhead which is unknown to us, and the time, as I mentioned earlier. It seemed to us quite important that while on one side of the ledger the advantages with which we are not familiar of having all of the Quartermaster activities located at Natick is a kind of a general advantage that you can say yes to, that most people could say yes to; on the other hand, the question of the location here in Chicago where you have based on our study all of the industries and all of the associations and all of the other people with whom this organization works most closely, we think is a very distinct advantage, and I think that either you or we should be in contact with those groups and ask them how they feel that this job can best be done.

Chairman ABRAMS. Which groups, now, do you mean, sir?

Mr. COUSINS. I am talking about the various institutes and organizations, most of which are located on page 109.

Chairman ABRAMS. I know what you mean. Could I ask how you people became interested in this whole thing originally?

Mr. COUSINS. We have got to recollect here a little bit. One of the problems is the man who wrote that report, Dr. Barthel, is now with the National Science Foundation in Washington, so we have a little problem there; and then Mr. Spaith, who was Mr. Ritterskemp's predecessor as treasurer and vice president of Illinois Tech, is now president of the Beverly Bank here in Chicago, so neither one of us was in this thing from the beginning, but our recollection is that we heard about the situation, and we heard various comments about it.

You may remember that at Illinois Tech we have the Association of American Railroads Central Research Laboratory and the Institute of Gas Technology. We are now working on a program that we are calling a research park. We have had a number of companies come and talk with us about locating their central research laboratories in the near vicinity because of this exchange of information between the various scientists and the scientific atmosphere that we think we have, and so when we heard about the Food and Container Institute situation, why we got interested and started asking questions and thinking about the thing and so forth. One thing led to another which ultimately led to that report.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you operate a food technology course at the Institute?

Mr. COUSINS. Yes, sir.

Chairman ABRAMS. Does that supply a good many people through the food and container industry?

Mr. COUSINS. Now I am with the research end of it. I don't know if you can answer that or not. Jim just came to the Illinois Tech February 1. Neils, can you?

Mr. N. C. BECK. We have done quite a bit of work in this field, food and container work, in terms of the best methods of preservation, the best binders and papers, the best can liners.

Chairman ABRAMS. You mean through research work?

Mr. BECK. That is right. As you know, we also have a sizable facility, a reactor——

Chairman ABRAMS. I understand.

Mr. BECK. And radiation laboratory in which we have done food research.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you have this food and technology course that a man can go in and take in a given number of years and go out into the industry?

Mr. BECK. Armour Research Foundation has no courses. We are in research full time. I don't know.

Chairman ABRAMS. Who can speak for Illinois Institute?

Mr. J. J. RITTERSKEMP, JR. I can, Doctor, and the story is we do have a food engineering course, the interest in which course, however, is declining rather rapidly, and how much longer we will be able to continue it is a doubtful question.

Chairman ABRAMS. There are not enough students taking it to warrant it. I see.

Dr. WORK. You mentioned these various areas in which you were doing work that were related to this. Who is that for, the Federal Government or for private industry?

Mr. COUSINS. Both.

Dr. WORK. Would there be any problem? You talk about the interchange of information. Would there be any problem there of a conflict of interest between the private industry and the Government? You, for instance, I am sure, follow the same policy that most institutions do of not taking identical projects from two different people.

Mr. COUSINS. That is correct. This is kind of an old question over many years, as I am sure you are well aware, and I think that we are of the conclusion that, No. 1, you depend on the integrity of the scientist because you do have this conflict of interest, and you do have the confidential relationship whether it be with the Government or an industrial sponsor, but within that boundary there are many things that are well worth discussions and seminars, and so forth, of principles of approaches to a problem without disclosing any specific confidential information on a particular product or a particular process.

Dr. WORK. How would you suggest we try to resolve the problem of the relative benefits of having a single institution, therefore, time computers and so forth, versus the contact of industry around you? How could you measure and come up with any answer that would have any value at all especially in a political argument?

Mr. COUSINS. This is one of the things that quite frankly disturbs us at Illinois Tech. We agree with the dilemma there. We think, however, that there are two or three important points. One is that some of the information that we are told which we have not seen has been presented is not fully accurate as far as what facilities are at Natick. For example, they talk about a radiation facility, and they don't have one, so we are told. They are talking about getting one. Whereas, here we have a reactor, and we have Argonne available, and there are other areas like that that we would suggest that you look into carefully as to whether these facilities really exist or really make a contribution.

Secondly, I think we would say that the only people who can make an intelligent—and call it guess if you want or estimate—judgment of this are some people like you who are experienced in this area. This is a judgment type of thing. You can't pin it down as you can a scientific experiment, and we recognize that.

Chairman ABRAMS. Do you feel from what you know of the Chicago area that you are the only logical place that could take this?

Mr. COUSINS. The only logical place? I I would have to say no.

Chairman ABRAMS. You don't?

Mr. COUSINS. I think we are the most logical because of the community that exists now and that is expanding. By community I mean the various other laboratories and the overall scientific operation, but I am not familiar enough with the work that goes on at Chicago or at Northwestern, but I would certainly never say that they couldn't handle it or that it wouldn't be a good move up there.

Chairman ABRAMS. Is this a good living area where you are going to build there?

Mr. COUSINS. It is a good living area depending upon how you define it. For example, as of the next couple of years all of the major expressways converge within a couple of blocks of our place. In other words, the Northwest, South and Southwest and Congress Street all come in where you can get in very easily. For example, in my case it now takes me about 40 minutes where it used to take me an hour, and then when the South Expressway is finished, it will cut another 5 or 10 minutes off that.

Secondly, there are beautiful apartments and housing going up. There is a new South Side plan that has been developed in which, as a matter of fact, some of the developers had a meeting with the city officials just yesterday on working that out. As far as the immediate area today, the only thing that is immediately available are some very nice apartments along the near South Side and along South Michigan. Other than that, you have the access to the suburbs.

Mr. RITTERSKEMP. We have four large apartment buildings on our IIT campus, too, and, of course, the Lake Meadows project.

Chairman ABRAMS. Is it considered a safe area for women at night?

Mr. RITTERSKEMP. Yes, I think it is coming to that point. It has had a bad reputation, sir, but the 2 months I have been on the campus, and I am living in an apartment right now, there has been nothing of a way that is bad in our contiguous area there.

We have our own police force, squad car. The second district gives us excellent cooperation, and the Chicago Police Department. I have had my wife up here this past week. She has gone shopping and so forth.

Mr. COUSINS. We have many of the Illinois Tech staff and the research scientists who live in these various apartments with their wives and families. I am told—I don't know, I can't back this up for you—that the people who currently work at the Food and Container Institute would be happy with this location, and so forth, so I only use that as an example.

Chairman ABRAMS. You feel then if you were given the general specifications of what this building would be, not any plans and so on, you could make some pretty good estimates?

Mr. COUSINS. Yes, sir.

Chairman ABRAMS. Have you any idea how long it would take you to make those estimates with that information available?

Mr. COUSINS. I think we could make the estimates within 2 weeks after receiving the specifications; yes.

Dr. WORK. Would that cover the things in addition to what they are putting in, the auxiliary services that they say would be needed here that wouldn't be needed at Natick because they don't exist? How would you arrive at those?

Chairman ABRAMS. Those would be given in the specifications, I would assume, here.

Mr. COUSINS. Their needs would be in the specifications, we are assuming, and we would show how those needs would be fulfilled.

Chairman ABRAMS. Those specs would be very general, obviously. We couldn't give you the exact specifications for the particular area. We could give you the number of square feet, the general type of construction, the number of rooms and that sort of thing.

Mr. COUSINS. I think we also need the various laboratory type facilities.

Chairman ABRAMS. It is not for a bid on your part, but a "guesstimate" as to what might be involved.

Mr. COUSINS. We need a field for laboratories. As you mentioned earlier, I can give you an example in our physics building. For our physics and electronics building our cost was considerably less than our chemistry building because we didn't need as many services.

Mr. BECK. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, put it on this basis, too. This is the Army's responsibility to supply us with what it considers the essentials. If later they say, "Oh, well, but you haven't made provisions for this," then we say: "You didn't tell us. You should. Well, OK."

Dr. ELDER. Were you able to find out whom to ask for specifications?

Mr. PEDEN. I have the gentleman that was written to. A letter was addressed to Col. A. D. Chaffin, Chief, Properties and Installation Division, Department of the Army, asking for the specifications.

Chairman ABRAMS. Spell that, please.

Mr. PEDEN. C-h-a-f-f-i-n. The person who wrote this letter; I am with the Association of Commerce and Industry. We have an industrial development department. They frequently do this sort of thing. They were asked to do this. Why they addressed their communication to this gentleman, I don't know.

Chairman ABRAMS. Who asked you to do it?

Mr. PEDEN. I think IIT asked us.

Chairman ABRAMS. IIT? I see.

Mr. COUSINS. This was kind of a discussion we had with many people involved.

Chairman ABRAMS. It is perfectly all right. I just was interested to know.

Dr. ELDER. This man they wrote the letter to, would he have any idea about installation?

Dr. PARKS. I wouldn't know. We have no contact with him. I don't know.

Mr. COUSINS. As Mr. Peden said, he wasn't able to contact the man who wrote the letter to ask that question. I would have to tell you from our knowledge and experience of working with the Government that the title he quoted would seem to me the man who would have the information with regard to installations and facilities for the Army, and so he theoretically ought to have it.

Dr. WORK. When was that written? How long?

Mr. PEDEN. March 20.

Dr. WORK. Going through the Government.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think you are optimistic to expect anything by this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BECK. De facto, we don't have the specifications.

Chairman ABRAMS. I think we are going to have to give this a lot of consideration, gentlemen, before we can even decide the next course on it unless you have specific suggestions. If we felt that it were possible to say that this is the location in Chicago, that would be the No. 1, and then, therefore, presumably the only one to be investigated and it would lay between this one and Natick, I think it would be a relatively simple job, but if we are to throw it on that all the areas in Chicago where it might be put, and then include the areas outside of Chicago, it becomes a very large proposition.

Mr. COUSINS. I agree with that, Mr. Chairman, and the only suggestion that I would have to you on this is that I think from the work that we have done—I was going to say it is reasonably obvious, but I think that is too strong. It looks to us as if the two logical areas are the Natick area or Chicago. However, when you say to me is there any other place in Chicago that could handle it logically, I can't say "No" to that.

Chairman ABRAMS. I want to ask that because I think if there is general agreement this is the most logical in Chicago, and if other people would agree to that as a basis to start on, then we have a very definite proposition to consider the two points.

Mr. BECK. In a very real sense this is not our problem, though, anyway. We simply are making the best possible case for what we think is a good location.

Chairman ABRAMS. I understand, but we also value your opinion objectively as to whether you believe this is the best area.

Mr. COUSINS. We do believe it is. I certainly wouldn't say it is the only location. We have had discussions with many members of the food and container industry in which our proposal was made known to them, and none of them came up with any alternative suggestion. They seemed to be quite satisfied with this. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. PEDEN. That is correct.

Chairman ABRAMS. You didn't ask them?

Mr. COUSINS. We didn't specifically say: Do you fellows want to make any alternative suggestion? We just talked about ours, and there seemed to be no objection.

Mr. RITTERSKEMP. Frankly, we are prejudiced along that line.

Mr. COUSINS. I want to answer your questions as carefully and honestly as I know how.

Dr. WORK. That was a point the Congressman took a strong position that it shouldn't be restricted to the two points.

Chairman ABRAMS. That is why I asked this question with the thought perhaps of going back to him and putting it to him definitely: Are you willing to accept an area based on the opinions not only of you gentlemen, but others, that this is the most likely area, and use that as a basis for comparison?

Mr. BECK. Unless I am interpreting the feeling in the matter incorrectly, if you, acting as an advisory board, say that this seems to us to be the most logical location in Chicago, he would have no objection whatever.

Chairman ABRAMS. Of course, that involves our making a study, really.

Dr. WORK. You really tried that at the meeting before when he was here.

Chairman ABRAMS. That same suggestion. I had forgotten it.

Mr. COUSINS. I have the feeling that he was concerned with not trying to make the pitch only for Chicago.

Chairman ABRAMS. Let's say primarily for Chicago and others after. That is only natural.

Mr. COUSINS. He didn't want to be accused of saying this is the only place to be located in Chicago in the country because that is a reasonably ridiculous statement, I think, because there are other places that it could be located. On the other hand, when anyone is making a decision about a university or anything else, you have to kind of sift it down a little bit and say: Now these are the ones that look like they are the most reasonable to spend any time and effort to take a further look at.

Chairman ABRAMS. Well, let's put it another way. I think, Dr. Elder, you brought it up that if it is to be moved from the city here, would it not be the most logical thing to take it to Natick. In other words, why would you take it to another place that is disconnected from the parent organization? Are there enough advantages to having it another place that you would move it any place except Natick if you took it out of here?

Mr. COUSINS. I don't know how to answer that because we haven't looked any place else.

Chairman ABRAMS. We haven't either, but as a general proposition it would seem if we are going to make it more effective and reduce the cost by moving it out of town, you would go to the parent organization and place it there.

Mr. BECK. Again, I don't think we know enough about Natick.

Mr. RITTERSKEMP. Is the food and container unit the only unit that is not now in Natick?

Chairman ABRAMS. There is another, I think. The animal unit is not there, but it has to be included in the move, doesn't it?

Dr. PARKS. The field evaluation agency, as they call it, in other words, their field test division is down at Fort Lee, Va. But that is logical that it should be there. Whether it will ever be moved or not, I don't know because that is where they put their equipment on the soldier, so they have to go on to a fort where there are soldiers, and I am just expressing my own opinion now. I don't know of any move to establish troop installation up there, you see.

Dr. HOFF. Don't they have troops at Maynard?

Dr. PARKS. No.

Mr. COUSINS. New England?

Dr. PARKS. Fort Devens and so on. I thought you meant move it to Natick.

Mr. COUSINS. The only point I was trying to make was you mentioned the fact that it was logical to have this field evaluation unit down in Virginia.

Dr. PARKS. Well, I should have said some military installation where there are troops.

Mr. COUSINS. Right. I will certainly buy that because I think if you carry their logic out at the moment, you would have to move that to Devens or some place that is close to Natick where they would have everything together. I am not arguing one side or the other of that. I am just trying to say I think the case for the Food and Container Institute is somewhat analogous in that here if our information is correct, that it is the center of the industry and the place where they can work most closely with the industry, then

that is a very logical argument for having it separated from their major installation at Natick.

Dr. PARKS. There are some troops, GI's, at Natick now. I guess there are maybe 20 subjects they use in those climatic chambers.

This Maynard they are talking about, does everyone know what that is? It was an Ordnance. It was an ordnance test station. Ordnance gave it up about a year ago, and the Quartermaster took it over. The general lives out there. There are few houses on the post. Colonel Whitney, I guess, lives there, and the Army does some of their air delivery test dropping out there. I have forgotten what it is, 2,000 or 3,000 acres or something. It was formerly an Ordnance test station. What their future plans are for that, I don't know, but this animal facility, they want to build, would be built at Natick.

Mr. COUSINS. I think one of the disturbing things to us, and we are very proud of both our educational and professional reputations, is this: What we feel is a lack of objectivity in looking at this thing. For example, we are told that the people here in Chicago have been told to keep their mouth shut or they will get fired. We are told—well, I will give you a specific example. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Morse, calls Dr. Rettaliata and says: What the heck are you guys doing in this thing, and you are proposing something that is illegal anyway, and all this kind of stuff which doesn't seem to us to be a particularly logical or objective way to take a look at it.

Chairman ABRAMS. We have had none of that given to us, of course.

Mr. COUSINS. I didn't feel you had. I just wanted to point out that this is really the disturbing thing from our standpoint because the best research and development should be done for the Quartermaster Corps, and we just think as best we know that Chicago is the proper location for it. We have then turned around and come up with a specific location where it can fit into the community and everything worked out nicely in our opinion.

Chairman ABRAMS. Gentlemen, is there anything more anybody would like to say one way or the other because we appreciate your coming in here on a holiday and giving us this time. We do very much appreciate the information you have given us, and we can't say what the course of this will be, but we can assure you if we are involved in it, we shall do our best to come to a very objective conclusion.

Mr. RITTERSKEMP. Doctor, may I "Rettaliat" by saying we appreciate the fair hearing that you have given us up to this point, and likewise we appreciate your coming here on a holiday because you are serving your country, too.

Chairman ABRAMS. I might say you can "Rettallat." [Laughter.]

Mr. RITTSRSKEMP. Thank you, sir.

(The meeting adjourned at 3:15 o'clock.)

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1961.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YATES: During the afternoon session of a meeting of a task group of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development in Chicago, Ill., on March 31, 1961, reviewing the relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute from the scientific and technological viewpoint, you made a request for a copy of the stenotypist's record of that session. At that time the chairman of the task group, Dr. Allen Abrams, stated that a copy of the record would be made available to you.

This letter is to inform you that the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development, in accordance with the contract No. DA-19-129-QM-1508 between the National Academy of Sciences and Headquarters, Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command, cannot release minutes of meetings without authorization from its sponsor. I therefore suggest that you make your request known to the Secretary of the Army for whom this particular study was conducted through the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Command, Natick, Mass.

Respectfully yours,
FRANK R. FISHER,
Executive Secretary, Advisory Board on Quartermaster, Research and Development.

QUARTERMASTER FOOD AND
CONTAINER INSTITUTE,
April 5, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Friday, March 31, at 1 o'clock, a pro forma hearing was held by a so-called task group of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Advisory Board on the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute, presumably on the question of whether the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute should be relocated in Chicago or in some other city in the country.

At that time I made a number of objections to the hearing, the principal ones being that insufficient time had been given to proponents seeking to retain the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute in the city of Chicago to prepare for the hearing; and second, to the fact that in spite of repeated requests made to the Secretary of the Army and to the Quartermaster Corps for the data underlying the Army's requirements for a new Food and Container Institute, both with respect to physical plant and necessary civilian and military personnel, the request had not even been acknowledged, let alone complied with.

I suggested at the hearing that the unrealistic time limit imposed by the Secretary of the Army on the Advisory Committee's study prevented obtaining any useful result from the hearing, and I requested a copy of the transcript showing my objections and the discussion between the members of the Advisory Committee Task Group, myself and the other Chicago witnesses who were there, in order that I might be in a position to make further representations to the Congress.

The chairman of the task group, Dr. Allen Abrams, agreed to make a copy available to me. Since that time I have repeated my demand for a copy of the transcript to Dr. Fisher and Assistant Secretary of the Army Morse, personally and through the House Armed Services Committee, but without success.

I am now in receipt of a letter dated April 4, 1961, from Dr. Frank R. Fisher, executive secretary of the advisory board on quartermaster research and development, National Academy of Sciences, copy of which I am enclosing, stating that Dr. Abrams cannot make a copy of the transcript available to me. This last example of flagrant and autocratic refusal to offer any kind of cooperation to those of us who are trying to obtain a fair and objective review of the proposal confirms my belief that the hearing was rigged and that every effort is being made to compel moving the Institute from Chicago to Natick.

The approval by the House of my amendment to the military construction bill certainly meant that the city of Chicago was to be given a fair hearing and fair consideration for retention of the Food and Container Institute in our city. That fair hearing has not been given.

Therefore, I formally protest the pretended hearing that was held last Friday in the city of Chicago and I hereby demand that a copy of the transcript of that hearing be made available to me as promptly as possible. I suggest, also, that if the Department of Defense is interested in giving all parties to this matter fair consideration, the Quartermaster Corps be required to make available to the Chicago group the information respecting the Army's requirements as listed above so that it may prepare a proposal based on facts rather than one which can only be based on speculation.

Sincerely yours,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., April 8, 1961.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. YATES: I understand from Assistant Secretary of the Army Morse that you have requested a copy of the transcript of a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development.

I find that the transcript you requested has not yet been prepared from the stenotype notes. I have asked that the transcript be transmitted to you as soon as received.

I regret the delay and I shall have the transmittal expedited.

Sincerely yours,
ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to my letter to you of April 5 in which I protested formally the so-called hearing of the Task Group of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Advisory Board on the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute, presumably on the question of whether the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute should be relocated in Chicago or in some other city in the country. In that letter I requested also that a copy of the transcript of that hearing be made available to me as promptly as possible.

I have just received the letter dated April 8 signed by Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., indicating that the transcript I had requested had not yet been prepared from the stenotype notes and that a copy would be transmitted to me as soon as it is received.

It is interesting that on the same day I received that letter, I also received from Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, a copy of the study prepared by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with the amendment I offered to the military construction bill. This amendment, which was adopted by the House, required the Secretary to make such a study to determine whether the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute should be relocated in the city of Chicago or elsewhere. The Secretary's study was transmitted to Chairman VINSON by letter dated April 7, 1961. The study itself is undated, nor is any date affixed to the special report prepared by the Task Group which is therein contained as an exhibit, which raises the question as to whether these were prepared before or after the hearings.

I predicted the study's conclusion in my letter to you when I declared that I believed the hearing was rigged. The result was obvious and inevitable under the condi-

tions set up by the Army. The Secretary of the Army recommends now, presumably as a result of the study, that the Institute be moved to Natick.

It is palpably clear that if the Secretary's decision had not already been made prior to the so-called study, it was made without reference to the transcript of the proceedings which he himself in his letter to me indicated had not yet been typed at the time he forwarded the study to Chairman VINSON. The transcript contains the views of the representatives from Chicago and is the only document in which their views are presented. Yet the transcript was never considered by either the task group or the Secretary. Can the Secretary say in truth that he accorded fair treatment to all parties?

In my last letter I suggested that "if the Department of Defense is interested in giving all parties to this matter fair consideration, the Quartermaster Corps should be required to make available to the Chicago group the information respecting the Army's requirements." We have tried in every way we know to obtain the Army's requirements as to land, buildings, and personnel. All our requests have been rejected. For some reason the Army to all intents and purposes has given this matter a classification of "top secret," equivalent to the classification reserved only for the most vital military secrets. If you will look at the transcript you will see that I specifically demanded such information from the representative of the Quartermaster Corps attending the hearings. I have heard nothing from him or the Army since.

We from Chicago hope that you will protect our right to a fair hearing and fair consideration as contemplated by the amendment adopted by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1961.

Hon. ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Congressman Sidney Yates, on the 11th of April, addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense calling attention to what he considered a biased study performed by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute from its present site at Chicago, Ill.

I have received a copy of Mr. Yates' letter and am particularly concerned with that portion of the letter which alleges that the Army has failed to make known to Mr. Yates and various Illinois interests information respecting the Army's requirements "as to land, buildings, and personnel" involved in the proposed relocation.

Mr. Yates points out that this information is deemed to be essential in order for his group to prepare an intelligent and knowledgeable recommendation on the proposed relocation.

In view of this serious allegation and because of my obvious responsibility in this matter, it is requested that you review this entire matter and provide me with a report on the validity of these allegations.

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON, *Chairman.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 18, 1961.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. YATES: This is in response to your inquiry of April 11, 1961, concerning the feasibility study to be made by the Secretary of the Army, as authorized by H.R. 5000, before transferring the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute from Chicago, Ill., to Natick, Mass.

In view of the decision announced by the Department of Defense to transfer the facility now occupied by the Quartermaster Chicago Administration Center to the General Services Administration, you asked whether the same estimated savings would result from relocation of the Food and Container Institute to Natick, Mass., as shown by our report "Analysis of Cost of Planned Inactiviation of the Chicago Administration Center, Department of the Army," B–141592, April 27, 1960, as from relocation of the Food and Container Institute to another site in Chicago, such as the Illinois Institute of Technology. In addition, you ask our opinion as to the factors which should be considered in comparing the costs of locating and operating the Food and Container Institute at different sites.

We are unable to give any opinion as to the possible saving of relocating and operating the Food and Container Institute at the Illinois Institute of Technology or other site in Chicago as compared to our estimated savings from relocation at the Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Mass. Our review was based entirely on the operations of the Institute at the Chicago Administration Center and the specific plans developed at Natick for relocation and partial consolidation of the Institute with other Quartermaster research facilities and activities already located at Natick. Provision for the relocation of the Food and Container Institute was but one of the considerations involved in the proposed deactivation of the Chicago Administration Center. Our report does include a statement of the actions taken by the Army at the time of our report in considering other possible relocation sites for the Food and Container Institute.

With respect to your second inquiry, we believe any meaningful comparison of cost for relocation at different sites must be based on the particular laboratory activities or combination of activities planned to be relocated to each site in relation to the facilities and activities which may already be located at the site. Any such study should consider the estimated costs for any necessary construction, conversion, or rehabilitation of facilities, equipment requirements, military and civilian personnel requirements for operation of the laboratories, and any related administrative services not otherwise provided for. Consideration must also be given to the need for community-type services and housing usually provided at military installations, and for the direct costs of moving.

We trust the information provided is satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

APRIL 25, 1961.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 21, which enclosed a copy of the letter dated April 12 of John H. Rubel, signing for Dr. Herbert F. York. The purpose of the letter is to express Dr. York's opinion that the relocation of the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass., is urgently required.

It is obvious that Dr. York has not informed himself as thoroughly as he should have about the project, but has signed a letter which someone prepared for him. He certainly could not have read the transcript of proceedings of the National Research Council which studied the proposed relocation, for he says: "The relocation of the Institute at Natick will mean that certain important technical facilities, such as the radiation facility, will be readily available for the work of the Institute, while in Chicago these facilities would have to be separately provided."

Had Dr. York read page 104 of the transcript he would have learned that the Illinois Institute of Technology now has a sizable reactor and a radiation laboratory in which it has done and now does extensive food research. Moreover, there is no such facility at Natick now—only one in contemplation which the Quartermaster Corps proposes to move from California to Natick. Thus, if Dr. York's argument for an appropriate location is based upon the availability of a reactor, it is clear that he should favor the Chicago location.

The facts revealed by the transcript are shocking and warrant an immediate investigation by your committee. For example, it is indicated that the Secretary of the Army has already expended $250,000 for designing the new facility for Natick. This appears to be an unauthorized expenditure, for it was made from the appropriation for fiscal year 1960 at a time when the expenditure had neither been authorized by your committee nor by the Appropriations Committee of the House or Senate. Even were the expenditure authorized, it would be excessive. The expenditure of $250,000 for designing a facility to cost $3.8 million is patently exorbitant.

Finally, it is indicated that the new structure proposed for Natick contains 97,000 square feet plus converted space of 20,000 square feet. The cost for this is $3.8 million. The Illinois Institute of Technology recently constructed its chemistry building containing 150,000 square feet—approximately one-third more square footage than the Natick proposal—at a cost of $3.5 million. If 90,000 square feet is the Corps' requirement for space for the Food and Container Institute, I am quite sure an appropriate facility could not be constructed on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology for much less than the amount requested by the Quartermaster Corps for Natick. We still have no idea, of course, and the transcript does not show the personnel which would be needed in operating the facility, either at Natick or elsewhere.

Much emphasis is placed by the Quartermaster Corps on the scientific atmosphere pervading the Natick installation. Certainly that atmosphere could not be more conducive to scientific activity nor better designed to carry out the mission of the institute than would be the surroundings of a great scientific and technological center of learning such as the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Mr. Chairman, it is becoming quite clear in every respect that it would be better for the new facility to be constructed upon the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE
RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1961.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. YATES: Secretary McNamara has asked me to reply to your letter addressed to him on April 11, 1961, regarding the proposed move of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute.

In order to clarify some apparent confusion regarding the sequence of events and the dates when certain reports were prepared, the following sequence of events has been established:

March 29, 1961: Organization meeting of task group of the National Research Council

Advisory Board on Quartermaster research and development.

March 31, 1961: Second meeting of the task group.

April 2–6, 1961: Preparation of the task group report entitled: "Special Report on Relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute."

April 7, 1961: Task group report approved by the Advisory Board.

April 7, 1961: Secretary of the Army's study on relocation of Quartermaster Food and Container Institute, prepared and forwarded.

April 13, 1961: Transcript of the March 31 meeting of the task group received by Army.

April 17, 1961: Transcript forwarded by Army to Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES.

It is noted that the task group report was prepared prior to completion of the transcript of its March 31 meeting. This does not appear to be unreasonable since the task group members were thoroughly familiar with the situation, had examined previous reports on the subject, and had participated in the deliberations of the March 31 meeting.

In regard to specific Army requirements as to land, buildings and personnel for the Food and Container Institute at any location other than in conjunction with their existing research and development facilities at Natick, Mass., I am informed by representatives of the Secretary of the Army's Office that no specific plans have been prepared. I understand that the Army is preparing a letter replying in more detail on this matter as raised in your letters to Mr. McNamara, dated April 5 and 11, 1961.

I am assured that the task group as well as other groups which have considered this problem in the past, gave careful consideration to arguments favoring the relocation of the Institute in Chicago.

Several studies conducted over a period of years by separate groups and by my staff show a preponderance of evidence favoring the relocation of the Institute at Natick, Mass., on the site of the main body of the Quartermaster Research and Development facilities. In view of this evidence, and after considering carefully such advantages as might result from relocating the Institute elsewhere, I have urged that facilities for housing it at Natick be provided as expeditiously as is prudent.

I trust that the foregoing information is fully responsive to your letter.

Sincerely,

HERBERT F. YORK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1961.

Hon. SIDNEY YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SID: This is in reference to your letter of April 25, 1961 in which you called my attention to the expenditure made by the Department of the Army in connection with the proposed transfer of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute to Natick, Mass.

I have requested the Secretary of the Army to comment on both the authority for the expenditure of this money and the large amount involved.

As soon as I receive the Secretary's reply to your inquiry, I will make it available to you.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1961.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. YATES: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your further inquiries, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, concerning the relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute.

The Army's selection of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development to study the problem was made for three reasons. First, the Council was identified by name in the section 108 amendment to H.R. 5000; second, the Council was recommended in the January 1961 "Critical Review of the Proposed Relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces" of the Illinois Institute of Technology; and third, the Army was satisfied that this organization, representing responsible academic, industrial, and research organizations, would provide objective and unbiased recommendations. To insure objectivity, a representative of the Army Secretariat attended the March 29 meeting of this board. On instructions, this representative informed the board members that, although the Army desired their recommendations as promptly as possible, their report must reflect the independent, objective thinking of the board after consideration of all available information.

The Secretary of the Army's study, of which the board's recommendations are a part, was to determine that location in the United States which would accommodate food and container research at optimum efficiency with minimum overall cost to the Government. The conclusion that Natick was the logical location for the Food and Container Institute was reached only after full consideration of the views of all interested parties. This included consideration of the Illinois Institute of Technology "Critical Review."

Your letter indicates that the Army has withheld its requirements pertaining to "land, buildings, and personnel" from the Chicago group. The detailed requirements for the Food and Container Institute at Natick were published in the proceedings of the 86th Congress, and most recently were reflected in the Illinois Institute of Technology "Critical Review." Additionally, no record can be found of any unanswered request from your office for detailed requirements for the Food and Container Institute which could be adapted to any location.

Regarding the availability of overall plans and specifications which could be adapted to any selected location, the Army has never prepared detailed plans for locations other than Natick, since all prior studies over a period of years have consistently demonstrated the over-riding advantage of this location from the viewpoint of operating efficiency and economy.

The Army facility plans at Natick involve the augmentation of existing facilities with a minimum of new construction. Location of the Food and Container Institute at any other site would involve not only the initial new construction items planned for Natick, but also certain additional support facilities which are in being at Natick. This fact has been recognized by the Illinois Institute of Technology. It is generally understood that construction costs at Natick and Chicago are relatively equal. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that total capital investment costs at a Chicago location would be higher than at Natick. For this significant reason the Army has not prepared detailed criteria, and plans and specifications for the Chicago location.

A comparison of initial construction costs is only one of several considerations which has led to the Army's conclusions concerning the relocation to Natick. The administrative support costs would be approximately $500,000 a year higher at any location other than Natick. There is also the need for approximately 50 more overhead personnel if the Food and Container Institute is not located with its parent command. This is to say nothing of certain essential research equipment that would have to be duplicated by construction at both locations if the Food and Container Institute were not collocated with its parent organization at Natick.

Sincerely,

H. A. GERHARDT,
Brigadier General, GS, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1961.

Hon. SIDNEY YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SID: Attached for your information is a copy of the letter I received from the Secretary of the Army in respect to the relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute.

The letter from the Secretary reviews in detail certain of the statements made by you in your letter to Secretary of Defense McNamara dated April 11, 1961 and is a direct response to my letter of April 14, in which I expressed concern over various allegations made in your letter.

Although Secretary's Stahr's letter indicates that he will furnish you with the same information as is contained in the letter addressed to me, I nevertheless am providing you with a copy to insure your receipt of this information.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

MAY 1, 1961.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of April 14 expressing concern over Congressman YATES' allegations that our recent studies on the proposed relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute were biased, and that the Army had failed to make known its requirements to Illinois interests.

I have reviewed this entire matter as you requested, and, in my judgment, these allegations are without foundation.

Our selection of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development to study the problem was made for three reasons: First, this Board was identified by name in Mr. YATES' amendment; second, the NAS/NRC was recommended in the January 1961, "Critical Review of the Proposed Relocation of the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces" of the Illinois Institute of Technology; and third, the Army was satisfied that the Board, representing responsible academic, industrial, and research organizations, would provide objective and unbiased recommendations. To insure objectivity, a representative of the Army secretariat attended the March 29 meeting of this Board. On instructions, he informed the Board members that, although the Army desired their recommendations as promptly as possible, their report must reflect the independent, objective thinking of the Board after consideration of all available information.

The purpose of my study, of which the Board's recommendations are a part, was to determine that location in the United States which would accommodate food and container research at optimum efficiency with minimum overall cost to the Government. Insofar as that element of the Advisory Board action is concerned, members of the Advisory Board were present in person at the meeting and thereafter deliberated and reached their conclusions based on all the facts, including their recollection of oral statements of interested parties. My conclusion was indeed made before a transcript of the meeting was completed and was based on the Advisory Board's report, on data contained in the Illinois Institute of Technology

"Critical Review," and on advice and information furnished by my staff. In fact, it is unusual that a transcript was made of this meeting at all. You can readily understand that I cannot often review the original evidence on matters which are brought before me for decision.

Mr. Yates alleges that the Army has withheld its requirements pertaining to "land, buildings, and personnel" from the Chicago group. In his letter of April 11 to Secretary McNamara, he stated, "We have tried in every way that we know to obtain the Army's requirements as to land, buildings, and personnel. All of our requests have been rejected." As far as I am aware, the Army has never received any written request from Mr. Yates for specific information with respect to the needs of the Quartermaster Corps for land, buildings, or personnel. I have been unable to uncover any evidence to indicate that such information was so withheld. In fact, the detailed requirements for the Food and Container Institute at Natick were published in the proceedings of the 86th Congress and most recently were reflected in the Illinois Institute of Technology "Critical Review."

As for the availability of overall plans and specifications which could be adapted to any selected location, the Army has never prepared any detailed plans for relocation of the Food and Container Institute other than to Natick, Mass., since all prior studies over a period of years have consistently demonstrated the overriding advantages of this location from the viewpoint of operating efficiency and economy.

The Army facility plans at Natick involve the augmentation of existing facilities with a minimum of new construction. Location of the Food and Container Institute at any other site would involve not only the initial new construction items planned for Natick, but also certain additional support facilities which are in being at Natick. This fact has been recognized by the Illinois Institute of Technology. It is generally understood that construction costs at Natick and Chicago are relatively equal. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that total capital investment costs at a Chicago location would be higher than at Natick. For this significant reason the Army has not prepared detailed criteria, and plans and specifications for the Chicago location.

Parenthetically, I point out that a comparison of initial construction costs is only one of several considerations which has led to my conclusions concerning the relocation to Natick. The administrative support costs would be approximately $500,000 a year higher at any location other than Natick. I refer also to the need for approximately 50 more overhead personnel if the Food and Container Institute is not located with its parent command. This is to say nothing of certain essential research equipment that would have to be duplicated by construction at both locations, if the Food and Container Institute were not collocated with its parent organization at Natick.

I deeply appreciate your interest in this vital construction requirement of the Army's, and I hope the foregoing information is adequate for your purposes. In separate correspondence, I will furnish Congressman YATES the same information.

Sincerely,

ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENOMINEE TRIBE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4130) to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, HALEY, EDMONDSON, SAYLOR, and BERRY.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 291) to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1961, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-Seventh Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to incur such expense (not in excess of $25,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us what this expenditure is to be used for or does this come under the heading of classified information? There is nothing in the resolution to indicate what it is to be used for.

Mr. FRIEDEL. This resolution authorizes an expenditure not in excess of $25,000 for the Committee on Ways and Means for operating expenses in order to obtain the services of experts on various types of taxes; as well as experts on tariffs and social security. This also includes subscriptions to business and financial publications and special reports on studies made by universities and other acknowledged experts in various fields of the committee's jurisdiction.

Also, it is necessary for the committee to make long distance telephone calls in connection with scheduled hearings. For example, the committee is currently conducting 6 weeks of public hearings on the recommendations contained in the President's tax message and more than 250 witnesses have been called.

The public address system has to be serviced and maintained—as the hearing room is in constant use. Such expenses are borne by the committee. Our committee feels that the Ways and Means Committee has made a very modest request for operating expenses for the 87th Congress. It must be remembered that no committee has any funds for making even long-distance telephone calls unless authorized by a resolution such as House Resolution 291.

Mr. GROSS. This is in addition to the funds already authorized for the committee; is that not correct?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MILLS. My friend, the gentleman from Iowa, knows that there are certain expenditures which committees incur that are paid through the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. But, expenditures of the nature just described are not paid in that way. Telephone bills and things of that sort are not paid through the Clerk's office. This is to enable the committee to get back to a point of solvency, I might say, because the chairman was a little bit derelict in not recognizing the fact that some of these expenditures were not paid through the Clerk's office, and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will not require him to pay these expenses out of his own pocket.

Mr. GROSS. I will say that this is something, when we find the Committee on Ways and Means, the tax-writing committee, at the point of insolvency.

Mr. MILLS. Well, that is the case.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the majority leader if he can inform the House as to the legislative program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume that the pending bill will be disposed of today and, if not, it will, of course, continue tomorrow. But tomorrow the House will take up the election case of Roush and Chambers, House Resolution 339. But, I want to announce to the House that on Thursday, the reorganization plans which I mentioned last week will come up.

I want particularly to call to the attention of the Members of the House that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has several bills which he will ask unanimous consent to consider on tomorrow. Those bills are:

H.R. 3668 relating to informal entries of merchandise; H.R. 2585 relating to credits against unemployment tax; H.R. 929 relating to prepaid dues income; H.R. 2244 relating to deduction of contributions to certain charitable organizations; and H.R. 4449 relating to importation of religious articles.

Mr. ARENDS. Those will all be on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct—tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that 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. 79]

Anfuso	Halpern	O'Konski
Ashley	Holifield	O'Neill
Avery	Hosmer	Powell
Bailey	Ikard, Tex.	Roberts
Barrett	Jensen	Roosevelt
Becker	Karth	Sisk
Burke, Mass.	Kearns	Smith, Calif.
Cahill	Kyl	Steed
Cederberg	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Macdonald	Thompson, La.
Curtis, Mass.	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Daddario	Mahon	Tupper
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Walter
Diggs	Mason	Watts
Dingell	Miller, N.Y.	Whitten
Fenton	Moorhead, Pa.	Williams
Flynt	Morrison	Willis
Grant	Moulder	
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONTESTED ELECTION—J. EDWARD ROUSH AGAINST GEORGE O. CHAMBERS

Mr. ASHMORE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported the following privileged resolution—House Resolution 339, Report No. 513—which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas the Committee on House Administration has concluded its investigation, including a recount of the ballots cast at the election of November 8, 1960, in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, pursuant to House Resolution 1; and

Whereas such investigation and recount reveals that J. Edward Roush received a majority of the votes cast in said district for Representative in Congress: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That J. Edward Roush was duly elected as a Representative to the Eighty-seventh Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, and is entitled to a seat therein.

Mr. ASHMORE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported the following privileged resolution—House Resolution 340, Report No. 514—which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives having considered the question of the right of J. Edward Roush or George O. Chambers, from the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, to a seat in the House in the Eighty-seventh Congress pursuant to H. Res. 1, Eighty-seventh Congress, and having decided that the said J. Edward Roush is entitled to a seat in the House in such Congress with the result that the said J. Edward Roush is entitled to receive and will be paid the compensation, mileage, allowances, and other emoluments of a Member of the House from and after January 3, 1961, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amounts as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution in connection with such decision of the House, as follows:

(1) The said George O. Chambers shall be paid an amount equal to compensation at the rate provided by law for Members of the House for the period beginning January 3, 1961, and ending on the date of such decision of the House.

(2) The said J. Edward Roush and the said George O. Chambers each shall be paid an amount equal to the mileage at the rate of 10 cents per mile, on the same basis as now provided by law for Members of the House, for each round trip between his home in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana and Washington, District of Columbia, in response to the request of the Committee on House Administration for his appearance before the committee in connection with the investigation authorized by H. Res. 1, Eighty-seventh Congress.

(3) The said J. Edward Roush and the said George O. Chambers each shall be reimbursed for those expenses actually incurred by him in connection with the investigation by the Committee on House Administration authorized by H. Res. 1, Eighty-seventh Congress, in accordance with that part of the first section of the Act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 400; 2 U.S.C. 226), which provides for payment of expenses in election contests.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill—H.R. 7577—making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7577, with Mr. ALBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] had 48 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] had 1 hour and 4 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, at long last, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided the question of the constitutionality of the law which created the Subversive Activities Control Board 11 years ago. That the law was held constitutional, by a 5-to-4 vote of the Court, on June 5 of this year, only serves to make the delay in the decision more painful.

A calm review of the action of the Court is asked for two reasons. I do not feel the Court deserves any loud hurrahs for its action, as necessary as it was. It was high time indeed for the Supreme Court to give power to this attempt by the Congress to restrict those forces who would turn on us from the inside and destroy our precious freedoms through the most devious and damnable of methods.

And since the Communist Party is concerned in this case I feel that the quiet approach is even more important. Indeed, a dangerous situation has developed in our efforts to alert the citizenry to the perils imposed by communism. We have been warned so long and so loudly of this menace to freedom that we no longer listen. The louder the cry of communism, the less we pay attention. In fact, the cry is often raised by those who would speed us to an equally disastrous fate. It is, however, our solemn duty to distinguish between the false cry of "Wolf," and a very real cry of "Bear," for it is a fierce Soviet grizzly that stalks our world.

In this regard—and in admitted fear of the ever-present danger of that Russian bear—I would like to discuss a facet of this world problem encompassed by this decision of the Supreme Court, which has vitalized the Subversive Activities Control Board. In the appropriations bill which we now have under consideration is a modest request for funds for the operation of the Board during fiscal year 1962. Prior to the June 5 decision of the Supreme Court, the item presented a rather strange request by a rather unusual Board. The Board was not even sure that it would spend the money it had requested. Stranger still, the Board had an unobligated balance of approximately $95,000 a year ago and is expected to end the current fiscal year with an unobligated balance of approximately $90,000. You must admit, gentlemen, that this is strange behavior indeed in a Government that has seemingly, though erringly, regarded a dollar spent as a dollar doubled and an extra dollar in the bank.

Why this measure of unprecedented economy by the Board, you ask? Sound administration? Automation? A secret that would wipe out the deficit? Without reflecting in any way on the operation of the Board, I can say that none of these was responsible for this apparent though unfortunate tip of the hat to Mr. John Q. Taxpayer.

Instead, credit has to go to the Supreme Court—and I would add quickly that not a Justice should bow in acknowledgment of any praise at this point. I speak to criticize the Court, not to praise it, and I speak with confidence that Democrats and Republicans will support me in the effort.

The Subversive Activities Control Board was formally organized on November 1, 1950. The Board is an independent agency, which, in essence, is an administrative court. It was created primarily to give fair and impartial hearings in actions brought before it by the Attorney General against specific organizations and individuals. Its hearings are subject to all constitutional procedural safeguards. Appeals from its decisions may be taken to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and from there upon application for a writ of certiorari to the

Supreme Court of the United States. The first case heard by the Board resulted on April 20, 1953, in a determination—and quite soundly, I feel—that the Communist Party of the United States is a Communist-action organization.

But what has since transpired is this: Until Monday, June 5, of this year, the Supreme Court had failed to act on the Board's initial case and refused to pass on the constitutionality of the law creating the Board. It had failed to support the Board's original finding that the Communist Party is a Communist-action organization in this country. In fact, it had refused to recognize the right of the Board to exist. Because of the delay in this case—which dates back to 1950—the Board's findings in 11 other cases have been in cold storage. The Board was powerless to enforce the law which the Congress had passed to protect our Nation from the Red menace. The Supreme Court fiddled while America burned. Now that the Supreme Court has spoken, even though it spoke with diverse tongues, the Board's order that the Communist Party and its members register with the Attorney General stands. Progress may now be expected on the backlog of other cases and the money appropriated will be needed.

What justification can be found for this long delay? A Supreme Court that has proved quite willing to look past the Constitution and enter the legislative field in other areas delayed in this case in carrying out the expressed will of the elected representatives of the American people. It was the Congress that created the Subversive Activities Control Board in title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950 in an effort to control subversives' activities in this country. It was the Supreme Court of the United States that stalled and thwarted its effort.

It was the contention of the Communist Party, of course, that this act which restricts its propaganda and exposes its treachery is unconstitutional. But in finally affirming the judgment of the Court of Appeals and the Board in this case brought by the Communist Party, the Supreme Court, in a majority opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, said:

> The Constitution does not prohibit the requirement that the Communist Party register with the Attorney General as a Communist-action organization.

Earlier, Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

> We do not find that the Congressional assertions that there exist in the United States individuals dedicated to communism, a Communist network, a Communist movement and a Communist organization deprived the party of fair hearings which due process of law requires.

And in speaking of the freedoms of expression and association guaranteed to us by our Constitution, the Court said:

> The Communist Party would have us hold that the first amendment prohibits Congress from requiring the registration and filing of information, including membership lists, by organizations substantially dominated or controlled by the foreign powers controlling the world Communist movement and which operate primarily to advance the objectives of that movement: the overthrow of existing government by any means necessary and the establishment in its place of any Communist totalitarian dictatorship. We cannot find such a prohibition in the first amendment.

Before reaching this decision the Supreme Court on two previous occasions when the case was pending before it chose not to act on the constitutionality of the law. The case was remanded by the Court in 1956. And in 1960 argument was delayed until the subsequent term of the court.

But let me go a little deeper into the background of this situation.

The Security Act of 1950 declared that there is a worldwide Communist revolutionary movement, the nature and control of which presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States. That danger is just as clear and more present than ever today.

The act aimed to regulate three categories of Communist organizations: First, Communist-action groups, which were defined as organizations under foreign control and which operate primarily to advance the objectives of the world communism movement; second, Communist-front groups, which were defined as organizations under control of and primarily operated to support Communist-action organizations; and third, Communist-infiltrated groups, which were defined as organizations which are substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by individuals who are or have been actively engaged in supporting a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government or a world Communist movement.

It is the primary function of the Subversive Activities Control Board to determine, at the request of the Attorney General, whether organizations are Communist-action, Communist-front or Communist-infiltrated and whether individuals are members of such organizations. Individuals and organizations so labeled by the Board in rulings upheld by the courts are required to register with the Attorney General.

The Attorney General is required to keep in the Department of Justice separate registers of Communist-action and Communist-front organizations, containing the names and addresses of such organizations, their registration statements and annual reports, and, in the case of Communist-action organizations, the registration statements of individual members. These registers are to be open for public inspection. The Attorney General must submit a yearly report to the President and to the Congress including the names and addresses of registered organizations and their listed members. He is required to publish in the Federal Register the fact that any organization has registered as a Communist-action or Communist-front organization, and such publication constitutes notice to all members of the registration of the organization.

Under the act a person who violates this registration provision shall be fined not more than $10,000, shall be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both, and an organization shall be fined not more than $10,000 for such violation.

Additionally, the effect of the act on a member of the Communist Party, now that it is held to be a Communist-action organization, in brief is this: It would be unlawful for him to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States; to engage in any employment in any defense facility; to hold office or employment with any labor organization or to represent any employer in any manner under the National Labor Relations Act; or to make application for a passport or for its renewal or attempt to use any such passport.

The Communist Party, or any of its action, front or infiltrated organizations, would not be permitted to transmit through the mail or any other instrumentality of interstate commerce any publication unless it is marked "disseminated by a Communist organization" or to use radio or television facilities without preceding its broadcast with a statement that this program is sponsored by a Communist organization which must be named. The Communist Party or any of its organizations will also be denied tax deductions and exemptions for contributions made to such an organization.

It was on November 22, 1950, that the Attorney General petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board for an order directing the Communist Party to register as a Communist-action organization. On April 20, 1953, the Board, by unanimous decision, directed the Communist Party to so register. The Communist Party petitioned the U.S. court of appeals to review the order of the Board. The order was affirmed by the court of appeals on December 23, 1954. The petition for rehearing was denied on January 14, 1955.

While the case was pending before the court of appeals, the Communist Party filed a motion for permission to produce additional evidence. The gist of the motion was that the additional material evidence became available after the hearing by the Board and that the evidence would establish that testimony of three witnesses for the Attorney General was false. The Government did not deny the allegations but contended that the findings of the Board were amply supported by evidence apart from the testimony of the three witnesses. The motion was denied on December 23, 1954, when the order of the Board was affirmed. The U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari. The Supreme Court did not, however, rule on the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act as amended, which required the Communist Party to register, but reversed the judgment of the court of appeals and remanded the case on the grounds that the court of appeals had erred in refusing to return the case to the Board for consideration of the new evidence proffered by the Communist Party's motion.

The court of appeals remanded the case to the Board. The Board finished its reconsideration of the case and returned the case to the court of appeals on December 18, 1956. On January 9, 1958, the court of appeals remanded the case to the Board again with an order to follow the principles laid down by

the Supreme Court in Jenks against United States to the effect that "criminal action must be dismissed when the Government, on the ground of privilege, elects not to comply with an order to produce, for the accused's inspection and for admission in evidence, relevant statements or reports in its possession of Government witnesses touching the subject matter of their testimony at the trial."

On January 9, 1959, the Board issued its modified report, again affirming its earlier determination. On July 30, 1959, the court of appeals again affirmed the Board's determination. On February 5, 1960, the Supreme Court again granted certiorari but did not hear the case until October 11 and 12, 1960. The decision was finally handed down on Monday, June 5, 1961.

Fearing that some, perchance, being unfamiliar with legal procedure, may not be able to gage the proper time for such actions, I respectfully cite portions of the dissenting opinion in the earlier Supreme Court decision. It was written by Mr. Justice Clark, with whom Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Minton joined on April 30, 1956, when the Supreme Court remanded the case because of Communist Party challenges to the creditability of three Government witnesses, the basis for which was not in existence when the proceedings were concluded before the Board.

Mr. Justice Clark took exception to the remand of the Court and pointed out that the Court "refused to pass on the important questions relating to the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950, a bulwark of the congressional program to combat the menace of world communism." Mr. Justice Clark said further, "believing that the Court here disregards its plain responsibility and duty to decide these important constitutional questions, I cannot join in its action." He added, "I have not found any case in the history of the Court where important constitutional issues have been avoided on such a pretext."

Later in his dissent, Mr. Justice Clark said:

> The allegations of the motion itself are entirely inadequate in that they point to no particular testimony before the Board as being false. There is no offer to disprove any testimony given and no fact that any issue in the proceeding is controverted.

Before concluding his dissent, Mr. Justice Clark said:

> I abhor the use of perjured testimony as much as anyone, but we must recognize that never before have mere allegations of perjury, so flimsily supported, been considered grounds for reopening a proceeding or granting a new trial. The Communist Party makes no claim that the Government knowingly used false testimony and it is far too realistic to contend that the Board action will be any different on remand. The only purpose of this procedural maneuver is to gain additional time before the order to register can become effective. This proceeding has dragged out for many years now and the function of the Board remains suspended and the congressional purpose frustrated at a most critical time in world history.

This pronouncement of Mr. Justice Clark was in 1956 and yet the case dragged on for 5 more long years as times became even more critical.

Shortly after the original remand by the Supreme Court, it was reported in the Washington Post that—

> Justice Department lawyers said they were astounded by the majority opinion. Some said it may prove to be the most important Communist victory in the courts of the past decade.

Mr. Justice Clark dissented again on February 5, 1960, with the ruling of the Supreme Court to set the case, Communist Party against Control Board, over for argument in October of 1960, the subsequent term of the Court. In his dissent, Mr. Justice Clark said:

> This order, coming as it does in midterm with 5 months of session yet remaining, is without precedent. It delays for another year decisions on two important acts of the Congress—the Smith Act and the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Mr. Justice Clark stated that available time could be had in late March to hear the case. He said:

> I think that this would be entirely appropriate. It would give the Communist Party some 60 days in which to prepare its brief. This is ample time, since the issues in its case are the same as when the case was here before, the record for the most part is identical and the lawyers who argued it then are handling the case again.

From the time when the Board issued its original order in the Communist Party case until last year, a total of 23 other proceedings before the Board have been instituted by the Attorney General. Those that were pending on either of the two occasions when the Communist Party cases were remanded to the Board were necessarily held in abeyance until the Board reexamined the party case. This was because each was based upon the premise that the Board had made a determination that the Communist Party is a Communist-action organization within the terms of the act.

During our hearings on our appropriation for the Subversive Activities Control Board in this session of Congress, Chairman ANDREWS asked Mrs. Dorothy McCollough Lee, the Chairman, if the Board's activities in 1962 and the years thereafter are dependent on a decision in the main case finally determined by the Supreme Court. Mrs. Lee answered, "I would say mostly although perhaps not entirely."

I am reminded in the entire case of a proud young boy who is forced to pass a gang of bullies each day on his way to school. His father has taught him how to fight but his mother has told him that he should not raise a fist. The result was an indecisive young man with a bloody nose and a dwindling number of friends who wondered why he did not strike back.

I kept seeing the United States with this bloody nose in a newspaper cartoon by a Seibel or a Herblock or a Crockett and I did not like it. I did not like it because the instructions of the Congress to the Attorney General to swing away at the man in the red trunks in the opposite corner were being blocked. I did not like it because it was our own Supreme Court that was responsible for one hand of the Attorney General being tied behind his back in this small but significant ring in our fight against Communist thugs.

Now that the Supreme Court has rendered its decision, I welcome the verdict but I cannot cheer. The decision has been too long delayed and the propaganda bruises that have been inflicted upon my country in the meantime still hurt. But we can bathe our wounds in the knowledge that at least one battle has been won, and in the hope that this will be the turning of the tide in our war for survival.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, budgetwise, things are getting out of hand. It is not so apparent in this incomplete bill now before you—but actions taken by this subcommittee bring the entire budget problem into focus.

Those of us who serve on this Appropriations Committee have never been too popular with our colleagues in the Congress. I now feel that we will have to be a lot less popular with you if we are to do our duty.

The Appropriations Committee as we know it today and the Bureau of the Budget—an arm of the Chief Executive—came into being about the same time 40 years ago. Together they were supposed to give the House a feasible tight hand on the expenditures of the people's money, or the use of the people's credit.

Today we have before us another appropriations bill which includes funds for the Bureau of the Budget. The report specifies certain functions we think are essential for the Budget Bureau to concentrate on so as to give our committee and the Congress a very comprehensive review of expenditures by categories of purpose. It is for this reason that we have allowed an increase for that Bureau.

The report states, and I quote therefrom:

> A major responsibility of the Bureau is to coordinate the many and varied activities of the Government. The committee is acutely aware of the many like and similar activities and programs carried on by more than one department or agency, a situation which opens the way to unnecessary duplication and expenditure. The Bureau is urged to continue to direct particular attention toward the avoidance or elimination of any such duplication in every way possible. It is a luxury we cannot afford.

Reference has been made to the totals for weather. We find that more than two times what is in this bill for the Weather Bureau is being spent on weather by other agencies. A few weeks ago we passed a bill for depressed areas activities and $300 million was authorized in back-door spending for that program. It is to be spearheaded by the Department of Com-

merce—yet no hearings were held before the Appropriations Committee on this proposal. No outline of what might be contributed by other agencies, already experienced and funded, to this program.

Last Thursday, our esteemed colleague, the Honorable HOWARD SMITH made a pretty candid speech to the House on the occasion of extending the Korean war excise taxes. I commend his speech to your serious reading. He laid some mighty basic facts right on the line.

To keep this easy to comprehend, I shall quote just one sentence from Mr. SMITH's speech:

> We have, so far this session, been asked to enact new authority to obligate and commit the Treasury in the 2 fiscal years, 1961 and 1962, by $11,813 million above the Eisenhower budget.

This is an astounding sum—and it covers only 2 years.

Almost every revision from the present administration calls for more men and money—get that—more men and more money. These ever-increasing requests remind me of a comment made by Uncle Joe Cannon of Illinois who served in this House for 44 years. As you know, he served as Speaker for many years, and for 10 years as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Before his death at the ripe old age of 90 years, he reminisced:

> A great many people try to apply the old proverb that public money is like holy water—free to all who seek salvation.

And, that is not all. Waiting at the doors of this Chamber are whole phalanxes of proposals which by direct appropriation, by direct entrance to the Treasury, by long-term planning in the name of continuity and other slick approaches, would skyrocket our present fat budget immeasurably. One wit has suggested that our budget will get to the moon long before spacemen from either Russia or the United States. Two wrongs do not make one right and the fact that we have funded operations, by direct borrowing from the Treasury, to the tune of $108 billion since 1932 does not necessarily grant virtue to that practice.

It is a time for serious meditation on this entire matter.

It is a time to review some of the things our leaders have said and are saying.

President Eisenhower often stated that the Federal Government should do only those things which States or local government could not do for themselves. President Kennedy was applauded when he said:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.

Again, on May 25, President Kennedy in addressing a joint session, said:

> If we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar, it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards; and, I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard—to refrain from adding funds to programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

Now, to me, that is good advice.

Mr. Kennedy is the President of our great Nation. As President, he is the leader of all Americans. He is the recognized leader of both Republicans and Democrats. I wish him success in his efforts. His success is my success as an American. It is imperative that he succeed for he wears the mantle of hope for Western civilization. Missile gaps and astronauts may be dramatic in our consideration of the cold war but prudent fiscal standards, annoying as they may seem, are of even, if not greater importance. I think that we should work for and applaud every act of the administration in that direction.

But on May 25, he also proposed programs that have aroused the frantic prodigal among influential Americans, in the press and among Members of Congress.

I am certain that we want to cooperate with President Kennedy. But the achievement of prudent fiscal standards, which he very properly requests, are made vastly more difficult. This is especially true for those members of your Appropriations Committee who have to deal with defense, with ventures into space, and with the continuing international poker game we call foreign aid. And, speaking of poker—some of us think that we have been tipping our hands—even telegraphing them—to our closed-mouthed adversaries who, with a blank and bland face, play their poorer hands more closely to the chest.

Let me repeat right here what our leader said on May 25:

> If we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar, it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards; and, I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard—to refrain from adding funds to programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

I would like to make an additional quotation at this point. It comes from an old friend and a very respected former Member, the Honorable Jesse P. Wolcott, now head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Appearing before the Rules Committee when he was ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, he said:

> We are within about 7 percent of socializing America. No country has ever been able to maintain the capitalistic system; no country has ever been able to maintain full sovereignty of its people when more than 35 percent of the national income was taken for the maintenance of the Government, and we are now up to almost 33 percent. Now, assuming we are a little stronger than some of the other countries, we know as an established fact from history that we cannot even go up to 40 percent. We can't take 40 percent of the national income for the maintenance of the Government and continue the American system. That is how serious and imminent the situation is, and that applies not only to this particular bill but it applies to all other bills which call for raising sums of money. You and I in Congress have got to stop and think, otherwise we will perhaps unconsciously change the form of our Government and the American system, which we know and which has made us the greatest country in the world; and bragging about liberty and wearing diamonds and flaunting them in the face of every other country—we are so wealthy we have got to be careful or we will do just what England did, just what Germany did, just what Italy did, and Russia perhaps might do without a dictator—they changed their very form of government from that of a representative democracy to a socialized state.
>
> It is, indeed, a time for all of us to stop and think.

Mr. Chairman, under permission previously granted, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point the latest figures, by States, of the total impact of taxes—Federal, State, and local—on the per capita income of individuals in those States. Excluding Alaska and Hawaii, these range from 27 percent of total income in Alabama and South Carolina, to a high of 41 percent in Delaware. Three other States—Florida, Nevada, and Vermont—have rates of 35 percent or more. New York is at 34 percent.

TOTAL IMPACT OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES ON INDIVIDUALS IN THE SEVERAL STATES

Out of each dollar received by individuals in the various States, the following percentages are absorbed by Federal, States, and local taxes. Of course, the percentages would be somewhat lower if gross national product figures instead of personal income figures were used in the calculations. The gross national product figures, however, are unavailable.

	Federal	Local and State	Total
Alabama	19.1	7.7	27
Alaska	11.5	6.0	18
Arizona	21.7	9.6	31
Arkansas	20.1	8.9	29
California	21.8	9.4	31
Colorado	21.6	9.9	32
Connecticut	24.6	7.0	32
Delaware	34.7	6.4	41
District of Columbia	25.6	7.0	33
Florida	26.7	9.0	36
Georgia	20.4	8.4	29
Hawaii	20.3	(1)	
Idaho	22.4	9.6	32
Illinois	22.4	6.9	29
Indiana	19.5	8.0	28
Iowa	19.1	9.8	29
Kansas	19.9	10.6	31
Kentucky	20.2	7.5	28
Louisiana	20.1	11.2	31
Maine	22.9	9.4	32
Maryland	22.0	7.8	30
Massachusetts	22.7	9.3	32
Michigan	21.4	8.9	30
Minnesota	21.2	10.3	32
Mississippi	18.4	10.5	29
Missouri	22.3	6.6	29
Montana	20.2	10.8	31
Nebraska	19.8	8.1	28
Nevada	25.7	9.1	35
New Hampshire	23.5	8.2	32
New Jersey	21.7	7.6	29
New Mexico	20.0	9.0	29
New York	24.7	9.2	34
North Carolina	20.6	8.1	29
North Dakota	20.5	12.0	33
Ohio	21.4	7.0	28
Oklahoma	21.0	9.2	30
Oregon	21.0	9.3	30
Pennsylvania	22.8	7.2	30
Rhode Island	23.7	8.5	32
South Carolina	18.9	8.3	27
South Dakota	18.0	12.2	30
Tennessee	20.5	8.1	29
Texas	21.3	7.7	29
Utah	20.2	9.3	30
Vermont	24.1	11.3	35
Virginia	20.9	6.9	28
Washington	20.4	9.5	30
West Virginia	19.3	7.8	27
Wisconsin	21.7	9.5	31
Wyoming	22.1	10.0	32

[1] Figures not available from source.

Source: Federal data based on table IV of "Federal Taxation and Expenditures in the Several States," the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, July 29, 1959. State and local data are based on table 14 of "Governmental Finances in 1959," Bureau of the Census, Government Division, Sept. 30, 1960. Federal data are for fiscal year 1958; State and local data are for calendar year 1959.

In inserting this table, I want to say a word of praise for our Ways and Means Committee. Like the Appropriations Committee and the Rules Committee, they, too, are not always popular. But I think that our colleague, WILBUR MILLS, as chairman of that committee, has steered an intelligent and judicious course. Certainly he and his committee have given every cooperation that our President has requested. Let us close the loopholes of tax evasion. Let us also, for instance, as in the case of the abuses of Federal highway funds, tighten the prudent fiscal standards that should apply to Federal expenditures. The application of State sales taxes to materials, the use of licensing and other practices are costing our national highway program between $800 and $900 million annually according to testimony before our committee.

I am not—and I suppose no one is opposed to sound expenditures of public money. The mere fact that we are committed to so many necessary funds makes the need for scrutiny even more essential. Nobody can quarrel with investments in progress which in the end add to our production and our revenues. Nor can we avoid our moral obligations to the unfortunate or the needy. Our defense is a serious matter. It is vastly important that the Congress carefully review the entire budget to make certain we spend wisely.

President Coolidge once said:

> I favor the policy of economy, not because I wish to save money, but because I wish to save people. The men and women of this country who toil are the ones who bear the cost of the Government. Every dollar that we carelessly waste means that their life will be so much the more meager—economy is idealism in its most practical form.

We in the Congress have a job to do. A sound dollar is vital not only to ourselves but to the entire free world. Strange as it may seem a sound dollar is the keystone of even our welfare programs at home. We should avoid the spiral of pension, benefit, and annuity increases that have attended the dollar's descent from 100 cents in 1939 to its low state of 44 cents today.

After World War II the American dollar was the very foundation of world exchange—today the currencies of several nations are more sought after.

We on the Appropriations Committee have made mistakes, and so has this House, but it is never too late to correct them. In this work we should, I think, ask your indulgence and your cooperation. The way ahead is fraught with difficulties but we must press on and solve each problem with intelligence and even sacrifice.

As Saint Paul said in his letter to the Philippians:

> Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think of these things.

The times demand the best in all of us.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, our colleague from Washington has made a statement which goes to the nub of the problem of fiscal responsibility. Many of us have looked to the Appropriations Committee to weigh the needs of the Nation and pressures for money against the amount of revenue that may be in the Treasury. I believe that all of us owe a great debt to our colleague WALT HORAN and the members of his committee for bringing these appropriation measures before us and so painstakingly explaining details as well as the overall problem of fiscal controls.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington has pointed up our great weakness; that is, the matter of so-called back-door spending, because where we have had appropriations in the past the Congress has been able to hold the line on expenditures and maintain it within the budget, but when we came to the back-door type of spending where expenditures were made by a Government executive agency through the borrowing of money from the Treasury and spending it without the scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations, we have exceeded the amount of the budget and our national debt has gone up.

I want to say to my colleague from Washington that I am proud of him today. He made a wonderful speech, and I hope the Members of the House will take it to heart and help the Committee on Appropriations in its difficult task in the days ahead.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague from Washington [Mr. PELLY] in commending the gentleman from Washington on a most outstanding statement he has made today. It had a lot of meat in it, it was sound in theory, it was sound in principle, and I am confident that the challenge the gentleman presented in his statement will go far toward the acceptance of our responsibility in regard to fiscal responsibility in our Federal Government.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, for 7 years it has been my privilege to serve on the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee covering the Department of Commerce as one, and general Government matters as another. After the reorganization of the Appropriations Committee last year, following the death of the former chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce, the two committees were combined under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. Those of us who originally served on the old Department of Commerce Subcommittee thought we had seen a chairman who knew his work, who was courteous to all of us, and who had a thorough grasp of the subject matter before the committee, the late Mr. Prince Preston of Georgia. Realizing how difficult it is for a chairman to take over a whole new field of subjects and agencies, some of us thought that we were going to have some long, protracted sessions.

I want to pay a real tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the Honorable GEORGE ANDREWS, of Alabama. It was clear at all of the hearings during a period of 7 weeks in which we sat that the Honorable GEORGE ANDREWS had done his homework well and consciously. Mr. Chairman, I believe I may safely say that it was more than evident to the members of the subcommittee that such a grasp of the subject area covered during our hearings could only be grasped by untiring and thorough study which was demonstrated daily by our chairman the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

He asked penetrating and searching questions of these agency heads and bureau chiefs in fields with which he had had no previous contact. And, I assure you they were penetrating questions. They opened the door to the committee immediately upon the start of our hearings. He had, as a strong right arm, in digging into these things, the ranking minority member who, unfortunately, is not here today, I understand, because of the illness of his wife, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], and the other minority members. We spent some 7 weeks, and we come before you with a bill which I think merits your approval.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to concur in the gentleman's remarks with reference to our very fine chairman. I think he did a magnificent job so far as the hearings are concerned.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I, too, would like to subscribe to the remarks of the gentleman from California in his high praise of the chairman of our committee. I served with the gentleman from Alabama on the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in previous years, and it was a delight and a pleasure to again serve with him on this committee. In the past he has exhibited unbounded energy and a keen appreciation of the appropriation process. As chairman I think he has done an outstanding job in connection with this bill, and I look forward to his serving in that capacity in the future.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank both gentlemen.

I might at the same time, Mr. Chairman, pay a compliment to the clerk of our committee, Earl Silsby, who was at our disposal, for giving us detailed information or acquiring such further details which had not been developed in some of the hearings, whenever we

wanted it, at any hour. He was there early and he left late.

Mr. Chairman, this is the great work of the Congress, the work done by the committees, and particularly is it important in appropriation work. A great deal depends on the chairman's willingness to put in his time, to learn his subject, and to move the hearings along. We had before us 20 different agencies and bureaus of Government, all of the agencies of the Department of Commerce, the Office of the Secretary, the Under Secretaries and assistants, all of the departments immediately answerable to the President, such as the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Small Business Administration, the White House and its staff. This meant jumping around at times from one field to another.

I cannot help but comment on one thought that seems to have impressed itself on three of the previous speakers. It impressed itself also on my mind. Reference has been made to the Weather Bureau. The Weather Bureau, which under the law, has the primary responsibility for gathering, studying, and disseminating information on weather, setting up a primary and secondary warning system on weather changes or weather dangers, is only getting or expecting today one-half of what the Air Force is getting for weather study, only about as much as the Navy is asking and getting for weather study. In addition the Department of Agriculture, the Coast Guard through the Treasury, the Federal Aviation Agency, and a host of others operate in the gathering and reporting of weather data. There is something wrong here. Granted, it is a new path in the scientific field in which we have these agencies or bureaus each competing and aspiring to outdo the other in getting control of a field for which there is an established governmental agency.

In our hearings the chairman called this to the attention of the Director of the Budget on whom rests the prime responsibility to prevent just this sort of duplication and he, Mr. ANDREWS, emphasized the need for the Director of the Budget to coordinate these requests from the various departments before they come before the Congress. He was told in very emphatic terms by the chairman that this matter should be studied and a report made back to our committee.

Throughout our hearings there developed another possible field of duplication of effort with contending departments, separately and individually, requesting huge sums of money for their individual departments. I refer specifically to the new area of the science of oceanography.

In this great scientific age which, of course, is going to mean the expenditure of more money, the acquisition of new equipment, the hiring of new personnel with greater and more advanced educational backgrounds, and new techniques. So that all these departments are moving in.

Now we also have the field of oceanography and we find now about four Government agencies moving into that field. True, perhaps the Air Force may need some weather information peculiar to their own use, the Navy for fleet maneuvers or ship operations, the Air Force for flight conditions, and so forth. But why does any Government agency need more of an operation in that field than the agency which was set up to operate in that field?

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether in consideration of the appropriation for the Weather Bureau the gentleman or his committee made any analysis of the accuracy of Weather Bureau forecasts and the amount of money that is spent by the Weather Bureau in this facet?

Mr. SHELLEY. We did not have the time to make an analysis of the accuracy of their reports. I do not think there is any person, including the meteorologist with the Weather Bureau, who will ever guarantee, right down to the *n*th degree, any of their forecasts or reports. We did find this out, that the Weather Bureau, like so many of these Government operations, is going through a great period of transition, with the use of new scientific instruments, with information that is being gathered from Tiros, and so forth. I think the chairman made reference to that, to the picture that was taken from Tiros I, which was taken all the way from the Siberian coast, clear over to the islands in the Atlantic, and which showed all of the North Pacific, all of the North American Continent, the Arctic area, clear over into the Atlantic area. They said that more information was made available in that one set of photographs from Tiros than could have been gathered by 10,000 people over a 10-month period, from 1,000 ships at sea.

They also said—and we are not skilled to evaluate properly their statement, or judge how much weight should be given to it—that this information will be far more reliable than the normal weather station reports on which they have relied heretofore.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I was referring specifically to the long-range forecast program which I think if you make any analysis of it you will find that after 30 years of spending public funds on efforts to find reasonable methods of forecasting, the Weather Bureau is doing a worse job as far as accuracy is concerned, than they did 30 years ago. I would suggest, perhaps, that when the appropriations come up again for further consideration, the gentleman and his committee might investigate the possibility of using other sources for getting this information because I believe there are other sources available.

Mr. SHELLEY. The gentleman has touched on one of the points we made in our hearings, that there has been a lack of coordination on the part of the Weather Bureau and some of the others to gather from one source all of the data that is available even today. Heretofore they have depended primarily on reports from ships at sea. But there are airbase reports, there are Navy reports, there are Coast Guard reports, there are weather station reports, there are all sorts of commercial reports. I personally think, as do most of the committee, that there has been a failure to coordinate, to analyze and to evaluate in one report the information gathered from all of these various sources.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close by emphasizing the necessity for the Bureau of the Budget, for whom we appropriate the money through this committee, and which employs approximately 450 people in permanent positions—far, far more than the Appropriations Committees of the Congress employ—I want to emphasize that the responsibility rests upon them and on the man to whom they are responsible, the President of the United States, to look into what can be a great new field of careless and wasteful expenditure and duplication, in the various scientific activities which we are now entering.

I do not think there is any question about any of the other items in the bill. I will not go into an explanation now, Mr. Chairman; I would rather wait until the general debate is over and then see what questions may be asked.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the consideration of H.R. 7577, making appropriations for sundry agencies including the Department of Commerce, for fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, provides an appropriate time for me to express my views to the members of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to express my views on a new Department of Urban Affairs.

First, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express gratification that the appropriation for the Department of Commerce provided for in this measure is $38 million below the budget and $135 million below 1961. I congratulate the Committee on Appropriations and as I said earlier in the debate, many of us count on this great committee to hold the line and weigh the needs of the various Government programs as against the urgency and the amount of revenue in the Treasury. Also, as I said earlier, the Committee on Appropriations has been successful during past years in cutting expenditures below budget requirements, but unfortunately, through the process known as back-door spending the agencies of Government have greatly exceeded the budget and their expenditures have been without the scrutiny or control of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy has asked Congress for legislation to create a new Cabinet post concerned with housing and urban affairs and certainly, with 70 percent of our people living in metropolitan areas, this request has considerable appeal. Even more so, it has appeal because our urban communities have been experiencing serious problems due to population migration, as well as housing and transportation problems. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it may well be that the Federal

Government has some responsibility in this matter, because grants for slum clearance and subsidized public housing and other Federal programs have gone a long way toward creating these problems. Also, the Federal Government's priority on taxes has made it difficult for local communities to finance their needs.

However, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express, after careful consideration, my opposition to the Federal Government accepting more responsibility in the field of financing urban needs.

Metropolitan area problems have been studied and investigated for the past two decades, but there is one fact which hardly will invite debate, namely, that if the Federal Goverment establishes a new agency to deal with urban affairs the net result will be that local communities' efforts to solve their own problems will rapidly diminish, while the pressures and promotion of new and greater Federal spending and responsibility in this field will greatly increase.

The critical situation of city services ties in, of course, with population congestion and increased use of the automobile. As a result, industry and middle-income families from modern cities, and with them tax revenues and job opportunities have tended to move into the suburbs. In the wake of this movement was the influx of low-income families arriving in larger cities, looking for jobs and needing schools and other facilities. Expanded needs for more water, school, sewage disposal and other similar city services has resulted.

In some communities, the suburbs and cities have joined together in seeking solutions for these problems by forming metropolitan districts. Many cities are meeting their own problems.

The solution, Mr. Chairman, has seemed to many mayors and city officials to be to come to Washington. There has been a great interest in this proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs. On the other hand, many thinking officials and community leaders have felt equally strongly that no Federal aid or supervision should interfere with the exercise of local responsibility. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal highway program, as it has affected cities, is a good example of the clash of thinking as far as Federal versus local and State responsibility is concerned. But in this argument let no one overlook the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has clearly asserted that where the Federal Government subsidizes it has an obligation to regulate. Let no one think that a local community can escape Federal control if it takes Federal dollars, be it for schools or be it for sewer plants.

Mr. Chairman, I have long believed that the best interests of the Nation would be served by limiting Federal responsibility to those areas specifically outlined and written into the Constitution by our forefathers. I firmly believe that the Federal Government should only help States and local communities when these States and communities cannot help themselves. I have firmly believed that the less government is the best government and that the less taxes collected by the Federal Government, the better it is for the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, if this Congress establishes a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, in my opinion it is just one further step toward the welfare state and another heavy burden on the debt-ridden taxpayer.

Year by year, the Federal Government increases in size. The number of its employees increases. The number of its programs increases. The number of new responsibilities increases.

The bureaucrats in these Federal agencies are ingenious in perpetuating and expanding their responsibilities. The best example of this I know today is the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Any Member of Congress who goes to the Commissioner of Education can obtain a pamphlet outlining a blueprint for Federal aid to education. Under the Constitution, this plan simply means that eventually the Federal Government would control education and eventually it would dictate what is taught in our schools.

Mr. Chairman, if we set up a new agency for urban affairs it will be the same. It will mean more units of subsidized public housing. It will mean more uneconomical programs for subsidized housing. It will mean more Federally subsidized city sewer plants. It will mean programs for the financing of city transit systems and the financing of parking lots. It will mean thousands more Federal employees.

Also, it will mean diminished effort at the local level to meet the problems of the cities. Mr. Chairman, I fear the trend in this country. I have watched the power of the legislative branch being increasingly transferred to the executive branch of Government. This is bad. The representatives of the people should never delegate their responsibility to control and manage the affairs of this country.

The same is true with our States and our counties and our cities. The officials and duly constituted authorities in State and local governments are all giving up their responsibilities to executive agencies of the Federal Government. They do this in exchange for Federal dollars.

The trend started with grants-in-aid, whereby local bodies were induced to give up their authority in return for grants. Truly, they have sold their heritage for a mess of pottage.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members of the House Committee on Appropriations will heed my warning. Certainly none of the Members of the House are more conscious of the need of a balanced fiscal program and the need likewise to resist spending pressures. Certainly the members of this great committee will recognize, more than others perhaps, that once the new agency is established it will entail expensive spending pressures and costs. It will entail more centralization and big government.

The Kennedy Task Force on Housing and Area Development recommended the provisions of Cabinet status for an agency on housing and urban activities. In his message to the Congress relative to the national housing program last March, President Kennedy recommended the creation of this new department.

Since then, I have been seriously considering this recommendation and in this connection let me say I believe it is politically unwise, administratively unsound, and financally unnecessary.

As I said earlier, I am opposed to further centralization of authority in the Federal Government. Already, the Federal Government has usurped powers and sources of revenue which rightfully belong to city and State governments.

The creation of another administration unit will further serve to confuse the problems of metropolitan areas. As the representative of such an urban congressional district, I have watched Federal programs in the past and, frankly, I have been forced to conclude that too often the problems of cities are caused by the Federal Government itself. It should stay out of local affairs. Indeed, I have concluded that the less the Federal Government meddles in their affairs, the better off will be the people who live in cities, because on a case by case basis and with local public opinion to stimulate action, the cities will better regiment their own forces at home to overcome their problems. Waiting for and begging Uncle Sam will cease.

Finally, a new department is not necessary because existing agencies are already equipped to coordinate the Government's programs and, certainly, Mr. Chairman, congressional policy regarding legislation affecting urban areas is not going to be changed by the establishment of a Federal department with Cabinet status.

These thoughts have come to me, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this appropriation measure. I have spoken today because I felt that the members of the Committee on Appropriations who are preponderantly in attendance at this time would understand my viewpoint perhaps better than other Members of the House.

In conclusion, I repeat, I am for less Federal Government, not more Federal Government, and I urge my colleagues to consider the results if a new Department of Urban Affairs, as proposed by President Kennedy, is established. We need less Government agencies, not more of them.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield our remaining time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, in commenting on this appropriations bill I would like, first of all, to commend highly the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] for the admirable way he has presented the facts and figures contained in the bill. I would like also to commend him for the able, impartial, and fair way in which he conducted the hearings of the subcommittee.

I would also like to say that the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], too, contributed largely to the success, impartiality, and thoroughness of the hearings. I also want to thank the staff

assistant, Earl Silsby, for his help and ever-ready cooperation. The hearings held by the subcommittee were very complete. Every expenditure was scrutinized carefully and every activity of the various agencies was given full consideration.

I am going to address myself primarily to one aspect of the activities of the Small Business Administration which was very thoroughly aired during the course of the hearings, the record on this subject covering 34 pages—from page 471 to page 505 of part 2 of the hearings.

This portion of the hearings refers to the practice of setting aside defense construction, maintenance, and repair contracts—as distinguished from other procurement programs—for the exclusive bidding by small contractors.

Generally speaking, all defense construction contracts of $500,000 or less are earmarked for exclusive bidding by small contractors. In other words, almost automatically and without formal application these contracts are set aside. In other, larger contracts, SBA sometimes intervened in behalf of small concerns. This, however, is done on a specific and selective basis. However, I have been told that in the Omaha, Nebr., area this $500,000 figure has only recently been raised to $750,000.

This situation in the construction field—as compared with general defense procurement—is such that the full Committee on Appropriations, on page 15 of the report adopts the following language—

I quote:

Some members of the committee feel that from the hearing record the defense construction set-aside program for small business has been so interpreted as to give contracting authorities little discretionary power. The result, they feel, has been an inflexible application of the program not found in other areas of defense procurement. Almost automatically all projects of $500,000 or less, and in some cases in excess of that amount, have been set aside without regard to the cost-increase factor, local economic situations or the possible effects on construction firms themselves. Some members of the committee are concerned that this policy, as well as the entire repair, construction and maintenance set-aside program of the Small Business Administration will result in increased cost to the Government and urge that the entire subject, including analysis of costs, be studied by the Small Business Administration, the Department of Defense, and the appropriate committees of Congress with a view toward clarifying and perhaps modifying the regulations to insure protection to the taxpayer as well as to small business. The committee concurs in SBA's suggestion that conferences be held and encourages all parties to the program, including construction industry representatives to participate in order to clarify the situation and provide coordination which now appears to be lacking.

As noted, this language is based on and is consistent with the hearing record and deals with only one of the functions of the Small Business Administration where things seem to have developed in a manner not intended by the original SBA Act. This portion of the committee report is designed to assist SBA in discharging its responsibilities placed upon it by the Congress and the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I believe most of us in this Chamber feel as I do and have vigorously supported the Small Business Act. I know that I have always supported adequate financing for the Small Business Administration to carry out its assistance programs for small business. I believe firmly—as I know most of my colleagues do—that sound administration, both now and by the former Administrator, has helped many small business firms throughout the country to expand and has placed them once again in a sound financial and competitive position.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I believe I owe a responsibility to the American taxpayer to guard his interests as much as possible. I know my colleagues on the committee feel this way, as do most Members of this House. Another part of our job is to see that government functions as smoothly and efficiently as possible with the funds provided. For these reasons I am concerned—as I know all my colleagues are—with any program which has built-in inflationary tendencies and forces the cost of government to go up. Every year we consider a military construction appropriations bill and the committee action in this report could—in the long run—have a very real effect on how much we will have to spend in that field.

I would like to stress here that the committee report on this bill refers only to the construction set-aside program. In other phases of defense procurement the set-aside program has worked remarkably well and both the present Administrator, Mr. John Horne, who happens, incidentally, to be a constituent of the chairman of the subcommittee, and his predecessor, Mr. Phillip McCallum, are to be highly commended.

However, the construction industry is far different from manufacturing. In the case of regular defense procurement, SBA and the Department of Defense have been able to establish a clear-cut policy, set high standards and draw up yardsticks by which the quality and performance capability can easily be judged. After all, one transistor designed to do a specific job is just exactly like another transistor, whether manufactured by RCA, Western Electric, or by some small firm. The price tag, too, can easily be judged and prices bid by small firms can be measured against prices quoted by the bigger concerns.

In order to insure this ability to judge and compare, contracting officers—to use their phrase—test the market by making a partial set-aside for small business. And they can take an item from the list for exclusive small business participation to compare bids with those received from bigger concerns.

This obviously cannot be done in construction. While two transistors may be identical, there are no two construction projects exactly alike. Even identical buildings, unless they are placed side by side, do not cost the same amount. And then, for one thing, soil conditions vary from block to block within a city, from State to State, and from region to region. There is also the matter of the elements. You can go right on operating an assembly line even if it is pouring down rain outside. A heavy rainfall can delay a construction project for days or weeks with additional costs to be considered. There is also a great difference in labor costs from area to area.

When the program of setting aside construction contracts was first inaugurated by SBA, the Departments of the Army and Navy did not participate. However, the language of the amendment to the Small Business Act sponsored by the previous administration in 1958 was so worded that SBA felt it had a mandate to enforce a wide-scale construction set-aside program.

Some of us do not feel that this is the case and so we have introduced legislation to correct it. I, for instance, introduced H.R. 3690 on January 31 of this year. Our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McSWEEN], also has introduced legislation of a similar nature designed to accomplish the same purpose. A bill identical to mine has been introduced in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from Montana, Mr. METCALF. As you can see, this is a strictly bipartisan—or better—nonpartisan approach.

After introducing my legislation I visited personally with the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency about it and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] responded by asking for an agency report on my bill. As of this date I have not seen such a report forthcoming and it would appear to me that the language in this Appropriations Committee report is a clear and definite suggestion to SBA to get such a report in the works.

Under the language of the 1958 act, SBA went back to the Department of Defense and requested set-asides in construction. The Department agreed and, as far as the Corps of Engineers was concerned, contracts of $50,000 or less would be set aside. Application would have to be made for projects larger than that.

At about the same time, SBA undertook to rewrite the rules on the size factor of concerns designated to participate in the exclusive bidding program. Prior to 1958 contractors employing 500 or less were considered small concerns. The rules were changed though, and now read that in construction, a small business concern is one which is not dominant in its field, is independently owned and, finally, did a gross business of $5 million or less—on an average—over the past 3 years.

SBA makes much, on page 501 of the hearings, that it called a public hearing on these rules changes in November of 1958, and that only one person showed up and that the hearings lasted a total of 20 minutes. In view of the fact that at that time contracts involved amounted only to $50,000 or less and that formal application had to be made

on any larger than that, this is not surprising.

Early in 1959, however, I began to get complaints from constituents, most of them among the category of small contractors, about this departure from tradition. I looked into the matter and conferred at that time with the chairman of the House subcommittee on military construction appropriations, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. In May of 1959, the construction set-aside program was abandoned by both Defense and SBA. Those of us concerned with the problem thought at the time it was solved.

In August 1960, SBA reactivated the program. Now, however, it involved contracts of $500,000 or less—not the $50,000 limit as before. On September 1, 1960, I wrote to the Administrator and I would like to quote from that letter. I said:

Your complaint is that the percentage of contracts handled by small firms declined between 15 percent and 20 percent from the 68 percent of all contracts which were handled by small firms a year ago.

Incidentally, I brought this matter of percentages up with the new Administrator during the subcommittee hearings this year and I got a different set of figures. Our exchange appears on page 472 of the hearing record. I asked Mr. Horne:

Do you have any figures as to what percentage should go to small business?

Mr. HORNE. Well, based on the 1958 figures, 73 percent would not be an unreasonable amount.

The SBA, therefore, wants to insure that 73 percent of all defense contracts go to small contractors. Well, let us take a look at what has happened in another agency. In a letter from the Bureau of Reclamation which appears on pages 487 to 488 of the hearings, Mr. Floyd Dominy says:

This Bureau recently made a limited survey of construction contracts amounting to less than $500,000 each which were awarded by our principal contracting officer, the assistant commissioner and chief engineer in Denver during the 26-month period ending February 28, 1961. During this period he awarded 111 such construction contracts with a total face value of $15,377,590, of which 99 awards, totaling $13,553,955 went to small business firms.

Mr. Chairman, may I remind you this was when the set-aside program was not in effect. This is a lot better than the 73 percent the SBA is suggesting. It indicates that small business contractors willing to compete openly can count on getting—not 73 percent—but up to 81 percent of such contracts. That is about what the Bureau figures total.

In my September 1, 1960, letter to the Administrator I tried to point out to him why the decline he complained of had taken place. Again, quoting from my letter to the Administrator I said:

For one thing, construction work is concentrated now in the field of missile launching sites. These programs are far too big for the "small" contractors possibly to handle. In areas where small contractors have gone in on a subcontracting basis, many have found themselves over their heads and have gone under.

There was another and even more important reason for this decline in small contractor participation, as I explain further along in my letter. I continue:

You, yourself, have created a situation leading to a statistical decline in the number of "small" contractors doing business with the Department of Defense.

You have changed the definition of small contractors from that of an employer of 500 or less to that of a contractor doing less than $5 million in gross business on an average over a 3-year period. This definition has substantially lowered the number of small contractors and, consequently, has statistically lowered the number of firms doing business and the percentage of all business they are doing. If the old criteria were applied, I think you would find the percentage of decline would be a great deal less.

At this point in my letter I outline to the Administrator my own reasons for opposing the reactivation of this set-aside program. The evidence introduced during the hearings on this bill amply supports the reasons expressed nearly 10 months ago.

Quoting again from that September 1 letter, I said:

It is my contention that your action, if followed through to its ultimate goal will result in at least a 10-percent increase in the cost of construction for all defense facilities.

This program is so vast and so terribly expensive that I feel every effort should be made within the Department of Defense to get the best possible price for every construction project, regardless of size and regardless of the number of bidders. No favoritism should be shown any segment of the industry—at the cost of increased taxes Americans would have to bear.

It is my hope that the Small Business Administration will reconsider, as it did a year ago, and withdraw the formal request for set-asides.

I did not let the matter rest here. I got in touch with defense construction people, with industry representatives and with others interested in the problem. I did a good deal of research and on October 19, 1960, I once again wrote to the Administrator.

I told him:

Both your letter and these researches confirm my earlier opinion that your agency is embarking on an unwise and unsound course in creating a defense construction set-aside program.

It is your contention that the defense construction set-aside program will not increase costs. I find this hard to believe.

Historically, a contractor's growth depends upon his ability to bid competitively through development of new techniques, new equipment and new efficiencies. The nature of the business is such that only through these ingenuities could a contractor expect to grow or stay in business. Once this competition is destroyed by Government subsidy to one segment of the industry, rising costs are inevitable in that segment; there can be no other alternative.

I discuss this same point further in that October 19 letter. I continue to quote:

I would like to point out, too, that your program may be self-destructive and that the only loser will be small business itself. Once protected by a canopy of Government subsidy small contractors will lose their initiative to compete and grow. The tendency will be to remain small so as to qualify under your new regulations. Only the desire to grow fosters growth. Your action will inevitably destroy this desire to grow in one very large segment of our American industrial economy.

In this connection I would like to quote from a letter of a friend of mine who happens to be a former attorney general of the State of Nebraska and who is presently in the construction business. In this unsolicited letter he says:

A great many small contractors are looking to the future when they will become big contractors. They do not want any program that will either force them to stay small or force them out of business if they become large and that is exactly what the set-aside program will do to many small contractors.

This raises the question of just who wanted this program in the first place. I have visited with contractors and have gotten in touch with the Associated General Contractors which represents 7,000 members. Of this number 89 percent are in the category classified by SBA as small. They have told me emphatically that they do not want this program and that the vast majority of their membership has gone on record against this type of program. I have received a letter from the Associated General Contractors of Wyoming. The letter states that of their 69 members, 66 were small. That group, too, was overwhelmingly opposed to the set-aside program.

One of my basic contentions has been that there is far too much unilateral action on the part of SBA, in this arbitrary construction set-aside program. There have been too few conferences involving industry and construction people in the Defense Department. In my October letter to the Administrator I point this out in these words, and I quote:

Let me reiterate that if you will confer at great length with those in the Department of Defense who are dealing daily with these problems and also with representatives of the construction industry, you will find that you have embarked on a course which will lead to higher prices, more of a tax burden, inflationary pressures and the ultimate destruction of an industry. I do not feel this to be in the best interest of America.

In the interest of the national defense program you should reschedule another public hearing not later than early in January on your definition as well as the economic need for your action under a very broad interpretation, that you should qualify contractors for defense work who are not presently qualified.

In this connection—my request for another hearing or further conferences—I would like to quote from a letter by Admiral Corradi, the Acting Chief of the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks who, it appears, has had similar thoughts. The admiral says on page 474 of the record from his letter, and I quote:

We contemplate an early meeting between officials of the Department of Defense and Small Business Administration on the subject of construction set-asides.

It was 10 months ago that I suggested such a meeting. In his March 29 letter of this year, Admiral Corradi suggested such a meeting. When I pointed out the admiral's comment to the Administrator, on page 475 of the hearings, his response was, and again I quote from the hearings:

Congressman, we have not consulted with the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

So, as of now, no conferences held. It is the hope of the committee, as expressed in this report, that such conferences will be undertaken, and soon. And, further, the committee hopes that such conferences will include all interested parties. That is part of the language of the report.

It would seem to me only logical and sound judgment to hold many such conferences prior to undertaking such a broad program. The rise in cost-factor should have been considered. Let me quote one sentence from a letter by the Department of the Army appearing on page 486 of the hearings. That sentence reads, and I quote:

It is not possible, once a set-aside has been made, to estimate any increased cost.

There can be no question but that these 10 months of a major set-aside program have forced prices to go up.

All of the factors I have listed and which appear in the hearing record—the inflexibility of the program, lack of coordination, no yardstick by which prices can reasonably be judged—add up to one overwhelming conclusion and that is that this program has already begun to cost more and the process will spiral dangerously in the years just ahead.

I would like to state here with all possible emphasis that there is no inference that small contractors will be getting together to conspire, there is no inference of collusion intended or meant. However, I would like to point out also that when any contractor finds that his stiffest competition is not allowed to bid on a given contract, this is not a desirable situation. The Army Corps of Engineers recognizes these facts on increased costs and has, I understand, at long last been asked its opinion on the subject. Their report has been forwarded to the Secretary of Defense.

I would like once again to refer to a letter from the Department of the Army. On page 486 of the hearing record it is stated, and I quote:

The Corps of Engineers reviewed basic contracts awarded to large firms which were also bid by small firms for the period of July 1, 1959, through January 31, 1960.

I would like to interpolate here that there was no set-aside program during this period so a comparison could be made. Again quoting from the hearings:

The review discloses that for the 107 contracts totaling $156,162,351 awarded to large firms the lowest small business bids totaled $175,045,308. This latter figure is 12 percent in excess of the total contract award amount.

Again let me point out that the Corps of Engineers will be handling close to $2 billion in construction during the coming year. If, as SBA has indicated, 73 percent of that money should go automatically on a set-aside basis to small business, then a 12-percent increase would total just about $160 million extra we are going to have to spend.

This 12-percent figure is not mine. It comes from the Corps of Engineers—the people who are directly responsible for a tremendous amount of military and civil construction every year.

Concerning the prospects of increase in price, the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks is even more blunt than the Corps of Engineers. Admiral Corradi says on page 473 of the hearings, and again I quote:

Speaking only for this Bureau I believe you will find most of the people immediately concerned with construction are of the opinion that our program will cost us more under set-asides.

To those who might say, "But these are only estimates," I would like to point out some examples of what has actually happened under the set-aside program. I have, incidentally, prepared a list of these examples which is available to any of my colleagues who are interested.

A case in point—and perhaps the most glaring—involves construction of the Shepard Air Force Base Hospital and clinic at Wichita Falls, Tex. This case appears on page 481 of the hearings. The contract was for $4½ million—far more than the $500,000 automatic set-aside limit. One firm was declared unresponsive—and I want to go into more detail on that a little later on—and the job was awarded to a small firm. The increased cost to the taxpayers on this job was $165,000. This is 15 percent of the project's cost.

There is another interesting case involving some channel dredging at Norfolk, Va., on page 474 of the hearings. The Navy wanted 8,000 cubic yards of material removed. A big firm bid $1.09 per yard but was declared out of the bidding because of size. The contract was awarded to a small firm at a cost of $2 per cubic yard. This little transaction cost us an added $7,280—or an increase of 83 percent. The important point here is that it not only cost unnecessary money, it points up how tightly the Navy people feel their hands are tied by present regulations. In other words, they do not have discretionary power. It indicates, too, the inflexibility of the program.

I will not press the point further but would like to cite just one more example. It involves the dismantling of a heating plant at the Richard I. Bong Air Force Base in Wisconsin. Charles Simkins & Sons bid low at $561,493. But the Simkins bid was thrown out because of the size of the firm. The bid accepted was $658,464, an increase of 15 percent—or $129,864. This is another example where a project larger than the $500,000 limit was set aside.

I would like to go back to that Shepard Air Force Base hospital business and discuss it briefly. It is interesting because it points out the utter confusion which can be created in an industry under a program of this magnitude when it gets started.

To start with, this job involved a lot more than the half-million dollar limit. The estimate was for $4½ million but the SBA asked that it be set aside.

The B. L. Abbott Co. of Houston, Tex., was low bidder on the job but was turned down by SBA on the grounds it was a big business firm. I looked into this further and would like to report on it.

On page 481 of the record appears a letter from Mr. George R. Drake, a vice president of Johnson, Drake & Piper, a quite large construction company. In his own words this is the story he tells and I quote:

A very capable ex-employee of ours starting out in business for himself decided his firm, the B. L. Abbott Co., would like to bid this work. Because of the size of the job, Johnson, Drake & Piper was asked by him to indemnify the required performance and payment bonds and to supply certain sums of money, at interest, for working capital in the event he was awarded the job and did the work. As we have done in several other cases we agreed to this simply because Mr. Abbott had been a valuable employee of ours prior to this time. The SBA, according to Mr. Abbott, determined that the B. L. Abbott Construction Co., although set up in every way to meet the technical criteria of SBA standards for a small business concern, was not a small business concern but was actually an affiliate of Johnson, Drake & Piper.

Their reason was ostensibly that because Johnson, Drake & Piper had agreed to loan money to the B. L. Abbott Construction Co., at interest, we therefore controlled his corporation.

What is the difference between borrowing money from a big construction firm and borrowing money from a big bank? When asked about this the Administrator, on page 484 of the hearings, said that it was because both firms were involved in the same kind of business. I would like to point out, as I did in the hearings on page 493, that I know of many banks which, when loans were defaulted, took over the business firms to which the money was loaned. Supposing a bank lends money to an auto dealer and he goes broke and the bank takes over the firm. Does this then prevent any other small auto dealer from borrowing money from that bank? It is questions such as these that make one ponder about this construction set-aside program.

It is evidence such as that recited in the hearings that make construction people in the Bureau of Yards and Docks, the Corps of Engineers and the men who work in the construction field on a day-to-day basis, contend that this program will cost the American taxpayers millions of wasted dollars. It is evidence such as this that has caused contractors, both small and large, to complain to me that the program is creating chaos in the construction industry.

It is evidence such as this—all of which is open for you to read and examine—which prompted the committee to include the language it did in its report.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Chairman, that this language will have the effect it is intended to have. I hope that the SBA, the various construction agencies of the Government and representatives of the construction industry will gather around a conference table and work out a solution which will be of help to all—and particularly to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in connection with defense construction set-asides I mentioned the examples of increased costs. Following are some of the examples of increased costs I referred to:

	Increased costs to taxpayers	
	Amount	Percent
1. Navy, Norfolk, Va., channel dredging, to remove 8,000 cubic yards of material: Low bid at $1.09 per cubic yard. Declared unresponsive because it was submitted by large firm. Bid awarded to small firm at $2 per cubic yard. Increased cost to taxpayers	$7,280.00	83
2. Hospital, dental clinic, Shepard Air Force Base, Tex.: Project cost estimate, $4,500,000. Low bid, B. L. Abbott Co., Houston, Tex., $4,316,555. Declared unresponsive because B. L. Abbott Co., although a small firm, had arranged financing through large contractors, Johnson, Drake & Piper. Bid went to another small firm. Increased cost to taxpayers	165,000.00	15
3. Dismantling heating plant at Richard I. Bong Air Force Base, Wis.: Low bid, Charles Simkins & Sons, Inc., $561,943. Unresponsive because of size. Next bid by small firm, $658,464. Increased cost to taxpayers	129,864.00	15
4. Levee protection and berm paving, Lake Pontchartrain, La.: Low bid, Atlas Construction Co., $110,318. Rejected as unresponsive, affiliated with larger firm. Awarded to W. K. Ingram Construction Co., $122,445. Increased cost to taxpayers	12,127.00	11
5. Cleaning and construction, control weir, Humphries County, Miss.: Bids opened Feb. 21, 1961. Low bid, $107,689.61. Declared unresponsive. Next low bid, $111,548.40. Increased cost to taxpayers	$3,858.73	3½
6. Dike construction, Bureau of Reclamation: Low bid by Engineers & Contractors, Inc., Provo, Utah, $260,000. Bid declared unresponsive because of firm size. Accepted bid, Thorn Construction Co., Inc., Provo, Utah, $265,079. Increased cost to taxpayers	5,079.00	2
7. Navy, Annapolis, Md., primary switching building: Low bid by a big concern, $74,800. Declared unresponsive. Bid went to small firm, $79,445. Increased cost to taxpayers	4,645.00	5
8. Marine Corps, Air Station, Cherry Point, N.C., pest control: Low bid by big firm, $12,405.10. Declared unresponsive. Bid awarded to small firm, $13,700. Increased cost to taxpayers	1,294.90	7

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

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to take this means of complimenting my distinguished friend and colleague from Nebraska for a well-thought-out study and documented presentation. I certainly want to associate myself with his position. I, too, have received a large number of letters from contractors in my district. This is a very serious problem, and probably it has come to the attention of many other Members of the House. I certainly hope that the proper committee will take cognizance of the legislation which the gentleman from Nebraska has introduced which I, too, support and that it will eventually come here for our consideration. Again, I want to compliment the gentleman for one of the finest and most well thought out presentations that I have had the privilege to hear for a long, long time.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, my colleague and good friend, for his remarks. Since I have known him and throughout his service in the House of Representatives he has always devoted himself by his actions and his votes to the welfare and interest of the American taxpayer.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, testimony before the Appropriations Committee in considering H.R. 7577 shows that the taxpayer's dollar is being used by the Federal Government in competition with private industry. This practice is being carried on in the Department of Commerce, as is evidenced by the testimony of Admiral Karo which is as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the cost of the maps include the purchase of machinery and other expenditures to obtain information as well as administrative and other costs?

Admiral KARO. No, sir; according to law or statute, we are only required to charge for the cost of paper and printing. We have interpreted that quite liberally and added all the present costs and even include the cost of distributing the charts. That is a little more than what the statutes require. We feel that the Government is entitled to a reasonable return on its investment. In other words, the charts should be of enough value so that people will not use them indiscriminately but yet they should be cheap enough so that the man who needs the chart will keep one up to date and one that is not obsolete. That applies not only to the aeronautical, but also to the nautical charts.

These maps are offered for sale by the Government in competition with Jeppesen & Co. of Denver, Colo., a private company making these maps as evidenced in the testimony by Mr. Jeppesen before the committee, as follows:

My reason for coming before your committee is to request relief from certain Government competition which threatens the well-being of our company, and jeopardizes its continuation as an essential supplier of these radio navigation charts.

Briefly, this is the situation. The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, of the Department of Commerce, is pursuing a vigorous program of producing radio navigation charts, copied in the main from the charts long produced by our company, and of offering these charts on the commercial market at a price that is a fraction of their actual cost.

In effect, the Government is commercially exploiting a product, based on our design and subsidized by taxes, in direct competition with our existing commercial products.

It is our belief that these activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, while they may be technically correct under the laws governing that agency, are certainly not a reflection of the true intent of Congress in establishing the Coast and Geodetic Survey mapping activity.

The original of these radio navigation charts were developed by the Jeppesen organization in 1934 for the sole purpose of providing the data needed by pilots for air navigation. No such charts then existed.

In our proper concern with this threat to our business life, we have tried to analyze every facet of the situation. We have studied our own publications and our costs. We have studied the Coast and Geodetic Survey publications and their costs. Can you understand our concern both as businessmen and as taxpayers when we learn these following facts, disclosed by the Coast and Geodetic Survey itself in answer to a direct senatorial inquiry:

"1. The total cost incurred by the Coast and Geodetic Survey during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, for the production of their current edition of the radio navigation charts, will be approximately $1,083,500.

"2. The total receipts of Coast and Geodetic Survey from the sale of these charts to commercial aviation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, will be approximately $206,000.

"3. Thus, the commercial activity of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in selling radio navigation charts during the fiscal year 1961, will result in a loss of approximately $877,500. This loss may include the small cost of printing charts supplied to military departments which would be reimbursable."

I have a table showing the comparative sales prices of the publications offered by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and by Jeppesen & Co. which I would like to submit for the record.

I believe that chart is on the back of the copy of my statement which you have before you. For a complete U.S. service, we charge $106 per year. The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey charges $58 and the rest of them are just about the same difference. You can break it down as one service versus another service.

Here is an example of Coast and Geodetic Survey pricing practice:

"Included in the C. & G.S. publications is a set of eight intermediate altitude charts, which are corrected and mailed to subscribers every 4 weeks—that is 13 times a year. The C. & G.S. sells this set of charts at $4 per year. If Jeppesen & Co. were to mail this set the postage alone would amount to $4.16 per year. So, on a duplicate set of charts, Jeppesen & Co. would have a cost for postage alone that would exceed the C. & G.S. selling price."

It is obvious that when the U.S. Government is permitted to engage in business and is only required to recoup the cost of paper and printing and does not attempt to recover all cost in connection with the product they sell to the public,

then private industry is doomed if this practice continues.

I am hopeful that remedial legislation may be adopted which will correct this situation.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the gentleman from Alabama that speaking from my experience on the witness side of the table appearing before his committee, I believe his committee is one of the better-run committees in the Congress. So I would like to voice the same sentiments previously expressed by our colleagues who have spoken, the gentlemen from California, Virginia, and Illinois, who praised the work of the gentleman from Alabama. Notwithstanding the personal pleasure I derived from appearing before the committee, I am now interested in finding out what happened to the items on which I testified, namely, $192,000 for salaries and expenses to staff the upper air weather stations in Winslow, Ariz., and Huntington, W. Va. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama whether this bill includes funds for those two upper air weather stations?

Mr. ANDREWS. I will say to the gentleman that there are ample funds in the bill for these two stations. The only effect of the reduction in the bill would be that they would not be put in operation quite as soon as they would have been otherwise. However, they will remain in the program.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. Since we have already invested in structures, it would certainly be a necessary investment to follow up with funds to hire the people to man these two upper air weather stations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

AMENDMENT TO INCREASE APPROPRIATION FOR SBA

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to congratulate the chairman [Mr. ANDREWS], and his committee on a job well done. I have read the report of the committee. I have gone over the bill, and I am really amazed at the amount of work that goes into this one particular bill. This bill emphasizes the importance of the legislative branch of the Government. In our form of government, of course, we have the three branches—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial and, I believe, their importance—although, of course, they are all important—is in that order. The legislative branch is very important because all the money that is spent by the executive branch or the judicial branch is appropriated by the legislative branch. In other words, the legislative branch makes it possible for the executive to have money or for the judicial branch to have money. Without the support of the legislative branch neither of the other branches would have financial support.

Mr. Chairman, the object of general debate or at least one of the objects of general debate is to point out to the Committee of the Whole and to the Members of the House improvements, if any, that can be made in the bill pending before us. In this particular case, I would like the Committee to consider raising the appropriation for the Small Business Administration on one item and that is on page 28, lines 11 and 12. I am going to offer an amendment to increase the amount of $17,525,000 to $18,447,000. This matter has been brought to my attention because I happen to be chairman of the House Small Business Committee and we work with the Small Business Administration.

Our committee has several subcommittees. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the ranking Democratic member, is chairman of the subcommittee having to do with the Small Business Administration. The gentleman from Tennessee is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I know that normally the members of the Committee on Appropriations go together, but in this particular case the gentleman from Tennessee has authorized me to say that he is going to support this increase.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do I understand the figure in the amendment the gentleman is going to offer will bring that item up to the level of the administration's request for this purpose?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct.

This amendment would restore the amount included in the original budget estimate for "Salaries and expenses" for the SBA lending program.

For the past 3 months, the lending operation of the SBA has been proceeding at an unprecedented rate, far beyond the normal capabilities of existing staff. In March, 1,332 applications were received—the highest on record. Applications in April were 1,066 and in May 1,209—both months exceeding any previous experience for the respective months. I understand the rate of receipt of applications in June is continuing at about the same record pace. This is particularly significant when one notes that the basis for the estimate for the fiscal year 1962 was an average of only 900 applications per month.

As another indication of workload this agency is encountering, inquiries pertaining to business loan applications during each of the months of April and May exceeded 18,000 which in itself is a terrifically heavy workload. This becomes even more significant when compared to the forecast in the budget estimate of only 11,200 inquiries per month.

In a tremendous effort to keep this workload moving, all available and qualified employees have been working many hours of overtime. Employees normally engaged in servicing of outstanding loans have been assigned to aid in the processing of these business loan applications. In spite of these efforts, the backlog has continued to mount month by month; and, at the end of May, 1,595 applications were awaiting processing, and over 1,300 loans previously approved were awaiting closing.

If SBA is to give small business the service which we want it to give, it must have sufficient help. As a matter of fact, a budget amendment has been received from the President amending the estimate for SBA and revising the estimate of application volume to 1,000 applications per month during 1962. The budget amendment requests an increase in the revolving fund, and it assumes that the full amount of the contingency reserve would be available for such additional salaries and expense cost as would be entailed. Very careful standards have been developed over the past years as a basis for determination of salaries and expense needs pertaining to the lending operation. I believe, therefore, that the original estimate was reasonable; and, since the work volume to which such standards were related was understated, I believe we must be careful not to take any action which would tend to impair the service this agency should give to small business.

There is another factor which I believe we also must weigh very carefully. SBA has over one-half billion dollars' worth of outstanding loans and each month SBA is adding additional loans which must be supervised and serviced. To do otherwise is to jeopardize recovery of the Government's investment. Yet, if SBA is inadequately staffed, either the loan processing and closings will continue to fall further behind or the loan servicing will suffer and delinquency and loss rate increase. Neither of these alternatives is desirable.

One further point should be mentioned. Administrator John Horne authorized loans to be made at a 4-percent interest rate in areas of substantial labor surplus. This action was taken as a step to stimulate business and employment in these areas needing economic assistance. This is a most commendable step but it cannot be effective if SBA does not have the personnel to handle the resulting workload with reasonable dispatch.

I strongly urge, therefore, the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that we have discussed with the members of the committee on the other side and members on this side this amendment, and we have agreed to accept it. It is true that the volume of applications filed with the Small Business Administration has increased tremendously since this budget was prepared. It has been a phenomenal increase since the members of the Small Business Administration appeared before our committee.

May I say also it is just as costly to process an application that is denied as it is to process one that is approved. Accepting this amendment will not add to the cost of this bill because the money comes from the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the Small Business Administration since its inception in 1954 has become one of the safeguards for the economic and productive life of this Nation. We do not wish to hamper this in any way, and the Members on this side will accept the amendment also.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, before speaking briefly on two items in this bill I want to register my admiration for the outstanding job which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] has done on these complicated and exceedingly important appropriations. Those of us who have appeared before his subcommittee know that he and his colleagues can always be counted on to provide both a courteous hearing and thorough and able consideration of the issues involved. It is a pleasure to rise in support of the committee's recommendations on the bill before us.

I want to particularly commend the gentleman from Alabama and his colleagues for allocating the sum of $594,500 for the important job of expanding agricultural weather services in a number of regions. Because of the great distances and the very wide diversity of climate in my own State and especially in my district, improved weather information is extremely important to my people. To meet this urgent need I had discussed the problem at length with the officials in the Weather Bureau and at my request, they developed a proposal for an expanded statewide observation and reporting system, centering around a network of agricultural weather observation stations and a teletypewriter circuit to disseminate around-the-clock weather information to communities in all parts of Oregon. In addition, to meet a special need for improved liaison with the Air Force weather unit at Klamath Falls, this program calls for a Weather Bureau meteorologist to be stationed at the airfield there to service aviation weather needs.

It is, therefore, good news for all of Oregon that the committee's recommendations include funds to establish this new statewide reporting system. The funds involved will pay dividends in future years in terms of better weather information on which farmers, industry, and other sectors of our economy can make decisions. It is a very important advance for our people and I want to express our appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama and his colleagues for their ready response to our needs.

Finally, I want to also commend the committee for its recommendations in the field of forest highways. Timber is a key factor in the economy of my district and most important to the Nation. We have almost 10 million acres of national forests in the Second District of Oregon. Highways through these beautiful forest lands are not only essential to good forest management, they are important to every American. I am pleased to note that the committee has recommended the full amount requested in the budget. As I have repeatedly pointed out, expenditures on resource management are in the nature of long-term investments that pay out in the case of our Oregon forests not only in dollars but in the enrichment of the lives of the millions of Americans who enjoy them.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to provide staff assistance for the President in connection with special projects, to be expended in his discretion and without regard to such provisions of law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation and employment of persons in the Government service as he may specify, $1,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 per centum of this appropriation may be used to reimburse the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, The White House Office", for administrative services.

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

Mr. Chairman, as of now I have no amendments to offer to this bill.

I will say to the chairman of the subcommittee that when we reach page 29 it will be my purpose to offer a point of order to the language found in lines 3 through 5 as being legislation on an appropriation bill. This provides for an increase in the salaries of the deputy administrators of the Small Business Administration. From what I have been able to read of the hearings, perhaps an increase in these salaries is justified. My quarrel with this is that the Small Business Administration is bypassing the proper legislative committee. The Small Business Administration should come to the proper committee, and I am sure they will get, on the basis of justification, proper treatment.

My only point in offering the point of order is in the interests of proper and orderly legislative procedure.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly right with respect to his interpretation of what occurred. The reason for this provision being in the appropriation bill is the fact that the deputy administrators of the Small Business Administration, having a statutory salary, now receive less actually than some of the employees who work for them. The committee was of the opinion that the deputies, having much greater responsibilities than the employees, should receive a commensurate increase. The gentleman is correct in stating this matter should properly go to the legislative committee. It was the committee's opinion, however, that inasmuch as this would take an amount of time and there was no assurance as to when the legislative committee might act, it was the committee's hope that the gentleman might be willing to go along with the action of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Illinois that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has been in business since early in January of this year, and the Small Business Administration should have come to our committee and could have come to our committee long ago.

Mr. YATES. Well, I think that is true, may I say to the gentleman; I think they should have come to your committee a long time ago, but I do not know of any reason why they did not do it. I think, however, as the gentleman himself pointed out, on the basis of the hearings the increase is warranted, and I do hope that the gentleman will not make a point of order against it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe it is within the province of the Committee on Appropriations to be raising and lowering salaries without authorization. Your job is to provide the money if the proper legislative committee and the House deems that a pay increase is justified. Now, that is my position. I do not find it pleasant to make a point of order against this particular item, but I must be in a position with other appropriation subcommittees to do the same thing. As a matter of fact, the independent offices appropriation bill a year or so ago provided a number of supergrades. I struck them out on a point of order against it. I just do not believe the Committee on Appropriations is the place to be raising and lowering salaries.

Mr. YATES. Well, ordinarily I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman, but I think in this particular instance the increase is so clearly warranted that, again, I hope the gentleman will reconsider his decision.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in this bill beginning on page 10, that there is salary and expense money in three places, including pages 11 and 12, dealing with maritime activities, and I am wondering why those could not have been brought together.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, they are limitations.

Mr. GROSS. Limitations. But, can they not be brought together in one place so that we can get a total figure for them instead of three places?

Mr. ANDREWS. They are separate items.

Mr. GROSS. Then, on page 14 I note that one Government agency appears to be paying another Government agency.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is done throughout Government for reimbursable services.

Mr. GROSS. Now, with respect to the special projects and the emergency fund for the President——

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the gentleman raising that point at this time?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. ANDREWS. Because we have not yet reached that point in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we have just dealt with special projects for the President on page 2. What kind of an increase are we making in the total appropriation to the White House, can the gentleman tell me?

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is really no substantial increase.

Title I of the bill deals with the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand.

Mr. ANDREWS. That includes the White House Office, special projects, and the increase over the 1961 appropriation is $151,500.

Mr. GROSS. There has been no reduction in this appropriation to the executive branch of the Government; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS. There never has been. However, in this particular case there is a reduction of $297,000 below the budget request.

Mr. GROSS. I would just like to observe that when Mr. Kennedy became President we heard a good deal of talk about lean staffing in the executive branch of the Government, and I fail to find anything that indicates lean staffing in this appropriation as far as the White House is concerned.

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

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

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the appropriation is $33,500 less for the next fiscal year?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is, for the total Executive Office?

Mr. GARY. For the total Executive Office.

Mr. ANDREWS. And $297,000 below the budget request.

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. ANDREWS. I was looking at the whole of title I in the bill, which is in addition to the Executive Office of the President, which includes funds appropriated to the President. You will find that most of these items referred to are mandatory pay increases; no increase in personnel, except for personnel purposes.

Mr. GROSS. What I am concerned with what we are spending today as compared with last year, not the asking price as contained in the budget.

Mr. ANDREWS. It is not very much.

Mr. GROSS. A couple of years ago the gentleman from Alabama and his subcommittee very diligently went into an expenditure out of either the Special Projects or Emergency Fund of President Eisenhower. There was an expenditure at that time of some $400,000 for that infamous Eric Johnston campaign by which the administration headed off any substantial revision in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Now, I note that a National Conference on International Economic and Social Development is about to take place in Washington, and I wonder if this is going to be comparable to the old Eric Johnston deal, only this time it would be designed to promote, out of taxpayer funds, sentiment in behalf of the Kennedy foreign-aid program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I am wondering if this National Conference is not designed to start a bonfire in behalf of the foreign giveaway program. Of course, the gentleman cannot answer that at this time, and I do not expect him to, but I am wondering if we are going to see the President's Emergency Funds or Special Project Funds, totaling $2.5 million, or any portion of that amount spent on this sort of thing. We can only await the answer to that. I do not expect the gentleman to answer.

Mr. ANDREWS. May I say to the gentleman that I cannot answer how it will be spent. I hope it will be spent according to the intent of the law for emergency purposes, and the gentleman can find in the record the expenditures made from the fund during this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman and his subcommittee developed the fact 3 years ago that President Eisenhower reached into one or the other of these funds and spent some $400,000 to help defeat certain revisions of the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. On that subject, I want to compliment the subcommittee for going into this import business to the extent you did. Let me suggest to the Members of the House that they read the hearings beginning at page 1030, and following, where they will find some excellent testimony as to what has happened to manufacturers in this country who have been hit by foreign imports.

I want to compliment the committee not only on that, but upon the information that it has developed in its questioning of Mr. Whitton and others with respect to this interstate road building program. You deserve the compliments of the House on both of those subjects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 703–706), $375,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN of Washington:

On page 25, line 7, strike out "$375,000" and insert "$143,500".

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1953, former President Eisenhower called for a review of Federal-State relations and Congress responded by creating a temporary Commission which came to be known by the name of its chairman, the late Meyer Kestnbaum of Chicago.

In 1955, the Kestnbaum Commission issued a formal report which included numerous recommendations on the division of functions and responsibilities between the Federal Government and the States. It covered nearly every phase of the subject, including natural resources and conservation, disaster relief, civil defense and urban vulnerability, Federal aid to airports, highways, welfare, public health, education, unemployment compensation, payments in lieu of taxes and shared revenues.

While many of the recommendations of this Commission may have been sound, little or no action was taken to put them into effect. These recommendations still stand and are available for use without further study.

During recent years there have been studies and surveys along many lines by various groups, including the Kestnbaum Commission, the Hoover Commission, the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and various committees of Congress. We have surveyed and resurveyed programs and financial arrangements, including Federal-State relationships.

As far as I can determine, very few of the recommendations of these studies have resulted in improved operations and practices. And no one can point to any specific savings which have resulted from any of these studies.

For example, in 1959 and again in 1960, former President Eisenhower proposed legislation affecting five grant-in-aid programs which would have resulted in reductions in the Federal budget. Under this proposal, the amount of Federal funds would have been reduced and the States would have assumed more responsibility by taking over certain sources of taxes from the Federal Government. No action was ever taken on this proposal.

Now we are asked to approve a large increase for this new Study Commission created by Public Law 380 in 1959. We are asked to nearly triple the funds for this group for next year.

It seems to me that we should schedule hearings and take action on the many proposals already made, before we spend additional funds on further studies. There should be some indication that we are willing to use the findings of these study groups before we make further studies. To do otherwise is a waste of money.

As a matter of fact, I think we use these special study groups as a means of dodging our responsibility to face up to problems of this type. It has become general practice throughout the Government to postpone action on difficult problems by providing for further studies and surveys.

My amendment proposes to hold the funds for this Commission at the present level. It does not abolish the Commission. It merely recognizes the fact that further expansion should be delayed until a firm need for further studies is supported by use of present findings and some form of further action.

We can study these matters indefinitely. But until Congress and the Executive are prepared to use the findings from such studies, no benefits can result therefrom. We need to act on the findings of studies already completed and recommendations already made. Additional appropriations for further studies cannot substitute for executive and congressional action.

If further expansion of this program is justified on the basis of findings and concrete results therefrom, additional funds can be provided as needed in future bills.

Our Federal budget is in a precarious position. Its condition regulates the value of the dollar you spend whether it be for groceries or for your annuities. I suggest that we had better look in the direction of a balanced budget in the name of a sound dollar as the President has requested. We have to start somewhere, and I think this is an unnecessary increase. I hope the House will accept this amendment, and I think we had better start someplace and recognize that there is no need for this increase or for the additional money.

Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree with a great deal of what my distinguished colleague from Washington has just said. The reason that we have this permanent Commission today is because the temporary commissions that had been appointed in the past had been ineffective. We have had studies, and as soon as the studies were over the commissions would disband, and the studies were forgotten. For many years we have been faced with a maze of overlapping and duplication of activities between Federal, State, and local governments. We have enough of it, as the gentleman from Washington pointed out, within the Federal Government itself, and our committee has asked the Budget Bureau to make a study of the overlapping of Federal agencies in order to eliminate the duplication of activities. But in addition to that we have duplication between Federal, State, and local agencies in matters of taxation, in matters of expenditures, and in practically every sphere of governmental activity.

The Budget Bureau cannot control the States, and it was for that reason that the Hoover Commission, when it made its study some time ago, recommended a permanent Commission to study this situation, to make recommendations to the Congress, and to follow up the reports so that we will get the maximum benefits from them. They have established a very excellent committee. We have on that committee some of the outstanding authorities in the United States. We have Members of the U.S. Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, Governors, members of State legislatures, mayors, and elected city and county officers. Now, this is a permanent commission that is making these studies.

If you will pardon a personal illustration, I am familiar with the necessity of a commission of this kind. It so happened that I had the privilege in 1925—and that was a long time ago—of coming to Washington, D.C., as executive secretary of the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation to conduct a study in the field of inheritance taxation. I had the privilege of conducting that study and preparing a report for the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation.

I am happy to say that is one report that did bring some very effective results. The situation in the meantime, however, has drifted. I was very much pleased to see that one of the studies made by this new and permanent Commission was in the field of State and Federal inheritance, estate, and gift taxes that went back in their studies to the report we had made in 1925, and brought that report up to date. They seek to coordinate the activities of the Federal, State, and local governments in that field, and I say to you that is very much worthwhile, because there are duplications, and if we can ferret out these duplications and eliminate them, it will save money for the various governments.

So far as I am concerned, $375,000 is a large sum of money, but it is a relatively small part of the amounts we are spending in this bill.

For example, we have in this bill practically $627 million. The appropriation for this Commission amounts to $375,000.

If this Commission accomplishes its full potentialities, we will save many times that amount of money over and over again as a result of its studies and recommendations. Personally, I think it would be a great mistake to reduce this appropriation.

Let me say that the appropriation is larger for 1962 than for 1961 because this fiscal year the committee was just getting started. With the amount requested for 1962 it will reach the level on which it expects to continue in the future, and it will not continue to ask for increasing appropriations from year to year. This appropriation will give them an opportunity to carry on their work in an efficient and satisfactory manner.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity, first, to commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], for his very eloquent address during general debate, in which he spelled out in very clear language the dangers that we face and what he seeks to do about it and what he is doing about it as far as that is concerned as a very diligent and industrious worker on the Committee on Appropriations. It would be probably only about 5 percent of the time during the course of a year that the gentleman from Washington and I would differ. This happens to be one of those occasions. I say in all respect to the judgment of the gentleman from Washington it is because I had the privilege of serving on the subcommittee with the distinguished chairman of the Intergovernmental Subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], that I take this position, for I had an opportunity to see firsthand what the problem is. I supported the authorizing legislation setting up this Commission, and I am happy to note in reading the hearings what the Commission has been doing to date.

As the gentleman from Virginia has pointed out, the Commission has only gotten started. This will be the first full year of their operation, and I think the full request ought to be granted to the Commission. When we look at items like "(1) The structure and potential improvement of the real property tax, (2) revision of the estate tax credit, (3) investment of idle cash balances by State and local units of government, (4) cooperative tax administration and (5) development of improved measures of fiscal capacity and tax effort of State and local units of government"—these are items which need some timely study, and that cannot be done on a temporary basis.

Mr. Chairman, I expressed concern during general debate on the authorizing legislation setting up this Commission that I hoped it would not become one of those that grew and grew and grew.

I am happy to note that in the hearings Mr. Bane is of the opinion that it would be topping out at this particular figure; in other words, for the next year they will not be asking for an increased appropriation or for an additional number of employees.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Do not ever believe that kind of talk, because a lot of these folks are going to be under Civil Service, and any time this House acts on wage levels or anything of that kind there is not going to be any topping out on any appropriation.

Mr. MICHEL. I should like to take Mr. Bane at his word for this, and if that is not the case next year, then I will be up here in the forefront supporting the gentleman. As appears on page 176 of the hearings, six people will be out working in the field of taxation and public finance; four people will be working in connection with metropolitan areas and four people will be working in the general field of governmental structure and relationships. I think these are very important fields for the Commission to go into, and I would like to see them have an opportunity to do the kind of job they are capable of doing.

Mr. Chairman, I support the full budget request on this item and urge the committee to reject the amendment of the gentleman from Washington even though he is my very good friend and close associate on the committee.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman FOUNTAIN, in sup-

port of the budget request for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for fiscal year 1962. I have no hesitation in assuring you, from my own personal experience as a member of the Commission representing the House of Representatives, that the funds being requested will be well spent.

I have been deeply impressed with the great amount of constructive work the Commission has accomplished already despite the fact that it has been operating on a severely limited budget. This is due in great measure to the skill of the Commission's chairman, Mr. Frank Bane, and a small but thorough and hard-working staff headed by Mr. William G. Colman.

Without going into too much detail, I should like to emphasize the truly unique nature of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. There is nothing like it in the entire structure of American National and State Government. It is the only Government body designed for the specific purpose of helping to make our Federal system a more effective and responsive means of self-government. As the subcommittee knows, the Commissions' membership is composed almost entirely of active officials of each level of government—men and women whose experience is extensive and whose knowledge of the frustrating problems of intergovernmental conflict and coordination is direct and immediate.

Both in theory and in practice, therefore, the Commission is equipped to make an important contribution toward resolving conflicts and duplications which are inevitable in our complicated but essentially sound system of government.

Despite the youth of the Commission and the severe limitations of its staff and resources, I believe it has accomplished a great deal. It has focused attention on a number of problems which have over the past several years caused much concern to responsible Government officials who have recognized that solutions required more extensive intergovernmental cooperation. These include the coordination of State and Federal death taxes, the administration of Federal grants for public health services, metropolitan area problems especially in the field of mass transportation and areawide planning, and the investment of idle cash balances by State and local governments.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Commission has demonstrated convincingly its great potential value to our country. I hope the House will agree that it should have the financial resources and the support of the Congress which its important purpose requires. The budget request is a relatively modest one. It represents a level of activity which the Commission's experience to date has demonstrated it can carry efficiently and effectively. The budget amount has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Subcommittee and by the full Committee on Appropriations. I hope the House will agree with their judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. To my good friend from Virginia let me say that $375,000 is still a lot of money to a lot of people, out in the district I represent in Iowa. We are not playing around with just a few dollars here. This $375,000 is an increase of $231,500 over the appropriation for the same purpose last year. That is a good, fat, healthy increase, believe me.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia is a a little iffy—if they do this, if they do that. I do not know of anyone who thinks they are going to do all of these things. This is another one of those deals, the foot in the door. The gentleman from Illinois spoke of this thing topping out at the $375,000 mark. Well, his own hearings show that at the least it is going to top out at $400,000, and it will probably take off from there, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] well suggests.

Now, why not leave this at $143,000? Your own hearings show that this advisory commission, or whatever it is, is going to hire a bunch of consultants. And, there are a lot of them elsewhere in this bill. The gentleman from Virginia shakes his head. You provide $50 a day and expenses for these consultants, do you not?

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

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

Mr. GARY. This is to complete the staff of the organization. Now, from time to time it might be necessary to call in a few consultants, but there is no plan at the present time to hire a lot of consultants. What they are trying to do is to get a staff that can do the work of the Commission, and then they estimate with this increase in staff that they are asking for, they will level off the organization.

Mr. GROSS. Let me read from page 177 of the hearings:

Mr. ANDREWS. At what rate do you propose to pay consultants and experts?

Mr. COLMAN. So far, Mr. Chairman, we have not been able to obtain such assistance at a rate less than $50 a day.

And so on and so forth. That is plus expenses.

Mr. Colman, the executive director of this new Commission, may be a most capable gentleman, but I notice one thing, that he was on the Kestnbaum Commission that recommended this bill, so he sort of went to his reward, did he not, coming from the Commission that recommended this setup, serving there at $17,000, and now he is getting $20,000? He has done pretty well. Mr. Colman may be a very fine gentleman, but at any rate he has gone to his reward on this intergovernmental commission.

Now, I did not think in the first place that we had to have an intergovernmental commission, because I was convinced then it was going to cost half a million dollars a year before they got through with it. It is coming close to that figure now, and I do not see any reason under the shining sun why we should now increase this spending from $143,000 to $375,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This Commission was created by statute. It is a bipartisan Commission. This is the first time funds have been asked for a full year of operation. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am in opposition to this amendment. I shall not take the time—in fact, I do not have the time—to tell you that as a member of that Commission, along with the distinguished Congresswoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], and three Members of the Senate, it has been a source of inspiration and joy to me to see representatives from various levels of the Government sitting down around the table, forgetting their special interests and trying to solve many of the difficult intergovernmental relations problems with which we are faced.

I am opposed to the Horan amendment for what I hope this committee will agree are convincing and compelling reasons. First, let me refresh your memory with a little history.

The establishment of this Commission implemented a recommendation of the Committee on Government Operations, which was unanimously adopted in August 1958, and which grew out of almost 3 years of intensive study of Federal-State-local relations by the Committee's Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. In the course of its investigations, the subcommittee held numerous public hearings, including nine regional hearings throughout the country during the fall of 1957, and made questionnaire surveys and special studies. The subcommittee's investigations pointed strongly to the need for a permanent Advisory Commission to build on the foundation laid by the temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Relations — the Kestnbaum Commission, whose 1955 report to the President and Congress was referred to and thoroughly studied by the subcommittee—and the need to strengthen communication and relations between the levels of government.

The need for a continuing body of this kind had been widely recognized, and its establishment, in my judgment, was long overdue. In fact, a similar Commission was recommended by the first Hoover Commission more than 10 years ago. I might add that the 2-year study of this neglected area of intergovernmental relations by the Kestnbaum Commission was the first official undertaking of its kind since the Constitutional Convention in 1787. In view of the extensive overlapping of governmental activity in our Federal system and the complexity of the problems involved, the report of the Kestnbaum Commission could only lay the groundwork for a continuing effort through permanent machinery for this purpose.

Following the Government Operations Committee's recommendation, I introduced an appropriate bill in 1959—H.R. 6904—which became Public Law 380 in September 1959. Identical bills were introduced in the House by our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman FLORENCE P. DWYER, and in the Senate by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE and a bipartisan group of 26 cosponsors. The support in the Congress for this legislation is reflected in the vote of 335 to 31 by which it was passed in the House, and the fact that it was passed without dissent by the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the need for an Advisory Commission was amply documented in the joint hearings on these bills which our subcommittee held with the Senate Committee on Government Operations in 1959. The witnesses who appeared were unanimous in their support of this legislation.

In addition, a great many statements were received from other Members of the House and Senate, Governors, mayors, State legislators, and private organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO, favoring the Commission's establishment. It may be of interest that resolutions urging the enactment of this legislation have been adopted by such national organizations as the Governors' Conference, the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of County Officials.

I might say that in my experience the subjects of intergovernmental relations and the structure and operation of government are highly technical and do not excite the interest of most members of the press. Yet there are few areas of government where public education and public interests are more imperative for responsible and effective self-government. I am hopeful that among its accomplishments the Commission will help to stimulate the interest of the press, and consequently of the public, in these matters.

But an even more important objective is to focus attention on the governmental problems at the State and local levels which give rise to the necessity and demand for Federal action. By examining such problems at an early stage in their development and by encouraging feasible and appropriate State and local remedies. I believe the Commission will make a real contribution toward strengthening the role and the self-reliance of the State and local units in our system of government.

Surely, those of us serving on the Commission from the House and Senate, as well as the Governors, mayors, county officials, State legislators, Federal officials, and private citizens who are members, cannot be expected to devote our personal time to this effort if the Commission is denied staff and facilities adequate to carry out its responsibilities.

I should like to bring to the attention of the House the remarkable record of attendance and participation by members of the Commission. All too often consultative bodies such as this become nothing more than paper organizations with token participation by the prominent and busy persons who hold membership. In this case I believe it is both heartening and indicative of its value that 20 of the Commission's 26 members were in attendance at its April meeting. These included three of the four Governors, three of the four mayors, all three county officials, both of the State legislators—there is presently one vacancy in this category—all three Members of the House, and the three Members from the Senate. In addition, all three private citizens were present. While the three Cabinet officers were unable to be present, the Department was represented in each case by a high-ranking official.

Now I want to deal in some specifics about the work of this Commission and why the Horan amendment, cutting its funds, should be rejected. I speak from intimate knowledge of the content of the Commission's appropriation request because its budget is developed in close consultation with the congressional members of the Commission. In the first place, the current appropriation for the Commission is not a valid basis of comparison because in the hearings last year before the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees it was emphasized again and again that the work was just getting started and that this year stable estimates based upon a full but moderate operation would be presented. This fact was recognized in the reports of the committees to their respective Houses. In fact, the Senate committee report specifically stated that an initial amount was being voted, and I quote, "until the budget requirements can be more definitely ascertained." It is patently illogical to try to hold the appropriation next year to an amount which was recognized as a partial and starting figure for fiscal year 1961.

Second, the Commission has emphasized in its statements to the Appropriations Committee, in which the congressional members have joined, that it does not plan on coming back each year with ever increasing requests; but rather, that the future and permanent needs of the Commission are modest in amount and should stabilize fairly close to the current year's request—or in the general neighborhood of $400,000 annually. I know that I speak for my two colleagues in the House—the Congresswoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the Congressman from Texas [Mr. IKARD]—when I say that so long as we are members of the Commission we intend to see to it that this range of expenditure is not exceeded.

Third, the Commission has demonstrated during the past year of partial operation that it is capable of developing practical recommendations in the area of intergovernmental relations which are not just research undertakings but have a reasonably degree of political feasibility. So far, the Commission has adopted five reports. These deal with first, coordination of Federal and State inheritance and estate taxes; second, investment of idle cash balances by State and local units of government; third, modification in Federal grants-in-aid for public health services; fourth, governmental structure and organization in metropolitan areas; and fifth, mass transportation services and facilities in metropolitan areas.

Some of these recommendations are directed to the National Government; some of those have already been put into legislative bills which have been introduced in the House and Senate. Others of the Commission's recommendations are directed to the States, and draft legislation on these subjects is being placed before the Committee on Suggested State Legislation of the Council of State Governments. Resolutions endorsing various of the Commission's recommendations will be considered by the Governors' Conference in Hawaii next week. I mention these results of the Commission's work to date to illustrate that the Commission is beginning to carry out the hopes of those of us who sponsored the initial legislation; namely, that this body, made up of representatives of all levels of government, would be able to do much in a practical way in strengthening State and local government throughout the United States and bringing about more effective relationships between Federal, State, and local governments.

Finally, if we adopt the pending amendment we will be, in effect, rendering impotent an activity which we voted into existence only 2 short years ago and which from present indications is completely living up to the expectations of the Congress. I emphasize again that the appropriation for the fiscal year 1961 was viewed as an amount to enable the Commission to get started, with this year's appropriation to mark an approximation of the level at which the cost of the Commission's work would stabilize. Furthermore, I feel sure that if the pending amendment is agreed to a number of the members of the Commission including Cabinet officers, Governors, and Members of Congress would interpret the action as indicating that the Congress did not support the philosophy back of its establishment of the Commission. I think that would mark a bleak day in Federal-State relations in this country. It would be interpreted by State and local governments as a lack of understanding and sympathy on the part of the Congress with the proper and effective roles of these levels of government in our federal system as established by the Constitution.

Each of us has talked about the need for better intergovernmental cooperation for years. Each of us has come to recognize that such cooperation will not come of its own accord, because public officials at all levels of government are too preoccupied with the problems of their respective jurisdictions. It is for this reason that the Congress decided wisely 2 years ago to establish the Advisory Commission and to charge it specifically with responsibility for improving Federal-State and State-local relations in order that all levels of government may support one another effectively in the critical years ahead.

Let me illustrate the value of the Commission's work by referring to its report on the coordination of Federal and State inheritance and estate taxes. This report has been hailed by tax au-

thorities as being the most comprehensive ever developed on this subject. The tax credit for State inheritance and estate taxes allowed taxpayers as an offset against their Federal estate tax has been one of the most vexing problems in Federal-State tax relations for nearly 30 years. Moreover, this area has been characterized by duplicate tax administration and excessive complexity for taxpayers. The Commission has submitted for the consideration of the President, the Congress, and the States a comprehensive program for the coordination of the multiplicity of taxes in this area.

It has placed before the Committee on Ways and Means a group of proposals designed to increase the States' share of these revenues, subject to legislative action by the States to reduce tax complexity and the compliance burdens of taxpayers. The program will shift some Federal revenues to the States in amounts determined by the Congress. Under the Commission's suggested formula, the States would receive approximately $400 million. The impact of this shift on the Federal budget, however, would be delayed 3 years or longer pending complementary legislative action by the States.

The Congresswoman from New Jersey and I have introduced bills in the House designed to carry out the Commission's recommendations in this complex field. The Commission's report not only has the backing, I understand, of the Treasury Department but also that of a number of State executives and legislators. It has been favorably endorsed by the executive committee of the National Conference of State legislative leaders and resolutions favoring it have been recommended to the Governors' conference by associations of municipal and county officials.

Let me further illustrate the value of the Commission's work by discussing briefly another report of the Commission which deals with the investment of idle cash balances by State and local units of government. It is estimated that State and local governments could obtain an additional $50 to $100 million of annual revenue by a more vigorous effort to place temporarily idle funds in interest-bearing accounts or investments.

This is particularly timely because State and local governments urgently need increased revenues. The Commission makes a number of recommendations to this end. Particularly, it recommends to State legislatures the enactment of such legislation as is necessary to authorize the investment of local and State funds in interest-bearing deposits and in State and Federal securities. The Commission is working with groups of State legislative leaders and with the national, county, and municipal organizations and the State leagues of municipalities and county officials to enlist necessary State legislative support and action. Stemming from this one report alone are potential annual savings to taxpayers of the Nation many times in excess of the operating expenses of the Commission.

In addition to the five items on which the Commission has completed the first phase of its work, some new items have been added, dealing with such issues as controls associated with Federal public assistance grants and State and local taxation of private personal property located on federally controlled areas.

As staff resources permit, the Commission will add further work to its program, applying the criteria of first, the importance of the problem; second, its manageability in terms of available resources; and third, the relative possibilities of obtaining constructive action on the problem. The last-mentioned criterion is especially important. It is the policy of the Commission not to involve itself in areas already under study by other responsible groups or with problems that have already been studied to death.

The Commission would like to emphasize that its objective is the development of practical recommendations with a reasonable degree of political feasibility—not the production of research studies for library shelves. We will spare no effort in following through at the Federal, State, and local levels to obtain the best possible batting average in terms of the legislative and administrative implementation of our recommendations. The Commission has a broad and essential mission—to try to increase the effectiveness of the Federal system in this country. It is a difficult task. Results will not come easily or quickly. They will come only through the continuing attention and conscious efforts of legislators and administrators at all three levels of government. The principal contribution which the Commission can make is to catalyze such attention and effort through the sharpening of issues and the presentation of recommendations which are susceptible to a clear-cut reaction by legislative bodies and political leaders. We believe that the Commission merits sufficient congressional support to give this undertaking a fair trial. The potential return on a small investment is great.

I therefore urge this committee to support this effort by rejecting the Horan amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HORAN) there were—ayes 17, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $6,750,000, and in addition there may be transferred to this appropriation not to exceed $17,524,000 from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, and not to exceed $397,000 from the fund for liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said funds: *Provided,* That the amount authorized for transfer from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, may be increased, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such amount (not exceeding $500,000) as may be required to finance administrative expenses incurred in the making of disaster loans: *Provided further,* That 10 per centum of the amount authorized to be transferred from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, only in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to carry out the business loan program: *Provided further,* That hereafter the rate of compensation for each of the four Deputy Administrators shall be $19,250 per annum.

Mr. BOW. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly disturbed because of the activities of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. In my opinion it is becoming more and more bureaucratic and dictatorial, and we should take heed of their acts lest they disrupt the highway system throughout the Nation. Certainly, unless they pay some attention to State highway department planners, I am fearful they shall make many mistakes. I should like to point out one example, and that is the activities on Route 77 in my congressional district.

Some time ago the Federal officials refused to accept suggestions for needed corrections in the design of Fulton Road interchange. The Fulton Road mistakes are now evident to motorists who daily see the built-in hazards of this interchange. Each time I drive it, Mr. Chairman, I wonder how soon fatalities will be the result of the failures of the Bureau of Public Roads to heed the warnings of local officials.

Now the question in my mind is will the Bureau of Public Roads make the same mistake on interchanges to be built on the freeway between Canton and Akron-Canton Airport. Three times the State highway department has sent submissions to Federal officials asking for full interchanges at both 54th Street and Wise Road and at County Road 228 Marchand west of North Canton. Three times Federal officials of the Bureau of Public Roads have turned thumbs down. The Bureau of Public Roads has insisted that only half interchanges be built at these two points when the initial contract is let later this year and the other two ramps at each point be built later. This could be a costly postponement. The State has submitted ample justification to Washington for building complete interchanges at both points now. This data includes statistics and support from the Stark County Regional Planning Commission, the Stark County engineer, the county commissioners, utility companies, real estate officials, and others.

Bureau of Public Roads officials have said that local planning groups and officials should offer advice, and advice has been offered. Mr. Chairman, I submit the Bureau of Public Roads should heed this advice. The residents of my congressional district support good highway programs—vote the money for them and offer assistance to improve highway transportation. They do this with the concept that adequate access will be provided on the superhighways to meet their local needs.

No one who knows the area will question that the section northwest of Canton is one of the most rapidly expanding residential areas in Ohio. No one will question that for industries such as the Hoover Co. of North Canton to continue to expand, access to high-speed roads is imperative.

I must insist, Mr. Chairman, that our local planning officials and the State highway department undoubtedly have a better grasp of the need for these two interchanges than the absentee overlords of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads which, to my knowledge, has yet to send any of its "men with the power to decision" to look over these crucial access points to Route 77 in Stark County.

I have corresponded with the Director of Public Roads on numerous occasions in this regard, only to have replies of bureaucratic gobbledygook ending with the statement if they can be of further assistance to please call upon them. To call upon them only further proves that they do not desire to cooperate with the Congress of the United States, with local planning officials, or State highway departments, but in their ivory towers they intend to dictate, without knowledge of local conditions, control over local areas.

May I in passing, Mr. Chairman, point out that the laws are written that there shall be local control and operation of these highway systems, subject to approval of the Bureau. This is very similar to legislation now pending for Federal aid to education which so many deny will create any Federal control. But here is proof positive that once you permit the interference of the Federal Government in local affairs the Federal Government finally becomes the octopus which strangles the life of those who believe in local government.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 28, lines 11 and 12, after "exceed", strike out "$17,524,000" and insert "$18,447,000".

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Subversive Activities Control Board, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), not to exceed $30,000 for expenses of travel, and not to exceed $500 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $305,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is a point of order to the language on page 29 in order?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is to language preceding line 5 on page 29 it is not in order.

Mr. GROSS. It does precede line 5 on page 29. The Clerk did not read the language on page 29, lines 1 to 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read and an amendment has been adopted to the paragraph starting on page 28, line 8, and ending on page 29, line 5.

Mr. GROSS. Then a point of order to the language on page 29, line 5, is not in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman it comes too late at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest, or in excess of $6.50 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we have heard and read much recently of the first 100 days of President Kennedy's administration. The best comparison between the first 100 days of President Kennedy's administration would be the first 100 days in 1953 of former President Eisenhower's administration. The evidence shows that President Kennedy's legislative program has progressed at a considerably faster rate than that of the former President Eisenhower. In a comparison of 20 pieces of major legislation, President Kennedy saw 5 enacted into law with 9 receiving House approval, and 9 passing the Senate. During this similar period, President Eisenhower saw only one important piece of legislation enacted into law, and only three major bills receiving House approval, and two receiving Senate approval.

On February 16, 1961 President Kennedy gave congressional leaders a list of 16 pieces of legislation in which he expressed a desire for passage at the earliest opportunity. Of these 16 bills, 5 were signed into law and 3 were on the way to him for signature. Seven of these measures had won House passage, and seven Senate passage.

This comparison confines itself to the first 100 days of President Kennedy's administration and of former President Eisenhower's administration. However, since the first 100 days this Congress has passed other important legislation and other bills have passed the Senate or the House, or have been reported out of committee and are waiting consideration by either body.

The record made by the Kennedy administration to date has been a remarkable one.

In my remarks, I include a table showing action on major legislation during the first 100 days of the Eisenhower administration and also during the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration.

It must be borne in mind that in 1953 former President Eisenhower, when he assumed office, had a Republican-controlled Congress. President Kennedy on assuming office had a Democratic-controlled Congress. So the first 100 days of both administrations can properly be compared. The record made by the Kennedy administration to date has been a remarkable one.

Mr. Chairman, the tables I refer to are as follows:

Major legislation during the 1st 100 days of Kennedy administration

Legislation	Senate					House					Final action
	Status	Vote			Other action	Status	Vote			Other action	
		Party	Yea	Nay			Party	Yea	Nay		
*Unemployment benefits temporary extension (H.R. 4806)	Passed Mar. 16, 1961.	Republican	29	2	(1)	Passed Mar. 1, 1961.	Republican	145	27	(2)	Public Law 87-6, Mar. 24, 1961.
		Democratic	55	2			Democratic	247	3		
		Total	84	4			Total	392	30		
*Increase in social security benefits (H.R. 6027)						Passed Apr. 20, 1961.	Republican	149	14		
							Democratic	251	0		
							Total	400	14		
*Depressed areas (S. 1) (H.R. 4569)	Passed Mar. 15, 1961.	Republican	15	16	(3)	Passed Mar. 29, 1961.	Republican	43	125	(4)	To President.
		Democratic	48	11			Democratic	208	42		
		Total	63	27			Total	251	167		
*Feed grains program (S. 993) (H.R. 4510)	Passed Mar. 10, 1961.	Republican	11	18	(4)	Passed Mar. 9, 1961.	Republican	4	161	(5)	Public Law 87-5, Mar. 22, 1961.
		Democratic	41	8			Democratic	205	41		
		Total	52	26			Total	209	202		

See footnotes at end of table.

Major legislation during the 1st 100 days of Kennedy administration—Continued

Legislation	Senate					House					Final action
	Status	Vote			Other action	Status	Vote			Other action	
		Party	Yea	Nay			Party	Yea	Nay		
*Increase in minimum wage and extension of coverage (H.R. 3935).	Passed Apr. 20, 1961.	Republican	14	17	[7]	Passed Mar. 24, 1961.	Republican	133	35	[8]	
		Democratic	51	11			Democratic	208	43		
		Total	65	28			Total	341	78		
*Aid to education (S. 1012) (H.R. 4970)	Hearings completed.										
*Medical care for aged under social security (S. 969) (H.R. 4222).											
*Federal aid for college education (S. 1241) (H.R. 6483).											
*Federal aid for medical education											
*Federal support for expansion of community health facilities.											
*Government Reorganization Act (S. 153)	Passed Feb. 6, 1961.		[9]			Passed Mar. 29, 1961.		[9]			Public Law 87-18, Apr. 7, 1961.
*OECD Treaty ratification (Ex. E, 87th Cong.).	Passed Mar. 16, 1961.	Republican	31	1		No House action required.					Signed Mar. 23, 1961.
		Democratic	59	0							
		Total	90	1							
*Creation of new Federal judgeships (S. 912)	Passed Mar. 3, 1961.		[9]			Passed Apr. 19, 1961.	Republican	87	76		To President.
							Democratic	250	0		
							Total	337	76		
*Establishing Office of International Trade											
*Easing of restrictions on trade with Iron Curtain countries.											
Omnibus housing (S. 1478) (H.R. 6028)						Hearings being held.					
Federal aid to dependent children (H.R. 4884)	Passed Apr. 20, 1961.		[10]			Passed Mar. 10, 1961.		[9]			Do.
Extension of Sugar Act (H.R. 5463)	Passed Mar. 29, 1961.	Republican	20	12	[11]	Passed Mar. 21, 1961.	Republican	80	84		Public Law 87-15, Mar. 31, 1961.
		Democratic	35	22			Democratic	204	45		
		Total	55	34			Total	284	129		
Omnibus farm bill (S. 1643) (H.R. 6400)											
Water Pollution Control Act Amendments (S. 861) (H.R. 6441).						Reported Apr. 25, 1961.					

*Indicates legislation contained in a list of 16 pieces of legislation President Kennedy gave to congressional leaders on Feb. 21, 1961, in which he expressed the desire they would be passed at the earliest opportunity.

[1] Vote on committee amendments, Mar. 16, 1961: Failed passage, 44 to 42 (Republicans: 26 for, 5 against; Democrats: 16 for, 39 against).
Vote on committee amendments, Mar. 16, 1961: Passed, 51 to 38 (Republicans: 26 for, 5 against; Democrats: 25 for, 33 against).
Vote on Williams amendment, Mar. 16, 1961: Passed, 45 to 42 (Republicans: 31 for, 0 against; Democrats: 14 for, 42 against).

[2] Vote on conference report passage, Mar. 22, 1961: 363 to 31 (Republicans: 129 for, 27 against; Democrats: 234 for, 4 against).

[3] Vote on Javits amendment, Mar. 15, 1961: Failed passage, 61 to 32 (Republicans: 29 for, 4 against; Democrats: 3 for, 57 against).
Vote on Dirksen amendment, Mar. 15, 1961: Failed passage, 66 to 27 (Republicans: 24 for, 9 against; Democrats: 3 for, 57 against).
Vote on Capehart amendment, Mar. 15, 1961: Failed passage, 71 to 19 (Republicans: 17 for, 14 against; Democrats: 2 for, 57 against).
Vote on Lausche amendment; Mar. 15, 1961: Failed passage, 55 to 36 (Republicans: 22 for, 9 against; Democrats: 14 for, 46 against).
Vote on Scott amendment, Mar. 15, 1961: Failed passage, 57 to 31 (Republicans: 27 for, 4 against; Democrats: 4 for, 53 against).

[4] Widnall motion to recommit, Mar. 29, 1961: Failed 126 to 291 (Republicans: 126 for, 42 against; Democrats: 0 for, 249 against).

[5] Vote on conference report, Mar. 22, 1961: Passed, 58 to 31 (Republicans: 11 for, 22 against; Democrats: 47 for, 9 against).

[6] Vote on conference report, Mar. 21, 1961: Passed, 231 to 185 (Republicans: 17 for, 149 against; Democrats: 214 for, 36 against).

[7] Vote on Dirksen amendment, Apr. 18, 1961: Failed passage, 63 to 34 (Republicans: 24 for, 10 against; Democrats: 10 for, 53 against).
Vote on Russell amendment, Apr. 18, 1961: Failed passage, 63 to 34 (Republicans: 20 for, 13 against; Democrats: 14 for, 50 against).
Vote on Holland amendment, Apr. 18, 1961: Failed passage, 62 to 35 (Republicans: 21 for, 13 against; Democrats: 14 for, 49 against).
Vote on Prouty-Bush amendment, Apr. 18, 1961: Failed passage, 58 to 39 (Republicans: 30 for, 4 against; Democrats: 9 for, 54 against).
Vote on Goldwater amendment, Apr. 19, 1961: Failed passage, 55 to 39 (Republicans: 24 for, 9 against; Democrats: 15 for, 46 against).
Vote on Monroney amendment, Apr. 19, 1961: Failed passage, 56 to 39 (Republicans: 19 for, 13 against; Democrats: 20 for, 43 against).
Vote on Smathers amendment, Apr. 19, 1961: Failed passage, 52 to 45 (Republicans: 24 for, 10 against; Democrats: 21 for, 42 against).
Vote on conference report, May 3, 1961: Passed, 64 to 28 (Republicans: 16 for, 15 against; Democrats: 48 for, 13 against).

[8] Vote on committee amendment, as amended by the Ayres-Kitchin amendment, Mar. 24, 1961: Passed, 216 to 203 (Republicans: 142 for, 26 against; Democrats: 74 for, 177 against).
Vote on Hiestand motion to recommit, Mar. 24, 1961: Failed passage, 196 to 224 (Republicans: 24 for, 145 against; Democrats: 172 for, 79 against).

[9] Voice vote.

[10] Open to amendments.

[11] Vote on Ellender motion, Mar. 29, 1961: Passed, 55 to 34 (Republicans: 20 for, 12 against; Democrats: 35 for, 22 against).

Major legislation during 1st 100 days of Eisenhower administration

Legislation	Senate					House					Final action
	Status	Vote			Other action	Status	Vote			Other action	
		Party	Yea	Nay			Party	Yea	Nay		
*Hawaii, statehood for (H.R. 3575)	Passed Apr. 4, 1953.	Republican	33	9		Passed Mar. 10, 1953.	Republican	177	37		
		Democrat	23	19			Democrat	97	100		
		Independent	1				Independent		1		
		Total	57	28			Total	274	138		
*Taxes, income, individual, reduce (H.R. 1)						Reported Feb. 17, 1953.					
*Tideland oil (Submerged Lands Act (H.R. 4198).	Reported Mar. 27, 1953.					Passed Apr. 1, 1953.	Republican	188	18		
							Democrat	97	89		
							Independent		1		
							Total	285	108		
*Rent controls, temporary extension (S. 1081)	Reported Apr. 10, 1953.										
*Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (Rept. 521) (H.R. 5495).											
Mutual Security Act of 1953 (H.R. 5710)											
Taxes, excess profits, extend (H.R. 5898)											
*Social security coverage extension											

See footnote at end of table.

Major legislation during 1st 100 days of Eisenhower administration—Continued

Legislation	Senate					House					Final action
	Status	Vote			Other action	Status	Vote			Other action	
		Party	Yea	Nay			Party	Yea	Nay		
*Renewal of school construction aid in defense areas (H.R. 6049).											
*Factory inspections by Food and Drug Administration (H.R. 5740).											
*Customs Simplification Act of 1953 (H.R. 5877).											
*Amendments to Immigration Act											
*Amends the Taft-Hartley Act											
Establishment Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.J. Res. 223).	Passed Mar. 18, 1953.					Passed Mar. 18, 1953.					Apr. 1, 1953, Public Law 13.
*Renewal of defense priorities and scarce materials controls (S. 1081).	Reported Apr. 10, 1953.										
*Resolution of nonrecognition of Soviet enslavement of peoples (S. Con. Res. 36).											
*Increase number of Commissioners in District of Columbia.											
*Study for local self-government in District of Columbia.											
*Renew school operation aid in defense areas (H.R. 6078).											
*Renewal of authority under the Reorganization Act.											

*Recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message of Feb. 2, 1953.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have just listened with great interest to what the gentleman has had to say. I take it from what he has said that you are doing so well—you Democrats—that you are going to adjourn the Congress in early July. I certainly would hope so because I am sure a lot of people would like to get the work of the Congress over with and get back home as we are supposed to do under the Reorganization Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the observations of the gentleman are at least theoretically agreed to by all of us, but the observation he has made is not an answer to what I just said about the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he knows from what source came the funds—whether it was from the President's special projects or emergency fund to take care of this boondoggle known as the Peace Corps. At the hearings was there any information brought out on that question? Do you know where they got the money to pursue that boondoggle?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not know, answering the gentleman's question, but I can say that no money came from the funds in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that the Congress appropriated $10,000 for that purpose or at least for a study of it. Of course, it has gone far beyond the $10,000 stage.

Mr. ANDREWS. I am sure it will cost more than that, but the only possible source from which it could have come out of this bill is the President's emergency fund. We had the expenditures itemized as recently as the month of May and there is no money for the Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. These two funds, as I understand it, one is the emergency fund for the President——

Mr. ANDREWS. That is only $1 million.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; that is only $1 million and the special projects fund is $1,500,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. None of that money was used for the Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Money from these funds are spent on the accounting of the President; is that not correct?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Are you able in your hearings then to find out to any appreciable extent what the money is spent for?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, and the gentleman will find in the RECORD a list of items for which the funds were spent from the emergency fund, and there is nothing in connection with the Peace Corps. The same thing is true of the special projects fund.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands that I have been critical of this spending of these funds by the President on his own accounting. I do not think it is right and I was as critical of it under the Eisenhower administration as I am now, and I am going to continue to be critical of such spending.

Mr. ANDREWS. The only money in this bill that is not pinpointed for expenditure is the President's emergency fund and that is only $1 million. But, we do ask for an accounting of the expenditures from that fund and those expenditures are listed in the record. There is nothing in there for the Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALBERT, 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. 7577) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

WHERE DO WE STAND ON NUCLEAR TESTING? AN ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has secured a special order for

Wednesday, June 14, for the purpose of discussing the important issue "Where Do We Stand on Nuclear Testing?"

The gentleman from California invites those Members who are interested in this subject to remain in the Chamber and participate in the consideration of this timely and important matter.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding service has been rendered to this House and to the Nation by our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

I refer to his action in placing in last Thursday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD significant excerpts from the recent Office of Education report entitled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future."

After reading these excerpts, or the report itself, I do not believe anyone can seriously question that the end result and, indeed, the goal of Federal aid to education is a progressive development and expansion of Federal control.

For any who still insist otherwise I can only offer the ancient adage that "there are none so blind as those who will not see."

I shall have further occasion to comment on this Office of Education document in connection with the impending debate on the Federal aid-to-education bill.

At the moment I raise only one point:

What does the official hierarchy of the National Education Association have to say with respect to this report—in the drafting of which it unquestionably had a major role, direct or indirect?

Does the NEA hierarchy still deny that Federal aid to education involves inevitable—and indeed deliberately planned—Federal control?

Is the NEA hierarchy now prepared to acknowledge that its previous denials on this score were honest errors of judgment—or that they were calculated efforts to deceive the American people and the Congress?

Does the NEA hierarchy actually favor the type and scope of Federal policymaking control which the Office of Education report projects and advocates?

Or, is the NEA hierarchy now prepared to repudiate massive Federal aid to education because it obviously will involve this sort of massive Federal control?

I suggest that it is time for this ruthless pressure group to come clean with the Congress, and the American people.

Meanwhile I again pay tribute and express my thanks to the gentleman from California for the immense service he has rendered.

NEW FRONTIERS IN THE KING RANGE AND THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced for reference to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a bill to provide for establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in my district in California.

Some 25,000 acres of Federal public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management are located in the King Range country. The area is located along the Pacific coast south of Cape Mendocino in southwestern Humboldt County and northwestern Mendocino County, about 200 miles north of San Francisco.

The bill—H.R. 6793—provides for management of the natural resources of this area under a program of balanced usage. This is the term used by President Kennedy in his recent natural resources message to the Congress to describe the positive policy under which the Bureau of Land Management is to manage the public lands.

The King Range provides an example of those public lands to which the President referred in the natural resources message when he spoke of:

> A vital national reserve that should be devoted to productive use now and maintained for future generations * * * Much of this public domain suffers from uncontrolled use and a lack of proper management. We can no longer afford to sit by while our public domain assets so deteriorate.

Acting on this conviction, the President has directed the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, first, to accelerate an inventory and evaluation of the Nation's public domain holdings; second, to develop a program of balanced usage designed to reconcile the conflicting uses—grazing, forestry, recreation, wildlife, urban development and minerals—and, third, to accelerate revegetation of range lands and installation of soil-conserving and water-saving works and practices to reduce erosion and improve forage capacity.

H.R. 6793 would help implement this forward-looking policy on this one unit of the national land reserve. Its purpose is to help bring the public lands in the King Range into full production so that they can contribute their share to both the local and national economies. All of the uses named in the bill are important, each in its place, and one is not singled out over another.

I am particularly pleased that this new policy spelled out by the President recognizes outdoor recreation as a use to be considered in BLM land management programs on an equal footing with the traditional uses. This recognition is long overdue in view of the rapidly growing outdoor recreational requirements of the American people. The recreational field is a new one for BLM. It is essential that it be granted the wherewithal if the orderly management of our public lands is to proceed. We must recognize that outdoor recreation as a major land use is growing fast, and should be planned for as part of any comprehensive system of land management.

As Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall said the other day:

> The necessity to meet the outdoor recreation needs of our people * * * will in all likelihood be the sharpest and most consistent pressure on our land, water, and forests in the years ahead.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE KING RANGE

Mr. Speaker, two key features of the King Range country are its inaccessibility and rugged terrain. This area is the westernmost bulge of the California coast. The highways all swing inland to bypass the Pacific coast's most precipitous stretch of shoreline.

This remote and slow-paced country has been called California's "unknown coast" because nowhere else in California does so much roadless, inaccessible coast face the Pacific. Kings Peak, the most prominent feature of the range, rises to more than 4,000 feet only 3 miles from the ocean.

In addition to lack of access, proper management of public lands in this area is complicated by the land ownership pattern. An ownership map looks like a crazy quilt. There are more than a hundred separate parcels of public land checkerboarded and otherwise intermingled among private holdings. Also, small parcels of private lands are isolated within the public holdings—"Little Berlins," the local people call them. This intermingled ownership obviously does not make for efficient management by either the private or public managers. It particularly discourages soil and water conservation investment.

Much of the logged-over forest land, and rangeland also, is badly eroded or covered with brush. Reforestation and revegetation are urgently needed. There are 3,500 acres of nonstocked timberland alone. I see as one of the most necessary features of this bill the encouragement of reforestation on BLM lands.

The King Range also includes scenic and other outdoor recreation resources of a high order. There are spectacular stretches of seashore, including beautiful, remote beaches and coves, magnificent stands of virgin Douglas-fir, as well as sugar pine, spruce, madrone, bay, and redwood. There is abundant wildlife, including deer and salmon and steelhead, and other species of fish and game of interest to sportsmen. It is a tribute to

the imagination of local residents that they realize the developing potential of recreation for the area to augment and supplement other uses.

The unreserved public lands in the area have been withdrawn from most forms of appropriation to private ownership since 1929. That year a temporary withdrawal for classification was made by Presidential order, at the request of the California State Division of Beaches and Parks, because of the recreation potential.

The King Range country also includes a number of fine private sheep ranches. The grazing value assigned to the public lands in the area is an estimated 1,000 AUM's. Leased lands have a rated capacity of about 900 AUM's. There is a great potential to increase grazing capacity. The predominant commercial timber in the area is Douglas-fir. The area's timber resources are estimated to include 240 million board-feet of merchantable size. BLM estimates that total potential yearly production of forest products, based on reasonably full stocking, full use of the presently unstocked timberland and a 100-year rotation, is about 8½ million board-feet a year. There are no known mining claims.

BALANCED USAGE

H.R. 6793 proposes an orderly procedure for reconciling the apparently conflicting requirements of the various classes of users for these various resources—under a program of balanced usage.

"Balanced usage" is defined in section 2 of the bill as:

> Utilization of an area of lands in such a manner as to satisfy all legitimate requirements for the available resources as fully as possible without undue denial of any of such requirements and without undue impairment of any of the resources, taking into consideration total requirements and total availability of resources, irrespective of ownership or location.

The concept recognizes that some uses are more mutually compatible than others, and that quality as well as quantity of use is to be considered. Therefore, it implies a primary or dominant use for any one particular tract or zone. It also implies secondary or subordinate uses to the extent that they are compatible with and do not impair the primary use, according to a seasonal schedule or otherwise. This primary use within a particular use zone is most important but in no way does it derogate the overall importance of each one of them.

Balanced usage also implies that those who administer such a program and determine the use pattern will make these determinations with the object of obtaining the greatest benefits for the most people over the longest period. It implies due consideration of intangible values as well as those values which can be measured by dollar return or production per unit. It implies periodic review and reevaluation of the uses and use zones.

The concept also implies management of renewable resources so as to obtain a sustained regular or periodic supply of products or services without impairment of the productivity, carrying capacity or enjoyment capability of the land. Balanced usage further implies that the total pattern of uses over an area will be integrated and coordinated so as to maintain ecological balance.

The uses to be balanced are all legitimate uses of the available resources, including outdoor recreation, watershed management, forestry, grazing, and other argricultural uses, mining, occupancy and other urban uses, wildlife, mineral production, and access.

As Karl S. Landstrom, the new Director of the Bureau of Land Management, told the Colorado Cattlemen's Association last week:

> There is no question in my mind that when the President said "balanced usage" he meant usage that will be best for all the people, taking into account conservation of resources. I am sure too that he meant a balance of uses from the standpoint of the entire system—not necessarily the presence of every usage on every tract or acre.

This concept, of course, is similar to the concept of multiple use under which the Forest Service has been administering the national forests for many years and which by action of the last Congress is now law. I doubt that the Forest Service today would take exception to the balanced usage concept as defined in H.R. 6793. Unfortunately, as Samuel Trask Dana, dean emeritus of the University of Michigan's School of Natural Resources, has pointed out, "multiple use" is too often looked upon as a panacea and a guarantee of virtue. The phrase has meant many things to many people. To some it has meant "my use, anywhere, at any time."

Dr. Dana and Dr. Myron Krueger, professor emeritus of the University of California's School of Forestry, discuss their views on this subject in their book, "California Lands."

In his book, "The National Forests," Arthur H. Carhart points out that, among laymen, the most widely accepted interpretation of multiple use in the national forests is "the idea of tying together the graduated and coordinated uses in balanced planning and management."

But, Mr. Carhart observes, land managers with specialized training are prone to talk multiple use but to continue to practice their own specialty when it comes down to actual cases. What happens, he says, is that as each specialist makes his plans the total result—

> is not a balanced, correlated use of the land and its various values, but a consecutive layering of specialists' schemes with little regard for any coordination between them. The sylviculturist lays out his full-scale plan, the range-management specialist superimposes his plan, the wildlife officer operates as if the other uses had to bow to wildlife needs, and the recreational designer throws all these aside as he prepares a program to put human uses ahead of all others. * * * It may not always be as thick, layer on many layers. But often it actually is the specialist with the loudest voice or the highest rating on the civil service roster who shouts his particular field into first consideration.

Mr. Carhart also recalls his own "groping" when he was with the Forest Service for a better term than multiple use:

> Such a better term should imply that land would be managed with a real priority for the use to which it was best suited, an orderly sequence in priorities, beginning with the use of most importance.

Multiple use is a fine concept when it is properly used and employed. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. In fact, it has never been precisely defined, even in the multiple-use bill passed last year. This simply cannot be done without a frank recognition of priorities as they relate to particular acreages.

The definition of "balanced usage" proposed in H.R. 6793 is intended to help with a meaningful description to head off abuses that some national forest users have tried to justify by invoking "multiple use." As Dr. Dana and Dr. Krueger say, we know as yet relatively little concerning the potentialities and limitations of planned management of wildlands with due regard to all of the various values involved. The definition of balanced usage proposed in this bill is offered in that spirit. Actually, this concept is nothing new. It is merely the application of generally accepted planning and zoning principles to wildlands. As one who is interested in and who took an active part in the passage of the multiple-use bill last year, I hope a consideration of this bill will be profitable.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Section 3 of the bill provides for the Secretary of the Interior to make a survey and investigation of the King Range area for the purpose of preparing a management program. This would include an analysis of the resources, a comprehensive land-use plan, statement of expected costs to the United States and expected economic effects on local communities and government, together with an evaluation of the proposed program in terms of the public interest.

Section 4 provides for review of the proposed program by the Congress, the Governor of California and the governing boards of the local governments before it could be put into effect.

The bill recognizes that the local people should have full opportunity to play a key role in program formulation. It requires public notice and public hearing to receive local views.

Section 5 is a key section of the bill. It would give the Secretary more authority than he now has to consolidate the public lands in this area in order to facilitate efficient management. To facilitate consolidation, land could be acquired by donation, by purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or by exchange. Land eligible for exchange would be any Federal land under the Secretary's jurisdiction in California or adjacent States. The Secretary could

equalize, with cash, values of lands to be exchanged. Now, BLM has authority to acquire land for consolidation solely by equal exchange of lands, solely within one State. Under the bill, all exchanges would be voluntary. Private land could not be acquired by condemnation.

Section 5 also would authorize and direct construction of basic recreation and access facilities, including hiking and riding trails and roads, which are needed for fire protection and timber access as well as recreation use. Authority to install soil and water conservation works and practices, and reforest and revegetate through cooperative agreement or otherwise is emphasized.

The bill emphasizes use of cooperative agreements—with the State of California, the county and other local governments, or nonprofit organizations—wherever feasible. Such agreements would also be specifically authorized for fish and wildlife management, including control of predators. Hunting and fishing would be under jurisdiction of State law. The State of California Wildlife Conservation Board has already earmarked State funds and stands ready to build a hunting and fishing access road into the King Range area, once a comprehensive plan has determined where the road should go.

Mr. Speaker, an unusual feature of this legislation is the strong consensus of local opinion supporting it.

Although the various classes of potential users—ranchers, lumbermen, hikers, hunters and fishermen, and so on—recognize the inevitable conflicts of interests, they also recognize that they have more interests in common. Almost everyone concerned with the future of this magnificent area realizes the value of an orderly, coordinated approach to its complicated management problems and great opportunities.

Fortunately, the topography suggests natural boundaries between types of uses. The use zones we have established in the bill lend themselves to natural division. For example, on the steep western slope of the range facing the sea there is a minimum of commercial-grade timber. This same area contains highest scenic values, and also grasslands suitable for grazing. The eastern slopes contain the best commercial timberland, much of which should be restocked. Further down is some fine grazing land. Much of the eastern side of the range will support deer and upland game. There is good fishing potential throughout the area, including, of course, the surf and offshore waters.

The bill is designed to accommodate views of the following: The Mattole Action Committee of Humboldt County, Humboldt County Board of Supervisors, Humboldt County Department of Forestry, Greater Eureka, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, California Wildlife Conservation Board, some individual members of the Sierra Club, and many interested and informed residents of the Mattole River Valley—in the shadow of the King Range. These local people have cooperated fully in working out details of the bill.

THE NEW LOOK AT BLM

Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the people of the King Range and of a district with more than 275,000 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, I am heartened at what is going on down at BLM these days. Its leaders are exploring new frontiers in the interests of better management of the 177 million acres of the American earth in 10 Western States entrusted to their stewardship.

In the past BLM has been considered by too many as primarily a land disposal agency, with collateral duties as interim custodian of public lands pending their transfer to others for "permanent" management. In the future, BLM may well be required to transfer millions of acres into private ownership and to State and local governments—10 million acres during the next 50 years, it is estimated. But what about the 167 million acres that is expected to remain in the public domain for the foreseeable future? Today BLM's responsibilities as a permanent land manager are finally receiving realistic recognition. The Bureau has been a sort of stepchild among the Government's great land management agencies for too long. I am looking forward to a Cinderella transformation with high expectations.

In this connection I have noted with interest recent statements and actions by the new leaders of BLM and the Department of Interior. For example: the 18-month moratorium recently ordered by Secretary Udall on most types of nonmineral claims on public lands, proposals to modernize certain antiquated public land laws, an inventory of public lands resources including recreational resources, requests for appropriations to provide basic sanitation and recreational facilities on certain public lands, reduction of costs to State and local governments for purchase or lease of public lands for public recreational use, approval of withdrawals permitting State investments in public access and wildlife habitat improvements on public lands, and reassessment of BLM's long-range program, Project Twenty-Twelve.

The moratorium will permit cleaning up a backlog of some 60,000 such applications. This breathing spell also will permit BLM to develop administrative remedies and propose legislation to prevent buildup of such a backlog again. I understand legislation is being proposed to modernize the public land laws. These statutes were invaluable tools for the settlement and development of the old frontier. But today some have outlived their usefulness; some have been misused by unscrupulous promoters and speculators. Under new legislation designed for the needs of today and tomorrow, it will be possible for private citizens to acquire public domain land in ways consistent with the national interest, and also with the interests of the States and counties and communities in which these lands are located.

As BLM Director Landstrom said recently:

> Programs for the public lands must be adjusted to meet the growing land and resource needs of the Nation. This may require some rethinking. We must at least re-educate ourselves to a fact sometimes lost sight of—that the so-called vacant and unreserved public lands in the Western States are actually withdrawn and reserved from most kinds of entry. They make up a "national reserve," as President Kennedy called it, to be inventoried, evaluated, wisely used, and conserved for future generations.

This rethinking of BLM's policies has already resulted in proposals to broaden the representation on the agency's local, State, and National advisory boards to include representatives of all the major uses. Until now, representation on the advisory boards has consisted predominantly of grazing users, with some representation for wildlife interests.

As Director Landstrom told the Advisory Board Council for Grazing recently—

> The growing importance of outdoor recreation, watershed protection, mineral development, timber sources, and water supply has given rangelands added values. Many people have suggested that broader sources of counsel and advice are needed.

As Secretary Udall told the same audience:

> The public lands in grazing districts no longer have value only for grazing. Now, in many areas of the West—and the number will surely grow in the future—other uses are growing in importance. Modern-day land management programs must take full account of these values.

The moratorium's breathing spell also will permit inventory of the resources and opportunities offered by the public domain—including opportunities for outdoor recreation.

Those areas which offer exceptional opportunities for public recreation should be made available and usable to the people who own them—as they now are on national forest land. It is an anomaly that this year we allowed $18 million for recreational construction, maintenance, and operation on national forest land, but nothing for similar work on BLM land. Some BLM land in my district has higher recreational values than some national forest land. Actually, some BLM lands are already being used for recreational purposes. During 1961 it is estimated that there will be more than 2 million recreational visits to BLM lands in California alone. Lack of minimum sanitation facilities is just one of the problems. The President's budget for fiscal 1962 requests the modest sum of $200,000 to initiate construction of basic recreational and sanitary facilities on certain BLM lands. I earnestly hope that next year the Congress will look upon this request with more favor than it has this year.

It is interesting to note that BLM, like the Forest Service, is a revenue producing agency. BLM is one of the relatively few agencies which produces more in revenues than it spends. Last year,

for example, the revenue to the Treasury from BLM lands was some $370 million. Expenditures totaled about $30 million.

In the book, "Land for the Future," Marion Clawson, the former Director of BLM who is now director of studies in land use and management for resources for the future, estimates probable demand for outdoor recreation land in the year 2000. He estimates that demand for "resource-based" lands—the category in which he places national forests—will increase 40 times within these next 40 years. Increased population, per capita income and mobility together with a shorter workweek are among the forces affecting future requirements for outdoor recreation.

Dr. Clawson emphasizes that meeting requirements for outdoor recreational lands will require action at all levels of government. If the Federal Government is to carry its share of the burden, it appears clear to me that we are going to have to realize the recreation potential of BLM lands, as well as Forest Service, National Park Service, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation and Fish and Wildlife Service lands. Dr. Clawson assumes that private recreation facilities also will expand. He makes the point that while such private facilities are to some degree competitive with public recreation facilities, to a greater extent they are complementary: when State parks are built, for instance, they create more opportunities for private recreation facilities than they displace.

Dr. Clawson also notes that comparatively, the heaviest burden for meeting our future outdoor recreation requirements will fall on the States. In this connection I am interested to learn that Secretary Udall has just announced additional incentives to the States and local governments to obtain BLM lands for recreational purposes. As part of his action to implement an act of the last Congress increasing the acreages of public lands which the States and local governments may obtain for recreation use, the Secretary announced that these lands may now be sold for as little as $2.50 an acre. Previously, the States and local governments have had to pay up to 50 percent of fair market value. As a result, last year less than 2,000 acres were set aside for recreational use under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

BLM's new cooperation with the States in an effort to stimulate expansion of the Nation's public recreation facilities also includes favorable action on State applications to establish national cooperative land and wildlife management areas. In California, for example, approval of such applications will permit the California Department of Fish and Game to invest State funds to improve access roads and trails and fish and wildlife habitat improvement on selected public lands with hunting and fishing opportunities. By its action, BLM has given the State some assurance that these areas will remain in public ownership for some time.

Another high priority effort at BLM these days is a thoroughgoing reassessment of the goals and timetable of "Project Twenty-Twelve," BLM's long-range program which was first announced last year. This 50-year program is now being revised in terms of the new policies and new goals laid out for BLM by the President and the Secretary of the Interior.

Secretary Udall pointed out in a recent speech before the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference that it has now been more than 20 years since the United States has engaged in a massive and sustained national conservation effort.

In his natural resources message the President said:

> We must understand our resources problems, and we must face up to them now. The task is large but it will be done.

I am very hopeful that under such forward-looking leadership we are on the threshold of our most productive years in the balanced conservation and use of the public lands of America for all the requirements of the American people.

THE GLOBAL WAR OF THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution calling for a declaration of war by the United States to meet the total global war being waged by the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy.

The inroads the Communist Party is making in all parts of the world is very distressing to me. It is time that we take advantage of all the resources at our command, and fight this disease with a more stern conviction.

I feel we must meet fire with fire, and the time is now. All true Americans in our great country, irrespective of politics, are opposed to communism.

PREAMBLE OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of the House I have been actively engaged in the study of the Federal Constitution and its amendments more than ever before, because I have currently seen the great need for such study.

The rapidly changing conditions in our Nation and the world at large emphasize the need on the part of lawmakers and administrators of our National and State Governments for a proper understanding and application of the provisions of this great charter of freedom and representative government.

This brings me to say that I recently read with great interest and appreciation the eloquent and realistic interpretation of the Preamble of the Constitution given in poetic form by a former Member of this distinguished body, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, who served here with distinction. Also he is the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission which had supervision of the building of the Panama Canal and he was civil Governor of the Canal Zone during the construction era.

The interpretation given by Governor Thatcher is an outstanding contribution to the general subject of the Constitution and I would commend its reading and study not only by Members of the Congress but as well by State legislators and members of the judiciary, both State and Federal.

The poem follows:

PREAMBLE OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION—ITS TEXT AND IMPLICATIONS—AS MIGHT HAVE BEEN TOLD BY THE AUTHORS

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

Hear ye! Hear ye! O ye men and women,
All, and everywhere, O hearken and heed!
Following the long and cruel war which
We have waged and won, our independence
To gain, we the people of the United
States, in order to form a more perfect
Union; to establish justice in our
Midst; to insure domestic tranquillity;
To provide for the common defense; and
To promote the general welfare; as well
As to secure the blessings of liberty
To ourselves and to our posterity—
Do here and now, and by this most solemn
And sacred action, ordain and establish
This Constitution for the United
States of America; and by this means
A Republic we create, republican
in form, and in spirit democratic;
And we guarantee to each and every
State a like government
Here, and hereby,

We set up for our Federal rule and needs
A carefully devised system of checks
And balances; whereby, and through such
means,
Three great divisions—the legislative,
The executive, and the judicial—
Are formed to guide, protect, and serve the
Nation

And after due approval seals our labors
Let no one in our most beloved land
E'er strive, by trick, device, or stratagem,
Or through connivance, at home or abroad,

To dilute, or undermine, or liquidate
This comprehensive and all-sufficient pact
Of freedom—the first in hist'ry on which
A nation has sought to base and ground itself—
The example for, and wonder of, all
The World; and which, if in its purity
And strength, is safely kept, will light us down
To future years remote; and serve as torch
For all who, in lands of tyranny and
Oppression, toil and hope for their deliv'rance.
Yea, if our own shall always be steadfast
And true, and o'er-fearless in their sanctions,
We shall, indeed, endure unto the end;
But if, by folly or acts treasonable,
This instrument is destroyed, government
Of the people, by the people, and for
The people, shall perish from the earth.

JOHN JANNEY: MISSED PRESIDENCY BY ONE VOTE

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, in remarks to the House on March 30, 1961, under the title, "Our First Grave Constitutional Crisis—1861," I quoted three moving addresses before the 1861 General Convention of the Commonwealth of Virginia by its President, John Janney (1798–1872), of Leesburg, Va.

In describing this important Virginia leader, I mentioned the fact that he had missed becoming President of the United States by only one vote.

As a result, I have received a number of inquiries from various parts of the country as to the circumstances of the vote.

The answer to the question can be found in a brief biographical sketch of Janney in the Official Program and Historical Booklet of the Loudon County, Va., Bicentennial, August 19–24, 1957, for which I am indebted to Hon. Lucas D. Phillips of Leesburg, distinguished member of the Virginia House of Delegates.

The indicated biographical sketch follows:

LOUDOUN COUNTY, VA., BICENTENNIAL, AUGUST 19–24, 1957

OFFICIAL PROGRAM AND HISTORICAL BOOKLET

John Janney

John Janney was born in Hillsboro, Loudoun County, Va., and died in Leesburg, January 5, 1872. He was an able and successful lawyer and for many years was one of the outstanding Whig leaders of the State. At the Whig convention held in Harrisburg, Pa., the Virginia delegation was much displeased because Henry Clay was defeated for the presidential nomination.

In order to appease them the leaders of the convention told them to name anyone they wished for Vice President and the convention would ratify their choice. In the caucus of the delegation the names of John Tyler of Williamsburg and John Janney of Leesburg were presented. Janney voted for his opponent, Tyler, and lost by one vote.

The choice of the Virginia delegation was ratified by the convention and Tyler was nominated. The ticket of Harrison and Tyler was elected and in 3 weeks after the inauguration Harrison died, thus making Tyler President.

In later years Janney was chosen as one of the two Loudoun delegates to the Secession Convention. Though a union man he was chosen president of the convention and in his official capacity he notified General Lee in a most beautiful and eloquent speech of his selection as commander of the armed forces of Virginia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), for today, June 13, 1961, on account of official business.

Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of illness in the immediate family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WEAVER to include a chart in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MCCORMACK to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein extraneous matter and tables; also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAHILL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. BARRETT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. CELLER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 48. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 49. An act to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 82. An act for the relief of Naoko Ishiwatari White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 85. An act for the relief of Mario Rosario Barrena-Villachica, Maria Dolores Villar Salinas, Angela Casanova Cabello, Carmen Guenaga Anchustegui, and Flora Casals Pons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 172. An act for the relief of Chew Chi Yan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 242. An act for the relief of Mary Dawn Polson (Emmy Lou Kim) and Joseph King Polson (Sung Sang Moon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 263. An act for the relief of Guisseppe Glorioso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 266. An act for the relief of Georgios Laskaris Tgotgolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 316. An act for the relief of Min-sun Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 373. An act for the relief of Myung Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 435. An act for the relief of Knud Erik Didriksen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 592. An act for the relief of Nishan Der Simonian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 606. An act to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 650. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 674. An act for the relief of Roman Dackow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 700. An act for the relief of Fung Wan (Mrs. Jung Gum Goon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 722. An act for the relief of Aideh Kobler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 805. An act for the relief of Yu Liao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 817. An act for the relief of Octavio Jiminez Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 825. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Yeannakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 848. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 866. An act for the relief of Jose Erasmo Reina (Lajara); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 942. An act for the relief of Dr. Perkins P. K. Chang (Chang Peng-Keng); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 944. An act for the relief of Mr. Najm Boulos Rihani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1040. An act to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1373. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Lanza Lascuola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1440. An act to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), relating to the establishment of a register in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle operators' licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1668. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of

the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1931. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1293. An act for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba;

H.R. 1360. An act for the relief of Anna B. Prokop;

H.R. 1467. An act for the relief of Modesta Pitarch-Martin Dauphinais;

H.R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mary A. Combs;

H.R. 1523. An act for the relief of Kazimiera Marek;

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda;

H.R. 1578. An act for the relief of Mah Quock;

H.R. 1621. An act for the relief of Miss Kristina Voydanoff;

H.R. 1622. An act for the relief of Dr. George Berberian;

H.R. 1871. An act for the relief of Min Ja Lee;

H.R. 1873. An act for the relief of Anna Stanislawa Ziolo;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Sotiropoulos;

H.R. 2101. An act for the relief of Evelina Scarpa;

H.R. 2107. An act for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno;

H.R. 2116. A act for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera;

H.R. 2141. An act for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun;

H.R. 2158. A act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 3489. An act for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec;

H.R. 3846. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired.

H.R. 3850. An act for the relief of Clark L. Simpson;

H.R. 4217. An act for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang;

H.R. 4219. A act for the relief of the estate of William M. Farmer;

H.R. 4282. An act for the relief of Casimir Lazarz;

H.R. 4713. An act for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; and

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 847. An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., and for other purposes;

S. 1852. An act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution designating the week of May 13–19, 1962, as Police Week and designating May 14, 1962, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 14, 1961, 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:

1015. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of an accrued portion of incentive pay to certain aeronautically rated or designated officers who have been eligible to such pay for a minimum of at least 10 years and who subsequently are removed from the status to such eligibility due to the fact that a determination has been made that the requirement for them in this capacity is no longer necessary in the interest of national security"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1016. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of regulations, policies, and practices relating to certain Federal grants made to school districts to assist them in financing the cost of the construction of needed minimum school facilities in federally affected areas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1017. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to approve the revised June 1957 reclassification of land of the Fort Shaw division of the Sun River project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with Fort Shaw Irrigation District"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1018. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior in the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C., 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1019. A letter from the Chief Deputy Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to the case of *Walter H. Duisberg* v. *The United States*, congressional No. 4–59, pursuant to House Resolution 128, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1020. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Department of the Interior covering grants made during calendar year 1960 to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, pursuant to Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1021. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1022. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent program of additional unemployment compensation, to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage of the unemployment compensation program, to establish Federal requirements with respect to the weekly benefit amount and limit the tax credits available to employers in a State which does not meet such requirements, to establish a Federal requirement prohibiting States from denying compensation to workers undergoing occupational training or retraining and deny tax credits to employers in a State which does not meet such requirement, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, to establish a Federal additional compensation and equalization account in the unemployment trust fund, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 291. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; without amendment (Rept. No. 512). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 339. Resolution relative to the investigation of the November 8, 1960, election in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, and declaring that J. EDWARD ROUSH was duly elected to the 87th Congress; without amendment (Rept. 513). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 340. Resolution providing for the payment of certain amounts in connection with the investigation authorized by House Resolution 1, 87th Congress, with respect to the entitlement of certain individuals to a seat in the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 514). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1935. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 75. A bill to amend section 2103 of title 28, United States Code, relating to appeals improvidently taken; with amendment (Rept. No. 516). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1073. An act for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis; without amendment (Rept. No. 517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Aloysius van de Velde; without amendment (Rept. No. 518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1581. A bill for the relief of Maria Falato Colacicco; with amendment (Rept. No. 519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1583. A bill for relief of Mrs. Chung-Huang Tang Kao; with amendment (Rept. No. 520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1630. A bill for the relief of Carma Pereira de Bustillos; without amendment (Rept. No. 521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3148. A bill for the relief of Maddalena Haas; with amendment (Rept. No. 522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3393. A bill for the relief of Istvan Zsoldos; with amendment (Rept. No. 523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Abrams Abramowitz; with amendment (Rept. No. 524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4553. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba; without amendment (Rept. No. 525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6996. A bill for the relief of Harry Weinstein; with amendment (Rept. No. 526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7622. A bill to amend section 1176 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia to permit certain gift enterprises in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 7623. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide that marketing agencies acting in good faith shall not be liable for selling livestock mortgaged under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act until the Secretary has exhausted his civil remedies against the mortgagor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 7624. A bill to amend section II of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington as amended by 47 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 172, p. 150); 52 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 700, p. 1198); 62 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 183, p. 170), and 66 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 480, p. 283); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 7625. A bill to provide that civilian officers and employees of the United States shall not be required to occupy Government quarters unless the head of the agency concerned makes certain determinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 7626. A bill to provide for the sale of Camp Breckinridge, Ky.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7627. A bill to amend the act of August 25, 1958, to extend that act for an additional 4-year period; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 7628. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 7629. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals, birds, and reptiles which are intended for exhibition in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7630. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayers and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 7631. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to establish an improved system of longevity steps for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 7632. A bill to amend section II of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington as amended by 47 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 172, p. 150); 52 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 700, p. 1198); 62 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 183, p. 170); and 66 U.S. Statutes at Large (ch. 480, p. 283); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 7633. A bill to eliminate absence requirements respecting certain tourists entering the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 7634. A bill to authorize the construction of the Goat Island and Carters Island Dams on the Savannah River, Ga. and S.C., for flood control, power, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 450. Joint resolution expressing a declaration of war by the United States to meet the total global war being waged by the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H. Con. Res. 334. Concurrent resolution to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, and to hold ceremonies on such occasion; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 335. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino of Arizona, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in Statuary Hall; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 336. Concurrent resolution to provide for printing of proceedings in connection with the unveiling of the Father Eusebio Francisco Kino of Arizona statue; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 337. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 6 transmitted to Congress by the President on June 12, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 338. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7 transmitted to Congress by the President on June 12, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 341. Resolution authorizing the employment of two additional mail clerks, Office of the Postmaster of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 342. Resolution providing for an additional clerk in the House stationery room, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 343. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. ST. GERMAIN presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island memorializing the Congress to enact legislation for Federal aid to education, which was referred 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. ANFUSO:

H.R. 7635. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Felicisima B. Dumlao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7636. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maria C. Zografidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7637. A bill for the relief of Theodora Newbold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 7638. A bill for the relief of Kim Hyung In Comstock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7639. A bill for the relief of Elzbieta Irena Stahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

180. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Whitney R. Harris, American Bar Association, Dallas, Tex., relative to reorganization plans recently submitted by the President to the Congress in respect to the reorganization of Federal agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1960 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $56. E. (9) $286.14.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,793.58.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $12,105.83. E. (9) $12,105.83.

A. American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge No. 12, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $14,869. E. (9) $14,219.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,184.66. E. (9) $4,184.66.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $103. E. (9) $8,817.98.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $6,759.04.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $565.16.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 111 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $328.79.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,130. E. (9) $3,303.10.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,267.83.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,611.43.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,055.91. E. (9) $4,055.91.

A. Frederic A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif., and 1201 19th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Federated Indians of California.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers and Rhoades, 1600 Three Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.
E. (9) $907.17.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 2133 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Company of North America and Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $680.41.

A. Roy Battles, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Jacob I. Bellow, 4338 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,501.37.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,804.70.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $120.

A. J. Wiley Powers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $175.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $250.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,408.24. E. (9) $1,624.53.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600.

A. Bryant, Campbell, McCormick & Danielson, 668 South Bonnie Brae Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $900.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 24 Beekman Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $183.42. E. (9) $167.86.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $156. E. (9) $156.

A. Maurice G. Burnside, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,575. E. (9) $36.87.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Greg-Gary Corp., 7 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
D. (6) $4,365. E. (9) $6,928.71.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Rapaport & Son, Inc., Central Street, P.O. Box 169, Windsor, Conn.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Washington I. Cleveland, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul G. Collins, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $120.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 18 East 86th Street, N. York, N.Y.
D. (6) $130. E. (9) $230.66.

A. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,419.13. E. (9) $1,419.13.

A. Committee for Effective Use of the International Court by Repealing the Self-Judging Reservation, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,500. (9) $1,100.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $398.95.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,211.50. E. (9) $72.50.

A. Division of Federal Relations of the National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7,803.91.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $569.52. E. (9) $10.40.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $181.49.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,620. E. (9) $18.72.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., New York, N.Y., etc.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $782.35.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $571.56. E. (9) $531.48.

A. William H. Hedlund, 909 American Bank Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif., etc.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 606 Commerce Building, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,220. E. (9) $50.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,050.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., Mills Building, Washington, D.C.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,150.76.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,843.75. E. (9) $283.45.

A. Charles E. Kief, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati Ohio.
D. (6) $1,408.24.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $57.50. E. (9) $1.19.

A. James F. King, 411 Universal Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General counsel for Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association; Washington counsel for Aluminum Extruders Council and Northwestern Lumbermen's Association.
E. (9) $660.83.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,630. E. (9) $248.94.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Office Employees, Jasper, Fla.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $94.04.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $153.12. E. (9) $5.51.

A. A. E. Lyon, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. James L. McCaskill.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $5.92.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,024.05. E. (9) $345.55.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,477.50. E. (9) $31.53.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $115. E. (9) $1.34.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,780. E. (9) $680.03.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $569.52. E. (9) $6.75.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $20.61.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,205. E. (9) $192.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Joint Minimum Wage Committee, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $50.49.

A. Arthur S. Miller Jr., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $101.55.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Edward F. Pipe, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $136.37.

A. M. L. Minzer, Jr., 2631 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commodity Exchange, Inc., 81 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,665.70. E. (9) $278.58.

A. Mollers Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd., Union House, Post Office Box 643, Hong Kong, etc.

A. Bernard Moss, 2500 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Supplemental Air Carrier Conference, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $16.75.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $774.63.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 608 RCA Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $323. E. (9) $576.51.

A. National Association of Agricultural Stabilization & Conservation County Office Employees.
D. (6) $9,966. E. (9) $1,795.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,170.58. E. (9) $16,944.28.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67,637.50. E. (9) $10,704.62.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, 512 Victor Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,463.56. E. (9) $1,851.93.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7,354.47.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $455.90.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $3,500.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
E. (9) $47.

A. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $49,567.20. E. (9) $2,558.20.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,100.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $845.23.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,663.02. E. (9) $735.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,653.38. E. (9) $8,469.11.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $5,408.29.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,156.71. E. (9) $3,824.76.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $425.90. E. (9) $1,370.83.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine War Damage Claimants Association, Escolta Building, Manila, Philippines.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $79.20.

A. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street N.W., Washington D.C.
D. (6) $2,813.44. E. (9) $1,809.40.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association.
D. (6) $18,000.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, RCA Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $833.32.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, RCA Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $827.

A. Charles E. Potter, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $1,325.35.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., etc.
D. (6) $12,250.01. E. (9) $6,032.05.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $86.70.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James P. Richards, 1536 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1017 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Mobil Oil Co., Los Angeles; etc.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $213.75. E. (9) $9.88.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4.07.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $17.51.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources Conservation.
D. (6) $972.60. E. (9) $1,556.86.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,144.15. E. (9) $496.29.

A. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $9,461.68.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,370.86. E. (9) $6,753.75.

A. Charles L. Stewart, Jr., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,530. E. (9) $314.64.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
E. (9) $125.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $268.45.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $201.40.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $83.47.

A. Julia C. Thompson, Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,055.18.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.94.

A. Hon. Edward J. Thye, Northfield, Minn.
B. Spring-Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,375. E. (9) $119.57.

A. William H. Tolbert, Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.
B. Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 191, Santa Paula, Calif.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of U.S.A. 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,408.63.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. Jerry Voorhis.
B. Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $1.06.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6,748.50.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,223.11. E. (9) $3,223.11.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,538.45. E. (9) $1,295.20.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,598.55. E. (9) $73.05.

A. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.
E. (9) $1.08.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1961:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATIONS OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D5" (received for services) and "D12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D13" and "D14," since the amount has already been reported under "D5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. V. J. Adduci, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington D.C.

D. (6) $3,684. E. (9) $658.96.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,784.94. E. (9) $4,784.94.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington D.C.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,747.85.

A. George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1017 Barr Building, Washington D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $20.85. E. (9) $32.35.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

B. Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $6,711.86.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $8,482.17. E. (9) $8,482.17.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $26,470. E. (9) $26,470.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $35,846.51.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $15,498.79. E. (9) $15,498.79.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,185.40. E. (9) $4,693.72.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.

D. (6) $50. E. (9) $50.

A. American Legion National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $66,954.24. E. (9) $26,284.28.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $13,197.92.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $66,993.10. E. (9) $5,932.14.

A. American Optometric Association, 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,269.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $551.62. E. (9) $551.62.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,702.37. E. (9) $2,656.42.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $65,301. E. (9) $11,365.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $75,901.85. E. (9) $6,056.78.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,273.26. E. (9) $4,273.26.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $30,094.29. E. (9) $14,864.43.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 275 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass.

D. (6) $130.27.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $666.80.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,209.50.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Richard H. Appert, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Alpha Portland Cement Co. and Weller Electric Corp., Easton, Pa.

E. (9) $47.28.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $546.50.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Class I railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

D. (6) $31. E. (9) $475.77.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. United States Trust Co., of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,073.14.

A. Lester Asher, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Conference of labor organizations.

D. (6) $500.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,384.39. E. (9) $5,384.39.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,389.90. E. (9) $2,389.90.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Association of Stock Exchange Firms, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,266.23. E. (9) $4,266.23.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $1,000.

A. Richard W. Averill, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $168.10.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Aeronautical Services Association, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $46.25.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $671.78.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,587.84. E. (9) $178.06.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $195.51.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $760. E. (9) $239.16.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roy Battles, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. John V. Beamer, 625 Valley Brook Lane, Wabash, Ind.
B. Fine Hardwoods Association, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $167.73.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $7.17.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $72.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Charles A. Betts, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Company, 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,290. E. (9) $338.81.

A. Hudson Biery, 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, etc.
E. (9) $21.99.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mollers Suidah Shipbreakers, Ltd., etc.
E. (9) $142.67.

A. Henry J. Bison, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $830.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $605. E. (9) $228.11.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corporation, Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Richard W. Blake, 1113 10th Avenue, Greeley, Colo.
B. National Beet Growers Federation, 1113 10th Avenue, Greeley, Colo.
E. (9) $750.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Special Justice.
E. (9) $120.

A. W. C. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Company, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $13.25.

A. Fred F. Bockman, 704 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Company, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $458.08.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boran, Seminole, Okla.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $230.12. E. (9) $100.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corporation, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Company, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $307.61.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $850.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth & Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth & Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George Brady, 45 Monadnock Road, Newton, Mass.
B. Superior Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $453.71.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $430.20.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Company, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,249.96. E. (9) $209.25.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corporation, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,150.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $854.81.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,015.27. E. (9) $3,015.27.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $14.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Company, Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $333.33. E. (9) $20.18.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $753.95.

A. Bryant, Campbell, McCormick & Danielson, 668 South Bonnie Brae Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $644.40.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,550. E. (9) $12.82.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $224.82.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $323.16.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $75.80.

A. Maurice G. Burnside, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,575. E. (9) $42.86.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.
E. (9) $213.15.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $754. E. (9) $562.16.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,875.06.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $47.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $85.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 411 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Avon Products, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $378.71.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $120.

A. John T. Carlton and M. H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $204.88.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hope Natural Gas Company, 445 West Main Street, Clarksburg, W. Va.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $430.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $826.26.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
E. (9) $1.10.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800. (9) $342.75.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Greg-Gary Corporation, 7 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Minera de Mexico, Gante 15, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Nacional De La Industria Pesquera, Manuel Maria Contreras No. 133, Mexico 5, D. F. Mexico.
D. (6) $3,727.83.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S. A. De C. V., Balderas No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. West Marin (Calif.) Property Owners Association, 960 Fifth Avenue, San Rafael, Calif.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $3,850. E. (9) $1,975.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,402.55. E. (9) $4,161.84.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. B. Rapaport and Son, Inc., Central Street, Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $243.58.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $174.79.

A. Washington I. Cleveland, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Junius E. Cobean, Sr., 109 East Windsor Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.
D. (6) $325.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $337.36.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $58.70.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $290.26.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $147.91.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 18 East 60th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $685. E. (9) $420.40.

A. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $946.19. E. (9) $946.19.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $1,366.72.

A. Committee To Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, Post Office Box 74, Old Bridge, N.J.
D. (6) $12. E. (9) $22.77.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $9.20.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1631 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturers' Association of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P.R.
D. (6) $1,916. E. (9) $16.63.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Company, 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6.68.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cuban-American Sugar Company, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $35.25.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,600.65. E. (9) $25.54.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,315. E. (9) $684.05.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $525.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $720.83. E. (9) $25.75.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $19,244.84. E. (9) $321.60.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,600.65. E. (9) $25.54.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
E. (9) $136.01.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 831 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,740.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $359.78.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $392.49.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank L. Dennis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $129.75.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,102.50.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $182.56.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,701.30. E. (9) $76.30.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,873.58. E. (9) $18,242.55.

A. Division of Federal Relations of the National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $18,562.40.

A. Mitchell A. Dodge, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $281.45.

A. Anthony P. Donadio, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $441. E. (9) $1.25.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $200.33.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. California Shipping Co., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $648.94.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $137.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $592.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employes of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,739.99. E. (9) $60.

A. Fred H. Dressler, Box 188, Gardnerville, Nev.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $284.10.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11–134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $12.25.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $6.70.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.39.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $516.25. E. (9) $50.15.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,092.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $68.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.50.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $306.11.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water & Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Palo Verde Irrigation District, Blythe, Calif.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $14.64.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,130.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $10.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $3,850. E. (9) $1,458.71.

A. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $95,128.15. E. (9) $24,179.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., etc.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., 700 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. John B. Fisher, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, Bangor, Maine.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,112.50. E. (9) $15.74.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $643.95.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $2,134.04.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,362.82.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,574.82.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $89.65.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. W. E. Fravel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $17.65.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24,007.58. E. (9) $8,747.47.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $7.20.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $680.88.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $26.09.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $0.60.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,012.50. E. (9) $126.17.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,429.31. E. (9) $6,342.73.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $78.95.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $13,879.50. E. (9) $9,996.51.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $56.57.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80.62. E. (9) $6.38.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerome Grignon, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $9,590. E. (9) $3.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $17.50.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., New York, N.Y., etc.
D. (6) $6,908. E. (9) $1,841.43.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.04. E. (9) $310.25.

A. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $139.64.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,088.05.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89.50. E. (9) $3.60.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Haley, Wellenberg & Bader, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $107.01.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,249.96. E. (9) $209.25.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,304.17. E. (9) $50.96.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,306.67.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $149.50. E. (9) $97.09.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $571.56. E. (9) $822.36.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $129.40.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $578.86.

A. Patrick E. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $82.70.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru, S.A.
D. (6) $13,400. E. (9) $461.32.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Cooperative Advertising, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $946.19. E. (9) $14.06.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, 400 United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $268.01.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $580.01.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Association, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,751.11. E. (9) $1,626.11.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $230.40. E. (9) $230.40.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $37.30.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $13.68.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers' Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers' Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $76.52.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240.63.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. J. D. Hittle, 200 Maryland Avenue N.E., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $78.23.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $287.50.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14.25.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Fuller Holloway, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $25.54.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $910. E. (9) $10.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $268.70.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $437.56.

A. Illinois State Conference of Building Trades Unions, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $3,988.34.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America.
D. (6) $1,212.50. E. (9) $20.20.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,734. E. (9) $12,734.

A. J. Stuart Innerst, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,661.54. E. (9) $14.52.

A. Institute of Industrial Launderers, 1833 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,860.15.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,460.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1.75.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Associates, Inc., First National Bank Building, St. Paul Minn.
D. (6) $1,070. E. (9) $542.45.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $73.07.

A. Japanese-American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $150.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 1066 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participations Industriales et Commerciales, S.A., Peter Merianstr. 19, Basel, Switzerland.
E. (9) $317.78.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., etc.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,229.95. E. (9) $111.85.

A. W. D. Johnson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, ORC & B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Ned Johnston, 4539 Everett, Kensington, Md.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1017 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $34.35.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $353.86.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $721.37.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Company, 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Oil Company, Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $251.95.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $64.60.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Company, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,035.81. E. (9) $1,979.81.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $4,062.50. E. (9) $223.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,608.74. E. (9) $1,919.61.

A. Charles E. Kief, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.75.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $246.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $206.25. E. (9) $1.84.

A. James F. King, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $675.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $510. E. (9) $60.73.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,854.85.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,450. E. (9) $5,539.31.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James K. Langan, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,126.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $900.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $551.25. E. (9) $13.65.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $650.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $75.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $547. E. (9) $19.80.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24.38. E. (9) $37.38.

A. Ivy Lee & T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,666.66. E. (9) $3,732.44.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $834.40.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $57.33.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,861.24. E. (9) $4,861.24.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $9.20.

A. Lawrence J. Linck, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Vanderbilt Hotel, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,682. E. (9) $9,491.85.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $48.33.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $382.50. E. (9) $10.61.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders' Association, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines.

A. Leonard Lopez, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,449.90. E. (9) $15.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $98.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corporation, 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,496.08.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $168. E. (9) $11.04.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,245.83. E. (9) $46.35.

A. James L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $75.22.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,478.62. E. (9) $252.40.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $781.26.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $100.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $44.18. E. (9) $607.23.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $28.45.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,287. E. (9) $27.81.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,999.96. E. (9) $706.90.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $2.38.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $19.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Willi Zietz, Savoy Hotel Hilton, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,737. E. (9) $643.52.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Confectioners Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Suzanne MacLean, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jerome J. Madigan, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Arch L. Madsen, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20.58.

A. Don Mahon, Post Office Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $865.14.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,635. E. (9) $733.83.

A. Ben J. Man, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,612.48. E. (9) $421.90.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $223.95.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.51.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,028.91. E. (9) $131.74.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $419.84.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $1,476.67.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,326.90. E. (9) $41.35.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $104.65.

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $215.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $50.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,315. E. (9) $682.80.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $270.31.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $877.60. E. (9) $845.45.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $236.25. E. (9) $74.13.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard W. Mays, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $17.50.

A. Lester H. Means, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Company, Major Appliance Division, Appliance Park, Louisville, Ky.
D. (6) $72. E. (9) $6.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,130.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ferro Corp., Glostex Chemicals, Inc., O. Hommel Co., and Pemco Corp.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,315.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $69.15.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,512.34.

A. C. R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $939. E. (9) $1,417.96.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $354.18.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $116.16.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $8.30.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $5.90.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $2.54.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $1,279.57.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,562.50. E. (9) $1,126.88.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $600.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Vanderbilt Hotel, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $9,501.86.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $27.50.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $58,786.64. E. (9) $10,280.86.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $7,960.19.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $85.35.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $615.90. E. (9) $615.90.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $104,595.42. E. (9) $1,575.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $3,551.05. E. (9) $257.98.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,877.23. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,161.65. E. (9) $8,161.65.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $259,299.09. E. (9) $8,845.61.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size & Weight Limitations, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantee, 1 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $16,350. E. (9) $14,559.21.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $5,512.90. E. (9) $5,512.90.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,312.75. E. (9) $5,413.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $168.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,241.67. E. (9) $977.70.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,472.55. E. (9) $2,472.55.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,939.20. E. (9) $1,733.80.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $222,100.66. E. (9) $15,086.30.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,080. E. (9) $1,080.

A. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,600.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,802.10. E. (9) $1,951.96.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Member associations of the league.
D. (6) $298,140.05. E. (9) $1,613.91.

A. National Legislative Committee, 114 Huron Drive, Washington, D.C.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,205. E. (9) $3,025.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,306.67.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,261.47. E. (9) $3,168.61.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,093.44. E. (9) $5,093.44.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $715.42.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,251.13. E. (9) $7,251.13.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,960.17. E. (9) $10,960.17.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,481.37. E. (9) $9,520.67.

A. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8.18.

A. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $31,167. E. (9) $14,935.14.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $502.39.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $204,168.29. E. (9) $3,221.60.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,409.12. E. (9) $4,409.12.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $2,525.58. E. (9) $2,479.01.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $5,656. E. (9) $5,482.81.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,690.70. E. (9) $16,817.43.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16.71.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,184.18. E. (9) $2,934.78.

A. Charles M. Noone, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $718.75. E. (9) $175.63.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E (9) $43.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $27,179.12.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 845 Northwest Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.16. E. (9) $4.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $38.85.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $4,953.79.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $182.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md., and 1131 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $923.10. E. (9) $62.23.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,692.04.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $200.38.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87.49.

A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. James D. Parriott, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $41.25.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,587.57.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $199.54.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $47.57.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $147.97.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
B. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $4,700. E. (9) $395.91.

A. Robert Pennington, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $226. E. (9) $2.20.

A. Sanford Z. Persons, 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $794.59. E. (9) $16.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Co., Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,810. E. (9) $377.54.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.
E. (9) $10.20.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $76.25.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $2,492.15.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $5,120.02.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $128,711.61. E. (9) $1,100.

A. Milton M. Plumb, Railway Labor Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, Railway Labor Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond E. Plummer, 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $827.94.

A. James K. Polk, Esq., 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $18.75.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines.

A. Frank M. Porter, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, R.F.D. W-2, Box 173, Herndon, Va.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $500.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $3.45.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Christman Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $86.16.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.
E. (9) $1.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $72.63.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., etc.
D. (6) $8,249.97. E. (9) $5,505.08.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $108.42.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1017 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $167. E. (9) $158.72.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $67.39.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Stanley Rector, 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creamery Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $3,586.88.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.
D. (6) $42.50. E. (9) $248.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $273.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $89.25.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $850.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $118,266.64.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,248.84. E. (9) $6,321.46.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $597.36.

A. William E. Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.
D. (6) $47.80. E. (9) $158.17.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 831 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
D. (6) $1,440. E. (9) $102.65.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $137.76.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,315. E. (9) $439.20.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $380.92.

A. Barbara Roads, 470 Palos Verdes Boulevard, Redondo Beach, Calif.
B. Air Line Stewards & Stewardesses Association, 316 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $154.61.

A. Samuel Roe, Jr., Box 1065, Balboa, C.Z.
B. Central Labor Union, Metal Trades Council, Balboa, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $343.75.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,100.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $692.30. E. (9) $179.15.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $533.20.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $113.96.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 810 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Arthur E. Scribner, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Seafarers' Section, MTD, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,375. E. (9) $14,614.82.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $19.50.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Federal Relations of the NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $222. E. (9) $1.82.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $110.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $43.45.

A. P. L. Shackelford, 4545 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $151.31.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $484.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $958.43. E. (9) $192.50.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $560.

A. Richard C. Shipman.
B. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.16. E. (9) $39.54.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $700.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,468.50. E. (9) $971.48.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1000 Bender Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1000 Bender Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houstor, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $260.

A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $55.40.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $13.50.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. John A. Smith, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Airlines, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $758.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $769. E. (9) $419.84.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $101.25.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gypsum Association, 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $98.16.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,280.78.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $548. E. (9) $1,315.05.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $585.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $46,398.97. E. (9) $8,714.78.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $514.18.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. John M. Sprague, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $19.35.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $3,784.99.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234 Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Luther C. Steward, Jr., 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,457.60. E. (9) $32.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,885.16. E. (9) $4,829.37.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $160.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,406.25.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $280.10.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference.
D. (6) $1,153.85.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Sugar Beet Growers Association, Hereford, Tex.
D. (6) $2,880. E. (9) $234.02.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Surplus Property Importers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Reservation, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ben Blumenthal, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,849.60. E. (9) $1,794.57.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $219.88.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $140.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. South Puerto Rico Sugar Co., 28 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $33.39.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $33.58.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $966.66. E. (9) $32.58.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,870.78. E. (9) $71.03.

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $20.13.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $179.10.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Southern Pacific Co., Western Pacific Railroad Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.29.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $427.75.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,061.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,418.75. E. (9) $217.30.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Dwight D. Townsen, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of U.S.A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $121.80.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,729.17. E. (9) $50.20.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,562.50. E. (9) $49.95.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. Richfield Oil Co., 555 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., etc.
D. (6) $800.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Ernest Allen Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $122.13.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C.Z.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $71.51.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $90.78.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $1,237.24.

A. United American Veterans Commentator, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,102.92.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $360.

A. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $24,293.98.

A. U.S. Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 820 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $925. E. (9) $872.91.

A. William R. Veal, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $110.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,000.

A. Carl M. Walker, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.00. E. (9) $31.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $40.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $448.12. E. (9) $42.42.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,803.12. E. (9) $3,017.86.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $396.83

A. J. R. Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C.C.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $157.53.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $37.79.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $24.10.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $794.37.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $498.85.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $601.08.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,830.53.

A. Horace P. White, Post Office Box 5241, Baltimore, Md.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 941 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $234. E. (9) $356.65.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Oliver F. White, 418 Third Street, Stambaugh, Mich.
E. (9) $3.92.

A. Richard P. White, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $139.03.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott C. Whitney, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $13.70.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $200.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Anaconda Co., Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $420.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $69.52.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $107.98.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $13.93.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Indians of California, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $2.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 5053 North Mount View, San Bernardino, Calif.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harding deC. Williams, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $9.50.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $48.95.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $284.95.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,019.23. E. (9) $794.56.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 714 Associations Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $2,930.33.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,446.15.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $637.24.

A. W. F. Wimberly, Post Office Box 4147, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Pure Oil Co., 200 East Golf Road, Palatine, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. C. Woodward, 940 NE. 79th Street, Miami, Fla.
E. (9) $1.08.

A. Edward W. Wootten, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. J. Banks Young, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,927.67.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1961:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Descripition, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1017 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard H. Appert, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Alpha Portland Cement Co. and Weller Electric Corp., Easton, Pa.

A. Armored Carrier Corp., 222–17 Northern Boulevard, Bayside, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, 1600 Three Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. E. I. duPont deNemours & Co.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Chamber of Commerce for Trade With Italy, Inc., 105 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Importers of Brass & Copper Mill Products, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Imported Nut Section of the Association of Food Distributors, Inc., 100 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Madden Corp., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Machinery Group of the National Council of American Importers, Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Olive Oil Association of America, Inc., 51 Chambers Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William J. Barnhard, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles A. Betts, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 704 Tile & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. George S. Brady, 45 Monadnock Road, Newton, Mass.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Oscar H. Brinkman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Apartment Owners Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne L. Bromley, 501 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 501 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Bryant, Campbell, McCormick & Danielson, 668 South Bonnie Brae Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Harold Burke, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washintgon, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Minera de Mexico, Gante 15, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Minera de Mexico, Gante 15, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Nacional De La Industria Pesquera, Manuel Maria Contreras No. 133, Mexico 5, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacionale de Productores de Azucar, S.A. De C. V., Balderas No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. West Marin (Calif.) Property Owners Association, 960 Fifth Avenue, San Rafael, Calif.

A. Howard Chase Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, 1 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Junius E. Cobean, Sr., 109 East Windsor Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees.

A. Conference of Americans of Central & Eastern European Descent, 233 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Patrick J. Connolly, 14th & K Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen Association, 265 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cuban-American Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Abraham A. Dash, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Degnan, 16 East 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. All America Rose Selections, Inc., 16 East 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank L. Dennis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Mitchell A. Dodge, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Anthony P. Donadio, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washintgon, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.

A. Clive L. DuVal 2d, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. Chas. Eichenbaum, 1015 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Sterling Stores Co., Inc., Little Rock, Ark.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joe G. Fender, 314 Melrose Building, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Warner W. Gardner, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Natomas Co., 111 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Linen Supply Institute of Greater Washington, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee.

A. Jerome Grignon, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Jay Hooker, Jr., & Henry W. Hooker, 214 Union Street, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Laundryowners Association, 932 8th Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn.

A. W. C. Howard, Quanah, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roger E. Johnson, 812 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Superior Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Tilden W. Johnson, Post Office Box 64583, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Ned Johnston, 4539 Everett, Kensington, Md.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1017 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Max H. Jordan, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daphne R. Leeds, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sealy, Inc., Serta Associates, Inc., and Restonic Corp., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Liberty Lobby, 825 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence J. Linck, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Vanderbilt Hotel, New York, N.Y.

A. Suzanne MacLean, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Macleay, Lynch & Macdonald, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. MacVey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann, Post Office Box 16, Kyobashi Post Office, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Ben J. Man, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mehler, Goldsborough & Ives, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard E. Munro, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

A. Converse Murdoch, Esq., 350 Delaware Trust Building, Wilmington, Del.
B. W. Stuart Emmons, Sunset Lane, Haverford, Pa.

A. John Kevin Murphy, 222-17 Northern Boulevard, Bayside, N.Y.
B. Armored Carrier Corp., 222-17 Northern Boulevard, Bayside, N.Y.

A. National Apartment Owners Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Vanderbilt Hotel, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantee, 1 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

A. New York World's Fair 1964–1965 Corp., Post Office Box 1964, Flushing, N.Y.

A. Charles M. Noone, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Walter Page, 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Tom Patten, Box 7111, Washington, D.C.
B. Naval Enlisted Reserve Association, Box 7111, Washington, D.C.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Christman Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Restonic Corp., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Sealy, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Serta Associates, Inc., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. David A. Shepard, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Byron Skelton, First National Building, Temple, Tex.
B. Chanslor-Western Oil & Development Co., 560 South Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles L. Stewart, Jr., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Amerop Commodities Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hon. Edward J. Thye, Northfield, Minn.
B. Spring Air Co., 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Sigmund Timberg, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sealy, Inc., Serta Associates, Inc., and Restonic Corp.

A. Ahbe Jay Treu, 352 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Harry Jay Treu, Inc., 352 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
A. F. Bourne Upham III, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., Post Office Box 1964, Flushing, N.Y.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Horace White, Post Office Box 5241, Baltimore, Md.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 941 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
A. Wilmer & Broun, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. William W. Woodruff, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Alexander W. Wuerker, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Honorable HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

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

Eternal spirit, whom we seek in vain without, unless we first find Thee within, may the healing hush of Thy presence in this hallowed moment fall upon our feverish and driven lives.

In a time for greatness, save us from small choices and from dwarfed perspectives. Deliver us from inner cowardice which makes us unwilling to pay the high price of better things. Teach us, this day, in all our dealings with others, to enthrone wisdom upon our tongues and kindness within our hearts.

Grant to us to dream great dreams and not to disobey the heavenly vision, and though the hope sometimes seems forlorn, may we be found without stumbling and without stain, facing, unafraid, unnumbered foes.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, June 13, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TALMADGE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 12, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5486. An act to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with any communication made to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the party to such communication;

H.R. 6775. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences;

H.R. 7053. An act to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7154. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the keeping and running at large of dogs; and

H.R. 7218. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 3,000 officers and members.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 5486. An act to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with any communication made to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the party to such communication;

H.R. 7053. An act to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7154. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the keeping and running at large of dogs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 6775. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences; to the Committee on Commerce.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Committee on Government Operations.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Research and General Legislation of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the new reports.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia.

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

John Joseph Gunther, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the new reports on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES TO INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be a representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William I. Cargo, of Maryland, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS TO FEDERAL-STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION SYSTEM

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of a permanent program of additional unemployment compensation, to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage of the unemployment compensation program to establish Federal requirements with respect to the weekly benefit amount and limit the tax credits available to employers in a State which does not meet such requirements, to establish a Federal requirement prohibiting States from denying compensation to workers undergoing occupational training or retraining and deny tax credits to employers in a State which does not meet such requirements, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, to establish a Federal additional compensation and equalization account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1959, RELATING TO INCENTIVE PAY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of an accrued portion of incentive pay to certain aeronautically rated or designated officers who have been eligible to such pay for a minimum of at least 10 years and who subsequently are removed from the status to such eligibility due to the fact that a determination has been made that the requirement for them in this capacity is no longer necessary in the interest of national security (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

GEORGE W. ROSS, JR.

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of George W. Ross, Jr. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 36

"Joint resolution relating to the Office of Saline Water of the U.S. Department of the Interior

"Whereas the Office of Saline Water of the U.S. Department of the Interior has requested Congress for $1,755,000 in appropriations to continue its program of research and development of sea and brackish water conversion processes; and

"Whereas in testimony before the House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee, officials of the Office of Saline Water said that construction of larger plants and incorporation of additional improvements can lower present costs considerably, and research 'holds promise of developing entirely new methods which may permit the attainment of a major breakthrough;' and

"Whereas the Office of Saline Water, by contracts with private industrial firms authorized in their program by Congress, will complete construction in the summer of this year a demonstration plant to convert sea water into fresh water at Point Loma, near San Diego; and

"Whereas the Chief of Basic Research of the Office of Saline Water testified before a House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee, 'I think we are approaching economically competitive converted water'; and

"Whereas all these signs point to the fact that the future municipal and industrial water needs of the southern California coastal shelf could soon be served economically and feasibly from the bordering Pacific Ocean; and

"Whereas an economic process to treat brackish waters so as to improve their quality and permit their reuse would be of great benefit to a number of areas of California; and

"Whereas water conversion processes, when applied in an economically feasible manner, will help permit the State of California to go to the bond market to finance other needed programs in addition to water development: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully endorses the aims and purposes of the program of the Office of Saline Water, and urges the California delegation in the Congress to support the appropriations requested by the Office of Saline Water, Department of the Interior; and be it further

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

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 42

"Joint resolution relative to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds

"Whereas the State of California and the political subdivisions thereof have in the past and are now currently engaged in financing, through the issuance of bonds, needed public improvements such as the building of schools, highways, water and sewer distribution systems and other projects for the promotion of the health, safety, and welfare of the people; and

"Whereas the interest income which the owner derives from such bonds has in the past and is now currently exempt from the imposition of any Federal income tax; and

"Whereas the Federal taxation of the interest of such bonds, as income, would result in the curtailment of construction of needed public improvements, and would result in either an increase of taxes imposed by the State of California and any political subdivision thereof in order to pay higher interest costs, or the assumption by the Federal Government of the responsibility of financing such improvements; and

"Whereas there is currently a national movement to permit the imposition of the Federal income tax on the interest income from the bonds issued or to be issued by the several States and their political subdivisions; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any amendment of the Constitution of the United States, or any other action by the Congress of the United States, or the executive branch thereof, which would have the effect of subjecting the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or to cause the tax to be increased because of such bond holdings by a taxpayer whether or not the increase is in fact titled a tax; and be it further

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

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 45

"Joint resolution relative to establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are now considering legislation 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 undersirable 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 programs now reside; and

"Whereas the State of California and several of the counties of this State have camp programs for youths already under sentence by the courts, and the Federal Youth Conservation Corps would provide for voluntary enrollment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly) That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges Congress to enact legislation as proposed in S. 404, which would authorize the establishment of 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 range, and of recreational areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A letter from the Harlingen (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, signed by J. E. Bell, manager, transmitting a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relating to the closing of the Harlingen Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH on June 12, 1961, p. 9941, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Two resolutions adopted by the Alaska Carriers Association, at Fairbanks, Alaska, relating to the regulation of the Alaska Railroad, and regulation of transportation between the original 48 States and points in Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the American Bar Association, relative to reorganization plans affecting Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of New Orleans, La., relating to the transfer of certain land located at the naval ammunition depot, to the city of New Orleans; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Resolutions adopted by the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, at Odanah, Wis., relating to Indian problems; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Henry M. Henderson, of Atlanta, Ga., relating to civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact S. 986, a bill to assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs, passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, be inserted in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

As a cosponsor of S. 986, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I am particularly pleased to have the honor of submitting this resolution for the RECORD. There is no doubt in my mind that the passage of S. 986 would help to relieve unemployment in States like mine which have long been particularly hard hit. Moreover, the passage of S. 986 would help provide some of the much needed public facilities for many of our hard-pressed towns and cities.

For all these reasons, I am indeed heartened to know of the support of the General Assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations for S. 986.

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

Whereas the problems of labor distressed areas are national in scope and a national solution is required; and

Whereas any surplus labor area which has a hard core of unemployment will benefit immeasurably as a result of the enactment of Senate 986; and

Whereas it is vital to the economy of the country that implementation be given to the principle of full employment by providing for the use of federally enacted legislation to contribute to a sound and substantial labor force; and

Whereas the State of Rhode Island, which has been classed as a labor surplus area, would benefit substantially by the enactment of this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate 986, legislation that would assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

TRACTORS FOR FREEDOM—PETITION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by 214 citizens of Oley, Pa., relating to the proposal of tractors for freedom. I ask unanimous consent that the petition be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached as follows:

PETITION TO HALT TRACTORS FOR FREEDOM

As voters, taxpayers, and interested citizens of the United States of America, who still hold democracy as the best way of government, we are signing this petition to halt the tractors-for-freedom movement.

We ask our representatives in the Federal Government to carry out the wishes of the American people by exercising their duties as our representatives to halt this outrageous blackmail on the part of Castro and the Communists.

Signed by Lyda R. Strock, and 213 other citizens of Oley, Pa.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1371. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license (Rept. No. 370).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 884. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants (Rept. No. 369).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. TALMADGE):

S. 2065. A bill to authorize the construction of the Goat Island and Carters Island Dams on the Savannah River, Georgia and South Carolina, for flood control, power, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

S. 2066. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, relative to marketing of apples; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. BYRD of Virginia):

S. 2067. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2068. A bill for the relief of Frank Lamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 2069. A bill to further amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2070. A bill for the relief of Kabalan Farris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2071. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that members of the Armed Forces who engage voluntarily in any activity or conduct while a prisoner of war which results in the giving of aid or comfort to an enemy of the United States shall not be entitled to receive any pay or allowances from the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2072. A bill for the relief of Rebecca A. Harrison; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2073. A bill to authorize two additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2074. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to amend sections 4(a) and 6 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of September 11, 1957, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTIONS

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 158) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

ADMISSIBILITY OF VOLUNTARY ADMISSIONS AND CONFESSIONS IN CERTAIN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill

to make voluntary admissions and confessions in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia admissible against defendents.

Mr. President, the rising tide of crime within the District of Columbia points up once again the need for legislation to clarify the Supreme Court ruling of 1957 in the *Mallory* case (354 U.S. 449). That ruling, as you will recall, held inadmissible the voluntary statement of a convicted and self-confessed rapist because of the delay in taking him before a committing magistrate. The Court held that a delay of 7½ hours in arraigning the prisoner violated rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which requires that an arrested person be taken before a committing officer without "unnecessary delay."

The Mallory ruling and the decision in the earlier case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332), have resulted in abolishing an old and fundamental rule of evidence regarding the admissibility of a confession. Prior to these decisions, the sole test of the admissibility of a confession was whether it was made voluntarily. Under this rule, if a confession was freely and voluntarily made, it was deemed to be trustworthy. Of course, if there was a showing that delay itself constituted sufficient inducement to elicit an involuntary confession, the court would adjudge such confession inadmissible. But, the point is, that mere delay in itself was not enough to invalidate a confession.

In the Mallory case, time alone was the deciding factor. There was no showing that any duress was used in extracting the confession from the prisoner. Indeed, there was no allegation on the part of the prisoner that any force whatever was used to get him to confess to the crime. There was nothing to indicate that the confession was anything but voluntarily given. But, despite the voluntary nature of the confession and despite the fact that the confession was substantiated by all the facts of the crime charged to the prisoner, it was invalidated merely by the passage of time.

Mr. President, I contend that to apply time alone as the test of admissibility of a confession is both unsound and unreasonable. It subverts a statute relating to the duty of an arresting officer into a rule of evidence. Because a police officer fails to observe the requirements of rule 5(a) a self-confessed murderer, rapist, or armed robber may be turned loose on society. In other words, the supposed sins of the policeman are visited upon an innocent society.

I submit, Mr. President, that Congress did not intend to throw on the scrapheap the time-honored test of voluntariness as to the admissibility of a confession when it approved the promulgation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. I submit that Congress had no intention of loosing convicted murderers and rapists upon a hapless public merely because a police officer failed to take a prisoner before a committing magistrate before the lapse of 7½ hours.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the many protections which the Constitution of the United States bestows upon persons accused of crimes. But, in the words of Judge Alexander Holtzoff, U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, who testified at subcommittee hearings on the subject of "Confessions and Police Detention," in 1958:

> We must bear in mind that the purpose of the criminal law is to protect the public. On the one hand, it is essential that no innocent person be convicted of a crime and that oppressive methods be not used against the guilty. On the other hand, it is equally indispensable that victims of a crime and potential victims of possible future crimes receive protection. The victim must not become a forgotten man. As was said by Mr. Justice Cardozo in *Snyder* v. *Massachusetts* (291 U.S. 97, 122), "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

In considering the effect of the Mallory decision, Mr. President, we should keep in mind that the Supreme Court did not base its decisions on any constitutional issue. It did not suggest that to admit Mallory's confession into evidence would be a violation of due process. The Court based its decision on its interpretation of the will of Congress as expressed in rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. I do not believe that the Court has correctly interpreted the will and intent of Congress in this matter. It is for this reason that I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2067) to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), 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 in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 5 of the Rules of Criminal Procedures for the United States District Courts or any other rule or statute of like purport, a voluntary admission or a voluntary confession of an accused shall be admissible against him in any criminal proceeding or prosecution in the courts of the United States or of the District of Columbia, and the finding of the trial court in respect to the voluntariness of the admission or confession shall be binding upon any reviewing court in the event it is supported by substantial evidence.

REDUCTION OF OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE AND REDUCTION OF MAXIMUM EFFECTIVE RATE LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to reduce the oil depletion allowance over a 3-year period from 27½ to 20 percent and simultaneously to reduce the maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes from its present 87 to 60 percent. Under the bill the changes would be made as follows:

Beginning January 1, 1962, the oil depletion allowance would be reduced from 27½ to 25 percent. This would produce a revenue gain of $75 million over present law. On that same date, January 1, 1962, the overall limitation on individual income taxes would be reduced from 87 to 75 percent. This latter action would result in a loss in revenue of $25 million and, taken together, would leave the Treasury Department with a net gain of $50 million for this year.

Effective January 1, 1963, the oil depletion allowance would be further reduced from 25 to 22½ percent, and simultaneously the effective rate limitation on individual income taxes would be reduced from 75 to 65 percent. The reduction in the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 22½ percent would bring the revenue gain to $160 million against a loss in revenue of $80 million as the result of reducing the effective rate limitation of individual taxes from 87 to 65 percent. Thus the Government during the taxable year in which the second adjustment is made would gain $80 million in revenue.

The third year, beginning with January 1, 1964, the depletion allowance on oil would be reduced another 2½ percent, bringing it to 20 percent, and on that date the maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes would be reduced to 60 percent. Reducing the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 20 percent would provide an estimated revenue gain of $250 million annually. Reducing the maximum effective rate limitation on individual incomes from its present 87 percent to 60 percent would result in a loss in revenue of $130 million annually, leaving the Treasury with a revenue gain of $120 million.

Thus we find that these two long overdue corrections in our basic revenue laws can be made, and still the Government after taking both into consideration would have an increased revenue of $120 million annually.

I recognize and respect the oil industry as one of the important segments of our American free enterprise system, but the 27½-percent oil depletion rate is too high. This rate was established at a time when our maximum corporate rates and the maximum individual income tax rates were both well below 20

percent and at a time when the cost of operating our Government was only about 3 percent of what it is today.

With the corporate rate now fixed at 52 percent and individual rates running as high as 87 percent, I do not think the oil industry is paying its proportionate part of the $80 billion annual budget.

On the other hand, to allow the U.S. Government to take 87 percent of a taxpayer's income is confiscatory; furthermore, it retards the growth and expansion of the American private enterprise system. Evidence that this rate has been advanced beyond the point of diminishing returns is borne out by the fact that reducing the effective rate limitation from 87 to 60 percent would result in a revenue loss of only $130 million annually.

These two proposed changes are being coupled together since they both deal largely with incomes of taxpayers in the upper brackets. Taken together, both corrections can be made and the Federal Treasury still can pick up an additional $120 million in revenue from an industry which under existing law is not paying its proportionate part of the operating costs of the Government.

In introducing the bill, it is recognized that legislation of this nature must originate in the House or be offered as an amendment to some revenue measure previously enacted in the House. Therefore, this proposal will be resubmitted as an amendment to the first appropriate revenue-producing measure which comes before us. I do not consider either the Federal-aid highway bill, H.R. 6713, which has a revenue-producing section, or the bill to extend the excise and corporate tax rates beyond the June 30 deadline, H.R. 7446, as appropriate measures for this amendment, but there will be other bills to which this can be offered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a letter dated June 7, 1961, signed by Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, in which he outlines the loss in revenue from the successive changes in the maximum effective rate limitations as well as the gains in revenue which will result in the three reductions in the oil and gas depletion rates.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, June 7, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As you requested the staff has prepared a draft of an amendment (attached) to reduce the overall maximum limitation on individual income tax from 87 percent at present to 60 percent over a 3-year period, and to lower the rate of percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas wells from 27½ percent at present to 20 percent, also over a 3-year period.

With respect to the overall limitation on individual income taxes, the draft provides for a three-step reduction, at 1-year intervals, commencing in 1962. For taxable years beginning in 1962, the rate would be 75 percent; for taxable years beginning in 1963, the rate would be 65 percent; and for taxable years beginning in 1964 and thereafter, the limitation would be 60 percent. The staff estimates that these changes in the overall limitation would cause a reduction in revenues to the Federal Government in the amounts shown in the following table:

Revenue loss
[In millions]

Maximum effective rate limitation, percent:	
75	$25
65	80
60	130

The draft also provides for a three-step reduction in the 27½-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas, at 1-year intervals, commencing in 1962. Under the draft, for taxable years beginning in 1962, the rate would be 25 percent; for taxable years beginning in 1963, the rate would be 22½ percent; and for taxable years beginning in 1964 and thereafter, the rate would be 20 percent.

It is extremely difficult to estimate the effect of small changes in the depletion rate for oil and gas, because we do not have the data we need concerning the present effect of the 50-percent limitation, and because the data on depletion claimed on individual income tax returns is incomplete. Consequently, our estimates for your proposal are rough.

Tax year	Proposed depletion rate for oil and gas	Estimated revenue gain over present law
	Percent	*Million*
1962	25	$75
1963	22½	160
1964	20	250

I hope this will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2069) to further amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISALLOWANCE TO TURNCOATS OF RECOVERY OF BACK PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which will make it unnecessary to pay soldiers who become turncoats hereafter. This situation was brought into focus by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Bell against United States, handed down on May 22, 1961.

Regardless of the correctness of that particular decision from a legal standpoint, I am sure that to permit a turncoat to recover backpay during the time when he had defected to the enemy is, as Chief Judge Jones, fo the U.S. Court of Claims, stated, "to put a premium on dishonor."

The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which permits the awarding of military backpay was a tribute to the objectivity of our traditional system of justice; but to continue the legality would make a mockery of the principles of loyalty and devotion to the country that we all hold dear.

The bill I am introducing, of course, could not have a retroactive effect. I would hope that legislation applying prospectively would never have need for application, but we must recognize that this situation could recur, and it would be folly not to take positive action to avoid liability for pay to turncoats in the future.

I hope that the bill can be given early consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Bell and others against United States, delivered on May 22, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD. I do not ask that the footnotes be printed, but that the decision itself, as delivered by Mr. Justice Stewart, be printed.

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

Mr. Justice Stewart delivered the opinion of the Court.

The petitioners were enlisted men in the U.S. Army who were captured during the hostilities in Korea in 1950 and 1951. In the prison camps to which they were taken they behaved with utter disloyalty to their comrades and to their country. After the Korean armistice in the summer of 1953 they refused repatriation and went to Communist China. They were formally discharged from the Army in 1954. In 1955 they returned to the United States. Later that year they filed claims with the Department of the Army for accrued pay and allowances. When these claims were denied they brought the present action in the Court of Claims for pay and allowances from the time of their capture to the date of their discharge from the Army. The Court of Claims decided against them, stating that "[n]either the light of reason nor the logic of analysis of the undisputed facts of record can possibly justify the granting of a judgment favorable to these plaintiffs" (181 F. Supp. 668, 674). Judge Madden dissented. We granted certiorari to consider a seemingly important statutory question with respect to military pay (363 U.S. 837).

The Court of Claims made detailed findings of fact with respect to the petitioners' conduct as prisoners of war, based upon a stipulation filed by the parties. These circumstances need not be set out in minute detail. They are adequately summarized in the opinion of the Court of Claims, as follows:

"[D]uring the period of their confinement each of the three plaintiffs became monitors for the 'forced study groups,' the sessions of which the prisoners were compelled to attend. Armed guards attended these sessions. The programs included lectures picturing what were declared to be the bad aspects of life in the United States as contrasted with idyllic life under communism. As monitors, they procured and distributed propaganda literature, and threatened to turn in names of any prisoners who refused to read and discuss favorably these propaganda handouts.

"Each of the plaintiffs made tape recordings which were used as broadcasts and over the camp public address system. Each of

them wore Chinese uniforms and were permitted to attend meetings outside the camp. The details of the plaintiffs' consorting, fraternizing, and cooperating with their captors and the devious ways in which they sought favors for themselves, thus causing hardship and suffering to the other prisoners, are set out in our findings. * * *

"Two of Bell's recordings were broadcast over the Peiping radio, stating among other things that on the orders of his platoon leader, his men had killed North Korean prisoners of war, and that President Truman was a warmonger. In written articles for the camp newspaper he alleged that American troops had committed atrocities and he personally had been ordered to kill women and children and not to take prisoners of war, and that if given the opportunity he would run a tank over the President's body.

"Bell was paid money to write these articles. He also delivered lectures before his company and to the camp on American aggression. He appeared voluntarily in a motion picture and appeared in bimonthly plays. He stated that if given a weapon he would fight against the United States. He sold food intended for the sick to other prisoners of war. By making reports to the Chinese, he caused one man to be bayonetted and others to be placed in solitary confinement.

"Cowart did many similar things, wrote propaganda articles accusing American soldiers of atrocities and of using germ warfare. He drew posters and cartoons for the enemy, acted in plays, walked and talked with the Chinese officers, guards, and interpreters, lived part of the time at Chinese regimental headquarters, stated he hated America, desired to study in China and to return to the United States in 5 years to help in the overthrow of the Government.

"Griggs did many similar things, attended enemy parties, visited Chinese headquarters frequently, referred to the Chinese as comrades, was accorded special privileges, made broadcasts, signed leaflets, wrote articles accusing the American soldiers of atrocities and declared the United States had used germ warfare."

As stated in their brief, the petitioners "do not admit to the alleged acts of dishonor contained in the stipulation and the findings of fact, but rather demur to them on the grounds that such facts are irrelevant and immaterial in a civil action for military pay provided by statute." The statute upon which the petitioners rely is an ancient one. It was first enacted in 1814 and has been reenacted many times. It provides:

"Every noncommissioned officer and private of the Regular Army, and every officer, noncommissioned officer, and private of any militia or volunteer corps in the service of the United States who is captured by the enemy, shall be entitled to receive during his captivity, notwithstanding the expiration of his term of service, the same pay, subsistence, and allowance to which he may be entitled while in the actual service of the United States; but this provision shall not be construed to entitle any prisoner of war of such militia corps to any pay or compensation after the date of his parole, except the traveling expenses allowed by law" (37 U.S.C. 242).

Although the plain language of this law appears to entitle the petitioners to their Army pay and allowances during their imprisonment in Korea, the Government has urged various grounds upon which we should hold that the provisions of the statute are inapplicable. We have concluded that none of the theories advanced by the Government can serve as a valid basis to circumvent the unambiguous financial obligation which the law imposes.

The Army's refusal to pay the petitioners was based upon an administrative determination that all prisoners of war who had declined repatriation after the Korean armistice "advocate, or are members of an organization which advocates, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence." In refusing to honor the petitioners' claims upon this ground, the Army was apparently relying upon a statute enacted in 1939 which made it unlawful to pay from funds appropriated by any act of Congress the compensation of "any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government" who was a member of "any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States." That this statute was the basis of the Army's decision is evident not only in the language employed in rejecting the petitioners' demands, but also in the pleadings filed in the Court of Claims. We need not, however, now decide the applicability of this statute to members of the Armed Forces, for the reason that the statute was repealed more than a year before the Army relied upon it in refusing to pay the petitioners.

Although this was the only ground ever advanced for the administrative denial of the petitioners' claims, the Government's brief in this court, for understandable reasons, does not even mention this repealed statute. Instead, the Government now relies upon other grounds to avoid the provisions of title 37, United States Code, section 242. It says that the petitioners violated their obligation of faithful service, and points to the principle of contract law that "one who willfully commits a material breach of a contract can recover nothing under it (4 Williston, 'Contracts' (1936 ed.), sec. 1022, pp. 2823–2834; 5 Williston, 'Contracts' (1936 ed.), sec. 1477; 5 Corbin, 'Contracts' (1951 ed.), sec. 1127, pp. 564–565; see also 'Restatement Contracts,' sec. 357(1)(a))."

In accord with this principle, the Government argues that in the Missing Persons Act, a statute first enacted in 1942, Congress provided a statutory basis for denying the petitioners' claims. We do not so construe that statute.

Preliminarily, it is to be observed that common-law rules governing private contracts have no place in the area of military pay. A soldier's entitlement to pay is dependent upon statutory right. In the Armed Forces, as everywhere else, there are good men and rascals, courageous men and cowards, honest men and cheats. If a soldier's conduct falls below a specified level he is subject to discipline, and his punishment may include the forfeiture of future but not of accrued pay. But a soldier who has not received such a punishment from a duly constituted court-martial is entitled to the statutory pay and allowances of his grade and status, however ignoble a soldier he may be.

This basic principle has always been recognized. It has been reflected throughout our history in numerous court decisions and in the opinions of Attorneys General and Judge Advocates General. "Enlistment is a contract; but it is one of those contracts which changes the status; and, where that is changed, no breach of the contract destroys the new status or relieves from the obligations which its existence imposes. By enlistment the citizen becomes a soldier. His relations to the State and the public are changed. He acquires a new status, with correlative rights and duties; and although he may violate his contract obligations, his status as a soldier is unchanged," (*In re Grimely* (137 U.S. 147, 151, 152)).

Almost 100 years ago Attorney General Hoar rendered an opinion to the Secretary of War regarding the right to pay of a Major Herod, who had been charged with murder, arrested, tried by a court-martial and sentenced to be hung. The Attorney General stated:

"It was not expressly a part of the sentence that Herod should forfeit his pay from the date of his arrest, and I know of no staute imposing a forfeiture of pay from the date of arrest in a case like this of Herod's. The sentence that he be hung necessarily implied a dismissal from the service, but not, as it seems to me, the forfeiture of backpay. I can find no authority for the opinion of the Comptroller that, as Herod was withdrawn from actual military service by his arrest made on acount of a crime committed by him, on the general principle that pay follows services, he should not be paid for the time he was under arrest. The monthly pay of officers of the Army is prescribed by statute, and so long as a person is an officer of the Army he is entitled to receive the pay belonging to the office, unless he has forfeited it in accordance with the provisions of law, whether he has actually performed military service on not" (13 Op. Atty. Gen. 103, 104).

A similar opinion was rendered by Attorney General Alphonso Taft a few years later. He rejected the theory of the second Comptroller of the Treasury that "[i]f the man, by his misconduct and necessary withdrawal from service, does not perform his part of the contract, the Government cannot be held to the fulfillment of its part thereof." The Attorney General said:

"The Comptroller has, I think, misconceived the true basis of the right to [military] pay. * * * In the naval, as in the military service, the right to compensation does not depend upon, nor is it controlled by, 'general principles of law'; it rests upon, and is governed by, certain statutory provisions or regulations made in pursuance thereof, which specially apply to such service. These fix the pay to which officers and men belonging to the Navy are entitled; and the rule to be deduced therefrom is that both officers and men become entitled to the pay thus fixed so long as they remain in the Navy, whether they actually perform service or not, unless their right thereto is forfeited or lost in some one of the modes prescribed in the provisions or regulations adverted to" (15 Op. Atty. Gen. 175, 176).

This principle has received consistent recognition in the Court of Claims. "It would, we think, be an anomalous proceeding to permit resort to the courts to ascertain whether, under all the various provisions with respect to pay and allowances of officers and men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, investigations should obtain to determine as a matter of fact whether the soldier involved had by conscientious service earned what the statutes allow him" (*White* v. *United States*, 72 Ct. Cl. 459, 468). "[T]he mere fact that an officer or soldier is under charges does not deprive him of his pay and allowances, * * * such forfeiture can only be imposed by the sentence of a lawful court-martial" (*Walsh* v. *United States*, 43 Ct. Cl. 225, 231).

The statute upon which the petitioners rely applies this same principle to a specialized situation. A serviceman captured by the enemy and thus unable to perform his normal duties is nonetheless entitled to his pay. The rule has commanded unquestioned adherence throughout our history, as two cases will suffice to illustrate.

In 1807 a sailor named John Straughan was a member of the crew of the American frigate *Chesapeake*. After that vessel's illstarred engagement with the British man-of-war *Leopard* off Hampton Roads, Straughan was taken aboard the *Leopard* and impressed into service in the British Navy. There he served for 5 years and 9 days before he finally was repatriated. Years later his widow sued for his pay and rations as a member of the U.S. Navy during the period he had been held by the British. The Court of Claims ruled that, even though we had not been at war in 1807, the *Chesapeake* had nevertheless been taken by an enemy, and that Straughan's widow was en-

titled to the U.S. Navy pay and allowances that had accrued while he was serving with the British (*Straughan* v. *United States*, 1 Ct. Cl. 324).

In October 1863, a lieutenant in the Union Army named Henry Jones was taken prisoner by Confederate guerrillas near Elk Run, Va. Jones was confined in Libby Prison until March 1, 1865, when he was exchanged and returned to the Union lines. Upon his return he found that he had been administratively dismissed from the service in November 1863, because he had been in disobedience of orders at the time of his capture. When the Army for that reason refused his demand for pay and allowances, he filed suit in the Court of Claims. The court entered judgment in his favor, stating that "[t]he contrary would be to hold that an executive department could annul and defy an act of Congress at its pleasure" (*Jones* v. *United States*, 4 Ct. Cl. 197, 203).

It is against this background that we turn to the Government's contention that the Missing Persons Act authorized the Army to refuse to pay the petitioners their statutory pay and allowances in this case. The provisions of the act which the Government deems pertinent are set out in the margin. Originally enacted in 1942 as temporary legislation, the act was amended and reenacted several times, and finally was made permanent in 1957. So far as relevant here, this legislation provides that any person in active service in the Army "who is officially determined to be absent in a status of captured by a hostile force" is entitled to pay and allowances; that "[t]here shall be no entitlement to pay and allowances for any period during which such person may be officially determined absent from his post of duty without authority; that the Secretary of the Army or his designated subordinate shall have authority to make all determinations necessary in the administration of the act, and for purposes of the act determinations so made as to any status dealt with by the act shall be conclusive.

We are asked first to hold that "[s]ince the Missing Persons Act is later in time, is comprehensive in scope, and includes within its provisions the whole subject matter of Revised Statutes 1288 [the statute upon which the petitioners rely], any inconsistency or repugnancy between the two statutes should be resolved in favor of the Missing Persons Act." This step having been taken, we are asked to decide that the petitioners, because of their behavior after their capture, were no longer in the "active service in the Army * * * of the United States," and that they were therefore not covered by the act. It is also suggested, alternatively, that the Secretary of the Army might have determined that each of the petitioners after capture was "absent from his post of duty without authority," and, therefore, not entitled to pay and allowances under the act. We can find no support for these contentions in the language of the statute, in its legislative history, or in the Secretary's administrative determination.

The Missing Persons Act was a response to unprecedented personnel problems experienced by the Armed Forces in the early months after our entry into the Second World War. Originally proposed by the Navy Department, the legislation was amended on the floor of the House to cover the other services. As the committee reports make clear, the primary purpose of the legislation was to alleviate financial hardship suffered by the dependents of servicemen reported as missing.

To hold that the Missing Persons Act operated to repeal the statute upon which the petitioners rely would be a long step to take, for at least two reasons. In the first place, the record of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs clearly discloses that at the time the Missing Persons Act was being considered, the committee was made fully aware of the 1814 statute, and manifested no inclination to disturb it. Secondly, it is not entirely accurate to say, as does the Government, that the Missing Persons Act is "later in time." After the original passage of that act in 1942, the statute upon which the petitioners rely was recodified in 1952 and again in 1958.

But the question whether there was a repeal by implication is one that we need not determine here, for it is clear that under either statute the petitioners are entitled to the pay and allowances that accrued during their detention as prisoners of war. The Missing Persons Act unambiguously provides that any person "in the active service * * * officially determined to be absent in a status of * * * captured by a hostile force * * * [is] entitled to receive or to have credited to his account the same * * * pay [and allowances] to which he was entitled at the beginning of such period of absence. * * *" It affirmatively appears on this record that the petitioners were in the active service of the Army, that they were in fact captured by the enemy, and that they were later officially determined to be "absent in a status of * * * captured by a hostile force." The terms of the Missing Persons Act are therefore expressly applicable.

The argument that it was open to the Secretary of the Army to determine that the petitioners in the prison camps to which they were taken were thereafter "not in the active service" cannot survive even cursory analysis. In the Armed Forces the term "active service" has a precise meaning, a meaning not dependent upon individual conduct (10 U.S.C. 101). Moreover, the verbal structure of the act, reenforced by common sense, clearly leads to the conclusion that "active service" refers to a person's status at the time he became missing. Nothing in the legislative history of the original statute or of its many reenactments offers support for any other construction. That history simply reflects a continuing purpose to widen the classes of persons to whom the benefactions of the law were to be extended, from the time those persons became missing.

The Government's alternative argument seems, as a matter of statutory construction, equally invalid. The legislative history discloses that the provision denying pay to a person officially determined to have been "absent from his post of duty without authority" was enacted to cover the case of a person found to have been "missing" in the first place only by reason of such unauthorized absence. Moreover, desertion and absence without leave are technically defined offenses (10 U.S.C. 885, 10 U.S.C. 886; see Manual for Courts-martial, United States, p. 315 (1951)). It is open to serious question whether the conduct of the petitioners after their capture could conceivably have been determined to be tantamount either to desertion or absence without leave (see Avins, Law of AWOL, p. 167 (1957); Snedeker, Military Justice Under the Uniform Code, p. 562 (1953)).

These are questions which we need not, however, pursue. We need not decide in this case that the Secretary of the Army was wholly without power under the statute to determine administratively that the petitioners after their capture were no longer in active service, or that they were absent from their posts of duty. Nor need we finally decide whether either such determination by the Secretary would have been valid as a matter of law. The simple fact is that no such administrative determination has ever been made. The only reason the Army ever advanced for refusing to pay the petitioners was its determination that they had "advocated, or were members of an organization which advocated, * * * the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force of violence." That determination has now been totally abandoned. The Army has never even purported to determine that the petitioners were not in active service or that they were absent from their posts of duty. The Army cannot rely upon something that never happened, upon an administrative determination that was never made, even if it be assumed that such a determination would have been permissible under the statute and supported by the facts. (See *Service* v. *Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363; *Vitarelli* v. *Seaton*, 359 U.S. 535.) For these reasons we hold that the petitioners were entitled under the applicable statutes to the pay and allowances that accrued during their detention as prisoners of war.

Throughout these proceedings no distinction has been made between the petitioners' pay rights while they were prisoners and their rights after the Korean armistice when they voluntarily declined repatriation and went to Communist China. Since both the Army and the Court of Claims denied the petitioners' claims entirely, no separate consideration was given to the petitioners' status after their release as prisoners of war until the date of their administrative discharges. Nor did the petitioners in this court address themselves to the question of the petitioners' rights to pay during that interval. Yet, it is evident that the petitioners' status during that period might be governed by considerations different from those which have been discussed. Other statutory provisions and regulations would come into play. Accordingly we express no view as to the petitioners' pay rights for the period between the Korean armistice and their administrative discharges, leaving that question to be fully canvassed in the Court of Claims, to which in any event this case must be remanded for computation of the judgments.

The disclosure of grave misconduct by numbers of servicemen captured in Korea was a sad aftermath of the hostilities there. The consternation and self-searching which followed upon that disclosure are still fresh in the memories of many thoughtful Americans. The problem is not a new one. Whether the solution to it lies alone in subsequent prosecution and punishment is not for us to inquire. Congress may someday provide that members of the Army who fail to live up to a specified code of conduct as prisoners of war shall forfeit their pay and allowances. Today we hold only that the Army did not lawfully impose that sanction in this case.

The judgment is reversed, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Reversed and remanded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2071) to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that members of the Armed Forces who engage voluntarily in any activity or conduct while a prisoner of war which results in the giving of aid or comfort to an enemy of the United States shall not be entitled to receive any pay or allowances from the United States, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REVISION OF CONGRESSIONAL CONTEMPT PROCEDURES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday's decision of the Supreme Court reversing the contempt of Congress conviction of Bernard Deutch emphasizes

again the need for new procedures in contempt cases.

It is evident that the courts are reviewing these cases under very strict standards. Moreover, years can elapse between the time the issue arises in the course of a committee investigation and the time it is resolved by the courts. Bernard Deutch refused to answer the questions involved in his case in 1954—and now, 7 years later, we finally learn that the questions were not pertinent to the committee's inquiry.

For some time I have sponsored a bill to improve the existing procedures. My bill would expedite the hearing and disposition of such cases, avoid the necessity of criminal charges against witnesses whose refusal to answer is justified, and aid the committees of Congress in obtaining information they should have at the time it is required.

Under the present law, if a witness refuses to appear or to testify before an investigating committee, the particular subcommittee must make a report to the full committee, the full committee must then report the matter to the Senate or House. The legislative body must then resolve to cite the witness for contempt, after which the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, as the case may be, must refer the matter to a U.S. attorney, who in turn must present the case as a criminal matter to a Federal grand jury. If an indictment is returned, a full-scale trial in a Federal district court must follow. Finally, months, or sometimes even years later, there may be a conviction and punishment. Meanwhile, in most instances, the original investigation has been closed without ever having obtained the testimony for which the witness was originally called.

My proposal would greatly improve the complicated and time-consuming procedures under the present law by authorizing immediate resort to the courts for aid in requiring the attendance and testimony of a reluctant witness. Under the provisions of the bill, when a witness refuses to testify before a congressional committee, he could be required to appear that very same day in the district court in whose jurisdiction the investigation is being conducted. Upon his appearance before the court, the witness would be subject to judicial jurisdiction, and a further refusal to testify in accordance with the order of the court would be punishable as a contempt of court. This procedure should bring home to a witness that he could immediately be punished for contempt if he decides, without justification, not to testify before a committee of Congress. At the same time, if the witness is justified in refusing to testify, his vindication will be prompt and he will be spared the opprobrium of a criminal prosecution.

Two other cases of rather recent origin served to highlight the need for congressional action in this area. One example is the prosecution of Austin Tobin, Executive Director of the Port of New York Authority, for refusing to produce some of the records of his agency before the House Judiciary Committee. His refusal was based entirely on jurisdictional grounds. A procedure such as I have outlined would have enabled an expeditious resolution by the courts of the issue without the necessity for criminal proceedings.

Another recent case involved Dr. Linus Pauling, a Nobel Prize physicist, who was called before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to testify about the circulation of petitions calling for an immediate ban on nuclear testing. Dr. Pauling refused to tell the subcommittee the names of the people who helped him to circulate the petitions. He did so on the grounds that the information was not pertinent to the congressional inquiry. In the Pauling case, contrary to that of Mr. Tobin, no contempt citation was sought. If a similar course had been followed, Dr. Pauling would have been involved in a seemingly unending legal controversy with the U.S. Government. Had my proposal been the law at the time of Dr. Pauling's hearing, the matter might have been resolved by an appearance in the Federal district court and a ruling by an impartial Federal judge. In neither the Port Authority case nor the case of Dr. Pauling has the information requested been supplied.

In individual views I presented as a part of the Internal Security Subcommittee's report on Dr. Linus Pauling, I emphasized that the main effect of this procedure would be to restrain unauthorized inquiries and to facilitate compliance with proper legislative demands for information. I fully recognize that there may be occasions where the Congress has absolutely no right to elicit information from a witness. At the same time there may be other occasions where witnesses refuse to cooperate with the Congress because they are well aware of the delay and cumbersome procedure used to obtain contempt citations and final judgments in these matters.

It is my firm belief that this proposed legislation represents a forward step in the safeguarding of the rights of citizens by leaving it up to a court and not each committee to finally determine whether certain questions that might be asked are material, relevant, pertinent to the inquiry and legislative purpose, and do not deprive any witness of his constitutional rights. The net effect of this procedure would be to fully comply with the language of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Watkins* v. *United States* (354 U.S., 178), where the Court said:

> It is unquestionably the duty of all citizens to cooperate with the Congress in its efforts to obtain the facts needed for intelligent legislative action. It is their unremitting obligation to respond to subpenas, to respect the dignity of the Congress and its committees, and to testify fully with respect to matters within the province of proper investigation. This, of course, assumes that the constitutional rights of witnesses will be respected by the Congress as they are in a court of justice. The Bill of Rights is applicable to investigations as to all forms of governmental action. Witnesses cannot be compelled to give evidence against themselves. They cannot be subjected to unreasonable search and seizure. Nor can the first amendment freedom of speech, press, religion, or political belief and association be abridged.

The courts even now must ultimately decide the question of whether a witness' appearance is necessary and in line with the proper legislative functions of the Congress. The procedure that I have just outlined would serve to expedite the determination of this question without intolerable delay and the imposition of criminal liability.

Mr. President, in the past, I have often pointed out the need for constructive and positive congressional action to correct inadequacies in our laws brought to light by court decisions. Whether the courts have been right or wrong on the facts in a particular case becomes a question of academic interest. The important thing for us to consider is that when a weakness appears in the effectiveness of Federal laws, it is the responsibility of the Congress to act in a manner which will be in the best interests of the American people. Early consideration of this proposal by the Senate would be most helpful in removing some of the unreasonable obstacles which now impede congressional investigations.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prescribe a method by which the Congress may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2074) to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses, introduced by Mr. KEATING, 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 (a) either House, any committee or subcommittee of either House, and any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress may, by an affirmative vote of a majority of its actual membership, invoke the aid of the United States district courts in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence, in furtherance of any inquiry such House, committee, subcommittee, or joint committee is authorized to undertake.

(b) The United States district court for the district within which the inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person by either House, any committee or subcommittee of either House, or any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question before such House, committee, subcommittee, or joint committee, as the case may be; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) Attorneys of the Department of Justice shall furnish legal assistance in invoking the aid of the United States district courts under subsection (a) to either House, or any committee, subcommittee, or joint committee which requests it.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ORPHAN CHILDREN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the 30th of this month the act of September 11, 1957, which deals with the admission of orphan children, will expire. Under that act I believe roughly 9,000 of such orphan children have been admitted. Those who are administering the program hope and desire that the admissions may be continued for at least another year. So I propose directly a joint resolution that would amend the act so as to make the act terminate on June 30, 1962.

There is a second section in the proposal which deals with those who have been granted visas in some cases and then could not enter because of a tubercular condition, if they are members of a family, all of whom would otherwise be admitted.

That act, which made possible special dispensation for cases of that kind, also expires on June 30, 1961. The joint resolution that I now introduce for appropriate reference would extend the Act until June 30, 1962.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) to amend sections 4(a) and 6 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of September 11, 1957, as amended, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution that the Senate does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 5 transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 24, 1961. As the Members of the Senate know this reorganization plan for the NLRB will become effective 60 days after it was transmitted to the Congress, unless it is disapproved by a vote of either House.

At this time, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to two features of this reorganization plan, though there are other aspects of the plan which the Members of the Senate will also undoubtedly wish to consider carefully and to debate at the time that the plan is considered by the Senate.

The first point I would like to raise is common to all of the five reorganization plans transmitted up to this time to the Congress by the President. Each of these plans would permit the legislative function of each of the agencies to be redelegated by the agency. I believe that this should be most carefully considered by every Member of the Senate. When the Congress created these agencies and delegated its own legislative function to them, it retained the safequard that this delegated power would be exercised by a group of men who were not only selected and nominated by the President but also confirmed by the Senate after an opportunity to judge them carefully. The power which the agencies have over the life of every citizen is very vast and the Congress has thought it appropriate to study carefully the qualifications of the men who would exercise this delegated power.

However, this Reorganization Plan No. 5, and the other reorganization plans, provide that the vast legislative powers of this Government as they have been delegated to the particular agencies may be exercised by men who have been subjected to no scrutiny whatsoever, except perhaps by the personnel officer of an agency or his subordinate. The Constitution granted the legislative power to the Congress and Congress delegated a portion of that power to individuals who were approved by the Senate. I do not believe that the Members from either side of the aisle in this House would wish to see that legislative power exercised, instead, by any agency employee with unknown qualifications hired by some unknown man or by some unknown process.

The second point which I wish to emphasize at this time concerns the decisions in individual matters. As I have said before on the floor of the Senate and in my individual views in the reports of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which I am a member, I believe, after a long and careful study, that the volume of administrative matters now before the various agencies has reached such proportions that it is no longer possible for the agency members to make the decision in each case. The duty of deciding cases must be delegated. If this decisionmaking duty is delegated by the agency, however, I believe that the parties should have a right of review by the agency.

This right of a party to have a review of the decision made by a subordinate is taken away by the reorganization plans. To be sure, the plans retain for the agency the right to review a matter if it so desires, or rather if the majority less one vote for such a review, but the right of the party to a review before the decision becomes final is completely taken away. Now I do not believe that we should permit a party to abuse the right of review, but I believe that the right should exist.

I shall speak at greater length on the various aspects of all the reorganization plans at a later date, but I did wish to call to the attention of the Senate these two features which appear in the NLRB reorganization plan as well as in each of the other reorganization plans: First, that the plans will permit the delegation of the legislation authority to any employee, and second, that the right of a party to have the decision of a hearing officer reviewed by the agency is completely taken away.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 158) was received and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STABLE ECONOMY—AMENDMENT

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1983) to encourage the flow and utilization of private investment to assist in the development of a stable economy and promote private home ownership, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 6713, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment for printing under the rule. This is a proposed amendment to H.R. 6713, which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I, and other Senators are cosponsoring. We intend to call up the amendment, to extend for 2 more years the existing national policy for regulation of billboards along the Federal Interstate Highway System, for consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, submitted by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Senators COOPER, PROUTY, LONG of Hawaii, MUSKIE, GRUENING, YOUNG of Ohio, SCOTT, KUCHEL, FONG, LAUSCHE, CLARK, and JAVITS) to House bill 6713 is as follows:

On page 4, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 105. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR AGREEMENTS WITH RESPECT TO AREAS ADJACENT TO THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM.

"Subsection (c) of section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out '1961' and inserting in lieu thereof '1963'.

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

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has submitted the amendment, which, as the Senator has said, would extend for 2 years the period in which States can take advantage of

the so-called billboard legislation enacted in 1958. I am particularly pleased that the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is following in the tradition of one we knew and loved very much—her husband. We remember the great fight made by the late Senator Neuberger along with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for the adoption of the legislation.

Mr. President, I offered the amendment in the Committee on Public Works, and it was defeated on a voice vote. There was not a very large attendance at the meeting that morning. Curiously, since that time it has appeared that a majority of the members of the Committee on Public Works support the amendment.

I wish to say, so that it will be very clear for those who read the RECORD, that the amendment does not propose any change in policy. It would continue the existing policy.

Three States have taken advantage of the legislation. Nine legislatures have passed legislation which will enable the States to take advantage of the 1958 act. Eleven other States have legislation pending before the legislatures.

Contrary to propaganda which has already started, the provisions apply only to the Interstate and Defense Highway Act. There are about 700,000 miles of Federal-aid highway which billboard advertisers can now use.

President Eisenhower recommended the provision. President Kennedy has recommended the extension of the act. I believe that the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] will lead a successful fight, as her distinguished husband led the successful fight in 1958.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to invite to the attention of the Senate the fact that the great State of Kentucky has shown its good judgment in sending a renowned Republican Senator in the person of Senator COOPER to the Senate, and has also passed enabling legislation to enable the State to conform to the Federal highway regulations in respect to signs.

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

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know whether my name is on the amendment, but if the good Senator will allow me to do so I should like to join as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. We shall be honored to include the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be joined as a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. My State also has passed enabling legislation. I think the Senator is striking a blow for beauty in our country, which is as important as almost anything else we have, in terms of domestic values and for decent respect of the sensibilities of people who use the highways.

I am delighted to join the Senator from Oregon. I join the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in the affirmation that the Senator from Oregon will carry the battle as nobly and ably as did her great husband, who was such a sincere friend of all of us. It will be an honor to join with her, and I hope we shall be victorious.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from New York.

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

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

By Mr. COTTON:

Commencement Day Address by Senator BRIDGES at St. Anselm's College, in Manchester, N.H., where he received the degree of honorary doctor of laws.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Address delivered by him on June 11, 1961, at a dinner meeting celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Christopher Columbus Lodge of Fairmont, W. Va., setting forth a picture of the impact and influence which Italians of all classes have had on American civilization.

LIPPMANN AND JOHNSON DENOUNCE DESPAIR OF FREE WORLD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, if there is one sure way to destroy a man or a nation, it is to undermine self-confidence. If we do not believe in ourselves, who is going to believe in us?

Strangely enough, this is exactly what is being done today by some of the finest and most dedicated Americans.

The news from abroad has been bad. Khrushchev has been making advances in Laos and Cuba and elsewhere. But this country is still the most powerful country in the free world. And the free world still has massive superiority over the Communist world, on the basis of every objective criterion: economic power, skilled manpower, and potential military power.

Our only weakness is in willpower. And here, in contradistinction to the fanatic Communist indoctrination in the inevitability of communism, too many Americans—including some of the most fervently patriotic—are shouting that we already have lost most of the world, and even much of America, to the Communists; that the Red march is inevitable and overwhelming.

This is nonsense. Within the last 24 hours, two great voices of freedom have spoken out on this issue—Walter Lippmann and the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON JOHNSON.

In his syndicated column this morning, Mr. Lippmann says in part:

> There are altogether too many of us who in dismay and disappointment are ready to admit that Khrushchev is right in predicting that communism is sweeping the world and that, short of war, we have no means of stopping it.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The root of the error is to equate, instead of to differentiate between the communistic movement which owes allegiance to Moscow and Peiping and the worldwide movements of social reform and social revolution, which almost everywhere seek national independence and nonalinement with the great powers.
>
> Mr. Khrushchev's hope and belief is that he will lead and direct all the reforming and revolutionary movements. We play right into his hands when we identify ourselves with the opponents of change rather than with the leaders of change.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Walter Lippmann be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

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

THE FOLLY OF DESPAIR

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have had a run of bad news and the time has come when we must make up our minds whether to face it and learn from it, or to shrink from it into a nervous breakdown with suicidal tendencies. There are altogether too many of us who in dismay and disappointment are ready to admit that Khrushchev is right in predicting that communism is sweeping the world and that, short of war, we have no means of stopping it.

They are like the man who, as an experienced diplomat once put it many years ago, is so worried that he will fall off the top floor of the Empire State Building that he stops the elevator and jumps out of the ninth floor window. I believe this defeatism to be profoundly mistaken and unwarranted. It is based on a misreading and a misunderstanding of what has happened since the Second World War and what is happening now. The root of the error is to equate, instead of to differentiate between, the communistic movement which owes allegiance to Moscow and Peiping and the worldwide movements of social reform and social revolution, which almost everywhere seek national independence and nonalinement with the great powers.

Mr. Khrushchev's hope and belief is that he will lead and direct all the reforming and revolutionary movements. We play right into his hands when we identify ourselves with the opponents of change rather than with the leaders of change.

For those who think that Laos and southeast Asia are "gone" and that like the dominoes all the Asian nations and the Pacific will "go" too, I should like to call attention to Egypt. It was not so many years ago—in fact it was in 1955—when we were told that Egypt and Syria and Iraq, and all the oil of the Persian Gulf, and the Suez Canal, were "gone" or "going." Egypt had gotten arms from Czechoslovakia; it got Soviet help in building the Aswan Dam; it nationalized the Suez Canal, and all was "lost."

Yet look at it now. Syria and Iraq and the Persian Gulf states are not Communist. Egypt continues to put its Communists in jail. Mr. Khrushchev has attacked Egypt publicly. President Nasser is calling a congress of the neutrals who do not take their directions from Moscow. Egypt has played a decisive part in preventing the flow of Soviet arms to the rebels in the Congo.

After Egypt and the Middle East, look at Africa, look at Guinea, which 6 months ago was written off as "gone." It is not gone despite the several hundred Soviet technicians who are there. Probably it is not "gone" in part at least because the Soviet technicians who are there have made themselves so unpopular. In any event the chances are good that Guinea in the end will line up with the rest of independent Africa as a neutral state.

There is now a great likelihood that the whole of north Africa, all the way from Mo-

rocco to Egypt, will take a neutral line, refusing to be dominated by Moscow or to take direction from Paris or Washington.

Moreover, I do not believe that Cuba is "gone," and I have a very strong impression that Mr. Khrushchev does not begin to think Cuba is "gone" as, let us say, Senator SMATHERS thinks it is. For Cuba is as far from Moscow as Laos is from Washington. In time, not necessarily in a very long time, the Cuban revolution will rejoin the community of American States. It will do this because it has no other place to go.

The wave of the future is not Communist domination of the world. The wave of the future is social reform and social revolution driving toward the goal of national independence and equality of personal status. In this historical tendency Mr. Khrushchev will be, as Mr. Alsop tells us he is supposed to have described himself, "the locomotive of history" only if we set ourselves up to be the roadblocks of history.

What is the lesson of all these experiences? At bottom the lesson is that there is, as the President said the other day, a worldwide social upheaval which the Communists did not create but which they hope to capture. If we make our own policy one of opposition to this worldwide movement of social change, we shall lose the cold war and Mr. Khrushchev's hopes will be realized. If, on the other hand, we befriend and support with active measures the movements of social change, their leaders will not submit to Moscow because they do not have to submit to Moscow. They do not wish to submit to Moscow because what want they want is independence.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, yesterday the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the former majority leader of the U.S. Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, delivered a most remarkable speech to the Capitol Page School. In the speech, likewise, the despair in America was deplored—this time by the Vice President, who pointed out the ridiculousness of charges that America is losing, that "America is being outwitted, outmaneuvered, and outflanked," or that we should "withdraw from the world and abandon the outposts of freedom." To do so, said the Vice President, would be to doom ourselves "to finish out our days in the foxholes of fools here on our own shores."

I wish to quote what the Vice President quoted from Winston Churchill, when he laid down this rule of conduct:

Never give in. Never give in. Never. Never. Never. Never—in nothing great or small, large or petty, never give in except to convictions of honor and good sense.

That was the theme of the fine remarks by the Vice President; and I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DAY OF DECISION

(Address delivered by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON before the graduating class, Capitol Page School, Washington, D.C., June 12, 1961)

Twenty years ago, in England, Winston Churchill spoke to an audience of young men about your age. In those remarks, he laid down this rule of conduct:

"Never give in. Never give in. Never. Never. Never. Never—in nothing great or small, large or petty, never give in except to convictions of honor and good sense."

For these days and times, those are strong words. Some might say they are old-fashioned. But I commend them to you and would like to take them as text for my brief remarks today.

In each of our lives, this is the time of decision. What you are to be the rest of your days depends upon choices you make now and during the next few years. Not just your choice of career is involved. You will, in the highest sense, be choosing character, reputation, purpose and, ultimately, your worth in life out of the many decisions these years thrust upon you.

You might wish—and your parents and friends might wish for you—more time, more experience, and less pressure in which to reach decisions of such lasting consequence. But that wish is idle. Delay itself shapes the future as surely as decisiveness.

With the precepts and values you already have, there is but one sure way: "* * * in nothing great or small, large or petty—never give in except to convictions of honor and good sense."

As an American clergyman of the last century put it: "Let men laugh, if they will, when you sacrifice desire to duty—you have time and eternity to rejoice in."

IN THE BALANCE

As it is for you, so it is for your country.

This is the time of decision for America. What America is to be for the rest of her days depends upon choices made now and within the next few years. Our national character, our world reputation, our historical purpose, our ultimate worth in the world—all are in the balance. It is idle to wish for more convenient times to decide a far more comfortable option to choose. Delay only shapes the future against us.

I say this pointedly and purposefully.

There is abroad among some Americans today a contagion of despair; a belief that our country is being outwitted, outmaneuvered, and outflanked by an adversary both irresistible and implacable. From this belief, there comes a rising cry for America to withdraw from the world, retreat from our opportunities, surrender our gains, and turn inward on ourselves with suspicion and distrust.

Outwardly and ostensibly—this doctrine is directed against elements of our national policy: against foreign aid and foreign trade, against military assistance and exploration of space, against economic growth and human welfare, against progress toward equality of rights and opportunities for all who bear the name, "American." But in a real sense the attack is not upon the policy but upon the institutions from which our policy flows: the Congress, the courts, the Executive, the military command, the Department of State, the Department of Justice—and beyond the Government, the churches, the universities, the unions of laboring men, the corporations of the businessmen, the enterprises of our farmers, and even upon the quality of our youth.

A TIME TO SPEAK

I do not propose—in these few minutes—to undertake the refutation of accusations unworthy of serious consideration. I do propose that it is time for responsible Americans—without regard to party—to make their voices heard, first, against irresponsible attacks upon the policies which have built our strength and secured our liberties, and, second, against ill-considered assaults upon the fundamental institutions of our free society.

There is a time to be silent and a time to speak. This is a time for responsible men to speak—and to be heard.

It has been said that "our ignorance of history makes us libel our own times." The libel of our policies—the slander of our free institutions—stems today from ignorance of history and of our own times as well.

America is not a nation in flight, fleeing before the advances of some irresistible foe. America is a nation—and freedom is a cause—much nearer to being victorious than to being vanquished. In the years of your lifetime, communism has failed—and freedom has succeeded—in Greece, Turkey, Italy, Western Europe, and the Middle East. Communist guerrillas have failed—and freedom has succeeded—in the Philippines, Malaya, Burma, and elsewhere in southeast Asia. Communist governments have been unseated in Latin America. Communism has been rejected in the most troubled lands of Africa. Those victories have been won by men who cherished their own freedom and fought for it—and were able to fight for it because of the very American policies now under blind attack by some here at home.

Doubting men may say we are overcommitted, overextended, and overburdened. But let me say, there is only one position where we would be fatally overcommitted, where our capacity would be hopelessly overextended, where our resources and our people would be perilously overburdened. The one sure position of American folly would be to withdraw to Honolulu and San Francisco on the Pacific and New York and Boston on the Atlantic, Houston and New Orleans on the gulf and attempt to withstand communism from a fortress America.

It is time for responsible Americans to raise their voices against the nonsense of American withdrawal from the world. If we should abandon the outposts of freemen, we would be doomed to finish out our days in the foxholes of fools here on our own shores.

Likewise, I say it is time for responsible Americans to raise their voices against the nonsense of these attacks upon the loyalty and integrity of the institutions of our free society.

OUR ENEMY IS WITHOUT

The enemy of our freedom is without—not within. But no nation, no society, can long stand when it is encouraged to distrust itself. Those who recklessly sow the weeds of suspicion among us do no service to the cause of freedom.

We have—as you well know—a Congress with a passion for keeping freedom strong. We have courts with a passion for protection of human rights—and God help us if it should be otherwise. We have ministers with a passion for human decency. We have professors with a passion for seeking and teaching truth. We have labor unions with a consuming desire to better the lot of the working man. We have businessmen with a scrupulous respect for law and ethics unexcelled in the commerce of the world.

There is strength in the institutions of our society as well as the policies of our Government. We must not allow that strength to be dissipated under blind attack or diluted by the poison of irresponsible assault.

Fear of passing censure, or abusive criticism, must never cause responsible men to remain silent before irresponsibility. To repeat the words with which I began: "Never give in. Never give in. Never, never, never, never—in nothing great or small, large or petty—never give in except to convictions of honor and good sense."

In this time of decision for America, what America is to be will depend in large measure on how faithfully responsible men live by that code.

OUR HIGHEST IDEALS

In affairs of the world—in concerns here at home—we are on the right course. Our highest goals are within our reach. We must not turn back. We must not give in.

The challenge to all Americans—whatever their age—is to accept a sense of duty in

facing the opportunities to which courage has brought us.

It is that responsible sense of duty—not a sense of irresponsible despair—that will carry our country to greatness and our cause to success.

I speak as I do before you because I remember Emerson's words: "So near is God to man, when duty whispers low 'thou must,' and youth replies, 'I can.'"

You have been privileged to serve in one of freedom's greatest institutions—the Congress of the United States. You know the frailties of its Members, but you know the vastly greater strengths of the institution. You know as few young Americans are privileged to know the strengths of all the institutions of our Government and our country.

I urge you: stand against those who doubt and despair and never give in. Stand with those who believe and keep faith and never give in. Your strength is great. Give of it—all your days. Duty whispers to each of you, "Thou must," and I am sure each of you will answer, "I can."

REORGANIZATION OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AND MARITIME BOARD

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Madam President, on May 8, I made a statement in the Senate regarding the need for reorganization of the Federal Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board.

Yesterday, the Senate received a plan to achieve that reorganization; and I wish to commend the administration for the soundness of its approach to this vital question and the promptness with which it has recognized the urgency of the problems involved.

With a revitalized Federal Maritime Commission not concerned with subsidies and related promotional activities, I am sure we can look forward to sound regulation of shipping that will be truly in the public interest.

Some days ago, I wrote to President Kennedy on this matter, urging him to press forward in correcting the administrative deficiencies connected with the regulation of shipping as soon as the reorganization is completed. I have assured the President of my support of his efforts to improve this vital service, and have suggested that the selection of Board members of dedication and ability is the key to our efforts.

I have further suggested that it would be most appropriate to appoint to the new Board a citizen of my own State of Hawaii.

There is, Madam President, no place in the United States with so vital a concern in maritime regulation as Hawaii. To us, the sea is the equivalent of the highways and rails that serve our sister mainland States. Our people are aware of the necessity of both public regulation and sustaining frequent and efficient service, and we have able and dedicated persons who would fill with distinction a position on the new Federal Maritime Commission. I sincerely hope President Kennedy will support this view.

To explain further my position on this matter, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to President Kennedy be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAY 29, 1961.

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I would like to express my hope that you soon will send to the Congress a proposal for reorganization of the Federal maritime agencies. As my previous remarks in the Senate indicate, I have long taken a deep interest in maritime matters and have felt that one of the fundamental problems involved therein is the undesirable association of promotional and regulatory functions in a single agency. I am confident that we can look forward to your taking steps to correct this situation.

There are, however, other aspects of the administration of offshore shipping matters that concern me. Clearly, something must be done. To paraphrase the legal maxim, regulation delayed is regulation denied, and recent experience with matters concerning Hawaii's freight rates has been most discouraging. Neither the public nor the carriers benefits from the delays, and neither has been able to recognize the standards or the philosophy of the Board sufficiently to give them the guidelines they need in planning for the future.

The scope of the Board's activities, the powers of examiners, the staffing of the agency, the rules of practice, the suspension of proposed rates, and the question of subsidy for offshore carriers are all involved. There have been, as I am sure you know, many suggestions made in these areas and some of the suggestions have been the subject of hearings before the Senate Committee on Commerce. On some subjects legislation is required; on others administrative changes is possible. I know you will follow the hearings with interest, and I am confident that the Congress and your administration working together can achieve major improvements in this service which holds virtual life or death power over the island economy of the State of Hawaii.

There is no doubt that the most important single step in improving regulation of shipping will be the appointment of a vigorous and public-spirited Board to head the agency charged with regulation of carriers. It is my belief that the members must be endowed with a will to regulate in the public interest, including the realization that continuation of service to Hawaii and other offshore areas is an absolute necessity.

I know of no domestic issue more directly affecting my State than maritime regulation, and I know of no field in which the people of Hawaii have more interest or a greater right to be heard. Similarly, I know of no other place in the United States where the public interest and the awareness of the legitimate needs of water carriers exceed that of our people. The people of Hawaii live in an environment in which the regulation of sea and air transportation plays an indispensable part in their lives, but they are represented on none of the agencies involved. I feel that a new regulatory agency will present a unique opportunity to correct this inequitable situation. I assure you there are highly qualified citizens of Hawaii from whom an outstanding member of the Board could be selected. I urge you therefore to give serious consideration to such an appointment.

Sincerely yours,

OREN E. LONG,
U.S. Senator.

GENERAL EISENHOWER VERSUS CHAIRMAN MILLER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, 2 days ago, the new chairman of the Republican National Committee was reported to have said President Kennedy had made a "tragic mistake" when he "rescinded and revoked" an Eisenhower administration plan to provide U.S. air cover for the move against Cuba.

Yesterday, according to the press, General Eisenhower denied that he had any specific plan to provide air cover for an invasion attempt, since there was no exact operation set for such a move.

I am confident that as between the two statements, the American people will believe the statement of the former President.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said:

Mr. President, shortly after I commented earlier today with respect to contradictory statements incident to the Cuban invasion I read an editorial from the Washington Evening Star entitled "Bits and Pieces." The editorial appears logical and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD after the remarks I made on the subject a few minutes ago.

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

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

BITS AND PIECES

The Cuban invasion story, with definite partisan overtones, is coming out bit by bit.

Representative MILLER, Republican national chairman, says the fiasco resulted from President Kennedy's decision against using American air power to cover the landing attempt. Senator CLARK, Pennsylvania Democrat, thinks that somehow it was all Mr. Eisenhower's fault in the first place, and that Mr. Kennedy saved us from the "doghouse."

The trouble with this sort of thing is that it tends to distort an already distorted picture for the sake of some hoped-for political advantage. If Mr. Kennedy decided to withhold air support, which we understand to be the case, that doomed the invasion. And at that point the whole project should have been called off. For it was foolhardy to permit a handful of men to land in the face of Castro's air superiority.

To his credit, Mr. Kennedy has never tried to dodge the assumption of responsibility. On the contrary he has specifically accepted it, and he has tried to curb the alibi artists within his administration. But there is only one way to silence a Senator or a Member of the House—gentlemen who at various times have sought to pin the blame on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the CIA and the preceding administration. The way to silence them is to tell the whole story of the Cuban affair. The American people are entitled to hear the truth from an authoritative source. They ought not to be required to depend on possible garbled bits and pieces for their information. And certainly there is not now any valid security reason for denying them the facts.

SOVIET ULTIMATUM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, on the floor of the U.S. Senate yesterday I made some observations with respect to the nuclear test cessation.

Now the Soviet Communists have given the United States and the rest of the free world an ultimatum. This morning, the press says:

GENEVA, June 12.—The Soviet Union served notice today that the negotiating stage was

finished at the conference on the projected treaty to ban nuclear tests.

Mr. Tsarapkin made it clear that the Soviet terms for agreement were not negotiable. He emphasized that the West would have to accept the Soviet Union's demand for a three-man council to administer test ban controls.

Whereupon, Mr. Arthur Dean, chief negotiator for the United States, is reported to have stated:

It only serves to confirm the impression of the last few weeks that the Soviet Union's real purpose is "not to negotiate but to dictate."

I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1961]

SOVIET ULTIMATUM ON ATOMIC PARLEY IS GIVEN TO WEST—RUSSIANS DEMAND OWN PACT OR TRANSFER INTO BROADER CONFERENCE ON ARMS—UNITED STATES DENOUNCES STAND—DEAN SAYS TSARAPKIN SEEKS TO DICTATE, NOT DISCUSS, AGREEMENT IN GENEVA

GENEVA, June 12.—The Soviet Union served notice today that the negotiating stage was finished at the conference on the projected treaty to ban nuclear tests.

The United States and Britain, the other conferees, were given the choice of accepting the Soviet Union's terms for a treaty or of having the 2½-year-old talks merged into broader disarmament negotiations.

Only by electing one of the alternatives can the West salvage the talks from the present impasse, Semyon K. Tsarapkin, the Soviet delegate, declared.

MOVE CALLED ULTIMATUM

The Western nations viewed the Soviet demands as an ultimatum.

(The administration was under pressure from two sides to take action. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said that the United States could not go on much longer without an agreement on nuclear testing, and several congressional Democrats urged that President Kennedy break off the talks in Geneva or resume atomic tests.)

KHRUSHCHEV'S DECISION

The Soviet demands were presented in the form of the memorandum on the test ban conference that Premier Khrushchev handed President Kennedy at their meeting in Vienna earlier this month.

The memorandum, which President Kennedy said "struck a serious blow" to hopes for agreement here, was offered by Mr. Tsarapkin today at the 317th session of the talks.

The negotiations began October 31, 1958.

Mr. Tsarapkin made it clear that the Soviet terms for agreement were not negotiable. He emphasized that the West would have to accept the Soviet Union's demand for a three-man council to administer test ban controls.

The Soviet plan, which calls for a Russian, a westerner and a representative of the uncommitted countries to run the control system by unanimous decision, has been rejected repeatedly by the West.

The West does not believe that the system would work with a power of veto in the hands of each of the three coadministrators.

Mr. Tsarapkin also said that the Soviet Union could never agree to the West's proposal for 12 to 20 annual inspections of earth tremors that could be caused by nuclear explosions in the Soviet Union. He denounced the Western demand as "excessive" and inspired only by a desire to get spies into the Soviet Union.

Mr. Tsarapkin said the Soviet Union would be "more flexible" on controls in the context of an agreement on "general and complete disarmament."

MORATORIUM AN ISSUE

But he said the West must also give ground on the moratorium on the smaller underground nuclear tests that would not be included in the formal ban until ways to detect them are found by science.

He said that the West, in asking that the moratorium pledge be limited initially to 3 years, after which the question would be reviewed, was seeking an out to resume testing.

The Soviet Union wants the West to agree to continue the moratorium indefinitely even if effective controls to check on violations are not found.

By offering the West the choice between accepting the Soviet positions or of enlarging the test-ban talks into overall disarmament negotiations, the memorandum showed the "elasticity of the Soviet positions and reflected accurately the constructive approach of the Soviet Government," Mr. Tsarapkin said.

Arthur H. Dean, of the United States, was quick to express regret that the Soviet Union had put the memorandum into the conference record as its latest official position.

It only serves to confirm the impression of the last few weeks that the Soviet Union's real purpose is "not to negotiate but to dictate," the U.S. delegate charged.

"Today more blatantly than ever before," he added, "the two Western delegations seem to have been presented with the Soviet position on a take-it-or-leave-it basis."

Sir Michael Wright of Britain bluntly asked the Soviet delegate if the memorandum was an ultimatum. Mr. Tsarapkin showed himself to be too annoyed to answer, a conference source said. The word "ultimatum" was used by one high-ranking Western conference spokesman to describe the Soviet document.

FINANCING FOREIGN PLANE PRODUCTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, an article in the Washington Post this morning by John Norris, able commentator on military affairs, states that Canada and the United States have just signed an air defense and plane production exchange agreement; and that as a result of this agreement, "a $200-million order will be placed in Canada for building F–104G Super Starfighters for use by other NATO countries in the defense of Western Europe."

The article states:

The United States will put up $150 million and Canada $50 million to enable the two Governments to make a significant contribution to the collective strength of NATO, the Pentagon announcement said.

The article says:

Deliveries will start in mid-1963, subject to action by the U.S. Congress and Canadian Parliament in providing the military assistance funds required.

That is not all.

An article in the same paper this morning, entitled "NATO Backs Accord on Building Jets," by the Herald Tribune News Service, dateline Paris, June 12, states:

A 4-year program to build F–104 Starfighter jets in Belgium, West Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands was approved today by the Permanent Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The four NATO members signed an agreement with the United States last December to build the jet fighter and interceptor.

Now, several things disturb me about these two newspaper stories.

The article says it must be "subject to action by the U.S. Congress."

Despite that fact, plus the fact treaties go to the Foreign Relations Committee, and foreign military assistance is defended before the Foreign Relations Committee, no notice of this transaction or comment of any kind has been received by the Foreign Relations Committee, although a letter was sent to the Armed Services Committee.

Secondly, as everyone knows, the unit cost of any product depends in large measure upon the volume.

The United States produces F–104's. Apparently the plan is to have us pay $150 million to have them also produced in Canada; and more, to have them now produced in four additional countries.

How can six assembly lines in any way give a unit price comparable to what would be the cost off one assembly line? It would seem this is especially pertinent to the American people because, in effect, they are putting up the money.

Finally, today there are thousands of unemployed airplane workers in my State, and tens of thousands in other States. Only yesterday a representative of these people was in my office protesting bitterly about the current heavy unemployment incident to the heavy reduction of airplane production in the United States.

The designers of this plane, Lockheed Aircraft of Burbank, Calif., do not own the Canadian plant in question; but they will receive a royalty on this Canadian production.

That may be fine for the Lockheed stockholders—but will not help the Lockheed workers who have been laid off.

Why should we make such extensive plans to produce these U.S.-designed planes outside the United States, especially, as I have presented to the Senate before, our unprecedented prosperity is nevertheless now accompanied by great unemployment?

I submit that the five countries in question could in no sense be considered "underdeveloped countries."

Are we now to establish a policy of other countries making the planes, our activities being confined to making the money?

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles in question be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 13, 1961]

UNITED STATES-CANADA AIR DEFENSE PACT SIGNED—AGREEMENT INCLUDES PLANE PRODUCTION EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(By John G. Norris)

Canada and the United States signed an air-defense and plane production exchange agreement yesterday that is aimed at bolstering North American and NATO defenses.

The deal, several years in the making, provides that:

The United States will give 66 F–101B long-range interceptors to the Royal Canadian Air Force to replace obsolete CF–100's in the North American Air Defense Command.

Canada will take over responsibility for the operation of all but 6 of the 33 radar

stations of the Pinetree Line, southernmost of the three chains of warning stations extending across North America.

Both countries enter into a production sharing project, under which a $200 million order will be placed in Canada for building F–104G Super Starfighters for use by other NATO countries in the defense of Western Europe.

The United States will put up $150 million and Canada $50 million to enable the two Governments to make a significant contribution to the collective strength of NATO, the Pentagon announcement said. The F–104 is a 1,400-mile-an-hour American Lockheed fighter being built in Canada and other countries under license.

Deliveries will start in mid-1963, subject to action by the U.S. Congress and Canadian Parliament in providing the military assistance funds required.

Delivery of the 1,200-mile-an-hour F–101 Voodoos will fill a gap in Canadian air defense. Several years ago Canada dropped development of its own high performance interceptor, the CF–105, as a replacement for the subsonic CF–100. At that time the RCAF intended to replace all manned air defense planes with the U.S. Bomarc ground-to-air missile, production of which since has been cut back.

At one time, the just-signed United States-Canadian plane deal tentatively included the transfer of some Canadian CL–44 transports to the U.S. Air Force, but this fell through.

Under the agreement, Canada assumes immediately all costs of operating five Pinetree Line radar stations. These stations—now operated by Canadians—are in Quebec, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland.

Eleven other radar stations in British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, and Nova Scotia, now operated by Americans, will be taken over by Canadians and financially supported by Canada, as soon as arrangements are completed.

NATO Backs Accord on Building Jets

PARIS, June 12.—A 4-year program to build F–104 Starfighter jets in Belgium, West Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands was approved today by the Permanent Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The four NATO members signed an agreement with the United States last December to build the jet fighter and interceptor.

EARLY CONSIDERATION OF MULTILATERAL EMBARGO AGAINST CUBA URGED

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, from the mail which has arrived at my office in recent weeks, from newspaper, radio, and television commentaries, and from just plain talk with scores of people from New York and other States, it is more than ever apparent that the Nation's No. 1 concern in foreign affairs is Cuba. It is not alone the Cuban fiasco of last April, nor the subsequent tractors-for-freedom negotiation, that has developed this great concern among the American people. It is also a greater realization by Americans that our foreign policy experts are desperately, and up to the present time unsuccessfully, groping for a way to eliminate communism's cancerous growth from Latin America.

Several months ago, I called for a complete embargo against Cuba by the Organization of American States. Many other voices have been raised on this issue. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have felt that a trade embargo against the Cuban dictator would be an effective instrument for ridding the Western Hemisphere of a threat to every nation of North and South America. Yet, after the passage of several months and the support of an armed invasion by this country, I have been informed by the State Department that the matter is still under study.

For that reason it was heartening to hear support for the position of an embargo against Cuba from a man who has served for over 3 years as the American Ambassador to Mexico and has had a wealth of experience in understanding and dealing with the people of Latin America.

The testimony yesterday of Robert C. Hill before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee substantiated the urgent need for affirmative action to combat communism throughout the entire southern part of the Western Hemisphere. Mr. Hill gave his wholehearted support to a complete embargo, through the Organization of American States, against all trade with Castro's Cuba.

Madam President, I again repeat my call for the United States to press for an early meeting of the Organization of American States, and at such meeting place high on the agenda the consideration of a multilateral embargo by the Western Hemisphere nations against all trade with Cuba.

DAMMING OUR INDIAN HERITAGE

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, many of us, including my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, are unhappy about the impending dislocation of the Seneca Indians and the violation of their historic treaty as a result of the Kinzua Dam now being constructed in Pennsylvania. While I was in the House of Representatives, and last year also in the Senate, I opposed the Corps of Engineers plan and asked that a full study be made of the alternatives proposed by Dr. Arthur Morgan. Nevertheless, despite the long record of opposition by myself and others who recognized the implications of the project, appropriations were voted by the Congress.

More recently, Senator JAVITS and I supported Mr. Basil Williams, president of the Seneca Nation of Indians, in his request for an appointment with the President so that the matter could be fully discussed and reviewed at the highest level before it becomes too late.

Madam President, yesterday an editorial appeared in the New York Times supporting the position of the Indians and urging the President to appoint an impartial and expert committee to examine the Morgan plan and the Corps of Engineers plan and make a full report to Congress on their comparative merits. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1961]

JUSTICE FOR THE SENECAS

The Philadelphia yearly meeting of Friends (Quakers) has challenged the conscience of the Nation, and President Kennedy's, in its report on the Kinzua Dam. That project would put under water valuable lands of the Seneca Indians despite opposition by the Seneca Nation.

Completion of the dam would be a clear, unilateral abrogation, without negotiation, of a treaty with the United States signed in 1794 which guaranteed the Seneca Nation control of its own lands. It would also violate the pledges of both the major parties, made in the last campaign, to recognize the rights of the Indians. The Democratic platform promised that "free consent of the Indian tribes concerned shall be required before the Federal Government makes any change in any Federal-Indian treaty or other contractual relationship."

The Seneca Nation fully recognizes the urgent public need to control the waters of the Allegheny River. And it has proposed an alternative, Conewango, project designed by Arthur E. Morgan, distinguished engineer and formerly head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which would allegedly furnish adequate flood control without destruction of the heart of the Seneca lands.

The Philadelphia Friends' report, with excellent documentation, urges President Kennedy to stop further preliminary work on the Kinzua Dam and to appoint an impartial expert committee to examine both plans and make a report to Congress as the basis for a sound congressional decision. We support that request. But, whatever action is taken by the President or Congress must, in all conscience, recognize the treaty rights of the Seneca Nation.

STRENGTHENING THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, is Senate bill 1750 at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 334, Senate bill 1750.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1750) to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(52 Stat. 1250; 15 U.S.C. 901, and the following), is amended by repealing paragraph (6) and renumbering paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7)", and in lieu thereof, to insert "(52 Stat. 1250; 15 U.S.C. 901–909), is further amended by repealing paragraph (6), by deleting the words "crime of violence" in paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year", and by renumbering paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7).", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Federal Firearms Act, as amended (52 Stat. 1250; 15 U.S.C. 901–909), is further amended by repealing paragraph (6), by deleting the words "crime of violence" in paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "crime punishable

by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year", and by renumbering paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7).

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended by deleting the words "crime of violence" in subsections (d), (e), and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of the report covering aspects of the legislation.

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

PURPOSE

Among other things, the Federal Firearms Act (52 Stat. 1250; 15 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) prohibits the shipment of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce to or by persons under indictment or convicted of a "crime of violence." This term is defined to mean murder, manslaughter, rape, mayhem, kidnaping, robbery, burglary, housebreaking; assault with intent to kill, commit rape, or rob; assault with a dangerous weapon, or assault with intent to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year. The act also prohibits the receipt of firearms by persons convicted of such crimes, or by fugitives who have fled across State lines to avoid prosecution for any of such crimes or to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceeding. Violations are punishable by fines of not more than $2,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 5 years.

This legislation would amend the act to make the mentioned prohibitions applicable to persons indicted, convicted, or fleeing with respect to any crime which measures up to the Federal standard of a felony; that is, any crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

STATEMENT

Over the past few years the infiltration of racketeering into our society and the exploding crime rate have increasingly become a cause for national concern. New laws are needed to give the Federal Bureau of Investigation additional jurisdiction to assist local authorities in the common assault against crime. S. 1750, introduced at the request of the Attorney General as an integral part of an anticrime legislative program, would be such a law. Additionally, it would make it more difficult for the criminal elements of our society to obtain firearms.

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

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HEIRS OF ANTHONY BOURBONNAIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 336, House bill 4500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4500) to donate to the heirs of Anthony Bourbonnais approximately thirty-six one-hundredths acre of land in Pottawatomie County, Okla.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "less", to insert "subject to a reservation to the United States of a right of access across such land whenever needed for public purposes".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 4500 is to donate to the heirs of Anthony Bourbonnais in an unrestricted status approximately thirty-six one-hundredths acre of land in Pottawatomie County, Okla.

NEED

The land in question is a narrow strip lying between the Bourbonnais Indian allotment and an adjoining State highway. Until a recent survey indicated the contrary, it was assumed that the acreage was part of the allotment and it was so treated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Enactment of the bill is needed to overcome the problems raised by the survey.

AMENDMENT

In order to preclude any claim against the Federal Government by reason of access provided by the land to be donated, the committee has adopted an amendment reserving to the United States a right of access across such land whenever such land is needed for public purposes.

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

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, an editorial in the New York Times of June 1, 1961, expresses a growing concern over the future development and use of satellites for commercial communication.

There is evidence that the Federal Communications Commission is moving toward giving preliminary approval to A.T. & T. and other international common carriers for the exclusive right to construct and to operate a worldwide communication system using satellites.

We all wish to have peaceful use made of the satellites as soon as possible, but we must also be concerned with the grave domestic and international problems which accompany the commercial use of satellites for communications.

The act which established the Space Council in substance provides that it shall be the function of the Council to advise and assist the President, as he may request, with respect to the performance of functions in the aeronautics and space field, including the following functions:

First. To survey all significant aeronautical and space activities, including the policies, plans, programs, and accomplishments of all departments and agencies of the United States engaged in such activities;

Second. To develop a comprehensive program of aeronautical and space activities to be conducted by departments and agencies of the United States;

Third. To designate and fix responsibility for the direction of major aeronautical and space activities;

Fourth. To provide for effective cooperation among all departments and agencies of the United States engaged in aeronautical and space activities, and to specify, in any case in which primary responsibility for any category of aeronautical and space activities has been assigned to any department or agency, which of those activities may be carried on concurrently by other departments or agencies; and

Fifth. To resolve differences arising among departments and agencies of the United States with respect to aeronautical and space activities under this act, including differences as to whether a particular project is an aeronautical and space activity.

The decision in this area which it is rumored is about to be made is so important that it should be of concern, I think, to the committees of the Congress. The committees of the Congress should understand, if not approve, the full implications of any decision which is made in this area.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SPACE COMMUNICATIONS PROBLEMS

The first practical application of recent scientific advances in space appears likely to be the establishment within the next few years of communications satellites which will greatly expand existing facilities for international transmission of information and intelligence.

The decisions made in the development of this field are likely to have far-reaching political and economic implications because they will create precedents for other areas of human activity in space.

Against this background it is astonishing and regrettable that some key decisions have been recently taken with almost no public discussion or debate. One such decision is that of our Armed Forces to create their own satellite communications network. Another such decision is that of the Federal Communications Commission, which has ruled that, insofar as this country is concerned, commercial satellite communication shall be carried out as a joint venture in which only present international communications firms shall participate.

Many questions arise immediately concerning these decisions. Is it really necessary to go to the expense of setting up separate civilian and commercial satellite communications networks? Is the FCC a body with relatively narrow responsibilities, really the group to make fundamental and precedent-setting decisions in an area that

involves so many interests outside the communications fields?

Since most of the technology required to set up a satellite network has been developed at public expense, is there any justification for limiting participation in the final commercial effort to a relatively small number of firms? Should not this Nation set an example for future international cooperation in space by attempting to get worldwide cooperation—perhaps through the United Nations—at the very beginning of such a global communications network? Has enough attention been given to the opportunity presented by satellite communications possibilities to increase competition in this field?

We would offer no dogmatic answers to these and many other similar questions that could be raised. We suggest, however, that the questions involved are too important for the American people to be content with decisions reached by groups of officials—either in the Department of Defense or the FCC—who are unlikely to have considered the full range of implications for this country and all humanity that these matters involve.

GOVERNMENT DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I should like to report to the Senate some progress in my campaign to get more Government defense contracts to labor surplus areas in New York State.

An analysis of defense procurement covering the first 3 months of 1961 shows that nine of New York State's labor surplus areas received more defense contracts then they did during the same 3-month period in 1960. Three areas showed decreases. Two other areas were named labor surplus areas for the first time during this period and, therefore, there is no basis for comparison.

While these new procurement figures indicate some progress, additional action needs to be taken to streamline defense procurement policies so that labor surplus areas will receive a more substantial number of Government contracts.

Government defense orders awarded to New York State's 14 labor surplus areas during the first 3 months of 1961 totaled $50.8 million—an average of $3.6 million per area. For the same period in 1960, a total of $38.5 million was awarded to 12 labor surplus areas—an average of $3.2 million per area.

The nine areas showing increases were: Albany-Schenectady-Troy; Utica-Rome; Amsterdam; Auburn; Elmira; Jamestown-Dunkirk; Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone; Plattsburgh; and Wellsville. The three areas showing decreases were: Buffalo, Gloversville, and Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon.

Total defense contracts awarded to all New York State firms, whether in labor surplus areas or not, amounted to $563.8 million for the first 3 months of 1961. This represents a decrease from the $752.8 million awarded to New York firms for the same 3 months of 1960. For the same period California continued to receive an increase in defense contracts—from $1,123 million to $1,240 million.

The latest defense procurement figures emphasize once again the need to open up procurement opportunities to more intensive competition. Open bidding is now applied to less than 15 percent of the $23 billion awarded in defense contracts. It is time we insisted upon more competition to give everyone a chance to bid for this business.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a table giving facts on this subject may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Trends in prime defense contract awards of $10,000 or more in New York State areas of substantial labor surplus (1st quarter of calendar 1961 and 1960)

[In thousands of dollars]

Major areas and contract awards	January–March		
	1961	1960	1961 as compared to 1960
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, May 1958 [1] to November 1959, March 1960:			
Total	3,641	824	[2] (+2,717)
Preferential	0	0	(0)
Buffalo, March 1958: [1]			
Total	25,028	25,118	−90
Preferential	211	13	+198
Syracuse, January 1961: [1]			
Total	−389		
Preferential	0		
Utica-Rome, January 1958: [1]			
Total	11,593	8,636	+2,857
Preferential	11	87	−76
Amsterdam, [3] March 1958: [1]			
Total	913	703	+210
Preferential	0	35	−35
Auburn, [3] April 1958: [1]			
Total	184	176	+8
Preferential	0	0	0
Elmira, April 1958: [1]			
Total	2,378	558	+1,820
Preferential	0	0	0
Gloversville, [3] April 1958: [1]			
Total	234	239	−5
Preferential	0	0	0
Jamestown-Dunkirk, [3] April 1958: [1]			
Total	665	425	+240
Preferential	0	0	0
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, July 1958: [1]			
Total	524	1,422	−898
Preferential	0	84	−84
Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone, [3] November 1959: [1]			
Total	58	12	+46
Preferential	0	0	0
Olean-Salamanca, January 1961: [1]			
Total	0		
Preferential	0		
Plattsburgh, [3] March 1959: [1]			
Total	5,946	322	+5,624
Preferential	18	0	+18
Wellsville, November 1958: [1]			
Total	272	74	+198
Preferential	0	0	0

[1] Date first designated as an area of substantial labor surplus by Department of Labor.

[2] These increases over the previous fiscal year should be noted in light of the fact that Albany-Schenectady-Troy was listed as an area of substantial labor surplus only for part of the previous fiscal year.

[3] Area of substantial and persistent labor surplus.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, the battle, friendly but vigorous, in respect to defense contracts, between New York and California continues.

My colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I, and our colleagues in the other body, are pressing for more competition in regard to defense orders. We have introduced proposed legislation to that effect.

We appreciate fully the sporting interest which is involved, but we are determined that there shall be more competition, and we are of the belief that if there is more competition, our State will do better, for our business and labor will sharpen up their pencils for that purpose.

NEW YORK STILL LOSING OUT

Mr. KEATING subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to commend my colleague from New York on the fine job he has done in presenting to the Senate more of the serious and disturbing facts about defense procurement in New York State. Some progress has been made but as I pointed out last week during the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration, New York's share of overall military prime contract work has fallen 5 percentage points as compared with the same period in 1960. Instead of 15 percent of the total, New York is only getting about 10 percent now. This is quite a drop for a 3-month period. It represents in dollars and cents a loss of nearly $200 million even though overall defense spending for this 3-month period has increased by more than half a billion dollars over the same period last year.

Moreover, Mr. President, it certainly appears that the new administration is taking away with one hand what it is trying to give with the other. What is the value of depressed-area legislation, vocational training programs for areas of labor surplus and a variety of similar measures to be carried on by the Department of Commerce and other Government agencies when at the same time the Department of Defense is deliberately directing its billions of dollars of procurement spending away from such areas? When, in fact, it is apparently shifting most of its work to one State on the west coast?

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Senate recently passed a Federal aid to education bill, the result of which is that New Yorkers will be taxed to pay educational expenses in Texas, California, and a number of other so-called poor States. Why, you may ask, is it necessary for New Yorkers to support schools in other States?

The answer, unfortunately, is that in order to encourage new industries, many of these States maintain very low property and income taxes on their own. In order to attract industry from New York and the Northeast, these States simply do not make use of all of their available tax sources. The result can be reflected in lower costs, lower bids on defense contracts in certain cases, and ultimately in a very serious and unbalanced concentration of defense contracts on the west coast.

So any way you look at it, Mr. President, New York gets the short end of the stick. New Yorkers continue to pay in taxes nearly 20 percent of the costs of the Federal benefits that other States enjoy but New York continues to lose out in the distribution of Federal funds whether for defense contracts or for education or for highway construction, or for a variety of other Government programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks follow those of my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat what I have said before on the

floor of the Senate: There are not any more able advocates for the people whom they represent than the two distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING]. They have done what they ought to do on the floor of the Senate. They are my friends.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that Congress, again and again and again, has directed the administration and the Department of Defense to utilize defense appropriations solely and singly to provide the most effective defense of the American people. It is against the law to use defense dollars for social purposes, no matter how worthy those social purposes may be. It is against the law of the land to use defense dollars for the purpose of relieving unemployment or for any other social purpose. Congress has said so, and the Comptroller General of the United States recently has confirmed what I have just said.

If the time ever comes when the defense appropriations of the Government of the United States are used for any other purpose than for the establishment and maintenance of our American military system capable of preserving and of defending our country, then God help us.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE EFFECTIVE ECONOMIC POWER OF THE WESTERN WORLD

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, if no other Senator seeks recognition, I should like to continue speaking for another 3 minutes on another subject, and ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

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

Mr. JAVITS. One of the great initiatives undertaken by this country was the Marshall plan, which represented the consolidation of the effective economic power of what is called the Western World. We have recently had an eloquent call from free Europe for newly implementing the same idea in the face of the intransigence and the implacable demand that we yield or appease, which was made by Chairman Khrushchev of President Kennedy at Vienna the other day. The call to us was sounded by Jean Monnet in a commencement address at Dartmouth College.

Approximately 14 years ago, it will be recalled, Secretary of State Marshall sounded the same type of call in the Marshall plan. May it be remembered that when Britain was in grave danger she wanted to merge with France at the beginning of World War II. We are not in such a dangerous situation now. We are strong and viable, and we represent together with Western Europe close to $1 trillion of annual gross national product which is the greatest bloc of economic power mankind has ever known.

Has anyone ever asked himself what Chairman Khrushchev would do to us if he had $1 trillion in productive resources? We know what he would do. He would pulverize us economically and he probably could. Yet we do not integrate our efforts to enlist this massive production in terms of the struggle for freedom. Why? Because we shrink from the implications of the legal, administrative, and structural forms of the integration of the free world. The whole Atlantic community, which has the main economic power of the free world, can be its agent to win decisively in the struggle for freedom.

I hope in the next few weeks, as we consider the foreign aid program, to propose some independent ideas of my own as to how we can tie the private economic systems of the whole Atlantic community into the foreign aid program, and as to how we can get more help from the European powers which, through the Marshall plan, have now become prosperous and viable on their own.

But mistake it not, Jean Monnet has made a strong historic declaration. We had better listen while it is yet time, for if we wish to call for freedom we must marshal up our economic power. All the fine speeches on the subject will not do it. We cannot marshal the economic power unless we undertake some of the efforts in terms of collaboration of the economic community, which is absolutely essential, and which may run counter to some of the shiboleths to which we have held. But the Russians will not listen or pay attention to these shiboleths.

The Communists will sweep us aside unless we consult what is the ultimate of our economic power, without regard to what has happened in the past, but only with regard to what is necessary for survival from here on. I hope our country will listen to Jean Monnet. I am proud to stand on the floor of the Senate and urge others of my colleagues to do the same thing. We must be brave if we wish to win for freedom, and he is beginning to show us a way.

From the devastation of the Second World War a grand design has been taking on shape and substance: a united Western World. The concept had for centuries formed the basis for discussion among philosophers and statesmen of the West, but it was never realized except in ephemeral forums or in the short-lived and misdirected conquests of a king, an emperor, and a dictator. After 1945, the harsh needs of our times drew the Western World together on a realistic, multilateral basis.

The first great, real step was the Marshall plan, enlisting the United States in the recovery of Western Europe and initiating the powerful forces of European integration. Commitments were made, commitments were kept, and with increasing momentum the tragically divided instruments of Western political ideology and human values were drawn together to create the most powerful economic potential in the history of the world. The question now is not whether or not this integration of the Western World will continue in spite of the remaining divisive issues that remain. The question which has been put before the West with growing urgency during the past decade is: Shall this economic potential be used to preserve and to extend the civilization and the values around which it has taken shape? Only an answer to the second question can provide an answer to the first. The Western World must turn outward, otherwise its continued movement toward integration will lose purpose and meaning and will stop.

Since 1957 the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference Economic Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has devoted itself to working out plans for providing a real, substantive answer. Much of its early work played a role in the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—which is soon to become a functioning body and to which the United States adhered last March. The purpose of this organization is to turn the strength of the Western World outward for the economic development of the free world's emerging nations so that they may achieve their economic growth in political freedom and so that they may give to their individual citizens a rising standard of life while enhancing his human dignity.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report of Jean Monnet's remarks on June 11, at the Dartmouth College commencement, inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

MONNET BIDS UNITED STATES STRENGTHEN TIES TO THE CONTINENT—DARTMOUTH HEARS THE FRENCH STATESMAN PRESS FOR UNITY AS WAY TO GAIN PEACE

(By John H. Fenton)

HANOVER, N.H., June 11.—Jean Monnet, a French architect of Western unity, called today for an extension of the partnership of Europe and the United States.

He said that the methods of economic and political unity being developed on the Continent pointed the way toward common institutions for an enlarged Atlantic community.

M. Monnet told the graduating class at Dartmouth College:

"Just as the United States in their own days found it necessary to unite, just as Europe is now in the process of uniting, so the West must move toward some kind of union. This is not an end in itself. It is the beginning on the road to the more orderly world we must have in order to escape destruction. The partnership of Europe and the United States should create a new force for peace."

TOTAL OF 588 SENIORS GET DEGREES

The speech by M. Monnet, a former president of the European Coal and Steel Community, combined the baccalaureate and commencement addresses at the exercises marking Dartmouth's 192d year. He was one of eight recipients of honorary degrees.

More than 2,000 persons attended the exercises on the lawn in front of Baker Library. Threatening clouds and a damp breeze dissipated as the seniors went to their places.

Dr. John Sloan Dickey, president of the college, bestowed degrees on 588 seniors, 13 graduate students, 23 medical school graduates and 20 students of the Thayer School of Engineering.

FORESEES SHIFT BY UNITED STATES

M. Monnet discerned an urgent need for the United States and Europe to move toward a true Atlantic community in which

common institutions will be increasingly developed to meet common problems.

Noting the advances toward unity on the continent, he said he was convinced that, ultimately, the United States, too, will delegate powers of effective action to common institutions, even on political questions.

The partnership between Europe and the United States would ultimately make it possible to overcome the differences between East and West, M. Monnet said.

The Soviet objective, as Premier Khrushchev has said many times, is a Communist world, the French statesman said.

"When this becomes so obviously impossible that nobody, even within a closed society, can any longer believe it, then Mr. Khrushchev or his successor will accept facts," M. Monnet said. "The conditions will at last exist for turning so-called peaceful coexistence into genuine peace. At that time, real disarmament will became possible."

As soon as it is clear the West is determined to unite, he said, the world will react to the trend. But he warned: "We must, therefore, take the first steps quickly. The danger increases every day."

In the past, M. Monnet went on, "there has been no middle ground between the jungle law of nations and the utopia of international accord." Now, he said, the steps taken in Europe toward unity have shown the way. The lesson, he said, is "the extraordinary transforming power of common institutions."

"As we can see from American and British reactions to European unity, one change in the road to collective responsibility brings another," he declared. "The chain reaction has only begun. We are starting a process of continuing reform which can alter tomorrow's world more lastingly than the principles of revolution so widespread outside the West."

M. Monnet said that the Atlantic partnership would "give the West the opportunity to deal on a basis with the problems of the underdeveloped areas."

"Just as our own societies would never have found their spiritual and political equilibrium if the internal problems of poverty had not been tackled," he said, "so the liberties which form the best part of the Western tradition could hardly survive a failure to overcome the international divisions between rich and poor, and between black, yellow, and white."

M. Monnet received the honorary degree of doctor of laws. So too did Kent Smith, Dartmouth alumnus of the class of 1915 and a retired industrialist.

Other recipients were Francis L. Childs, Winkley Professor of Anglo-Saxon and English language and literature emeritus, and Yousuf Karsh, photographer and portraitist, doctor of humans letters; Albert W. Tucker, chairman of the mathematics department at Princeton University, and Frank H. Westheimer, chairman of the chemistry department at Harvard University, doctor of science; Phyllis McGinley, the poet, doctor of letters, and James F. Malley, class of 1911, retired industrialist and former member of the New Hampshire Legislature, master of arts.

TO ESTABLISH A WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 269, Senate bill 811.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 811) to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain excerpts from the report of the Committee on Public Works.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the establishment of a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission which would be responsible for coordination of Federal, State, and local plans for the development of the water and land resources in the Wabash River Basin, Ind. and Ill.; prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, integrated, joint plan for water and related land resources development in the basin; recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects in such basin; to foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the basin; to submit periodic reports to the President, the Federal agencies, and the Governor of each State; and to submit to the President a comprehensive, integrated joint plan, and necessary revisions, for the water and related land resources development in the Wabash River Basin, with views, comments, and recommendations of the interested Federal agencies, Governor of each State, and chairmen of interested interstate commissions.

DISCUSSION

Enactment of S. 811 will provide authority for studies and development of plans for the utilization of the land and water resources in an area of 33,100 square miles in the States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The entire stream and its tributary areas will be considered in preparing plans for proper development of its resources. The possibilities for economic and population growth of this area is based to a large extent on full and proper use and conservation of its land and water resources. Conservation and control of floodwater is urgently needed for domestic, municipal, and industrial water supply, and protection of people, homes, farms, and improvements from the ravages of devastating floods. The Wabash Basin includes about two-thirds of the State of Indiana, and a large area of the State of Illinois, and yields a large percentage of the waters of those States. At times the flows are of such magnitude that they menace existing developments and discourage improvements in the fertile flat valley lands, and in other instances the erratic flows discourage many potential developments that require an adequate and dependable water supply.

The enactment of this measure would provide for coordinated studies of plans for improvements which have as their purpose the enhancement of opportunities for about 4 million people residing in a rapidly developing area of our Nation. Complete utilization of land and water resources is essential in developing a sound and permanent economy.

Many flood control, navigation, watershed protection, water pollution control, water supply, and other water and land resources development projects have been constructed, are under construction, authorized, and are being planned in this area. The Study Commission would review all existing and proposed projects with a view to fully coordinating the purposes of those projects in existence, under construction, authorized, those being planned, and those under study, so that there will be a final plan with the best utilization of the resources of the area embodied therein.

In his message to Congress on natural resources, printed as House Document No. 94, 87th Congress, the President recommended the establishment of planning commissions for all major river basins where adequate coordinated plans are not already in existence. Enactment of S. 811 will be in accord with this recommendation.

VIEWS OF THE COMMITTEE

Comprehensive water resources development plans have been prepared in the past for certain areas and found to be of great value in the formulation and selection of projects for construction. Examples of these studies are the comprehensive report on the New York-New England region and the equally comprehensive report on the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins in Southwestern United States. Other comprehensive studies, such as those on the Columbia, the Missouri, the Mississippi, and the Ohio, have provided to form an invaluable basis for the development of the water resources in those basins.

The Congress has authorized similar study commissions for the southeastern river basins of the United States and for certain southwestern river basins. The committee is of the opinion that the proposed study of the Wabash Basin will prove of equal value in the future development of the water and related resources of this extremely important area of our Nation.

It is not the purpose or function of the Commission to interfere with or delay improvements already authorized that are urgently needed, but to coordinate and work out arrangements for a plan that will provide for the fullest utilization and development of all the water and land resources of the Wabash River Basin.

The committee therefore recommends enactment of S. 811.

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

The bill (S. 811) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) Because a well-integrated and comprehensive plan of development and utilization of water resources in the Wabash River Basin can only be achieved on a cooperative basis with the participation of all affected Federal agencies, States, and local agencies and interests, it is essential that a full and complete investigation, study, and survey be made of the land and water resources and their utilization for the region within the Wabash Basin, consisting of the watershed of the entire Wabash River and its tributaries, located within States of Indiana and Illinois.

(b) It is intended that the Commission, in the performance of its duties will—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, and local

plans for the development of water and related land resources in the Wabash Basin;

(2) prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, integrated, joint plan for water and related land resources development in such basin;

(3) recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects in such basin; and

(4) foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in such basin.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall be composed of members to be appointed by the President of the United States as follows:

(1) A Chairman who shall not, during the period of his service on the Commission, hold any other position as an active officer or employee of the United States, but a retired military officer or a retired civilian officer or employee of the Federal Government may be appointed under this clause without prejudice to his retired status and he shall be entitled to the compensation payable under this Act or to his retired pay or annuity, whichever he may elect;

(2) One member from each Federal department or agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the Commission;

(3) One or more members, as determined by the President, from each of the States of Indiana and Illinois, to be nominated by the Governor of such State, or, in the event of the failure of the Governor to nominate a person satisfactory to the President within sixty days after a request by the President to make a nomination, by the President upon his own nomination, and unless otherwise determined by the President, the term of each such member shall run for the same period as that of the Governor making the nomination; and

(4) One member from each interstate commission created by a compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, which has jurisdiction over any of the waters of the Wabash Basin, to be nominated by such commission, or, in the event of the failure of such commission to nominate a person satisfactory to the President within sixty days after a request by the President to make a nomination, by the President on his own nomination.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall organize for the performance of its duties within thirty days after all of its initial members have been appointed and funds have become available for carrying on its work. At such time as he deems appropriate, the President may terminate the Commission, and all property, assets, and records of the Commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agency or agencies of the United States as the President may designate.

(b) The Commission shall elect a vice chairman from among its members.

(c) Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same maner in which the original appointment was made.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to engage in such activities and to make such studies and investigations as are necessary or desirable in the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in section 2 of this Act;

(2) to submit to the President a report on its work at least once a year, and such report shall be transmitted by the President to the Congress, and to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and the chairman of each interstate commission, from which a member of the Commission has been appointed; and

(3) to submit to the President a comprehensive, integrated, joint plan, and any necessary major revision thereof, for water and related land resources development in the Wabash Basin, but before the Commission transmits such plan or major revision to the President, it shall transmit a copy of the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and the chairman of each interstate commission, from which a member of the Commission has been appointed, and each such department and agency head, Governor, and commission chairman shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan to report his views, comments, and recommendations to the Commission, and such views, comments, and recommendations shall be transmitted to the President with such plan or major revision after such modification by the Commission as may be necessary because of such views, comments, and recommendations.

(b) Each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall from time to time report on the work of the Commission to the head of the Federal department or agency, the Governor of the State, or the chairman of the interstate commission from which he was appointed, and shall present to the Commission for its consideration any comments or suggestions received as a result of such report.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) For the purpose of carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as the departments and other agencies of the United States, employ such personnel as it deems advisable; purchase, hire, operate, maintain, and dispose of such vehicles as it may require; pay in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by it or any of its members, officers, or employees, in the performance of duties vested in it; and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) A majority of the members of the Commission holding office at any time shall constitute a quorum but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(c) The Chairman of the Commission, or any member thereof designated by him for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(d) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Commission may be made available for public inspection during the ordinary office hours of the Commission.

(e) Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission or any member or employee thereof designated by him for the purpose, the head of any department or agency of the Government is authorized (1) to furnish to the Commission such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by the department or agency to which the request is addressed, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with the Commission such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, and such department or agency shall be reimbursed for the services of such personnel.

(f) The Chairman shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by the Commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds available to the Commission. In carrying out his functions under this subsection, the Chairman shall be governed by the general policies of the Commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof.

COMPENSATION OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

SEC. 7. (a) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to section 3(2) of this Act shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which they are appointed, the salary of their regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to section 3 (3) and (4) of this Act, shall each receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day when engaged in the performance of the Commission's duties, but the aggregate compensation received by any such member shall not exceed $7,500 in any calendar year. The per annum compensation of the Chairman shall be at the rate provided for grade GS–16 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or if he is not employed on an annual basis, $75 per day but not to exceed $12,000 in any calendar year.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR NORRIS COTTON AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, on Sunday the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] delivered the commencement address at the University of Vermont. On that occasion he was endowed with the honorary degree of doctor of laws. Having known him a long time, I know what an energetic and conscientious public official he has been and what a fine mind he has brought to his responsibilities, both as a Member of the House of Representatives, and as a Member of the U.S. Senate. He is a distinguished lawyer in his own right, and I believe all who know him know his genuine devotion to public welfare. So we extend the hand of congratulation to our friend, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

WE ARE OUR BROTHER'S KEEPER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I believe that every Senator is familiar with the benefits of Public Law 480, which generally speaking, has not only merited, but received, bipartisan support. Never have I seen a clearer presentation of the full meaning of the Public Law 480 program than that contained in an address made by one of my constituents, Mr. Ralph G. Golseth, of Danville, Ill., entitled "We Are Our Brother's Keeper."

Incidentally, I regard Mr. Golseth as one of the real authorities of the country on the subject of vegetable fats and oils. His address was delivered to the International Association of Oilseed Crushers in Stockholm, Sweden, on the 6th day of June. I think it is timely and highly informative. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WE ARE OUR BROTHER'S KEEPER

(Remarks of Ralph G. Golseth, president, Lauhoff Soya Co., before the International Association of Seed Crushers, Stockholm, June 6–9, 1961)

I regard it both as a privilege and challenging responsibility to address the International Association of Seed Crushers. This is an organization that is built on the idea of service and mutual interest. It seems to me that service and mutuality of interest are two highly important elements in our endeavor to make our nations and the world a better place to live. You are men of influence, of capabilities, and you represent an intelligent and responsible citizenry. I feel sure that you want to do your part to mold the growth and development of the world along sound and constructive paths. So it is indeed both a privilege and a sobering responsibility to address you.

It was my original thought that any detailed discussion of U.S. statistics would be somewhat superfluous to the tables appended to the copies which have been distributed. And in fact somewhat secondary to more important factors in the world today.

However, our president, Mr. Chipperfield, has wisely suggested that some comment be made as to prospects for the year beginning next October 1 as well as to U.S. farm policy and the results of last fall's election. I am grateful for his suggestion and am glad to comply with his request.

The statistics which you have are quite preliminary as to 1961–62 production and in turn export availabilities. While they in no sense represent official estimates, they were prepared in consultation with Government officials.

Based on these most preliminary indications it now appears that the U.S. total supply of edible oils and fats for 1961–62 will exceed the current year by some 300,000 to 325,000 metric tons in terms of oil. Nearly 100,000 tons of this prospective increase will be required for increased domestic consumption occasioned entirely by the population increase.

Thus, there is prospect of 200,000 metric tons or more for export as oil, or oilseeds, or as addition to carryover stocks on October 1, 1962. I expect some continuing expansion in soybean exports. Any remaining additional oil availability will be needed in the food-for-peace program under either Public Law 480 financing or the oversea charitable donation program. I shall deal with this subject in some detail, but it is certainly appropriate to mention at this point that our new administration is pursuing the food-for-peace program with the vigor it so rightly deserves.

U.S. production and supplies of industrial oils and fats are expected to show little change from 1960–61 with the only significant changes being an increase in tallow and grease production which is about offset by a projected decline in flaxseed. Since the increase in flaxseed price support was not announced until later, there is reason to hope for an acreage of flaxseed somewhat in excess of the March 1 farmers intentions as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chipperfield also requested a few comments as to the results of our election last fall. I am assuming that he has in mind the effects upon U.S. farm policy and especially as it may relate to our exports of oilseeds, oils and fats. In my opinion many of the farm policy shifts so far made would have come sooner or later by the force of logic and necessity. The results, therefore, might be most briefly summarized by saying they are primarily of degree and not of principle.

We are most fortunate, I believe, in having such a prompt and justifiable change in farm policy as it affects our items of major interest, soybeans and flaxseed. Prompt steps were taken to expand production of these two oilseed crops. The increase in flaxseed price support had the full support of our domestic industry. Soybean processors through the National Soybean Processors Association have yet to take any position on soybean price support. As individuals some processors and some producers did express opinions that the $2.30 support is too high. This is, of course, an item of individual opinion and time alone will tell.

There is no question in my mind but that some increase in soybean supports was justified. Anyone wishing to pass judgment on this question, should, I think, keep in mind the uncontested need for an increase in soybean acreage and production. Soybean acreage has been held down for the past 2 years by an unfavorable support relationship to corn while Government holdings of corn and other feed grains continued to build up and up.

In my opinion we should all be most grateful to our new administration for prompt recognition of this problem and for the prompt action to expand oilseed production. Encouragement has also been extended to the minor crops of safflower, castor beans, and sesame by permitting them to be planted on acreage diverted from feed grains.

The result of this shift in emphasis of farm policy will come to market in October in a soybean crop which, the good Lord willing to let it rain, should exceed 625 million bushels. Surely a happy thought to processors after the short supply of U.S. soybeans in 1960–61, and an equally happy thought to farmer-feeders of protein meals.

Encouragement of further soybean expansion is expected from Public Law 480 oil financing and the charitable oversea oil donation programs.

Now, I shall turn to my prepared paper with some omissions in the interest of brevity.

In our deliberations it is not only fitting—it is imperative—that we emphasize the ideal of brotherhood, the reality of brotherhood, and the responsibility that human brotherhood confers upon us all.

One of the troubles with our world today is that too many people—and too many nations—either reject the ideal of human brotherhood, or regard it not as a fact, but as a petty theory. That is one of the reasons the future is troubled and peace is so elusive.

It is my belief that people are very much alike.

They long for peace.

They love their families.

They want to live better.

They have a basic impulse to do good.

They have, in short, a fundamental appreciation of human brotherhood.

At home those of us who worry about such things are dismayed by the lingering elements of discrimination and lack of fulfillment. Abroad we find our wisdom challenged and our strength and judgment tested. We become aware, even as we take just pride in many accomplishments, that the record of the past is not a guarantee of the future.

What is borne in on us from all quarters is the practical economic and political meaning of the Biblical tenet that we are our brother's keepers. And what is presented to us by virtue of circumstances is an opportunity, an opportunity for leadership in accommodation to orderly change in our domestic society and in the world we inhabit.

It is an opportunity as fresh and exciting as it is rigorous and uncertain. Not all change is automatically desirable, and not all change is within our power to guide or control. But change there will be, and the highest task of leadership is to foresee and shape the forces that, like wind and rain, continually alter environment.

For those whose musings today lead them to weigh concerns along with blessings, there may be some applications in the observations of Francis Bacon some three and a half centuries ago in his essay of Seditions and Troubles:

"The surest way to prevent seditions (if the times do bear it) is to take away the matter of them. For if here be fuel prepared, it is hard to tell whence the spark shall come that shall set it on fire. The matter of sedition is of two kinds; much poverty and much discontentment. And if this poverty and broken estate in the better sort be joined with a want and necessity in the mean people, the danger is imminent and great. For the rebellions of the belly are the worst.

"The first remedy or prevention is to remove by all means possible the material cause of sedition whereof we spake; what is want and poverty in the estate. Above all things, good policy is to be used that the treasure and moneys in a state be not gathered into few hands. For otherwise a state may have a great stock, and yet starve."

Our generation, in the second half of the 20th century has been witness to a conjunction of great historic events:

First, we are seeing the awakening of the underdeveloped nations after many centuries of slumber. This we all should encourage along constructive lines.

Second, we see efforts by both the East and the West to assist these countries in economic development.

Third, we have seen a breakthrough in agricultural technology which may only be the beginning.

Anyone approaching these great historical events in a conventional manner finds in them many grave and difficult problems. Looking at them separately and from a traditional point of view leaves one bleak and baffled. This arises from the human inclination to be problem-prone rather than opportunity-oriented.

What we need to do is to view these historic events not from a conventional attitude, but with a fresh look. We need to see them not separately, but in relationship to one another.

Thus seen, the rapidly advancing agricultural technology affords a primary opportunity to help the developing nations to help themselves, to help build a political, economic, and social structure suited to their aspirations and oriented toward freedom, therewith to strengthen the free world in its struggle with the forces of totalitarianism. In some areas now a cause for international concern, money is secondary in stimulating the work force. Food can be used for wages in taking first steps toward self-sustaining economies.

I used to tell my children the faster airplanes fly, the sooner we get to know one another, the better our chance for survival. Of course, this premise assumes survival is important.

As we examine our food potential, we really find only tremendous opportunities,

not problems. Should we not examine and strive to match abundant agricultural capacity and knowledge with the great needs of the developing countries?

What I am suggesting is the conscious reorientation of our food production, marketing, and distribution policies to the needs and opportunities to be found in a sound and farseeing foreign policy.

This is not a new thought. I claim no originality for it. It has already been partly put into effect. What I am really doing is to provide the logical basis for a recasting and broadening of attitudes toward the opportunities now at hand.

We need programs that accommodate the present needs of people, that recognize the breakthrough in agricultural technology in some areas, and that are designed to meet the worldwide opportunities presented by the great events that I have described.

Many good people have a cautious or critical attitude toward programs designed to move increased amounts of American farm products overseas. This has been reflected in skeptical attitudes toward Public Law 480, so far, the chief legislative means of moving agricultural abundance to consumers who might otherwise have done without. But the experiences of the past 5 years certainly should have removed htis apprehension. The insurance that these special export programs move additional quantities of farm products, beyond what is being absorbed by the normal channels today—this is what distinguishes Public Law 480 from other export programs. It is my feeling that Public Law 480, which has been considered by some to be the province of idealists, might better be considered as subject matter for hardheaded realists.

If a special export program enables us to help meet the food needs of the developing nations, and at the same time permits us to find a useful outlet for our abundant production, isn't this all to the good?

Public Law 480 is such legislation. It is unfortunate that the connotation of surplus disposal has ever been applied to a law which has the basic objective of meeting the needs of friends.

The merits of this approach are increasingly recognized by the countries which receive the products, by the nations of the Soviet bloc, by the various countries of the free world which export agricultural products in competition with us, and by the people of the United States.

Food can be a powerful ambassador of good will and hence an effective instrument for peace. The food exporting nations, and all other nations of the free world, can and should cooperate together helpfully in this endeavor.

This is the purpose of the food-for-peace program. Specifically the program involves an eventual expansion of commercial trade in farm products and a strengthening of special export programs, and the outright donation to the needy.

It may well be that the food-for-peace effort will yield its greatest returns in improved international understanding through providing for more for the less economically favored countries of the world. This, of itself, would be worthwhile.

The food-for-peace program has helped turn a seeming liability into an asset. Not long ago, many looked upon our agricultural surpluses almost wholly as a problem. Now we are beginning to see that part of the abundance made possible by our efficient agriculture is serving us well in the area of foreign policy.

Doesn't it make economic sense for the United States and other exporting countries to share abundance with the millions who are in need of food, rather than store it in bins? Or, reduce production? It seems to me that it well behooves us to use every possible tool we have for the preservation of peace.

It is our opinion that there is no food surplus—simply lack of appropriate means to get the food to those who need it. Preliminary reports of food-for-peace surveys indicate perhaps a shortage of supplies for potential needs in friendly countries.

Now, just exactly what is the food-for-peace program designed to achieve?

First of all, the sharing of abundance with needy people is a highly desirable end in itself. Through this sharing we seek to demonstrate our understanding and friendship for the many millions of recipients in the newly developing areas of the world.

Second, by relieving hunger and promoting economic growth in these areas, we are strengthening their capability and their will to resist aggression and subversion. That is one of the keystones of our American foreign policy.

Third, our food, technical assistance, and other aid are promoting economic development.

Fourth, this economic development means expanding markets for all farmers and all businessmen.

The program that has come to be called food for peace encompasses operations initiated several years ago with strong support from the leadership of both major political parties.

Not only was President Eisenhower, as is President Kennedy, a strong supporter of this program, but also numerous congressional leaders have played a strong role in their continuing support of this constructive program. The Department of Agriculture, the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration have exercised great wisdom in administration.

It should be noted that some 70 percent of U.S. agricultural exports are commercial sales for dollars. These commodities move under straight commercial transactions and include shipment on which export payments are made to keep U.S. support commodities competitive with world prices.

In a sense, these constitute food for peace at its best—mutually beneficial, multilateral trade using the efficiency of commercial trade channels.

In connection with regular commercial sales, I should like to discuss the emerging European Economic Community in relation to food for peace, in its broadest sense. The European Economic Community has had the strong support of the United States for obvious reasons. American agriculture and U.S. oilseed processors are supporting these major objectives. At the same time we have been gratified that the United States is urging the six countries to adopt a liberal and outward looking tariff and trade policy, so that the European Economic Community trade with the United States and the free world in general will be able to expand on a reciprocal basis. No doubt, there will be many problems.

Such a policy will be in the interests also of the six countries themselves. The establishment of a Common Market will offer them great opportunities for expanding production and sales on a competitive basis. Thus, they will be better able to develop their economic strength.

As the competitive strength of the Community grows, its export opportunities will also increase. To be able to expand its export trade, the Community will find it necessary to become more and more liberal in its foreign trade policy. This it will find necessary because trade can be expanded only on a reciprocal basis. This includes the United States. This also includes various import and export restrictions and subsidies of the friendly nations—yes, there will be problems.

The European Economic Community has had to develop its agricultural proposals against the background of the agricultural situation and current policies of the six countries. European agriculture has increased production 31 percent above prewar. This increase was stimulated by high support prices and a multitude of subsidies as well as by technological progress. Import restrictions originally imposed for balance-of-payment reasons have been continued for protective purposes. State trading practices, mixing regulations, skimmings, and a variety of other devices have also been used to protect European farm production and oilseed processors.

Compared with the present agricultural and trade policies of the major European Economic Community countries, the Commission proposals for a common agricultural policy have certain good features.

On the other hand, the proposals would, as a means of supplementing internal price support programs, continue certain protective devices now employed by European Economic Community countries and in some cases extend their use to all six countries.

Is it not time that U.S. soybean oil, cottonseed oil, and other oils and fats enter Western European markets under freely competitive conditions? We ask no special favors for oilseed products except that they enter under the same conditions as the raw material. We are willing to compete on equal terms. As you know we are not subsidized.

We in the United States prefer processing be determined by economics and not by Government intervention. European crushers have completely free access to our raw materials—we should have no duties on our oil to Europe. Economics of freight alone are sufficient to favor raw material so long as the destination market exists for both oil and meal.

What we would like is true reciprocity with the Western European nations.

Failure to provide equal opportunity for these oil imports will fan the flames of protectionism in the United States, already concerned with balance-of-payment problems. This is not helpful. Special advantage does not sow the seeds of brotherhood.

You can help by urging your governments to move in the direction of greater liberalization for mutually beneficial trade. In addition, the special export programs help to support this effort of using food for peace. A small percentage of the foreign currencies being generated under our Public Law 480, title 1 sales are being used in market promotion projects in many of the economically developed countries. All sellers benefit from these market promotion projects.

In our field, the Soybean Council of America, jointly financed by the American Soybean Processors and counterpart Public Law 480 funds, carries on promotional activities in many parts of the world. Promotional activities, I repeat, benefit all producers and processors of oil seeds.

Special Government export activities include Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies, donations, and barter, as well as Mutual Security Act economic aid and sales for foreign currencies. About 30 percent of total U.S. agricultural exports are moved under the special programs. These constitute the foundation of the food-for-peace program.

Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies constitute the largest single segment of the special programs. By authorizing such sales of U.S. farm products to countries lacking foreign currencies, Public Law 480 has widened farm market outlets and has increased availability of food and fiber to our friends abroad.

The Mutual Security Act, like Public Law 480, also authorizes sales for foreign currencies. From 1954 through 1959 the United States sold about $1.7 billion worth of food, feed, and fiber at market value under the Mutual Security Act.

These sales generate hard currency markets, too. Witness Spain, now a really large buyer of soybean oil for dollars.

Donations of emergency relief supplies are made to help friends abroad when disaster strikes. In the fiscal year 1960 food was provided for victims of natural disasters in 11 countries. For example, we fed refugees in Hong Kong and the Middle East. We helped typhoon victims in the Ryukyu Islands and Japan, and earthquake victims in Chile and Morocco. We supplied food for charitable institutions and school lunch programs.

The U.S. Government also works voluntary organizations in developing people-to-people food donation programs. These include such agencies as CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. Also participating are the international organizations UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Administration) and UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund). Seventy-five million American people support this program through their gifts, their work, and their membership in the voluntary agencies.

In the meantime, other free world nations are rendering vital aid to foreign people in distress. Some of this aid is extended on a country-to-country basis, some through and in consultation with international organizations.

In the latter category is the Wheat Utilization Committee, on which are represented the major wheat-exporting countries—Argentina, Australia, Canada, France, and the United States. This committee, with the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization as an adviser-observer, is investigating the possibility of increasing and making more effective coordinated use of wheat to promote economic development, improve nutritional standards, and expand world commercial trade in wheat.

With the food-for-peace program we are associating the need for food abroad with our tremendous agricultural technological capability.

In terms of feeding hungry people, results have been highly gratifying.

1. Nutritional levels in the underdeveloped parts of the world have gone up.

2. Agriculture generally has kept abreast of or ahead of population increase in the underdeveloped areas.

But we must keep in mind that even with the sharp advances in agricultural technology, its growth must continue at an increasing rate because of the tremendous increase expected in population in the years ahead and the growing pressures to raise living standards.

The food-for-peace program is promoting economic growth in the newly developing countries. This, too, eventually will mean enlarged, permanent markets. Economic development stimulates sales. Many countries, graduated from sales for foreign currencies to sales for dollars after their war-disrupted economies had been rebuilt.

Today Public Law 480 foreign currencies are contributing to economic development in Asia, the Middle East, southern Europe, and Latin America. Here are a few samples:

India: Power projects, irrigation facilities, schools.

Indonesia: Rehabilitation of railways, highways, harbors, airports.

Israel: Agricultural development, electric power facilities, transportation.

Greece: Roads and bridges, electric power, agricultural development, vocational education.

Brazil: Grain elevators, transportation, electric power.

Economic development, in addition to creating permanent markets is furthering the general foreign policy aims of the United States and the free world. One of the keystones of foreign policy is a strong free world—strong enough to stand against aggression and subversion. Increased economic well-being will go far in achieving that strength.

Following negotiation of the United States-Indian wheat-rice agreement, which was signed on March 4, 1960, the Indian Express editorialized, "The Eisenhower-Patil food agreement stands out as an act of good faith in human relations. It is of high material value enhanced by the terms and the timing. It is of far greater import in terms of the spirit of faith in human ideals and in the striving to retain them."

The image that the United States is building among the hungry peoples of the world is tangible. It cannot be blotted out with propaganda. By using food as a major instrument of foreign policy we are doing what the Communists would like to do but can't.

In the rivalry between East and West, agriculture is one area of many in which we have clearly and without question demonstrated superiority. The food-for-peace program is expanding the opportunity to make that agricultural superiority felt.

The food-for-peace program is not without its hazards.

1. We must not hurt the economies of other agricultural exporting countries by usurping their markets.

2. We must beware of making the developing countries dependent upon us, indefinitely, with their growing populations, for our continuing help.

3. We must avoid flooding the recipient countries with our food, depressing their farm prices and hurting their agriculture.

4. We must not give away, barter, or sell for foreign currency, food, and fiber, that we could otherwise sell for dollars.

However, just because there are hazards, we cannot forego the use of our capability in the agricultural field. We must not bury our talent.

Accomplishments of the program have been demonstrated; the hazards have been avoided in the past. We are confident they will be in the future.

At the same time, overall performance can be improved. Part of this can come from greater understanding of the program's objectives and accomplishments. Above all, better performance will come if all concerned are alert, not only for problems, but for opportunities. Is it not good sense—yes, good business—for you as hard-headed businessmen to study and suggest means of implementing similar programs in your countries? Can we businessmen accept the challenge and make proposals to our Government and other groups to expand food consumption among the less fortunate? Mankind is your business. In the largest sense you are your brother's keeper.

Arnold Toynbee has said: "Our age will be well remembered, not for its horrifying crimes nor its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

I am neither a politician nor a scientist, but my guess is that the next major war is the last war for us.

Aren't we our brother's keeper?

TRUST STATUS OF CERTAIN LANDS ON THE CROW CREEK INDIAN RESERVATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 337, H.R. 3572.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3572) to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. It is the policy of Congress that the value of all Federal property heretofore or hereafter given to an Indian tribe, band, or group, including the property granted by this Act, shall be considered by the Indian Claims Commission for setoff purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050). In order to incorporate that policy in the Indian Claims Commission Act, the third paragraph of section 2 of said Act is amended by deleting the words "the Commission may also inquire into and consider all money or property given to our funds expended gratuitously for the benefit of the claimant" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Commission shall also inquire into and consider all money or property given to or funds expended gratuitously for the benefit of the claimant prior to the Commission's award".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that a portion of the report on the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3572, is to place in trust status 1,276.25 acres of federally owned lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota. The committee amendment, set forth in section 2, provides that the Indian Claims Commission shall determine whether the value of these lands, and other lands donated to other tribes, should be an offset against any claim against the United States allowed by the Commission in favor of the tribe that has been the beneficiary of such a gift.

NEED

The land was purchased in 1944 for $5,760 with Federal funds from an account called "Indian money, proceeds of labor." The money was accumulated from the cattle-raising activities at the Crow Creek Indian school which closed in 1954. The General Services Administration will dispose of the acreage if it is not donated to the tribe. GSA has received a firm bid which is being held in abeyance pending early congressional approval of this bill. The tribe plans to lease the land for grazing purposes. This will produce an income of about $1,200 a year for the tribe. The tribe will lose much of its present land in connection with the construction of Big Bend Dam on the Missouri River, and the lands donated by this act will provide some homesites for dislocated Indians.

COST

Enactment of the bill will require no appropriations, but will result in the loss of the amount of the bid ($29,363) which has been received by the General Services Administration.

AMENDMENTS

As passed by the House, H.R. 3572 did not specify how this gift of land would be treated in connection with the claim of the Crow Tribe now before the Indian Claims Commission.

A number of the bills donating surplus Federal lands to Indian tribes which have come before the committee contain language specifying how gifts of lands shall be considered in relation to such tribal claims. In some cases the lands are simply eliminated from the suits. In other instances there is a provision for a setoff against any claim recovered by the tribe of the present market value of the land. In other instances no mention is made of whether a setoff shall apply. Also, there is uncertainty whether gifts of land made subsequent to the cutoff date for filing claims (August 13, 1951) should be considered as offsets.

In an effort to arrive at uniformity in this regard the committee has reported several such bills, amended, to provide for setoffs. However, in order to preclude the need for such amendments, and to establish a policy that all gifts of land are considered, the committee recommends general language directing the Indian Claims Commission to determine, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the 1946 Indian Claims Commission Act, the extent to which the value of the property given to the Indians should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

This directive applies not only to the land involved in H.R. 3572 but to all gifts of Federal property to an Indian tribe. It is the committee's belief that the Indian Claims Commission is in the best position to examine all of the factors surrounding the claims of the tribes and to decide on the merits whether any setoff should be made against any judgment awarded the tribes. Moreover, the Claims Commission Act gives the Commission authority to determine setoffs generally, after examining all of the equities involved, and it seems appropriate to leave that function with the Commission, with the clarifying language of the committee amendment, rather than for Congress to attempt to determine the equities.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The favorable report from the Secretary of the Interior dated March 10, 1961, follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. March 10, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 3572, a bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota.

We recommend that the bill be enacted.

The bill donates to the Crow Tribe and places in a trust status approximately 1,276.25 acres of federally owned land.

The land was purchased by the Federal Government with funds from an account called "Indian money, proceeds of labor." These are Federal funds (not Indian) derived from Federal operations on Indian reservations which are not required to be disposed of in some other manner. The money in this account may be expended by the Secretary under an indefinite and continuing appropriation for the benefit of the Indians, the agency, or the Indian school on whose behalf the money is collected (25 U.S.C. 155). The money is accumulated from such activities as the operation of a beef or dairy herd in connection with an Indian school.

The purchase was made in 1944 and the purchase price was $5,760. There are no improvements on the land.

The land was purchased for use in connection with the Crow Creek school, which was an agricultural high school specializing in beef cattle production. The school was closed in 1954, and in 1957 the land was declared to the General Services Administration as excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks applied to the General Services Administration on June 16, 1958, for a transfer of the land to it under the act of May 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 240). That act authorizes the transfer if the property is found to be chiefly valuable for wildlife conservation purposes (other than conservation of migratory birds). The State's application was denied by the General Services Administration on the ground that the land is not chiefly valuable for wildlife conservation purposes.

The General Services Administration later offered the land for sale on the open market as surplus property, and we are informed that it has received a bid of $29,363, which is limited to 60 days from January 24, 1961.

The land is located near Fort Thompson, Buffalo County, S. Dak., within the exterior boundaries of the Crow Creek Reservation. The tracts are contiguous to each other (but not in a solid block) and are surrounded by allotted land. The tribe wants the land to lease for grazing purposes. Anticipated rentals are estimated to be about $1,200 per year. The land may also provide a limited number of homesites for some of the Indians who have been forced to move from the taking area of the Big Bend Dam.

We believe that the land should be given to the Indian tribe for grazing and homesite use, rather than sold as surplus property.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an interesting book review which appeared in the May 20, 1961, issue of the New Yorker magazine. The title of the review is "The Candy Kid." It attempts to evaluate the so-called blue book of the John Birch Society.

Because of the candidness of the review, because of the broad perspective in which the blue book is assessed, I ask unanimous consent that the review be included in its entirety in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE CANDY KID

(By A. J. Liebling)

In 1922, when I was 18 and it was new, I read James Elroy Flecker's play about Hassan, the confectioner of Baghdad, and it became one of my clandestine addictions, like my taste for Atkinson's Doncaster Toffee. It has a sucrose, glucose, dextrose quality, like warm spun sugar twining itself around the aorta. Hassan, its protagonist, through a chance encounter with the Caliph Haroun-al-Rachid, is removed from the humble but cozy purlieus of his shop to the world of affairs of state. At first the transposition pleases him. "For all these years I have been a humble man, of soft and kindly disposition—such a man as the world and a woman hate," says he. "But now I shall never again be the fool of my fellows." Afterward, though, failing to soften the Caliph's line on capital punishment, he is glad to retire, and withdraws from public life as a pilgrim, marching off stage singing, in chorus with the rest of the caravan, "We take the Golden Road to Samarkand."

For Hassan's sake, I was predisposed in favor of Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., founder of the John Birch Society and author of its Koran, "The Blue Book" (copyright Robert Welch, 1959). Mr. Welch had an early life much like that of my older friend. He was, before he became an author, a candymaker in Cambridge, Mass. The only other American public man I can think of with an equally mellifluent background is Adolf A. Berle, Jr., who was chairman of the board of the America Molasses Co. But whereas Hassan, squatting among his sugar kettles, used to write poetry, Mr. Welch, by his own account, read world history. And while the peppermint popped and the popsicles purred, he became so impressed by the analogies he discovered in his reading that, like Mohammed, he heard a voice saying to him, "Recite." Accordingly, he summoned a number of disciples to meet him at a hotel in Indianapolis, where there are always rooms (except during auto-race week), on December 8, 1958. "The Blue Book" is, its author explains, a record of what he said at the ensuing meeting, as fraught with consequences as a chocolate bar with peanuts. Only 11 disciples attended, leaving him one short of the conventional complement, but they represented 8 States.

It is inspiring to think of that seminal meeting, in a hotel banquet suite, perhaps named for one of the characters of James Whitcomb Riley, the Hoosier laureate—the Little Orphan Annie Room. The Wise Men from afar sit one knee over the other around the manger of the new truth, and Mr. Welch tells them:

"The Gobble-uns'll git you ef you don't watch out."

"With short breaks for coffee, for luncheons, and for brief discussions in between sections of the presentation, it required 2 whole days to set forth the background, methods, and purposes of the John Birch Society. The pages that follow are simply a transcript practically verbatim, of that presentation," Mr. Welch reports. "I personally have been studying the problem (of communism) increasingly for about 9 years," he told the original 11, "and practically full time for the past 3 years. And entirely without pride, but in simple thankfulness, let me point out that a lifetime of business experience should have made it easier for me to see the falsity of the economic theories on which communism is supposedly based, more readily, than might some scholar coming into that study from the academic cloisters; while a lifetime of interest in things academic, especially world history, should have given me an advantage over many businessmen in more rapidly seeing the sophistries in dialectric materialism."

His world history is Neo-Spenglerian, although, he concedes, "there is certainly more Welch than there is Spengler" in it, and he has contributed not a few new details. It was Darius and not Cyrus who, according to Mr. Welch, overthrew the "Neo-Babylonian civilization;" Greek colonists conquered Italy, founded Rome, and "developed Roman civilization;" and the Roman Empire of the West "started dying from the cancer of collectivism from the time Diocletian imposed on it his New Deal."

The notion of conventional historians like Rostovtzeff and Burckhardt has been that

the Roman economy hit the skids a century and a half earlier, and that Diocletian, poor man, was merely trying to pick up the pieces. One of his measures was a system of price controls, and this probably has caused Mr. Welch to confuse him with Franklin D. Roosevelt. The theory that Greece conquered Rome has not yet become dogma, either, but it may; it is in line with the discovery that the South won the Civil War after Sherman's Flight to the Sea.

"Basically, when you dig through the chaff and the dressing in Spengler enough to get at his thought, he held that a societal development which we ordinarily class as a civilization is an organic culture, which goes through a life cycle just the same as any of the individual organisms which we see whole and with which we are more familiar." Western Europe reached its high point in the second half of the 19th century, Mr. Welch holds, and is now dying of a "collectivist cancer" that has invaded us. We must excise it—a herculean task. His prose abounds in figures of speech based on cancer and cardiac afflictions, which should be impressive to a public of predominantly elderly executives. (Welch himself is 61.)

Theories, however, are less his concern than facts—his eye deciphers surface appearances as easily as it does the creme fondant within the walnut imperial. For example, he says of one nation not commonly detected: "And gentlemen, any idea that Norway is not, for all practical purposes, now in Communist hands * * * is in my opinion as unrealistic as the thought that Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana is a Democrat." (The Norwegian Storting, or Parliament, has one Communist among its 150 members.)

"Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco" are places where the Communists "either already have control, however disguised, or are rapidly acquiring control." Nehru, Nasser, and Sukarno are Communists, like General Eisenhower.

"The Communists are now in complete control of Bolivia and Venezuela." The only Latin-American governments Welch endorsed in 1958 were Paraguay, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Batista's Cuba, all dictatorships. Batista has now, of course, gone down the drain—an incalculable loss to Western civilization. Hawaii, Mr. Welch revealed, was Communist through and through. Since its admission as a State, the poison has, presumably, reached our vitals.

"The whole slogan of civil rights, as used to make trouble in the South today, is an exact parallel to the slogan of agrarian reform which they (you are expected to know by this time who "they" always are) used in China." Discovering the points at which the John Birch line makes fast to those of other kindred revelations is a continual beguilement as the reader of "The Blue Book" goes along. Here it hitches with the White Supremacists. A bit farther on, declaring the Algerian war a Communist creation, it ties on to the colons.

Our troubles, however, are of our own making. "The first great break for the Communist conspiracy came in 1933, with our formal recognition of Stalin's regime. At that time the Russian government was staying alive financially from week to week by methods which, in the case of individuals, would be called check-kiting." (At the moment, as I recall, we were pretty broke ourselves. The banks stayed closed until Roosevelt got them open again, and Al Smith and the Daily News advocated recognition of the U.S.S.R. as a method of reviving us.) "Our recognition tremendously increased their prestige and credit, at home and with other nations. It saved them from financial collapse." What good it would do the Russian government, if broke, to increase its credit at home, in Russia, where nobody had any money, is one of "The Blue Book's" minor enigmas.

In Asia, where we are also out of luck, our Government prevented Chiang Kai-shek's troops from getting even ammunition, while the Russians gave the Reds tremendous stockpiles of Japanese arms. (The primary cause of the defeat of the Chinese Nationalist Army was the military aggressiveness of the Chinese Communist forces, and sound tactics, which were based on the capabilities and limitations of the Red military. Communist victory was achieved without the extensive use of modern, large-caliber weapons, motor transport or aircraft, but by sound, aggressive tactics on the ground.—Lt. Col. Robert B. Rigg, a U.S. military observer, in Red China's Fighting Hordes.)

The chief weapon of the Communists in thus maggoting the world outside our borders has been treachery, not science. They have never, for example, built an atomic bomb: Their agents had simply walked off from our plants with the necessary separate parts, which had then been assembled in Russia, and exploded whenever it best suited the Soviets' pretenses. In the light of this fact, all the pother about disarmament conferences is superfluous. All we have to do to disarm the Russians is to install a proper security system in our own plants. (When they walked off with the parts of our heavy-rocket booster, they might at least have left us the plans.)

And now that they are working up on us—they've got Hawaii already, remember, with two Red Senators on Capitol Hill—they have three possible courses. One would be, through a sufficient amount of infiltration and propaganda, to disguise communism as just another political party. When I reached this point, I peeked ahead to see which party was to be the Trojan donkey. But Mr. Welch had written, "We do not anticipate that development." Another route to the consummation of conquest would be by fomenting internal civil war in this country, and aiding the Communist side in that war with all necessary military might, as an outside power may do in say, Cuba. But he didn't anticipate that, either, although he said, "One never could tell."

The third method, "which is far more in accordance with Lenin's long-range strategy," is the "one which they are clearly relying on most heavily." This, on which they are already launched with gratifyingly fearful results, is to take over the Government by a process so gradual and insidious that they will have us in the bag before we know it. One step is to lure us deeper and deeper into the United Nations, which is a thinly disguised branch of the Soviet Government itself, "until one day we shall gradually realize that we are already just a part of a worldwide government ruled by the Kremlin, with the police-state features of that government rapidly closing in on ourselves. But another part of the plan is the conversion of the United States into a socialist nation, quite similar to Russia itself in its economy and political outlook. The best way to explain the aim here is simply to quote the directive under which some of the very largest American foundations have secretly but visibly been working for years. This directive is so to change the economic and political structure of the United States that it can be comfortably merged with Soviet Russia."

Here Mr. Welch, like Mohammed in most of the Koran, omits the source of his quotation. In the prophet's case, it is always understood to be God. At this point, with Asia gone under altogether, Europe gone under (all but Spain and Portugal), South America gone under (all but Paraguay), Africa gone under (all but the Union), us going (all but Arizona), the reader might well expect, as I did, a call to a preventive war, or at least the setting up of a force, entirely commanded by admirals called back from retirement, that would put the skulking devils in their place. This could be done in three steps. One, we stop them from snitching any more bomb parts. Two, we blockade them and starve them out. Three, we send them only stale surplus chocolate bars to eat until they say "uncle" ("dyadya"). I can imagine the 11 disciples squirming on their hotel chairs in the Claypool, hardly able to hold themselves down as they awaited the slogan cry "Out cutlasses and board."

But, Welch warns, this is the trap they planned for us. "Although our danger remains almost entirely internal, from Communist influences right in our midst and treason right in our Government, the American people are being persuaded that our danger is from the outside, is from Russian military superiority." What we have to do, then, is not spend money on defense, not pay taxes, but balance the budget at zero, stultify central government, defend States rights, stop Federal aid to education (it leads to thought control), pay no attention to talk about the horrors of war, since we won't have any arms anyway, and, above all, derecognize Russia and it will blow away. To make the juju stronger, we are to abandon foreign aid, abolish the income tax, and "win that battle, against communism, presumably, by alertness, by determination, by courage, by an energizing realization of the danger, if we can; but let's win it, even with our lives, if the time comes when we must." (Without spending money.) It sounds like a program for eating your jelly beans and having them, or ruling the skies with obsolete airplanes. It also sounds like the program of turning a back on the world devised for 17-century Japan by the Tokugawa Shogun Iyemitsu. "Don't look and it will go away" was the Tokugawa's prescription, but the outside world didn't, and when Japan looked again, centuries later, she found herself in a most humiliating position. (In the interim, 80 percent of her people had lived in fairly continuous hunger, which forced them to the regular practice of infanticide to keep the population down.) The Birch creed should, I would think, tickle the pants off any Russian official in his right mind, for its essence is unilateral disarmament through permitted obsolescence, a breakup of Federal authority, and a withdrawal from the international field.

One of the entrancing episodes of the John Birch epopee, for me, was the behavior of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, supposedly a fire-eater, who had John Birch tracts, which are essentially pacifist, passed out to his men. I wondered whether he had read them. The obsession of ubiquitous treachery, moreover, is exactly what will make a soldier soonest take off. A division convinced of the prevalence of treason all the way back to base will scatter at the first shot.

When the modern Hassan reaches the chapter of his revelation in which he discusses positive measures against the "worldwide Communist conspiracy" ("And so, let's act"), he is less impressive than when he is evoking the dangers that hedge us around. As an initial move toward breaking Marx's back, he would establish reading rooms, "somewhat similar to the Christian Science reading rooms," where the writings of Robert Welch would be available. The society's publications "should be put in barbershops, from which we obtained firm written promises to welcome these publications and keep them on the reading tables." Members of the society should listen to the broadcasts of Fulton Lewis, Jr. And everybody should write letters for worthy causes like withdrawal of recognition from Russia and the repeal of the income tax. Above all, there should be "exposure" of Communists, by publication.

"Let's make what we are talking about clearer by an illustration. There is the head of one of the great educational institutions in the East (not Harvard, incidentally) whom at least some of us believe to be a Communist. Even with a hundred thousand dollars to hire sleuths to keep him and his present contacts under constant surveillance for a while, and to retrace every detail of his past history, I doubt if we could prove it on him. But—with just $5,000 to pay for the proper amount of careful research, I believe we could get all the material needed for quite a shock. We would run in the magazine an article consisting entirely of questions to this man, which would be devastating in their implications. The question technique, when skillfully used in this way, is mean and dirty. But the Communists we are after are meaner and dirtier, and too slippery for you to put your fingers on in the ordinary way—no matter how much they look and act like prosperous members of the local Rotary Club."

The disproportion between the magnitude of the evil discovered everywhere and the insignificance of the remedies proposed makes Birchism a demoniac religion. The Birchist, like man before the invention of fire, wanders helpless among malignant forces, his only consolation inner knowledge of how terrible things are, his only protection an amulet in the form of a "blue book," his only weapon a postage stamp. His chiefest satisfaction is his conviction that his neighbor will perish, and that he will probably deserve to. "Communist" for the Birchist, the reader gathers after the first page or so of the book, means anybody who approves of paying taxes, national defense, public education, civil rights, the United Nations, labor unions, or poetry since Tennyson. There is no politician in whom Welch sees hope; even BARRY GOLDWATER is a softhearted sap. And so it is true, for him, that there are "Communists" everywhere. Socialists, in the penumbra of the weird world Welch inhabits, are Communists; Roosevelt and, save the mark, Woodrow Wilson strengthened central government, so were Socialists, so Communists. It is an ugly doctrine, which inhibits every effort to outperform our rivals, because implicit in it is the assurance that the effort will end in betrayal. Taken seriously, it could be more destructive than the nerve gas that all up-to-date chemical-warfare branches are now supposed to possess, which paralyzes the will to resist. Only this gas, instead of being carried over borders by ICB missiles, is a native product, for home consumption, like coconut bars.

THE FOLLY OF DESPAIR

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I should like to include in the RECORD at this point a column which appears in this morning's Washington Post, from the pen of our distinguished political pundit, Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Folly of Despair." In the article Mr. Lippmann attempts to recast the troubled times of the moment in the context and perspective of recent history, instead of in the narrower confines of the setbacks and discouragements which arise occasionally from day to day.

Because of the insight it provides and the reconstitution of faith in our position in the world which it espouses, I am sure Members of the Senate have read the article with great interest, as I have; and I believe that we ought to share it with those who may see it only in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE FOLLY OF DESPAIR

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have had a run of bad news and the time has come when we must make up our minds whether to face it and learn from it, or to shrink from it into a nervous breakdown with suicidal tendencies. There are altogether too many of us who in dismay and disappointment are ready to admit that Khrushchev is right in predicting that communism is sweeping the world and that, short of war, we have no means of stopping it.

They are like the man who, as an experienced diplomat once put it many years ago, is so worried that he will fall off the top floor of the Empire State Building that he stops the elevator and jumps out of the ninth floor window. I believe this defeatism to be profoundly mistaken and unwarranted. It is based on a misreading and a misunderstanding of what has happened since the Second World War and what is happening now. The root of the error is to equate, instead of to differentiate between, the communistic movement which owes allegiance to Moscow and Peiping and the worldwide movements of social reform and social revolution, which almost everywhere seek national independence and nonalinement with the great powers.

Mr. Khrushchev's hope and belief is that he will lead and direct all the reforming and revolutionary movements. We play right into his hands when we identify ourselves with the opponents of change rather than with the leaders of change.

For those who think that Laos and southeast Asia are gone and that like the dominoes all the Asian nations and the Pacific will go too, I should like to call attention to Egypt. It was not so many years ago—in fact it was in 1955—when we were told that Egypt and Syria and Iraq, and all the oil of the Persian Gulf, and the Suez Canal, were gone or going. Egypt had gotten arms from Czechoslovakia, it got Soviet help in building the Aswan Dam, it nationalized the Suez Canal, and all was lost.

Yet look at it now. Syria and Iraq and the Persian Gulf states are not Communist. Egypt continues to put its Communists in jail. Mr. Khrushchev has attacked Egypt publicly. President Nasser is calling a congress of the neutrals who do not take their direction from Moscow. Egypt has played a decisive part in preventing the flow of Soviet arms to the rebels in the Congo.

After Egypt and the Middle East, look at Africa, look at Guinea, which 6 months ago was written off as gone. It is not gone despite the several hundred Soviet technicians who are there. Probably it is not gone in part at least because the Soviet technisians who are there have made themselves so unpopular. In any event the chances are good that Guinea in the end will line up with the rest of independent Africa as a neutral state.

There is now a great likelihood that the whole of North Africa, all the way from Morocco to Egypt, will take a neutral line, refusing to be dominated by Moscow or to take direction from Paris or Washington.

Moreover, I do not believe that Cuba is gone, and I have a very strong impression that Mr. Khrushchev does not begin to think Cuba is as gone as, let us say, Senator SMATHERS thinks it is. For Cuba is as far from Moscow as Laos is from Washington. In time, not necessarily in a very long time, the Cuban revolution will rejoin the community of American states. It will do this because it has no other place to go.

The wave of the future is not Communist domination of the world. The wave of the future is social reform and social revolution driving toward the goal of national independence and equality of personal status. In this historical tendency, Mr. Khrushchev will be, as Mr. Alsop tells us he is supposed to have described himself, "the locomotive of history" only if we set ourselves up to be the roadblocks of history.

What is the lesson of all these experiences? At bottom the lesson is that there is, as the President said the other day, a worldwide social upheaval which the Communists did not create but which they hope to capture. If we make our own policy one of opposition to this worldwide movement of social change, we shall lose the cold war and Mr. Khrushchev's hopes will be realized. If, on the other hand, we befriend and support with active measures the movements of social change, their leaders will not submit to Moscow because they do not have to submit to Moscow. They do not wish to submit to Moscow because what they want is independence.

THE CUBAN INVASION

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post. It has to do with the comments recently attributed to the new chairman of the Republican Party, Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER, particularly in regard to the comments he made on the Cuban question.

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

TRAGIC MISTAKE

The new chairman of the Republican National Committee, Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER, has broken the unwritten political truce about Cuba with his charge that the Kennedy administration perpetrated "an American tragedy." Mr. MILLER's specific complaint—that President Kennedy "rescinded and revoked the Eisenhower plan to have the Cuban freedom fighters protected by American air power"—happens to be true. But did this, and the announcement that no American forces would take part, constitute the ghastly mistake which Mr. Miller professes to see?

In the clarity of hindsight there were enough mistakes to fill a couple of political war chests, and perhaps in the immediate sense the failure to use American air power was one of them. Mr. Kennedy's order, it seems plain, removed whatever chance there might have been for a badly conceived plan to succeed. All questions of treaties and international opinion apart, if the plan had worked militarily—and the if is a big one—many of the misgivings might have been swept away. The United States received virtually as much blame as it would have received if it had committed its own forces.

But that argument assumes that a military operation alone in Cuba would have guaranteed the overthrow of the Communist satellite which Fidel Castro has been building. A far more persuasive argument on the other side of the case has been made by Theodore Draper in his admirable review of events in Cuba. In his article in Encounter, reprinted in the New Leader, he notes:

"The Eisenhower administration had not given the underground priority, and the Kennedy administration ruled out full-scale intervention.

"Yet, short of the Castro regime's collapse at the first blow from the outside, the invasion required a spontaneous outburst of popular support or an ever-increasing measure of American support. An invasion force which succeeded in overthrowing Castro without a demonstrative show of popular support could only have ruled Cuba in a

state of perpetual civil war or as a thinly disguised American occupation. At best, it would have postponed another outbreak of "Fidelismo" for a few months or years. At worst, it could have made Cuba into another Algeria."

What is significant is that the Republican leadership, judged by Mr. Miller's charges, evidently has concluded that there is a popular issue here in berating Mr. Kennedy for his decision not to intervene directly. And if there is to be a political debate on this point, then some further considerations ought to come into the discussion.

Mr. Draper, who himself has no illusions about the menacing nature of the regime in Cuba, reports that former Vice President Nixon, as early as April 1959, wrote a memorandum advocating the training of guerrilla forces to overthrow Castro. Mr. Nixon also is said by others to have argued within the Eisenhower administration for an invasion with the support of American ground troops, if necessary.

Yet when Mr. Kennedy, during the political campaign last fall, advocated helping anti-Castro forces inside and outside Cuba, Mr. Nixon termed the recommendation "dangerously irresponsible." He cited five treaties and the United Nations Charter in which this country has undertaken not to intervene, and he added:

"If we were to follow that recommendation (of Mr. Kennedy) we would lose all of our friends in Latin America, we would probably be condemned in the United Nations, and we probably would not accomplish our objective."

Those were the words of the Republican presidential nominee last October. If Mr. Miller is now inviting a full postmortem, it will be, indeed, instructive to have all the facts come out.

CONGRESSIONAL AND SCHOOL RECESSES

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, on Thursday, June 8, I made some brief remarks about the possibility of putting Congress on a "full time" basis with year-round sessions and that we take what recesses become available so as to coincide with the school recesses when Members of Congress can spend some time with their families.

At that time, I asked to have printed in the RECORD a petition of the Democratic Congressional Wives Forum and the Republican Congressional Wives Club which went on record as favoring a "summer recess" policy.

That petition inadvertently omitted the names of Mrs. Fred Marshall and Mrs. John M. Slack, Jr.

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Madam President, the fastest growing form of higher education in my State of Massachusetts today, as well as in the United States, is the public community colleges. One began operation last fall in Pittsfield, and three more will open their doors to students next September in Boston, Haverhill, and Hyannis. They are a part of the Commonwealth's vital long-range program to make higher education available at a minimum cost to everyone in the State.

An article published in the Boston Globe on Sunday, June 11, 1961, gives an excellent account of the work which these colleges are doing.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The Bay State's new 2-year colleges

[All opening this fall except Berkshire Community College, which opened last fall]

Name	Location	Openings	Courses offered	Yearly cost [1]
Berkshire Community College	Pittsfield	300	Liberal arts,[2] business administration,[2] electronics technology.	$200
Cape Cod Community College	Hyannis	150	Liberal arts,[2] business administration.[2]	200
Massachusetts Bay Community College.	Boston (27 Garrison St.).	300-500	Liberal arts,[2] business administration,[2] electronics technology.	200
Northern Essex Community College.	Haverhill	150	do	200

[1] Tuition only; commuting expenses, books, etc., extra.
[2] Transfer to another college after 1 or 2 years. However, some business administration courses will be "terminal" 2-year programs. (An associate in arts or associate in science degree is given for completed 2-year courses. Transferees to other colleges will continue studies for bachelor's degrees.

"COMMUTER" COLLEGES SCORE—STATE OPENING THREE IN SEPTEMBER, ANOTHER EXPANDING

(By Ian Forman)

Hard-pressed Massachusetts will create 900 new "college places" this September in one bold new stroke.

Three new 2-year community colleges are opening their doors for the first time—and a fourth is being enlarged.

Boston, Haverhill, and Hyannis are the sites of the growing chain of these State-run "commuter" colleges, whose first "pilot" institution opened successfully at Pittsfield last fall.

Already the applications are pouring in, but the rule is: It's never too late to apply, even through the summer.

This new concept in higher education, which will rapidly assume a major role in Massachusetts, aims at two things:

1. Prepare students in liberal arts and sciences so they can transfer within 1 or 2 years to a 4-year college or university.

2. Prepare other young men and women in 2-year "terminal" courses for more technical careers in business, industry, electronics technology, and other areas than high school education now affords.

Are these new colleges any good? you may ask.

Should I apply to go or, if a parent, should I encourage my youngster to go?

The best immediate answer might be to look at Pittsfield's Berkshire Community College which opened last fall.

Within only 1 year, a girl student has transferred to Middlebury and a boy to Amherst College, both with good scholarships. Another girl is switching to Connecticut this fall, and several more students will transfer to the University of Massachusetts in February.

This is an amazingly good first-year record—and a reflection on the faculty assembled—since most transfers normally will occur after the second year, which is coming up.

In addition, two students in the business-technical courses have left for well-paying jobs.

This dual nature of the Bay State's growing 2-year college system should not be forgotten; the post-high-school advanced education of top technicians and executive assistants in industry and business.

This technical-vocational role may well be the answer to supplying our "technician hungry" electronics industry—and eventually producing top assistants in areas like medicine and dentistry.

There's a big head of excitement building up at these about-to-open colleges. The pioneering spirit is helping draw qualified and inspired faculty.

And the other new colleges are drawing similar people.

For instance, Dr. John F. McKenzie, former dean of men at Boston University who is now director of Boston's Massachusetts Bay Community College, says Boston also is a magnet for college teachers.

"Boston is an attraction culturally," he said, "but just as important, its many universities give younger faculty an opportunity to study here for advanced degrees."

McKenzie, too, noted the desire of faculty to be part of a "from the ground up" pioneering effort, and adds that many top-flight secondary school teachers are looking for a chance to teach at a more advanced level.

Located at least temporarily in the former B.U. College of Practical Arts buildings at 27 Garrison Street, Back Bay, Massachusetts Bay Community College will be the State's largest, growing probably to 700 or 800 students within 2 years.

Cape Cod Community College provides opportunity for the only higher education in the cape area. Director Bartlett says, "Roughly 70 percent of our students say they couldn't have gone to college anywhere else."

It costs $200 tuition a year for all the community colleges. Many students will go through by living at home, and earning tuition and book money in the summer, he said.

Northern Essex Community College in Haverhill will be directed by Dr. Harold Bentley, formerly director of Worcester Junior College for 12 years.

Following the industry cooperation pattern at Pittsfield and Boston, Dr. Bentley is working with such local industries as Western Electric, Raytheon, and Avco in setting up his industrial technician courses.

Director Thomas E. O'Connell at Berkshire Community College has found local industry extremely helpful in providing faculty from their staffs, equipment and postgraduate job placement.

Because in its closing hours the 1961 legislature passed $750,000 to keep the program moving, against Governor Volpe's recommendation that a halt be called to review the plans.

Walter M. Taylor, executive secretary of the Massachusetts Regional Community Colleges Board, said there will be two more such colleges opened in September 1962.

Whether they'll be in places like Greenfield or the Athol-Gardner area, where interest is strong—or in larger spots like Springfield and Worcester, where interest is just stirring—no one yet knows.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF "FIGHTING IRISH" 101ST INFANTRY REGIMENT

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Madam President, this week marks the 100th anniversary of the organization of the 101st Infantry Regiment, better known as the "Fighting Irish" or "Irish 9th."

The regiment began in 1798 in Boston as the Columbian Artillery Company in an artillery regiment. Around 1850, a number of Boston Irishmen joined it and, under the leadership of Capt. Thomas Cass, turned it into one of the finest militia companies in the city.

In 1855, however, the Governor of Massachusetts announced his intention of disbanding all military companies composed of persons of foreign birth. Captain Cass surrendered the company's charter because of what he felt was a grievous insult to the good name and men of the unit and it was reformed as a civic group for literary and military purposes. I suspect they were a little more military than literary, as they did a good deal of drilling on the Boston Common.

When the Civil War broke out, prominent Irish-American citizens of Boston met to recruit a regiment. Captain Cass was selected as the colonel for the new unit and the Columbian Artillery was immediately reestablished as the "Irish 9th" Regiment.

It fought valiantly in Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland in many battles ranging from Bull Run, Antietam, and Chancellorsville to Spottsylvania and finally Gettysburg. The regiment paid a high price in casualties, however, for its long and gallant record; and many of its men, including Colonel Cass, who was killed at the battle of Malvern Hill, died in the field.

Since then, the "Fighting Irish" regiment has served its country well in every war. In honor of its fine record, I am glad to say that Mayor John Collins, of Boston, has proclaimed June 11–17 as 101st Infantry Centennial Week.

VALERIAN ZORIN

Mr. PELL. Madam President, recently Dr. Peter Zenkl, former lord mayor of Prague, and the father of the prewar social security program of Czechoslovakia, wrote a most interesting editorial about Valerian Zorin which appeared in the May 27 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I had the honor of knowing Dr. Zenkl when I was serving our Foreign Service in Czechoslovakia. Because of his anti-Communist stand, Dr. Zenkl had to flee for his life and is now living in the United States. He suffered, too, under the Nazi occupation of his homeland when he was arrested and interned.

Dr. Zenkl's editorial highlights the ludicrous spectacle of a man like Zorin donning the cloak of self-righteousness at the U.N. Zorin's nefarious activities in connection with the treacherous Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia make his conduct in the U.N. questionable to say the least.

Madam President, it is a genuine pleasure for me to ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Zorin, 'Defender' of the Congo and Cuba in the U.N. Is an Old Hand at Subversion" be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ZORIN, "DEFENDER" OF THE CONGO AND CUBA IN THE U.N., IS AN OLD HAND AT SUBVERSION

(By Peter Zenkl)

In the chaos which gripped the Congo Patrice Lumumba was murdered. In the United Nations debate on the Congo, Soviet spokesman Valerian Zorin accused the colonial usurpers of the treacherous murder of Lumumba.

To the uninformed, Zorin's lamentations might suggest genuine revulsion from political murder. Some of us, however, remember another February only 13 years ago. In Czechoslovakia after World War II the Communists used every available means to subvert the Government of Czechoslovakia, which still believed in coexistence. The top conspirator in this effort was Valerian Zorin, deputy minister of the U.S.S.R. and former Soviet Ambassador in Prague.

Valerian Zorin laid the groundwork for his reputation as "the gravedigger of Prague" long before the climactic events of 1948. A longtime party activist, Zorin joined the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1941 to become head of the department of central European matters. He formed a close relationship with Zdenek Fierlinger, the Czechoslovak quisling who was Czechoslovak Ambassador to Moscow.

Immediately after the liberation of Czechoslovakia from Nazi rule in 1945 Zorin, then Soviet Ambassador in Prague, openly supported the activities of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. In 1947, in my capacity as chairman of one of the largest non-Communist parties, I went to Zorin before he left his post in Prague to protest the violation of the treaty of noninterference—the coexistence treaty which had been signed by the Soviets in 1943. I asked him when Soviet interference in our affairs would end. His reply was, "When it will be no longer necessary."

When the Communists faced a new national election and realized that the country had turned against them, they consulted Moscow and prepared for the coup d'etat of February 1948. When arms had been distributed to loyal party members, Zorin, accompanied by five Soviet generals, suddenly reappeared in Prague. He came purportedly to supervise the delivery of Soviet wheat to the Czechs, but he made it a point to make contact with select Czechoslovak ministers.

In February 1948, a congress of the Union of Soviet Czechoslovakian Friendship celebrated the 30th anniversary of the Red army. With Zorin and all the members of the Soviet mission in Prague looking benignly on, Prime Minister Gottwald delivered an aggressive speech, including the warning that "all attempts to upset the new order and to bring back the capitalist order as it existed before Munich are the result of the plans and plots of the Western imperialists."

As soon as Czechoslovakia was safely under Soviet domination, Moscow's agents flooded Czechoslovakia. Under their direction the Czechoslovak Communists began the wholesale liquidation of their political opponents. Communist revolutionaries, trained in Moscow, were not only given the task of clearing Czechoslovakia of reactionary elements and redirecting Czechoslovak industry to serve Soviet economic purposes, but they were also given the job of teaching Communist fanatics from all parts of the globe—Africa, Asia, Latin America—so that they might further the cause of Soviet colonialism. One of the students trained in Czechoslovak Communist schools was Antoine Gizenga, Lumumba's successor as Soviet stooge in the Congo.

It is ironical that Zorin, who had so important a part in the subjection of my country to Soviet tyranny, should be taken seriously by anybody as the liberator of the Congo.

TOUR OF EUROPE BY IDAHO TEENAGE STUDENTS

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, Idaho is proud of 14 teenagers who are touring Europe as a result of their own hard work. These youngsters worked, scraped, and planned for 2 years to materialize the dream they are now living.

What they have accomplished, and how they went about doing it, is a remarkable story, and I think it is well told in an article which appeared in the New York Times of June 3, 1961.

I am glad that I could play some small part in this project, which was to arrange a special tour of the U.S. Embassy in Paris for these resourceful youngsters.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

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

IDAHO TEENAGERS OFF TO SEE WORLD—14 YOUNGSTERS WORKED AND SAVED 2 YEARS FOR TRIP

(By Nan Robertson)

Fourteen teenagers from an isolated county in Idaho left New York for Europe yesterday on their first journey to the outside world.

The nine boys and five girls had worked almost 2 years to raise money for the trip. They worked in sawmills, pitched hay, baked bread, bottle-fed orphan lambs, churned butter and helped irrigate land.

The idea came from Jeane Mizer, Blaine County's school guidance counselor, who felt the children were being "almost totally shut off" from broader horizons by their geographical location and lack of funds.

Blaine County, mountainous and rural, is in a sheep- and cattle-raising area. Hailey, the largest community and county seat, has a population of 1,200. There are 3 high schools in the county, the largest with 168 students. Many of its families are poor.

At first the local people thought a European tour for their children was financially impossible. The cost of touring seven countries over a 6-week period was $1,000. But the youngsters, who range in age from 14 to 18 years old, thought differently.

Sixteen-year-old Sharon Price, of Gannett, who lives on a farm with her widowed mother and seven brothers and sisters, stone-ground her own flour from the family wheat and each week baked 50 loaves of bread and sold them to neighbors.

Elaine Cloughton, 15, of Bellevue, raised "bum" (orphan) lambs, bottle-feeding them at dawn and throughout the day. Once they were big enough, she sold them for about 16 cents a pound.

WORKED IN SAWMILL

Gary Rogers, 17, who is also from Bellevue, worked in a sawmill full time during two summers and after school. His father is a foreman there.

Each member of the group earned at least one-third of his travel expenses. The remainder came from parents, friends, or scholarship funds.

In addition to their chores, the group remained at school after classes at least one

night a week to study languages or prepare research papers on the countries they planned to visit.

Their tour of England, the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, and France was planned by the National Student Association, which deals primarily in international cultural projects.

While they will visit schools, factories, and farms, there are other, more romantic items on the agenda, including a gondola ride in Venice, a picnic on top of the Jungfrau in Switzerland and a trip down the Rhine.

The teenagers, groggy and red-eyed, arrived here Wednesday after the long train ride from Idaho. For many, it was their first train ride.

They spent 24 hours seeing the sights and then embarked on a jet for London. None had been on a plane before.

Fred A. Picard, of Sun Valley, who worked with Miss Mizer on the tour plans, said he hoped this pilot project would be the first of many in Blaine County and elsewhere.

"This is a dream opportunity for these kids," Mr. Picard said. "They've worked their way out of isolation and into the big, wide world."

NAVY POLARIS SUBMARINE PROGRAM—LETTERS OF INTENT

Mr. CANNON. Madam President, there has been much discussion recently in Congress about defense procurement policy. Much criticism has been directed to the high percentage of negotiated contracts that is awarded by the Department of Defense.

However, before negotiated contracts are issued there is often much defense business given out under letters of intent. This indefinite form of contractual agreement, which many Pentagon officials insist on calling letter contracts, is issued to many large and favored defense contractors.

In the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1961, there appeared an informative article, "Polaris May Strain Navy Contract Plan." The author, Allen M. Smythe, a reputable financial writer, points out the effort of Vice Adm. George F. Beardsley to hold down the backlog of Navy letters of intent. Included therein is a list of large Navy contractors holding letters of intent.

It would be interesting for the Senate to be informed of what our other branches of the military service are doing to control the issuance of their letters of intent because I believe it would be valuable to limit this practice as much as possible except in cases of demonstrated emergencies.

In order that my colleagues can be further informed on this important subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

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

POLARIS MAY STRAIN NAVY CONTRACT PLAN—TIGHTER CONTROL PUT ON LETTERS OF INTENT

(By Allen M. Smythe)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The new administration's emphasis on an enlarged Polaris submarine program may strain the Navy contractual procedures and threatens to increase the backlog of letters of intent which has been steadily decreasing over the last 2 years.

However, Vice Adm. George F. Beardsley, Chief of Navy Materiel, said the number, dollar value, and conversion time for letters of intent must not be increased and, if possible, be further reduced.

To accomplish this he is ordering a monthly review of each letter of intent, a tighter control to issue or extend them, and a lower limitation of the fund obligations authority. These lower rates, coupled with a tight control on increasing these obligations, compel contractors to provide data for conversion into formal contracts at an earlier date.

The amount obligated under 143 present outstanding letters of intent valued at $672,437,000 represents approximately one-half of the final contract value. A high percentage both in number and value is associated with the top priority Polaris program.

Among the large defense firms now awaiting conversion negotiations are: Lockheed Aircraft, 7 valued at $71,475,000; General Electric, 7 valued at $70,382,000; Bendix, 4 valued at $44,770,000; Librascope, 6 valued at $40,569,000; Western Electric, 11 valued at $39,349,000; Convair, 3 valued at $36,144,000; Westinghouse, 6 valued at $20,365,000, and RCA, 2 valued at $18,187,000.

Electric Boat Co. and Newport News Shipbuilding Co. have both had letters of intent converted in the last 60 days to definitive contracts of over $30 million.

APPOINTMENT OF WALTER HART AND MILES STANLEY TO NATIONAL PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, I rise to express my appreciation to President Kennedy and to Secretary Luther Hodges on their selection of Mr. Walter Hart and Mr. Miles Stanley for appointment to the National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment—a committee which will concern itself mainly with the problems of unemployment in our economically distressed areas. These two gentlemen are West Virginians of exceptional merit, and I can truthfully state, from my long association and friendship with each, that they will be a credit to the committee. Both are men of keen insight, remarkable ability, and each is endowed with prodigious energy.

Mr. Hart is an editor of renown in West Virginia, and his daily column in the Dominion News, of Morgantown, "It May Interest You," has been widely read throughout my State for many years. He has been a keen observer of the daily scene, and an articulate voice in the affairs of his city and the State. He is a vigorous exponent of progress, and a tireless worker for the common man.

Mr. Stanley is president of the West Virginia AFL–CIO, and his sincere approach to the problems of both labor and management has won for him an affectionate regard by each. He was an effective member of the Douglas depressed areas committee, and, also served Gov. W. W. Barron in determining a legislative program for the revitalization of West Virginia. He is devoted to bettering the lives of working people in every possible way.

I commend their appointments as indicative of the good work which we may expect from this committee.

A NEW FRONTIER FOR MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the message of the President, received yesterday, calling for reorganization of the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration is one of the most hopeful messages to come to Alaskans since the advent of the New Frontier. It will be good news not merely for Alaska but also for our sister State Hawaii, as well as for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Indeed all our outlying areas have suffered from the conditions which the President's reorganization plan seeks to rectify.

The interest of the State of Alaska in the organization, policies, and procedures of the maritime regulatory agency arises from the responsibility of that agency for regulation of water carriers in the Alaska trade.

At this moment Alaska is fighting to defeat another of the periodic rate increases for Alaska water carriers which have been habitually granted by the Maritime Board and its predecessor agencies over the years.

Almost totally dependent, as it is, upon water transportation, for its freight, Alaska has throughout its history been hobbled and hindered in its growth by the imposition of the highest water freight rates in the world.

The latest 10-percent increase in tariffs filed by Alaska carriers in December 1959, and now the subject of proceedings before the present Federal Maritime Board, represents one more round in a weary struggle in which Alaskans have, traditionally, felt their interests were cruelly ignored while the profits of carriers continue to rise. The increase now under adjudication came on top of a 15-percent increase granted by the Board in 1958. Should the present contest covering the 10-percent increase be determined in favor of the carrier Alaska would be bearing the burden of increases for water freight transportation of 26.5 percent in less than 3 years. During the last decade waterborne freight rates to Alaska have increased 56.4 percent.

The fact is the State of Alaska can never develop its great natural resources unless it can be relieved of the onerous costs of water transportation it now pays.

It has long been apparent to many that one of the roots of problems of high water transportation rates is the form of the organization established to exercise regulatory control over them. As is stated in the message of the President:

> Intermingling of regulatory and promotional functions has tended * * * to dilute responsibility and has led to serious inadequacies, particularly in the administration of regulatory functions.

This statement of the President is a reflection of my own thoughts on reorganization of the Federal Maritime Board, which I expressed in March of this year when I testified before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcom-

mittee of the Senate Commerce Committee on this subject. At that time I characterized the present organizational structure of the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration as a schizophrenic malady which could be remedied only by the kind of action now recommended by the President. As I pointed out in my statement:

In theory, it would appear that the function of the Federal Maritime Board is to regulate and control rates, services, practices and agreements of oceangoing common carriers by water. However, as the current Government organization manual states, "The Federal Maritime Board and Administration foster the development and encourage the maintenance of a merchant marine." In other words, the Federal Maritime Board must promote and encourage development of the same industry it is expected to regulate.

Moreover, the schizophrenia here is intensified by the fact that the Maritime Administrator, whose clear duty is to promote the growth of the merchant marine, is also Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board that regulates operations of the very same merchant marine.

It is, therefore, virtually impossible for the same agency to both promote development of an industry and, at the same time, regulate it, if the regulating is to be of any effect, and in the public interest.

Regulation by its very terms, involves restrictions of some aspects of carrier operations. Almost inevitably, a case can be made that regulation—for example, failure to allow rate increases—inhibits growth of the industry.

With the best intentions in the world it seems impossible that the Maritime Administration can, on the one hand, work to strengthen and promote the merchant marine, and on the other hand, act to restrict it.

As noted in the Landis report, a related and important factor in the organizational problem of the Federal Maritime Board is that it is organizationally located within the Department of Commerce. While recognizing that the Board operates independently of the Secretary of Commerce (except that it is guided by policies of the Secretary in awarding subsidies) it is, nevertheless, dependent on the Department for assignment and payment of personnel, for budgetary allocations, for office space, and other housekeeping services. The effect of this relationship must tend to exert controls over the operation of the Board.

Now that the President has acted we should have an opportunity to cure the disability which has, for so long, prevented effective regulation of the water carriers.

I am extremely hopeful that, along with establishing a separate regulatory agency and a promotional agency more responsive both to the needs of the public served by the carriers and of the carriers themselves, there will develop a new spirit and attitude of public service on the part of the carriers. This has been seriously lacking in past years, but I believe it is vitally necessary that the carriers and the new regulatory agency to be established adopt an attitude of service to the public which at least matches the zeal of the carriers for improving their financial position. For the improvement of the finances of the Alaska carriers has in the past been accomplished by the extraction of ever higher rates from the public, without, in my view, adequate regard for the effects of this on the economy of Alaska or the welfare of the consumer.

Further, I am hopeful that the new organization will find dynamic, imaginative solutions not only to problems of consumers resulting from exorbitant costs of shipping, but, also, to problems of the carriers resulting from dwindling business, overage fleets and costly operations. Answers to these problems have been notably lacking over the course of the last years.

I look forward to the early implementation of Reorganization Plan No. 7, and to a progressive program of development of the American merchant marine under enlightened regulation in the public interest.

NO DOUBT WHERE PUBLIC STANDS ON KENNEDY'S MEDICAL CARE PLAN

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial from the Anderson Independent of Anderson, S.C., dated Monday, June 12, concerning the public support of the administration's plan to increase the benefits under the medical insurance program for the aged.

The writer of this editorial has cleared away the fog surrounding this issue and has efficiently and factually presented the case for medical insurance for the aged. The writer cites the recent Gallup poll on this issue, indicating that 67 percent of the American people favor the administration's program. This editorial very clearly points out that the best insurance against socialized medicine are programs such as the medical insurance program for the aged.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with my remarks.

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

[From the Independent, Anderson, S.C., June 12, 1961]

NO DOUBT WHERE PUBLIC STANDS ON KENNEDY'S MEDICAL CARE PLAN

The highly accurate Gallup poll on the issue shows a whopping 67 percent of American citizens favoring President Kennedy's plan to up the social security tax to pay for medical insurance for the aged.

Two out of three persons favor the Kennedy plan—in Anderson, in South Carolina, in Georgia, in the United States as a whole.

This view holds despite millions of dollars being spent by the American Medical Association, its State branches, and local societies, and by the insurance combines to fight the program.

If all the pressure the AMA and cohorts are putting on Congressmen could be packed into a rocket the United States could land a regiment of astronauts on the moon in one shot.

One of the chief arguments of the plan's opponents is that the younger working population will be paying the bill and doesn't stand to benefit for 20 or 30 years.

Ironically enough, the poll shows the younger working group—those 21 to 29 years of age—favor the plan by 63 percent.

In the middle bracket—30 to 49 years—67 percent want the program enacted.

Among those closest to retirement—50 years of age and older—the total is 69 percent—only 4 percent higher than the average for the two younger groups.

That knocks the props from under the AMA on that point, and serves 'em right for giving the back of their hand to the intelligence of the younger citizens in our working bracket.

Younger men and women know that they, too, will be in the old-age bracket all too soon and don't like the prospect of having savings, other insurance, and earned security income wiped out overnight by a spell of illness requiring skyrocketing medical and hospital costs.

Congressmen from this and other regions who had succumbed to the pressures and blandishments of the AMA's medical unioneers might do well to find out how the people they profess to serve view this matter—and we don't mean from the paid lobbyists, chambers of commerce, or manufacturers association spokesmen.

Insofar as the AMA and satellites are concerned, there are many doctors, high and respected in their profession, who are not fighting this plan, but they are captives of the AMA union, one of the tightest closed shops in the world. They discreetly remain silent.

Defeat of the program would be only a temporary victory. Inevitably it will be approved; in the years ahead the program will be improved upon.

Continued opposition by the AMA and fellow professional and congressional travelers to this and other programs needed in the realm of health is inviting what nobody wants if other means can be found—socialized medicine.

But if the present course is pursued, the policy of blind opposition, the medical profession is going to wake up one day socialized right up to the goozle, just as has happened in England.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4130) to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. HALEY, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. BERRY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also 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 Senate to the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

S. 847. An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the

United States of America, Inc., and for other purposes;

S. 1852. An act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1293. An act for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba;

H.R. 1360. An act for the relief of Anna B. Prokop;

H.R. 1467. An act for the relief of Modesta Pitarch-Martin Dauphinais;

H.R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mary A. Combs;

H.R. 1523. An act for the relief of Kazimiera Marek;

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda;

H.R. 1578. An act for the relief of Mah Quock;

H.R. 1621. An act for the relief of Miss Kristina Voydanoff;

H.R. 1622. An act for the relief of Doctor George Berberian;

H.R. 1871. An act for the relief of Min Ja Lee;

H.R. 1873. An act for the relief of Anna Stanislawa Ziolo;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Sotiropoulos;

H.R. 2101. An act for the relief of Evelina Scarpa;

H.R. 2107. An act for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno;

H.R. 2116. An act for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera;

H.R. 2141. An act for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun;

H.R. 2158. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 3489. An act for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec;

H.R. 3846. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired;

H.R. 3850. An act for the relief of Clark L. Simpson;

H.R. 4217. An act for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang;

H.R. 4219. An act for the relief of the estate of William M. Farmer;

H.R. 4282. An act for the relief of Casimir Lazarz;

H.R. 4713. An act for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt;

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution designating the week of May 13–19, 1962, as Police Week and designating May 14, 1962, as Peace Officers Memorial Day; and

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION — NOMINATION OF HOWARD MORGAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination of Howard Morgan, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

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

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Madam President, the nomination before the Senate is one which the White House should have withdrawn. It is one which the Committee on Commerce, without such action by the White House, should have disapproved. That neither of these events took place may be assigned to persistence of misinformation and to misplaced sentimentalism.

We are not concerned here with punishing for youthful misdeeds three decades after their event. We are not seeking to adjudicate in 1961 larceny charges made in 1937. We are not even asserting that a man who lies under one set of circumstances in 1952 is necessarily a liar about other things in 1961.

What we are concerned with is the contemporary discovery that Howard Morgan by calculated misstatement and omission sought to mislead the Senate Committee on Commerce in April and May of 1961, and that he currently arrogates to himself the right to decide whether he will or will not obey the law.

It is a misfortune that only a few members of our committee were able to attend the Morgan hearings. It is an even greater misfortune that the printed hearings, complete with exhibits, were not available in time to be studied before our committee met in executive session to consider this nomination.

The consequence is that a majority of the committee has been recorded as finding in the hearing record no impediment to Howard Morgan's service on the Federal Power Commission.

If the story of Howard Morgan's life were as he presented it to the committee, there would be no impediment.

This is what he would have us believe:

Howard Morgan worked his way through college in the construction camps of the Northwest. In 1936, when he was 22 years old, there was a fist fight between two contractors, one of whom was his employer.

After the fight had been going on for some 10 minutes, a truckdriver working for the other employer jumped on the back of Mr. Morgan's employer and began choking him. Mr. Morgan pulled the truckdriver off his employer's back so the fight could continue, as it did.

This incident did not attract much attention at the time, but later the truckdriver brought a complaint against Mr. Morgan before a justice of the peace in Wasco County, Oreg., where the fight took place.

Mr. Morgan was summoned to a hearing before the justice of the peace. He described the incident and maintained that all he had done was to protect a man from unfair and unreasonable attack.

Then the justice of the peace, who seemed more familiar with the complainant than with the law or commonsense, asked Mr. Morgan whether his employer had asked him to remove the truckdriver from his back. Mr. Morgan answered that his employer had been too busy defending himself against two attackers to hold a conference with Mr. Morgan.

Thereupon, the justice of the peace announced that Mr. Morgan should have waited for such a request and that his failure to do so would cost him $25.

The foregoing is a close paraphrase of a written description of the assault incident which Howard Morgan circulated to members of the committee.

In his oral testimony, he elaborated a bit, by explaining that the attacking contractor started the fight when he grabbed a screwdriver and attempted to stab Mr. Morgan's employer three or four times. Mr. Morgan also added that after he had removed the attacking truckdriver from his own employer's back, the truckdriver got up, with a rock in his hand, and tried two or three times to hit Mr. Morgan with it.

Continuing now with the story of Mr. Morgan, as told by Mr. Morgan:

When the summer of 1936 was over, the job on which Mr. Morgan had been employed, which involved highway surfacing in eastern Wasco County, ended; and Mr. Morgan returned to Portland, where he enrolled in night school.

His employer during the summer of 1936, Jack R. Eatch, still owed Mr. Morgan some back wages for work during a preceding winter. Mr. Morgan wanted to collect the back wages, in order to buy a tire for his automobile. When he mentioned this to his former employer, Jack R. Eatch, the latter began looking through the equipment he had brought back from the Wasco County job, to see whether he could find a tire that Mr. Morgan could use. He found a passenger car tire that was not his own, but which had somehow or other appeared in the camp at Wasco County, and had been transported back to Portland, unnoticed. Mr. Eatch offered this tire to Mr. Morgan, in lieu of a payment on his back wages, and suggested that he might trade it in at a filling station for a tire that would fit Morgan's car.

Mr. Morgan took the tire to a filling station, and traded it in. Later, the filling station proprietor found that the tire received from Mr. Morgan carried a serial number that identified it as stolen.

As a result, on February 7, 1937, Mr. Morgan was taken into custody by the Portland police, was photographed and fingerprinted, and was charged with being a fugitive from a larceny charge in Maupin, Oreg.

After being held overnight, he appeared in Portland municipal court, on the next day, and the judge ordered that he be held for Maupin. Oregon State Police picked him up, the same day, and took him to The Dalles for investigation.

While he was held there, Mr. Jack R. Eatch, who had learned of Mr. Morgan's arrest, hurried to The Dalles, explained that he had given the tire to Mr. Morgan, and arranged for reimbursement

to the service station proprietor. The police immediately released Mr. Morgan.

No formal charge was ever brought, nor was there any court procedure of any kind concerning the matter.

Howard Morgan's autobiography next finds him entering Reed College, where, in 1940, he was awarded the degree of bachelor of arts. During his senior year, he was president of the student body.

Upon his graduation from Reed College, Mr. Morgan started work with Consolidated Freightways, in Portland, and continued there until March 15, 1941.

He then became self-employed as a researchman for litigants before the Interstate Commerce Commission, making in this employment $1,500 a year.

While so self-employed, Mr. Morgan received a call from Mr. Harry Niles, then chief of police of Portland. The chief asked Morgan to come down and talk with him. He did so, and was surprised when the chief offered him a job as his administrative assistant. The chief had been given Morgan's name by Reed College.

Mr. Morgan, as he tells the tale, considered for a week or so whether to accept the offer from Chief Niles, but finally told him that he had had overtures from Joseph Eastman, and the probability was that he would shortly go to Washington, D.C., and that in the meantime he would go to Berkeley, and enter the University of California Graduate School.

Chief Niles then said that he had in his files a record on Mr. Morgan; that he had investigated the matter, and that in his judgment a miscarriage of justice had occurred. Chief Niles said there was nothing in the files that would keep Mr. Morgan from working for the Government, but they might result in some delay, and possibly embarrassment to him. The chief also said that the normal way to have the files expunged from the record was to go through a court procedure and ask that they be withdrawn everywhere that they might appear.

Mr. Morgan told the chief that he did not have the funds to do that. Chief Niles then volunteered that there was another method whereby police records on Mr. Morgan could be expunged, that the chief himself could do it, as head of the department that originated the records.

Chief Niles asked Mr. Morgan whether he had any objection to Niles' permanently expunging the record, and Mr. Morgan said "No." About 2 weeks later, Chief Niles called Mr. Morgan, and told him that he had withdrawn the records from his files, from the files of the State police at Salem, and from the FBI files in Washington.

Mr. Morgan then continued his self-employment in Portland until August 1941, at which time he entered the Graduate School of the University of California, at Berkeley.

On February 9, 1942, he became an employee, in Washington, D.C., of the Board of Investigation and Research.

Shortly thereafter, he applied for transfer to the Office of Defense Transportation. In connection with both jobs, he stated on personnel forms that he had never been arrested. In this connection, I refer to encircled question 8, at page 48 of the hearings.

On August 16, 1942, he applied for a commission in the Navy. Before it was granted, he went to work, on loan to the Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks, and left there on November 1, 1942, to become a Navy ensign.

On his application for a Navy commission, he also stated that he had never been arrested. In this connection, I refer to the top question on the form reproduced at page 51 of the hearings.

Mr. Morgan stated to the committee that he had not recorded his arrests on his application for a Navy commission or on any of the forms 57 he had executed to obtain employment with the Federal Government in 1942, 1949, and 1952.

He did not report the arrest connected with the charge of larceny because he felt he had been wrongfully charged, and that it was something that he need not carry on his shoulders and explain for the rest of his life. He was not quite sure why he did not report his arrest on the charge of assault, but thought it likely that he had merely forgotten it.

At the end of World War II, Mr. Morgan returned to Portland, and returned to civilian life in February 1946.

His biographical statement to the committee says that after the war, he engaged in practice as a transportation consultant, and that in 1948 he purchased a large livestock ranch.

In the meantime, during 1946 or 1947, Police Chief Harry Niles, of Portland, died.

In 1948, Howard Morgan was elected to the Oregon Legislature.

Again, I should point out that the Morgan biography I am stating is derived from his own words to our committee.

While the legislature was in session in 1949, Mr. Morgan was approached by a man he had never seen before, and has not seen since, and was threatened with reprisals involving his police records if he did not vote for a slot machine bill then on the floor. This was the first inkling Mr. Morgan had that Chief Niles had not destroyed the records, as promised, but had merely put them in his desk, and that they had been found, and returned to the files after his death.

Upon being threatened, Mr. Morgan called in the newspaper reporters, and told them of the incident that had happened in 1937, and asked them to check on it, in case he should be accused.

In 1952, Mr. Morgan was elected by a narrow margin to serve as the chairman of the Democratic Party, in Oregon.

He promptly undertook a housecleaning and a renovation of his party, and in this had the help of the late Senator Richard Neuberger—formerly a distinguished Member of this body—and others. As Mr. Morgan himself has said, they made bitter enemies in both parties by the methods they chose.

In 1953, an effort was made to drive Mr. Morgan out of politics. It took the form of widespread circulation of a reproduction of a police index card, complete with fullface and profile photographs and description of the larceny charge.

Mr. Morgan realized that the card could only have come from the Portland police files; and when he checked the files, he found that the records on him had been replaced.

He was asked for a statement on the matter by the editor of the Eugene, Oreg., Register Guard. Mr. Morgan then, on November 10, 1953, wrote a letter to the editor of that paper, and transmitted with it an affidavit which he had procured from Jack R. Eatch, of Portland.

That affidavit is reproduced in full at page 39 of the hearings. I have used it as the basis of my description thus far of events connected with the so-called larceny charge.

Similar letters, with copies of the affidavit, were sent to other Oregon newspapers, including the Portland Oregonian and the Portland Journal.

Mr. Morgan continued as chairman of the Democratic Party in Oregon until July 1956. Shortly thereafter, he became a staff member of the national Stevenson-for-President campaign.

In January 1957, he was appointed public utilities commissioner, and continued to serve in that capacity until January 12, 1959, by which time Democratic Governor Robert Holmes had been succeeded by Republican Governor Mark Hatfield.

There is only one member of the Public Utilities Commission in Oregon, and the post is not subject to confirmation.

Since his retirement as public utilities commissioner, Mr. Morgan has engaged in ranching at Sisters, Oreg.

That, Madam President, is the story of Howard Morgan as he would have us know it.

Let me point out, though, that all of this was not volunteered. Some was given us only in answer to probing questions.

He did, however, volunteer the story of his heroic resistance against blackmail by slot machine interests and his explanation that Chief Harry Niles removed the Morgan records from the Portland police files.

Most of his biographical account is true, although some parts are contradicted by other facts or by what Morgan himself said at other times.

What troubles those of us who have signed the minority report is that the true parts and the false are knit together and explained by amazingly contrived rationalizations.

They are not quite believable, so that we are left with the impression that when pressed, Mr. Morgan glibly twists the truth.

On January 26, 1961, the press secretary at the White House released an announcement of the President's intention to nominate Joseph Charles Swidler, of Tennessee, and Howard Morgan, of Oregon, to positions on the Federal Power Commission.

In due course, copies of the press release were obtained for the Commerce Committee files.

There was no occasion to examine the release until the actual nominations were received, and they did not come to the Senate until March 21, shortly before the Easter recess.

The Howard Morgan nomination first came before the full committtee for hearing on April 11.

If my recollection serves correctly, I did not receive a single letter or wire about Mr. Morgan from any source between the announcement of the President's intention to nominate him and the start of his hearing.

Mr. Morgan, himself, came to my office and assured me that the industries he would be called upon to regulate had nothing to fear from him.

In response to my specific question, according to my best recollection, he denied that there was anything in his background which could subject his nomination to criticism.

In general, he made a good impression on me, but as the date for the hearing neared, I was more and more nonplused by my failure to hear anything good or bad about him in my correspondence. I directed the minority staff to make some inquiries in Oregon.

Naturally enough, we telephoned Republicans, but they referred us to Democrats for confirmation of their assertions that Howard Morgan had two noteworthy characteristics: He is careless with the truth and has frequently asserted that other people are crooks.

Oregon Republicans were particularly indignant that Morgan had appeared as a witness before the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field and had there, as they put it, "besmirched the name of our dead Governor."

They also said that Morgan had been arrested a couple of times, but that the records on the arrests could not be found.

We did not assign much importance to the statements that Morgan had been arrested at some time in the past, because there had already come to our attention a copy of the Portland Police Department index card that had been circulated throughout Oregon in 1953.

We felt we could not ignore it, but we also thought that we should ask Morgan to comment on it in private. Accordingly, it was arranged that one Senator from the majority and one from the minority of our committee would talk with Morgan in private.

This conference took place during the afternoon of April 11, which was the date of the first hearing on the Morgan nomination.

I was later informed that the two members of our committee who talked with Morgan were satisfied with his explanation of the origin of the card. They informally suggested that the matter not be pursued in open session.

That suggestion would no doubt have been followed had it not been for the fact that our suspicions were aroused by other developments.

We looked over the Portland vice inquiries conducted by the McClellan committee, and from them derived some questions which Senator SCOTT asked during the April 11 hearing.

Two of Morgan's answers were contradicted by the record of the McClellan hearings, and he was immediately confronted with that fact.

The colloquy with Senator SCOTT begins near the top of page 21 and continues through page 23 of the Morgan hearings. This experience with Mr. Morgan suggested that we make independent inquiry about Mr. Morgan's past record, and not rely exclusively upon his own statements with respect to it.

Accordingly, as we wished to proceed fairly and to avoid launching derogatory rumors through the mere fact of inquiry, we asked the chief counsel of the Commerce Committee to request that the White House make available to us whatever police records the FBI had found relating to a charge of larceny of a tire and to a charge of assault and battery.

The word came back that the request would be granted, followed by later word that there was no police record. We thereupon directed telegrams to the Oregon State Police, to the police chiefs at Portland and The Dalles, to the sheriff of Marion County, and to the marshal at Maupin.

We also contacted by telephone a retired State policeman who, we had been told, was the arresting officer in the assault case. From him we learned that FBI agents had called on him an hour before and that they had in their possession a copy of Morgan's arrest record on the assault charge.

When we asked the Washington headquarters of the FBI for copies of whatever they had found on Morgan's arrests on charges of larceny and assault, we were referred to the White House.

We persisted with our inquiries there and finally, through the chief counsel of our committee, received from the White House a copy of Portland Police Department and municipal court files relating to Morgan's arrest on the larceny charge.

The Portland documents are printed in the hearings at pages 86 through 88.

The White House gave us nothing on the assault charge, but later we received from the Oregon State Police a copy of the arrest record. See page 36 of the hearings.

We also received from the Oregon State Police a print from a microfilm record relating to the arrest made on the larceny charge. The text of this card is printed at page 43 of the hearings. It will be noted that the card states that Morgan admitted the theft.

On the same page of the hearings, it will be seen that Morgan said to Senator SCOTT that the purported admission of guilt was false. The information we received from the police chief at The Dalles, where Morgan was taken after his arrest in Portland, merely indicates that Morgan was released to State police on February 10, 1937, 2 days after his arrest in Portland.

Our search comes to a dead end at that point, as the marshal at Maupin had no record whatsoever.

Thus, we have only the State police index card to controvert Morgan's statement—at page 52 of the hearings—that, "in effect I was arrested for the purpose of investigating to find out whether I should have been arrested or not, and the investigation proved that I should not have been."

Apart from Morgan's testimony, we have nothing to show final disposition of the charge.

At the same time that we began searching police records to see whether Morgan had had any brushes with the law, we obtained from the General Services Administration Records Center at St. Louis, Mo., photostatic copies of forms 57 that Morgan had executed.

Later, we obtained the complete personnel file, and learned that, in all, Morgan had stated six times on personnel forms that he had never been arrested or summoned into court as a defendant on a criminal charge.

In addition, he made the same statement on his application for a Navy commission.

In each of the seven instances, he was under legal mandate to tell the truth, and on two occasions, he was also under oath.

The governing statute in this matter, in pertinent part, appears at page 89 of the hearings. For each offense, it permits a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

By the time our investigation had reached this point, we were aware that Morgan had falsified facts nine times—or certainly there was serious question as to the facts—twice to our committee and seven times in his personnel forms.

We began to think that there might be illumination in comparing what Morgan said at various times with other available records.

Accordingly, we asked Dun & Bradstreet to make a report on Morgan, with special attention to police records and to character and reputation.

We asked the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress to search newspaper files, and we checked city directories for many years back. Our search yielded some curious and thought-provoking contradictions and inconsistencies.

On the basis of the hearings and the committee's files, certain conclusions are inescapable.

There is no doubt that Morgan was twice arrested and seven times falsified the fact on personnel forms.

There is no doubt that Portland Police Department records relating to the charge of larceny were removed from that department's files in 1941.

Morgan's explanation of the circumstances is hard to believe.

When we asked Robert L. Steele, the present acting chief of police of Portland, to comment on the matter, he replied:

> The circumstances concerning the removal of police files on Howard Vincent Morgan are unknown to present members of this bureau. Those persons who may have had personal knowledge of this incident in 1941 are since deceased.

There is no doubt that when Morgan hid his arrests he believed that the police files on him had been permanently destroyed. He admitted that fact in answer to a question by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], which Senators will find at page 67 of the hearings.

On all of those points, there is no doubt.

On the other hand, there is considerable doubt or uncertainty as to whether Jack R. Eatch was Morgan's employer at the time of larceny charge, and if he was not, the affidavit he gave to explain away the larceny charge must collapse.

There are two bits of evidence:

First. Although Eatch stated himself to be a resident of Portland in 1937, he is not listed in the Portland city directory from 1936 through 1939. He first appears in the directory in 1940, where his occupation is listed as "driver."

Second. We find no instance prior to the date of Eatch's affidavit in 1953, wherein Morgan claimed Eatch as his 1936 employer. He had an opportunity to do so in 1942 when he listed his prior work experience for the Office of Defense Transportation.

This point is discussed in the memorandum printed at page 80 of the hearings, and may I say in passing that the date of execution of Form OEM–2 referred to on that page was March 8, 1942, not 1932 as there stated.

Further, there is no doubt that Morgan has deliberately sought, as I view it, to mislead the Commerce Committee as to his relations with Eatch.

Morgan did not tell us that Eatch was the man whom he said he was defending in the assault matter.

He did not volunteer to us that he was in business with Mr. Eatch in the purchase and sale of war surplus machinery from February 1946 until November 1948.

He did not tell us that he is currently in business with Eatch in the Pioneer Construction Co.

Each of these omissions, by itself, means little, but cumulatively, they fit a purpose of concealment.

Why should Morgan want to leave our committee with the impression that from 1936 until 1961 he was almost a total stranger to Eatch, and that the only relationship between them was that of employer and employee 25 years ago?

We are left to infer that Morgan himself recognized the Eatch affidavit as too pat, too nicely contrived for sober belief.

We are left to assume that Morgan himself foresaw how quickly the Eatch affidavit would become suspect if it were known that in 1946–47 Morgan was in business as a partner with Eatch and that at the time of the confirmation hearing was in business with him again.

It will be noted that I distinguish between what Morgan volunteered to us and what he said under questioning.

It is fair to do so because Morgan was kept informed by our committee's majority staff of the various documents that came to us as the investigation of his background continued. That we tried to do.

Thus, Morgan was not surprised by any questions put to him and was able to conform his answers to the documents on which our questions were based. Even so, he was left in the curious position of declaring, at page 44 of the hearing record, that the White House was wrong when it said in its January 26 press release that Morgan was then a part owner of the Pioneer Construction Co. in Portland.

The White House statement is supported by the Portland city directory, the Oregon corporation commissioner, and Dun & Bradstreet's supplemental report dated May 3, 1961. This report will be found at page 78 of the hearings.

Note, however, that by May 5, Dun & Bradstreet found it necessary to make a further report. This second supplemental report was occasioned by the fact that Mrs. Ruth Eatch of Pioneer Construction Co. phoned and asked that Dun & Bradstreet contact Pioneer's attorney to learn complete details concerning Howard Morgan's interest in Pioneer Construction Co.

This was just 3 days after the issue had been raised in our committee's examination of Howard Morgan.

The attorney, when contacted, explained that $25,000 of capital stock had been jointly subscribed in the names of Howard Morgan and Alfred Corbett and had been paid for, but that the share certificates had not yet been issued.

This statement, of course, is consistent with Morgan's claim that he used his wife's money when investing in Pioneer Construction Co., but word magic cannot erase the fact that to subscribe for shares in the name of Howard V. Morgan, Howard V. Morgan had to sign his name. He did not sign his wife's name; he did not sign as trustee; he signed simply, "Howard V. Morgan."

It is only fair to say that we checked some other information given us by Howard Morgan and found it true and absolutely accurate.

This was the case with respect to his academic record. He claimed no credits that were not officially of record. We did learn, however, that he entered Reed College as a sophomore transfer student in 1937, and did not spend 4 years there as stated in his 1949 form 57.

In his 1952 form 57, he correctly showed that he had 1 year at the University of Oregon and 3 years at Reed College, but by this time, he was claiming 1 year—interrupted by war—at the University of California Graduate School, rather than the one semester that he completed.

In his biographical statement to our committee, he did not falsely claim unearned credits, but he did use magnificent generality to describe his one semester of work at the Graduate School, University of California.

Here are his words:

> After graduate work in economics and the administrative law of utility regulation at the University of California (Berkeley), he served under the direction of the late Joseph B. Eastman in the Office of Defense Transportation during 1941–42.

That quotation leads us very naturally to his work in the Office of Defense Transportation. He was not there for the 2 years suggested by "1941–42."

He was there for less than 6 months; from February 9, 1942, until September 22, 1942.

He served only remotely under the direction of the late Joseph B. Eastman.

Actually, he worked for E. J. Buhner, Chief, Freight Operations Section, Motor Transport Division, and his job was to assist a Mr. Ray G. Atherton.

The biographical statement which Mr. Morgan furnished to our committee, and to which he said—at page 5 of the hearings—he had nothing to add, states:

> After the war (Morgan) engaged in practice as transportation consultant, and in 1948 purchased a large livestock ranch.

Actually, Morgan was merely a voluntary consultant in transportation to the Oregon State Grange beginning in November 1948.

His gainful occupation after the war, from February 1946 until November 1948, was the purchase and sale of war surplus heavy construction machinery. In this connection, I refer Senators to the minority staff memorandum appearing at page 82 of the hearings. All the details are there.

Mr. President, I could continue in this vein for some time, but I think by now I have made what I consider to be my point.

Howard Morgan, in the most charitable view, did not try very hard to give us the enlightenment we thought should be given to our committee.

When cornered on some matter that he had had occasion to explain before, he glibly hauled out the story he had used before.

On new disclosures, he was a little evasive. For example, when confronted with the Oregon State Police record with its recital of an admission of guilt, he declared the statement false and added that police often put "little comments like that in their records."

He was obviously inventing as he went along when he excused his failure to declare his interest in Pioneer Construction Co. by saying that only his wife's money was involved.

The majority report, mistakenly, as I see it, urges that the nominee had reasonable grounds to believe that he should forget about the larceny charge and that his belief that the records would never come to light excused his failure to mention his arrest.

That theory is answered at page 15 in the minority views, which I urge Senators to read. Of particular significance, it seems to me, is Morgan's effort to persuade newspapers to print his version of the larceny charge.

As the minority views point out, he could have taken his key witness into court to testify in an action to expunge the assertedly erroneous police record. Instead of trying the substantive issue in court, he tried it in the newspapers.

He had used the same technique in dealing with this committee, but as he tells the story, he gave information to only one columnist, who insisted on writing about it, but was able to persuade three other newspapermen not to do so.

There may be those who would look tolerantly on Howard Morgan's tendency to write and talk about himself in terms so favorable as to skirt the edge of truth, and who would dismiss his overstatement of his experience and abilities as mere "puffing."

That view might be acceptable if he were applying for a selling job, in which exaggeration might be useful and expected.

The position Mr. Morgan is seeking is not that of selling overpriced trifles through overstatement, but of wielding vast power over our Nation's resources, and involving many people.

He asks our confirmation to membership on a commission whose acts can determine whether businesses succeed or fail and whether gas and electricity will be available on demand to meet consumer needs. If his nomination is confirmed, he will be expected to come before our committee and tell us of the problems confronting his agency and to comment on legislative proposals.

How much faith can we place in his word?

When we have found him so willing, by his own admission, to avoid speaking bluntly and frankly to save himself embarrassment, how much trust can we put in him? Sometimes I find myself asking the same question.

I have regretfully concluded that we would do best not to trust him at all in those circumstances.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, we are not here trying to pile new punishment on Howard Morgan for misdeeds in his youth. What we are trying to do is to measure the 1961 Howard Morgan against the standard of excellence which I think should be and must be required for confirmation to membership on the Federal Power Commission.

Measured by that standard, I think Howard Morgan fails. Fourflushing and reluctance to tell the truth, as I see it, are disqualifying. I shall, therefore, vote against confirmation of the nomination of Howard Morgan. He is not the caliber of one whose nomination I would vote to confirm. Naturally I hope that other Senators will examine the record made before the committee, and the views that I have tried to present to the Senate, as my duty impels me to do, and arrive at their own judgments with respect to the nomination.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I rise in opposition to confirmation of the nomination of Howard Morgan. I was present during the testimony, and I am aware of the views of the minority and the majority.

The confirmation of two nominations is pending today before the Senate. I believe it should be made perfectly clear that nothing which I have to say turns on any difference of opinion or ideological variance as between the two nominees and my own views. The President is entitled to nominate and to send to the Senate for confirmation the name of anyone who he thinks is capable and competent to perform the duties of the office. The President is also entitled to select persons whose views are in consonance with his own, no matter how different they may be from those of Senators, including myself.

That I am not concerned about ideological differences is evidenced in the fact that both of the recommended appointees to the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Swidler and Mr. Morgan, are what are known generally as public power advocates. I respect their position, which has much support in many parts of the country. I do not agree with it, because I do not like to see the money of my Pennsylvania constituents voted out of their pockets regularly in order to permit the constituents of Senators in other States to light their houses and heat their homes with subsidies afforded to them through taxes paid by my Commonwealth.

Therefore, the entire public power theory to my mind is a tax redistribution proposal whereby Pennsylvanians would pay their own fuel bills and also pay a substantial part, through taxes, of the fuel bills of persons enjoying the privilege of low-cost public power in other parts of the country. My own views are in support of those expressed by President Eisenhower on the partnership theory, which recognizes that there is a place in the underdeveloped or less developed parts of our country for public power, though there are far fewer now than formerly. There is also a place for private power, and the partnership theory seems to me to make sense.

Both Mr. Swidler and Mr. Morgan hold public power theories. I am not opposed to the nomination of Mr. Swidler, and I shall vote to support confirmation of his nomination for the reasons I have stated. The President is entitled to nominate a man with whose views he agrees. The President is also entitled to present to the Senate the name of Mr. Morgan on the basis that he agrees with his views.

But it is not Mr. Morgan's capacity to do the job which is fundamentally at issue, although his competence appears to have been grossly overstated, and in the testimony he admitted that while it is known about 90 percent of the business of the Federal Power Commission concerns natural gas, he had very little experience in natural gas cases as a public power commissioner of Oregon.

The question is whether or not Howard Morgan is a liar and a perjurer. The question is whether or not, on six different occasions, Howard Morgan deliberately, consciously, and intentionally withheld information about two previous arrests for the purpose of advancing his own career. The question here is whether the nomination of Howard Morgan, an admitted perjurer and liar, and admittedly subject, by his own estimate of his own guilt, to admonition or condemnation, should be confirmed.

We had the benefit of a message from the President of the United States, which stated the criteria which the President believes should be adhered to in selecting persons to hold public office. There was some question about that point in the Meriwether case. I voted against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Meriwether, because the Alabama Ku Klux Klan was altogether too cozy with Mr. Meriwether. But he is now appointed. The Senate acted. We must now live with Mr. Meriwether, as the President must live with Governor Patterson and others who were and are Meriwether's friends.

The President will also have to live with Howard Morgan if the Senate confirms his nomination notwithstanding the evidences of his perjury. This is what the President himself said in his message of April 27, which was sent to us not very long before the name of Howard Morgan was sent to us. The President said:

> Ultimately, high ethical standards can be maintained only if the leaders of government provide a personal example of dedication to the public service—and exercise their leadership to develop in all government employees an increasing sensitivity to the ethical and moral conditions imposed by public service.

The President, later on, quite rightly said this:

> No President can excuse or pardon the slightest deviation from irreproachable standards of behavior on the part of any member of the executive branch.

Yet it will be argued here by those who support Mr. Morgan's nomination that that is exactly what he has done. The fact that the President keeps the nomination before the Senate would indicate that he, too, approves of Howard Morgan, who, by his own testimony and by his own admissions in the hearings, does not come within the President's own criteria for the holding of public office in the executive branch because, indeed, there was more than a slight deviation from irreproachable standards of behavior.

For example, Mr. Morgan was asked whether he thought his own conduct was proper. Mr. Morgan answered, at page 67 of the hearings:

> I think that I can be and probably should be reprimanded or admonished for an infraction of the rules. * * * I think that in this case while what I did was something I cannot defend as absolutely right it was not seriously damaging to anyone and I would not have done it if it had been.

What Mr. Morgan is saying is that if he sees fit to lie six times in connection with applications for government official employment, or to secure a commission as an officer in the U.S. Navy, it does not hurt anyone. What Mr. Morgan is saying is that if his nomination is confirmed as a member of the Federal Power Commission, as a known perjurer, it does not hurt anyone, that he must come before Congress and must submit his opinions which affect the rights of all Americans, and submit them as one who has admittedly lied about his early record.

I do not agree that that cannot and does not affect anyone or hurt anyone. As a matter of fact, Mr. Morgan has participated in several dubious proceedings. I know that those who say "Confirm Mr. Morgan's nomination" are doing their duty and are acting from the highest motives and convictions, and believe that these are very minor charges. I respect their views. Much will be said here about these being youthful offenses, which any one of us could have committed. Indeed, we might have. So far as I am concerned, I will not admit whether I, too, might not properly have been at times arrested for assault and battery, because hotheaded young men under certain circumstances will take a poke at someone else. The fact that I do not have a criminal record of that kind may be purely an accident and simply because under the circumstances where

I might have engaged in such youthful offenses there were no policemen present. Therefore, I do not want it said that I am speaking in opposition to the confirmation of Howard Morgan because he got into a fight, even though the circumstances of that fight became known to us only through his own interpretation of the incident.

No, it is not important that he was engaged in an assault and battery and that he was fined $25. It is little more important that the records of Wasco County show that he admitted the theft of a tire, even though much effort is being made by the Howard Morgan supporters to indicate that that did not happen either. But the records show it did happen. That admission appeared in the hearings. He said that the theft was a minor one, and that actually he did not know the tire was stolen, that his boss had given it to him. On the other hand, the Wasco County affidavit shows that Howard Morgan admitted the theft of the tire. He did not reveal that fact to the committee. It was brought out by cross-examination. The affidavit exculpating him was signed by his business partner. He did not tell us. It was his business partner who signed the affidavit.

It may not be important that he knew that the records of the stolen tire incident had been removed improperly from the files by his friend, the police chief. It may not even be important that Mr. Morgan admitted that he knew there were no records when he concealed the fact that he had been arrested. It may not be important that that gave Mr. Morgan a sense of security, because he thought if his friend had taken the records out of the files they could not be found, and that if he lied no one would ever know he had lied. It may not be important that these things have happened. It may also be true that these offenses occurred in his youth, in his early twenties.

However, Madam President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and others who have stated their opposition, and who will state their opposition, are not basing their opposition upon the basis of youthful offenses. We are not basing our opposition on the fact that Howard Morgan was involved in an assault and battery or in an alleged tire theft, and that he may or may not have been guilty of those offenses, and that, in fact, those offenses, had they been revealed, would not be here regarded in all probability as a reason to oppose the confirmation. No; we are not here to take advantage of a young man's misfortunes or youthful aberrations or minor misdoings.

What we object to is what happened when he was between 28 and 38 years of age; not when he was a mere youth, as those who support him will say, but when he was between the ages of 28 and 38, when on six different occasions he violated the law of the land and committed an offense which was punishable as I shall read, in order to advance the career of Howard Morgan as an officer of the U.S. Navy, and to advance the career of Howard Morgan as a Government appointee and Government employee; that this occurred at a time when he was perfectly capable of knowing the difference between right and wrong; that he concealed the interest of Howard Morgan, not his responsibility as a citizen of the United States or an officer of the American Government. On these six occasions, as fully set out in these hearings, every time he was asked:

> Have you ever been arrested or convicted since you were 16; have you ever in your life been arrested or convicted; have you ever in your life been arrested and convicted and fined for any criminal offense or for any offense whatsoever?

Howard Morgan said, "No; I have not."

Now the President asks us to ignore this; it is not important that a man would lie; it is not important that he would perjure himself six times; it is not important that such a person ought to be supported because his views happen to be those of the public power advocates. No; we are asked to forget all that. What is the law? We in Congress are supposed to be amenable to the law. Let us question ourselves. As some Senators said, "Question yourselves. Could you have committed these offenses?" The answer is, "Under certain circumstances, yes"; or "We could have been involved as Morgan was involved in them."

But a more difficult question was not asked: Could you, under the same circumstances Morgan faced, have lied six times in your endeavor to advance your career to the point where you became a Senator of the United States? I do not believe any Senator could say that he would have done so; that he would have concealed arrests from his constituents; that he would have lied about these particular involvements, to advance his career in the Senate of the United States.

Nevertheless, Senators are asked to name to one of the highest independent agencies in the Government, the Federal Power Commission, a man who did that which they cannot condone. Here is the law as it appears found in title 18, United States Code, section 1001:

> Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both (18 U.S.C. 1001).

Howard Morgan's transgressions made him subject to indictment and trial and, if convicted, subject to punishment of a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. The fact that he can be so punished appeared on the face of some of the statements and affidavits which he made; therefore, he cannot possibly avoid saying he did not know of them.

But some will say, I suppose, "This is just another law; it does not mean anything. Other people have done it. Nobody gets prosecuted."

Oh, no, Madam President. On the contrary, there have been a number of proceedings in the Department of Justice to condemn people who did not have powerful friends. This is a case of the double standard, the case of a man who has friends, the case of a man who has influence. But if one does not have friends or influence in this country; if he does not have behind him people who will push him for public office, perjurer or not, this is not what will happen to him.

It was held that this statute is applicable, even though the charges which resulted in the arrests are dismissed, and the statute is applicable even though the arrests may be irrelevant to the applicant's fitness for a Government position. That was decided in *United States* v. *DeLorenzo*, decided August 13, 1945, 151 Federal 2d 122. DeLorenzo was convicted under the statute for failing to list 4 arrests on a form 57 filed in connection with 11 or 12 days of service as a labor member of a dispute panel of the New York Regional War Labor Board. The charges against him had been dismissed after each arrest.

Furthermore, the statute is frequently and routinely invoked. Records of the Civil Service Commission show that last year alone 53 cases of false statements on form 57's were referred to the Department of Justice for action.

In addition to the criminal penalties provided by the statute, the Civil Service is empowered to invoke administrative penalties for false statements on employment applications. These penalties have included removal of the individual from his position and barring him from Federal employment for a period of from 1 to 3 years.

The minority views state:

> We cannot sanction a double standard. Mr. Morgan's omissions must be judged in the light of the law. At least as rigid, if not a more rigid standard of integrity and honesty should apply to those selected for membership on a key regulatory commission than to applicants for ordinary Government jobs.
>
> Nor, in our opinion, is the impact of these incidents mitigated in any way by Mr. Morgan's testimony that at the time he filled out the various forms he believed he had been improperly arrested and that the police records relating to him had been removed from the files and destroyed.

Mr. Morgan knew very well they had been destroyed. The minority views continue:

> This would seem to indicate that Mr. Morgan felt himself safe from discovery in failing to disclose these arrests.
>
> Furthermore, Mr. Morgan's propensity for concealment did not end in 1952, the date of his last form 57. The testimony before the committee reveals additional incidents which involve something less than full disclosure.
>
> First, Mr. Morgan did not tell the White House about one of his arrests nor about his concealment of them on personnel forms until after his confirmation hearing had started.

He did not tell the White House of his relationship to Mr. Eatch, the man who made the affidavit which appeared to exculpate Morgan of the assault and battery charge.

In answer to a question of mine, Mr. Morgan said he appeared before the McClellan committee under subpena. I called his attention to the fact that that statement was not accurate, by confronting him with the published record of the committee's hearing report, in which he said:

I am a voluntary witness who was subpenaed at my own request.

My point is that Mr. Morgan does not lie merely on applications, but lies naturally, and therefore is not worthy of the trust of the U.S. Senate and the people of the country.

The minority views continue:

In the face of all these facts, we cannot believe that Howard Morgan measures up to standards set by the President or to acceptable standards for service on the Federal Power Commission, an agency with vast regulatory power over our national resources. His nomination is not consonant with the standards set by the President in his specific message to Congress on integrity in the Government service.

The report of the majority makes light of this whole thing. The report adds things which never occurred in the testimony. The report adds items which are from outside the hearings. I shall refer to them.

The report of the majority suggests that some other member of the "unusually rough and tough group who had the reputation of fighting and stealing could have stolen the tire."

That statement is, of course, after the event, and was not brought out at the hearings. Had that statement been made during the hearings, the committee would have had an opportunity to check its truth.

Another item:

As late as February of this year, Mr. Eatch—

Morgan's partner, the man who made the affidavit to exculpate Morgan—

reiterated the statement, and your committee gives it full faith and credit.

No one who appeared before the committee had talked with Mr. Eatch at any time, except the nominee himself.

It ought to be noted here that we take the record strictly on what Howard Morgan, an admitted perjurer, says happened, because there was never any corroborating evidence by Eatch or anyone else as to the concealment of records. There was never any affidavit made by anyone else as to what happened concerning either of those offenses.

As I have said, Mr. Morgan himself feels that some punishment should be meted out to him. But he wants to be a public member of the Federal Power Commission, so he does not feel the punishment should be too severe. Mr. Morgan feels he should be a member of the Federal Power Commission, but it would be all right to taint his record before he starts to serve by quoting his statement:

I think that I can be and probably should be reprimanded or admonished for an infraction of the rules * * * while what I did was something I cannot defend as absolutely right, it was not seriously damaging to anyone.

This follows the Morgan theory of one law for the influential, and another law for the little fellow who knows nobody.

Serious damage is done public morality when falsehood is rewarded.

The majority report of the committee does not feel that the removal of its records from the arrest file was any more than a mistake all around, and ought to be forgotten. The majority of the Committee on Commerce says, in effect, "Forget the whole thing. It does not matter very much." But Morgan himself does not go that far. Morgan says, at page 67 of the hearings, concerning this mysteriously removed file:

Merely removing the record does not remove the incident and I do not feel that this justified me in ignoring the matter when I filled out form 57's.

I said to Mr. Morgan:

But, Mr. Morgan, when you did fill out these three forms and denied that you had even been arrested you were at that time under the impression, were you not, that these things had been removed from the record by a police chief and therefore they could not be discovered and brought up against you, isn't that true, factually, even though you say that wasn't your motivation?

Mr. MORGAN. You can say that, yes, sir, but that was not the motivation."

Senator SCOTT. May I ask you one other question?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SCOTT. And that is, Do you feel that what you did represented some deviation from, let us say, irreproachable standards of behavior?

Mr. MORGAN. I think that I can be and probably should be reprimanded or admonished for an infraction of the rules. There is no question about it.

So the nominee would, if his nomination were confirmed, be a member of the Federal Power Commission, following whose name there should be set forth, in parentheses, "a man who ought to be admonished and reprimanded." But the executive branch of the Government is willing to place him in judgment over others.

So, Mr. President, it is proposed that without regard to the Federal laws against crimes and the Federal legal provisions for punishment, the Senate should vote to put above others a perjurer who admits that he himself should be admonished and reprimanded. It is proposed that the Senate of the United States give him a coat of whitewash, and then join in saying, "Mr. Morgan committed a lot of offenses. He lied six times. All this makes him a good member of the Federal Power Commission."

Mr. Morgan further stated as follows:

But I have served as a decision-making official and handed out punishment for violation of rules to businessmen and I think they and I or anyone else who violates a rule is entitled to reasonableness in viewing what was done, by what sort of person it was done, by how much the public interest was damaged, if at all. I think that in this case while what I did was something I cannot defend as absolutely right it was not seriously damaging to anyone and I would not have done it if it had been.

Mr. Morgan's attention was called to a case under a former administration, when a nomination was sent to the Senate; and the committee, in righteous indignation, refused to recommend confirmation of the nomination to another post, and took that position on the ground that the nominee had overstated his educational qualifications; that committee of the U.S. Senate, in which the majority at that time constituted about the same number as the present majority in the Senate, said:

We cannot recommend confirmation of the nomination of the one the President has nominated, because the nominee said he had a college degree and college credits which he did not have, and said he earned $500 in salary more than he actually did earn. All that is horrible, and we cannot recommend confirmation of his nomination.

Subsequently the nomination was withdrawn by the President, evidently because the President felt that because the Senate felt as it did, because of the untrue statements, the nomination should be withdrawn.

But now the present administration says, "Oh, what the nominee did was terrible," and Mr. Morgan said about the other man, when asked about him, that he read the transcript, and that the man added to his record 47 units of study which he had not received, and listed a university degree which he had not received—all of which, Mr. Morgan said self-righteously, the man did not have; and Mr. Morgan said he did not have a law degree, either, and that he was thrown out of law school, and that the statements made by the other man were falsifications which he made on form 57, and that far from being, in reality, only a possible source of delay, they were absolutely crucial to actual appointment to the position sought.

So Mr. Morgan would have denied confirmation of the nomination to a man who did not give all the information about his educational background; but Mr. Morgan, who lied six times about his criminal arrests and about the outcome of those arrests, feels that his nomination should be confirmed, although he believes that what he did is not to be condoned; but he believes that a man who merely said he earned $500 more in 1 year than he actually did, and who did not have the college credits he listed, is a horrible person, and that his nomination should not be confirmed.

Mr. Morgan was asked why he concealed from the President the facts about the assault case. There was a long line of questioning about it, and he was asked by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] in general about the assault matter. In that connection, I now read from the hearing:

Mr. MORGAN. I want to make it very clear that while I cannot recall with accuracy what my feelings may have been about the so-called assault case, I think it is extremely probable that I did not remember that on any of those occasions.

He said he did not remember the assault and battery. If he had stopped his statement there, he would have convinced us, because I cannot remember every fist fight I had, either. But he

went on and gilded the lily, and again proved himself unworthy of belief. He said:

I don't make that as a claim because I cannot remember with precision. My memory is good enough so that I know when I remember and I know when I don't, and in this case I do not remember. But I think the probability is that I had forgotten it.

Certainly that was the case a few weeks ago when I made every effort to think of everything the President ought to know before allowing my nomination to go forward.

The matter which I have chosen to ignore—

He himself said, "I have chosen to ignore"—

is the other matter and I agree with you, it has put me under heavy obligation, both to explain my reasons for so doing and also to conduct my life and my affairs in such manner as to justify the liberties I have taken, and this, sir, I have done.

At another point Mr. Morgan explained why he did not remember, by saying that that is a very convenient habit of his, which he would call "a forgettery," about which he said that at times, when things are unpleasant or embarrassing, he does not choose to remember. All that is to be found in the hearings.

In order to find out what would happen if Mr. Morgan were now being considered for a job in private industry—because Mr. Morgan spoke with some pride about how he used to punish businessmen; and, incidentally, I noticed that he referred to businessmen as if they were a special breed of cat with whom he felt warranted in dealing on the basis of crime and punishment, and Mr. Morgan pointed out that he has punished businessmen—I asked a bonding company what it would do if it had before it, for employment in private industry, a man who had the record of Mr. Morgan. I did not state Mr. Morgan's name. I did not tell the bonding company that a Senate confirmation proceeding was involved. In fact, I, myself, did not write the letter; but I had the assistant chief counsel of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce write to the president of the Maryland Casualty Co., by that means trying to find out what position the bonding company would take in regard to a man like Mr. Morgan, because at the very least Mr. Morgan should have the qualifications required for such a businessman or for businessmen—about whom Mr. Morgan thinks so poorly.

I now read the letter and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the reply thereto, but not the attachments, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks.

MAY 26, 1961.

Mr. ELLSWORTH MILLER,
President, Maryland Casualty Co.,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. MILLER: In connection with a matter pending in our committee, I have been directed to ascertain how your company would react to an application for bonding of a top executive whose background contained this information:

1. Arrested in 1937 at age of 22 on fugitive charge and turned over to other police in the same State for investigation of theft of a tire and some cans of lubricating oil. Available records do not show final disposition of charge, but applicant says there was no prosecution. A police index card made contemporaneously states he admitted the theft.

2. Arrested in 1936 for assault. Fined $25 and $17.50 costs.

3. In 1942, 1949, and 1952 filled out a total of seven Government forms, and in answer to question whether he had ever been arrested or summoned into court on a criminal charge, said "No." (Penalty for false answers can be not more than $10,000 or 5 years or both.)

4. In his 1961 job application, misstated his record of previous employment so as to exclude his 1946–47 and his present business association with a man who was a participant in the fight leading to the fine for assault and who, in 1953, made an affidavit stating that the applicant came into possession of the stolen tire innocently.

I would very much like to have your answer by June 1, if you can be so prompt.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MCELROY,
Assistant Chief Counsel.

Here is the answer:

MAY 31, 1961.

DEAR MR. MCELROY: Your letter of May 26, 1961, addressed to Mr. Ellsworth Miller, president, Maryland Casualty Co., has been referred to me for reply.

It is not possible to give a categorical answer to the question of whether or not we would bond a man whose past record revealed the facts set forth in the four numbered paragraphs of your letter. While the record as stated would certainly cause us to view the applicant with suspicion, it does not automatically follow that we would refuse to bond him.

Many cases come before us similar to the one you have presented. The final disposition in each instance is determined by our investigation and assessment of the facts as we see them. We have, for instance, bonded a youthful parolee in a minor position with a stock brokerage firm on recommendation of a police commissioner who convinced us that there were extenuating circumstances in the case. On the other hand, we have refused to bond a paroled murderer, not so much because of the particular crime as because the applicant was to be employed as a bank messenger.

In the instant case the theft was a youthful crime which occurred some 24 years ago. The assault charge goes back to 1936 and does not of itself prove dishonesty of character, although it may well indicate emotional instability. As underwriters we might overlook these early indiscretions, provided there was evidence of a subsequent good record.

I am asking the Senate of the United States to say whether its standards are higher than those of the Maryland Casualty Co.

The subsequent record in this case, of course, is considerably marred by the misrepresentation of facts in 1942, 1949, 1952, and 1961. We would regard the misrepresentations referred to in your paragraph No. 43 and the omission of his present business association as the most serious in that they appear to have been deliberate and hardly to be attributed to oversight or a lapse of memory. The gap in the employment record for the period 1946–47 is a type of omission which we find to be very common in our investigation work. Such omissions may or may not be intentional. Frequently an individual does not have records or cannot establish exact dates of employment from memory as far back as 15 years, particularly if he has changed jobs often or has had intervening periods of unemployment. Ordinarily, we insist on a complete accounting of time only for the latest 5-year period. On the other hand, if we knew of such a gap in the record as appears here, we would want to question the applicant intensively about it.

So I should like to assure the Senate I am doing exactly what the Maryland Casualty Co. would do in a similar situation.

We regard the declination of an application or the cancellation of an existing bond as a most serious matter, and final action is taken only after considerable deliberation by our underwriters.

Here is the strong point of this letter, which I hope Senators will carefully note:

While there would be a strong presumption against the applicant to whom you refer, there are many questions which an underwriter could ask before coming to a final decision. What, for instance, are the duties and responsibilities of the "top executive" position to be occupied by the applicant? For what amount is he to be bonded? What are the opportunities for collusion with other employees? What system of internal controls exists and how frequently and by whom are audits made?

I think that is a very good one. What check would we have on this man afterward if his appointment is confirmed for a term of years? He can run rampant after his nomination is confirmed.

Is the applicant in a position to furnish collateral or third party indemnity, etc.?

He furnished no collateral in testifying before us, but he is offered third party indemnity if the U.S. Senate should confirm his nomination, because he then goes home with the seal of the U.S. Senate.

Howard Morgan, perjurer, confirmed by the U.S. Senate for high office.

Do that if you will, I say to Senators, but you will do it without me, and you will do it without some of the rest of us who listened to some of the high-sounding statements made during the last 8 years that the Senate would not confirm the nomination of anybody who did not tell the truth; who listened to all the stories about integrity in public office; who listened when other nominations came up and were opposed; who listened to the matter of the confirmation of the nomination of one for a Cabinet office whose confirmation was defeated because some Senators felt he was not entirely candid. They said, as I found when I looked up the record, that he was not entirely candid. I say that was not the case. That particular man was fully candid, and a great public servant, and a man who did more than any other man to preserve for the United States its progress in the development of the nuclear bomb, whose nomination was refused confirmation because Senators said he was not entirely candid.

I say to Senators, you do not have that worry here. You do not have to say Howard Morgan was not entirely candid. I will straighten that out for you. He was not. He lied six times. So if Senators are worried about confirming the nomination of someone who is not entirely candid, they have a standard to which to repair, they have an

analogy, they have a parallel, they have history to follow. Some Senators may be able to swallow some of these inconsistencies, but I cannot. I go on with the letter:

Because the material seems pertinent to your inquiry, I am taking the liberty of attaching copies of a bulletin of the Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, dated August 29, 1957, and an article reprinted from Federal Probation, December 1957 issue. I believe that these enclosures, although dealing specifically with convicted persons, probationers, and parolees, reflect the general attitude of surety companies toward problems of the type to which you have referred.

Mr. President, I do not ask to have the attachments to these letters printed in the RECORD, although I will make them available to any Member of the Senate. They are not pertinent to this case, but they are available if anyone wishes to assure himself of their effect.

Finally, in conclusion—which are the finest words any Senator can utter—I am opposed to the nomination of Howard Morgan. I am opposed to him not because of any crime he committed, but I am opposed to him because he lied about those criminal charges. As a Reserve officer in the U.S. Navy, I am opposed to him, as you are, Mr. President (Mr. PELL in the chair), because I do not like to think of fellow naval officers who obtained their distinction by lying about previous arrests they may have suffered.

I am opposed to him because I do not think he is worthy of the confidence of the Senate or of the people of the United States.

I am opposed to him because the President of the United States has asked us to hold high the standard of integrity, to regard such a standard as important, and to expect of every public official complete devotion to his duties and integrity in public office.

The President has set the standard, and I agree with him. The Senate knows its duty in this particular period. The Senate's decision will be final, but some Senators may not have had the privilege or opportunity of hearing what the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and I have said, and may ask their colleagues, "What is this?" and may be told, "It is the Morgan matter." Then they will ask "The President wants it?" Some Senators will say, "Yes, he wants it," and they will say, "OK."

There is more to it than that, Mr. President. There is more to it than having Senators saunter into this Chamber and say, "I vote 'yea' on the confirmation of the nomination of this man."

Once the nomination of this man is confirmed, a new low standard will be set for public office. Once the nomination is confirmed, the Senate will have said to the President and to the public, "It does not matter if he violates a law, on the basis of which he could have been fined $10,000 and sent to jail for 5 years. It does not matter that he lied. It does not matter that he admits himself he lied. It does not matter that he admits himself he is deserving of punishment. None of these things matter. All we care about is ideology. He has a different point of view on power than some other people have, and people would think we were against public power if we did not vote for a private perjurer."

MAY 26, 1961.

Mr. ELLSWORTH MILLER,
President, Maryland Casualty Co.,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. MILLER: In connection with a matter pending in our committee, I have been directed to ascertain how your company would react to an application for bonding of a top executive whose background contained this information:

1. Arrested in 1937 at age of 22 on fugitive charge and turned over to other police in the same State for investigation of theft of a tire and some cans of lubricating oil. Available records do not show final disposition of charge, but applicant says there was no prosecution. A police index card made contemporaneously states he admitted the theft.

2. Arrested in 1936 for assault. Fined $25 and $17.50 costs.

3. In 1942, 1949, and 1952 filled out a total of seven Government forms, and in answer to question whether he had ever been arrested or summoned into court on a criminal charge, said "No." (Penalty for false answers can be not more than $10,000 or 5 years or both.)

4. In his 1961 job application, misstated his record of previous employment so as to exclude his 1946–47 and his present business association with a man who was a participant in the fight leading to the fine for assault and who, in 1953, made an affidavit stating that the applicant came into possession of the stolen tire innocently.

I would very much like to have your answer by June 1, if you can be so prompt.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MCELROY,
Assistant Chief Counsel.

MARYLAND CASUALTY CO.,
Baltimore, Md., May 31, 1961.

Mr. JOHN M. MCELROY,
Assistant Chief Counsel, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCELROY: Your letter of May 26, 1961, addressed to Mr. Ellsworth Miller, president, Maryland Casualty Co., has been referred to me for reply.

It is not possible to give a categorical answer to the question of whether or not we would bond a man whose past record revealed the facts set forth in the four numbered paragraphs of your letter. While the record as stated would certainly cause us to view the applicant with suspicion, it does not automatically follow that we would refuse to bond him.

Many cases come before us similar to the one you have presented. The final disposition in each instance is determined by our investigation and assessment of the facts as we see them. We have, for instance, bonded a youthful parolee in a minor position with a stock brokerage firm on recommendation of a police commissioner who convinced us that there were extenuating circumstances in the case. On the other hand, we have refused to bond a paroled murderer, not so much because of the particular crime as because the applicant was to be employed as a bank messenger.

In the instant case the theft was a youthful crime which occurred some 24 years ago. The assault charge goes back to 1936 and does not of itself prove dishonesty of character, although it may well indicate emotional instability. As underwriters we might overlook these early indiscretions, provided there was evidence of a subsequent good record.

The subsequent record in this case, of course, is considerably marred by the misrepresentation of facts in 1942, 1949, 1952, and 1961. We would regard the misrepresentations referred to in your paragraph No. 3 and the omission of his present business association as the most serious in that they appear to have been deliberate and hardly to be attributed to oversight or a lapse of memory. The gap in the employment record for the period 1946–47 is a type of omission which we find to be very common in our investigation work. Such omissions may or may not be intentional. Frequently an individual does not have records or cannot establish exact dates of employment from memory as far back as 15 years, particularly if he has changed jobs often or has had intervening periods of unemployment. Ordinarily, we insist on a complete accounting of time only for the latest 5-year period. On the other hand, if we knew of such a gap in the record as appears here, we would want to question the applicant intensively about it.

We regard the declination of an application or the cancellation of an existing bond as a most serious matter and final action is taken only after considerable deliberation by our underwriters. While there would be a strong presumption against the applicant to whom you refer, there are many questions which an underwriter could ask before coming to a final decision. What, for instance, are the duties and responsibilities of the "top executive" position to be occupied by the applicant? For what amount is he to be bonded? What are the opportunities for collusion with other employees? What system of internal controls exists and how frequently and by whom are audits made? Is the applicant in a position to furnish collateral or third-party indemnity, etc.?

Because the material seems pertinent to your inquiry, I am taking the liberty of attaching copies of a bulletin of the Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, dated August 29, 1957, and an article reprinted from "Federal Probation," December 1957 issue. I believe that these enclosures, although dealing specifically with convicted persons, probationers, and parolees, reflect the general attitude of surety companies toward problems of the type to which you have referred.

Very truly yours,

A. H. WALKER,
Vice President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the points made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and earlier by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] were examined by the Committee on Commerce. They were examined and reexamined. They were carefully considered.

The hearings were obviously extensive. Senators will note the transcript of hearings, which is 89 pages long.

After all the testimony had been taken and after all the evidence had been brought to light, the committee favorably reported the nomination by a vote of 11 to 4.

Mr. President, the situation, as developed this afternoon, impresses one person in one way and another person in another way. There are two matters which have been dwelt upon at great length.

At first, when I heard the testimony, I thought an effort was being made to prove that Mr. Morgan had stolen a tire and some oil, had gotten into a lot of trouble on that account, and had not informed the committee or anyone else about what had occurred; that perhaps he had been arrested, and, for all I knew

at the moment, had been sentenced to the penitentiary for years, and had served his sentence.

However, after the testimony was presented it was apparent the facts were quite otherwise.

It became apparent that Mr. Morgan, when a young man, had been given a tire by his employer in part payment of his wages. His employer apparently had not made much profit on the particular contract and was hard put to supply ready cash. Thereafter Mr. Morgan sold the tire. It was discovered to have been a stolen tire. The police discovered this, and accosted Mr. Morgan with the facts.

Subsequently Mr. Eatch, who has been mentioned many times this afternoon, made an affidavit disclosing what had actually occurred. As I understand the case, Mr. Morgan was exonerated from all blame in connection with the matter. No one knew where the tire had come from; it was in a truck with much other equipment. But it is known Mr. Morgan did not steal it.

Thereafter the record concerning the transaction was expunged from the files of the Portland, Oreg., Police Department. I should like to explain what I mean by "expunged" by quoting the very wonderful definition of that word made May 23 last by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] when he said:

> When the Senator from Nebraska says "expunged" he means physically and literally taken out of the record, and permanently removed.

That is exactly what happened in the Portland Police Department in reference to the record in the case.

So when subsequently Mr. Morgan filled out a form or forms he had nothing to report on that incident because there was no record in the department; that was proper in my opinion.

What about the other incident about which we have heard so much this afternoon and previously, Mr. President? At the start I thought we were going to learn that Mr. Morgan had committed grievous and grave assault upon another human being and that he was guilty in every manner for having done so. But even some of those on the committee who were not, shall I say, altogether in favor of reporting the nomination, declared they thought perhaps in this particular case Mr. Morgan should receive some kind of an award for heroism, because the facts as disclosed to the committee were that Mr. Morgan intervened in and broke up a fight in which another man was trying to stab his employer with a screwdriver. Of course, great harm might have resulted on this account, and wounds, fatal or otherwise, might have been inflicted.

After that Mr. Morgan, a very young man at the time—as I recall, 22 years of age—was taken before the justice of the peace. He had no lawyer. He explained what had occurred. After all the testimony was taken—as I gathered, in a very loose manner—the justice of the peace fined Mr. Morgan $25 and assessed costs of $17.50 against him.

My only point in mentioning these things, Mr. President, is in an attempt to demonstrate there was no real reason, there was no good reason, there was no substantial reason at all why, on any Form 57 or on any other form Mr. Morgan should have reported the tire incident.

It is entirely possible—and I believe Mr. Morgan when he so says—that in making out these forms he honestly forgot the incident relating to the assault charge; not the occurrence itself, of course, but the fact that he had gone into court. Apparently a majority of the members of the committee either believed likewise or they thought this was not of paramount concern.

That is what I come to now, Mr. President. What is at issue? Is it the fact that on X occasions Mr. Morgan did not say "yes" instead of "no," in response to a question on a Government form? Or is it a question of whether, on account of the splendid record he made in the field of utility regulation in the State of Oregon, he stands in a position by reason of the appointment, to perform a broader and better service in that same area to all the people of the United States?

To my knowledge, no one has contradicted Mr. Morgan's expert knowledge in this area. It has been said that he does not know too much about natural gas. But it has not been denied that he served the public well in Oregon, and that he has sufficient familiarity with the general subject to become a specialist in all of its phases during the early period of his service on the Federal Power Commission. I believe that is the test. Too often in recent years, in my opinion, members of regulatory commissions have forgotten the prime reason for their appointment, namely, to serve the public. With Mr. Morgan's presence on this important regulatory body, we can all be assured that first and foremost in his consideration will be the protection of the public interest—the consumer.

Mr. Morgan did not make a report to the White House regarding the assault charge. He did report the question having to do with the tire. Having reported the one, it follows that he would have reported the other had it remained in his memory.

Careful examination was made of the entire situation in the executive department at the White House after these later disclosures were made. We saw no sign that the President cared to withdraw Mr. Morgan's nomination, and I am glad that he did not, because the considerations which first caused the President to nominate Mr. Morgan are those which should properly be applied here, namely, Has he been a good and useful public servant in his home State of Oregon, and, Is he equipped in every way to do a good job for the people of the United States in this Federal responsibility? The committee decided in the affirmative, and I hope that the judgment of the Senate will be the same.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe it was my privilege to attend most of the hearings. Without reflection on the part of any of my fellow committeemen, I believe I spent more time at the hearings on the nomination of Mr. Morgan and Mr. Swidler than did any other Senator. From time to time our distinguished chairman was called to other official duties and it became my duty to represent the committee and to preside at the hearings. I make that statement—and I am happy that my distinguished friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is in the Chamber at the time I make this statement—merely to indicate how unfortunate it is that other Senators did not have the opportunity, understandable though it may be, to examine, view, and scrutinize the personality of the nominee. In my opinion, he is a clean-cut young man, a fine, excellent, and devoted father, with a very charming and lovely wife and a charming daughter. In my opinion, it was tragic that in the committee chamber day after day the family should have been exposed to a rehash of a story that had years before been printed on the front pages of the newspapers in the State of Oregon. The attempt today to revive the story creates absolutely nothing new. It was tried against Morgan before. He was scandalized unjustly then, and the statements were repeated before the committee.

Mr. President, what kind of man are we considering? I have heard him characterized as a liar and a perjurer. Those who utter such characterizations should be pretty careful with their language, because we are dealing with a human being, a responsible and capable man who has been the best public utilities official the State of Oregon has ever had.

If stronger proof of that statement is desired, I refer Senators to an editorial that appeared in the Oregon newspapers. It is in the record.

When Mr. Morgan was a young man attending college, someone started a fight on a construction gang where he was employed. What did this young fellow do? He pulled a second attacker off the back of his boss. Did the police officers then arrest him, as has been said here? No. Two days after the incident he was summoned before a justice of the peace. As one would receive a civil subpena, Morgan was summoned 2 days later. He was called before the justice of the peace, and he explained that all he was trying to do was to stop a fracas. He was pulling another man off the back of his boss, who already had one attacker to handle.

The judge said, "Well, I do not care much about the amenities involved. Did the boss ask you to do it?"

He said, "No; I did it out of humanity."

The judge said, "Humanity or no humanity, $25 and costs."

That incident occurred many, many years ago, when Mr. Morgan was a youth of 22.

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

Mr. PASTORE I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator referred to the sentence of $25 and costs. I read the underlying facts that led to the prosecution; and in my opinion what the

nominee did in that case was morally right. A red-blooded man with self-respect, under the facts that existed, would have jumped in in the manner in which Morgan did.

Mr. PASTORE. Especially when we consider that at that time he was a typical American boy attending college. Then what happened? He became the president of his college class. This so-called liar and perjurer became the president of his college class.

Let me cite another honor. After Morgan's graduation from college the chief of police of Portland, Oreg., called him in and said, "I would like to have you as my assistant. I have full knowledge of this incident.

"We have a record showing that you were charged with stealing some tires." So said the chief of police of Portland.

Let us go into that subject a little. Mr. Morgan was working on a construction gang when he was attending school, and for some reason, in lieu of compensation, he was given a tire, which someone had reported to have been stolen. He was stopped as a fugitive from justice. Morgan was never charged with stealing. Nothing ever happened with respect to the charge, but the police had a record on him. The chief of police knew about the record, when he called Morgan in. The chief said:

I would like to have you as my assistant, but there is the record of two arrests.

Morgan said:

That is not fair. I never did anything wrong. I never stole a tire.

The chief said:

There are two ways to expunge a record. You must either go before the court and make a request, or we will expunge it in this way—

And the chief put the record in his desk.

Morgan, a believing youth with confidence in his own innocence, thought that was the end of it. He never heard about the charges for a long time. He signed an affidavit asserting that he was unjustly picked up. The chief of police said:

The record is expunged and I have no record.

So Morgan made the statement on his form 57, indicating his answer to be that he was not arrested.

As a young man, he thought the whole affair was a cruel injustice.

The question was asked Morgan:

Why didn't you say that you paid $25 for an assault?

He said:

Well, I forgot it.

There are two who know whether or not Morgan is telling the truth. One is Morgan himself, and the other is Almighty God. Beyond that point we would have to convict this nominee by circumstantial evidence. Only Morgan and God know whether he has told the truth. Morgan says he forgot it, and I am not ready to play God.

Today we are considering confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Morgan. A statement was made about Mr. Morgan being for public power. Why is not the statement finished? He is for consumer interests, which is why I am for Morgan. He is for the consumer, as he was for the consumer when he was public utilities commissioner in the State of Oregon.

Lest we be quick with our indictments, libels, and slanders, let us consider what his neighbors think about him.

Let us go to the people who were his neighbors—his fellow citizens of Oregon. Let us go to the people who know this man, and see what they have to say about him. If anyone can find a woman in the United States who is more respected and more admired than EDITH GREEN of the State of Oregon, I want to know it. This is what she said:

It is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I do appear before this committee with Howard Morgan. I have known him for many, many years and I of course am extremely pleased that the President has appointed him to a position on the Federal Power Commission.

Does she stop there? I ask Senators to listen to the rest of her statement. Let us listen to how she speaks of this so-called liar, this alleged perjurer:

Mr. Morgan is a person of tremendous intellectual capacity. He is a man of unquestioned integrity and courage and he is also a very articulate spokesman for those causes in which he believes.

Does she stop there? Listen to the rest of it:

I have known not only him but also his wonderful family for a long period of time. It seems to me that he has served his State exceedingly well and I am sure that the people of Oregon will take great pride, both Republicans and Democrats, in the fact that his talents have been recognized by this administration.

Is that JOHN PASTORE saying that? Is that the Senator from Rhode Island, who did not intimately know this man in Oregon, who is saying that? Is it said by Senator MUSKIE from the great State of Maine, who did not know this man in Oregon? No; it is EDITH GREEN, a Representative from his State of Oregon, who has known him for many years.

Is there better proof than that? Where can we find stronger proof than that? Let us look at what our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] has said. She is surely an authority. I certainly will accept her as my authority. Mrs. NEUBEREGR said:

Mr. Morgan is well known in our State. I am especially proud of his association with my husband when they were colleagues in the Oregon State Legislature.

Howard—

Not "Mr. Morgan"—but as one who knows him well and respects him highly—

Howard received the acclaim of Gov. Robert Holmes, of Oregon, when he was appointed utility commissioner. There were those in the State who had some reservations about this appointment. Yet after Mr. Morgan had been serving in the capacity which he did, many changed their minds. Even though their points of view might have differed, they stood up and spoke for his fairness and commended him highly.

Editorial comment around our State after this appointment was made by the President has been of great interest. I would like to quote from some of these.

The Medford Mail Tribune, which is an important paper in the southern part of the State, observed that Mr. Morgan "is dedicated to serving his concept of public interest, the interests of all the people rather than a few."

That is what I like about Mr. Morgan, the fact that he is interested in the many, not the vested few.

I voted for him in committee. I shall vote for him on the floor. I shall vote for him not because he believes in public power but because he believes in the little man, the man who has to pay the bill, the consumer of America. That is why I am for Mr. Morgan. He is a consumer man. He believes in and protects the consumer interest—the public interest.

I could read from the testimony of Representative ULLMAN. It is part of the record. As a matter of fact, it is almost a litany of commendation and eulogy and tribute and respect and recognition. These are my witnesses. They are my documents. This is my proof.

This is why I believe the President of the United States has found a good man in Howard Morgan to protect the public interest. Because he has found him, I congratulate him. Because I feel the way I do, I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination. I recommend to my colleagues that without reservation they vote to confirm this great public servant and support the President of the United States.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island and to commend him on his courageous and forthright presentation of the case for Howard Morgan. I wish to add, in the context of his remarks, some repercussions of this particular case which I have encountered around the country in connection with public political forums on what are called on many occasions the political responsibility of American life today. These are seminars in form in which businessmen, clubwomen, and young people are invited to ask questions about and inquire into the status of public service in America.

Invariably, whether we were in the East or Middle West or on the Pacific coast, the question always came back to: How can we attract better men to public life when they can only expect to have all the minutiae of their youthful past scrutinized and held up before all the public with some kind of disgrace? As a result, men and women of the greatest responsibility are deterred from serving in the public service, because they do not want their families and relatives and friends subjected to the kind of excoriation which is being visited on Howard Morgan today. Torturing an understandable past is one of the great deterrents, in my judgment, to attracting to the high level of responsibility of public service the kind of men and women that we desperately need.

The case of Howard Morgan is one of the best cases in point. I believe his case points up two things that we ought

to bear in mind in regard to our public responsibility. One is the imperative need for trying to keep this matter in perspective, to equate that which is important with the proper level of responsibility, and keeping in its proper place that which is a part of the process of growing up.

Likewise, I believe our system possesses one freedom that we ought to hold very dear. That is not only the freedom to make a mistake, if a mistake was ever made, but a freedom to learn from that mistake and to move on into the full responsibility of citizenship and public service in this country.

I believe we threaten to violate both the attraction of public life to people of responsibility and the principle that a man has a right to make a mistake, with the freedom and the right to learn from that mistake in order to serve his country better. Both of these being issues central to the career of Howard Morgan, it seems to me the Senate could do no greater service than to prove to the people of our country, here and now today, that we applaud a man who makes the grade, who proves his caliber, who proves his interest at the right time in the life of a man who seeks a public career, with all of its hazards, and that we do justice to the cause we say our system really seeks to perpetuate, at a time that we are holding this system before the rest of the world with the beseechment from us that they seek to emulate what we have set forth.

I do not know the details of the lives of all the Members of this body, but I think I can say, with clear candidness, that there, but for the grace of God, go I. I do not know whether any of us, in our youth, may have had some little incident lifted out of context which may have proved to be embarrassing at a subsequent time, depending on how it was held before the public, how it was treated in the headlines, how it was assessed standing alone as a single incident in a long life that was filled with contributions of responsibility and integrity.

Mr. President, it is time we made it abundantly clear that we will not indulge in pettifogging and in the incidental minutiae of a man's past. We are interested in his public record, in his present, in his capabilities for future service and responsibility. Only on this plane do we justify the warranted endorsement of what we regard as the American system of popular responsibility in public service, when we can hope, through that formula, to attract capable men and women of our country to that kind of dedication which alone will enable our system to survive.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am inclined to start my speech not only with the salutation, "Mr. President," but also with the salutation, "May it please the court," because I feel, as one of the cocounsel for the defense in this proceeding, that I should thus refer to myself. In fact, I am almost tempted to move for a directed verdict of acquittal. However, I shall let the case go to the jury in a few moments for its verdict, because procedurally I have no other alternative. I am satisfied that the jury will give us a verdict of acquittal.

There is really nothing more to say after the brilliant defense made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. Now I see the distinguished Senator from Washington asking me to yield, so before I present my argument, I shall yield to him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. President, I had planned to say some things concerning Mr. Morgan's personal matters, about the nomination of Mr. Morgan, but, as the Senator from Oregon has said, they have been covered so well and so effectively, that I think anything I might say not only would be an anticlimax but might cause some of the things which have been said to lose their real effectiveness.

I have taken part in the consideration of numerous nominations for the Federal Power Commission before the committee of which I am the chairman. In every one of the cases, no matter who the President was, no matter whom he nominates, there is always the tug of war between the private and the public utilities. That is so no matter how we look at it. The nominee will be dubbed a private utility man or a public utility man, or a consumers' man, or an oil or a gas man. Despite what we hear about the nominee or what is brought up in the hearings, despite what his personal biography may be, there is always, underneath, that tug of war.

I shall state what compels me to favor the nomination of Mr. Morgan in this particular instance; and the Senator from Oregon will bring it out in more detail. The State of Oregon has a public utility commissioner. There is not a board, as in most of the States of the Union. In Oregon, the man who is selected by the Governor to be public utility commissioner acts as one. He has tremendous power to make decisions in the Pacific Northwest, where the utility controversy is constantly in evidence.

Mr. Morgan was appointed by the Governor of his State to be the public utility commissioner of Oregon, and he has served in that capacity. I have spoken with many persons about Mr. Morgan's tenure of office and how he handled the complex, controversial, and sometimes political cases which came before the board in the controversy which is constantly taking place between the private and the public utilities. Without exception, whether it was the president of a large utility company or a member of my own utility district, or public power officials, as they are sometimes called, all have said, whether they liked Mr. Morgan's decision or not, that he is a man who has been fair and objective. These are qualities that are most difficult to secure in a man who is appointed to the Federal Power Commission.

This is what compels me, leaving out other factors, to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Morgan.

I have known Mr. Morgan personally for a quarter of a century. I have seen him off and on for many years. In serving in his position he has acquired more respect from both sides than any other man whom I know who has served as an Oregon public utility commissioner.

I think Mr. Morgan, with his great experience, will become a valuable member of the Federal Power Commission, and will call the shots there in the same way he called them as public utility commissioner of Oregon. That is what compels me to vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Morgan. The other incidents do not bother me too much, one way or the other, because, as the Senator from Oregon knows, we have heard about them and read about them for years in my State of Washington and in the State of Oregon.

I think the appointment of Mr. Morgan is one of the best appointments that have been made. It is seldom that someone can be found who has the kind of record and the type of experience which will fit him for the difficult office of member of the Federal Power Commission. Too often, nominees have tended to lean more to one side or the other, and that is what causes trouble. That is why the nomination of Mr. Morgan is one of the best that have ever come before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, for his very sound defense of Mr. Morgan. I completely agree with every evaluation of Mr. Morgan which the Senator from Washington has set forth.

Mr. President, the Senate is making a legislative record today. In fairness to the nominee, I think all will agree that in my capacity as senior Senator from Oregon I owe it to the nominee, I owe it to my State, and I owe it to the people of the country to make the statements I include in the speech I am about to deliver, because I think that is only the fair and right thing to do. It will not be a long speech, but it will be a record which, I think, from the standpoint of the legislative history of the nomination, needs to be made.

I believe Senators will agree that during my almost 17 years in the Senate I have followed a course of action in regard to nominations sent to the Senate by the Presidents who have served during that period of time which has resulted in my being referred to, on some occasions, as one of the watchdogs of nominations. I stand on that record. I have opposed nominations, as the RECORD will show, when, in my judgment, the nominees failed to meet one of the four historic criteria that every nominee must meet in order to qualify, in my judgment, for a presidential nomination under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution, and that criterion is character.

If a man is lacking in good character, the Senator from Oregon, believing him to be lacking in good character, will not vote to confirm his nomination. That is my position whether the nominee comes from Oregon or anywhere else in the Nation, because the fact is that there are men who are or have been President of the United States who could be called as my witnesses and who would testify that when certain names from Oregon were being considered on several occasions—to be exact, three—I intervened before

those nominations ever were submitted and made it perfectly clear that if they were submitted, I would object to them, because, in my judgment, the nominees were lacking either in character or in one of the other of the four criteria which are binding, in my judgment, upon the Senate under the advise-and-consent clause of the Constitution.

So, Mr. President, with that statement, I wish to make this record this afternoon, as the senior Senator from Oregon, in support of this great citizen of my State, whom the President of the United States has honored by appointment to the Federal Power Commission, and by nominating him, the President has honored my State.

Mr. President, it is with the deepest pleasure that I support President Kennedy's nomination of Howard Morgan, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Morgan has been a trusted and admired friend of mine for many years; but, beyond that, he is a scholar who has studied and worked in the field of utility regulation for more than 20 years. He is known and respected throughout my State as a fearless and incorruptible public servant; he has the breadth of outlook and independence of judgment which enable him to rise above partisanship and narrow dogma; and he has an unswerving devotion to the public interest.

In short, Mr. Morgan is precisely the kind of man needed on the Federal Power Commission during the past 8 years, just as he is precisely the kind of man President Kennedy pledged himself to appoint to the regulatory agencies. I do not think the President could have selected a better man for this heavy responsibility, and I wish to compliment him now on the choice he has made.

As the Members of the Senate know, partisan attacks have been made on Mr. Morgan in the newspapers and in the committee. I wish to discuss and analyze these attacks. Although there does not seem to be any need to draw a diagram for my colleagues, they know perfectly well where these attacks come from.

In fact, if memory serves me right, every member of the Federal Power Commission during the past 30 years who was devoted to the public interest had to undergo the same kind of ordeal which Mr. Morgan is undergoing now—the only difference being that those men were attacked only after they had served as Commissioners long enough to demonstrate their dedication to the public interest, whereas Mr. Morgan has the distinction of being singled out for attack even before being sworn into office. The reason for that is, of course, his record as Public Utility Commissioner in Oregon, where he is regarded as the best man to serve in that capacity in the last 40 years.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the two members of the Federal Power Commission who were attacked for their defense of the public interest were Leland Olds and Thomas Buchanan; and is it not also true that, in the case of Mr. Olds, a statement he had made some 20 years before was dug up and was used against him; whereas, in the case of Mr. Buchanan, nothing was proved against him, but confirmation of his nomination was nevertheless refused? Is that not true?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and those were the two cases I had in mind, in connection with the statement I made a moment ago. I thank the Senator from Illinois for completing the record.

Not since Clyde Aitchison left the Oregon Commission, to serve on the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1917, have we in Oregon had a commissioner to regulate our local utilities who displayed the courage, brains, tenacity, hard work, and judgment brought to that assignment by Howard Morgan.

As I shall demonstrate shortly, the utility executives who understand the benefits of honest, fair, and firm regulation were, and still are, among those who honor and respect Mr. Morgan for the work he did. But there are other utility executives—I am glad to say they are a minority—who had grown accustomed to regulating the regulatory agencies themselves, both in Oregon and in Washington, D.C.; and it is these men who exerted themselves to defeat Governor Holmes, under whom Mr. Morgan served. It is these men who are now stimulating the attacks upon Mr. Morgan, by which they hope to prevent him from serving the people of the United States.

Not as a personal friend, but as a fellow Oregonian who has watched carefully the high caliber of service which this man has brought to public life in Oregon, I urge the Senate to confirm this nomination and let Mr. Morgan take up the work which the President has assigned to him.

In my capacity as the senior Senator from Oregon, I make this recommendation; and in my capacity as a friend, knowing the character of the nominee, knowing him to be incorruptible, I make this recommendation.

Let me make it clear that this recommendation is not based merely upon the zeal and industry which Mr. Morgan brings to the work before him, or even upon the fact that he is a champion of the consuming public, who is needed so very much on the FPC.

As the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] stated a few minutes ago, he is in favor of confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Morgan because he is for the consumers; and, of course, after all, the Federal Power Commission is an agency of the Congress, and, in the last analysis, has the responsibility of protecting the consumers' interest. That was the primary purpose of the establishment of this agency, in the first place.

Mr. President, I make this recommendation even more strongly on the basis of the studied fairness and the judicious care with which Mr. Morgan approaches his work.

Mr. President, some of the Members of the Senate may not know that Oregon has the only 1-man utility commission among the 50 States. This means that for 2 years Mr. Morgan handled all matters involving rates and services of all utilities, including light, gas, power, water, telephone, telegraph, trucks, buses, and railroads, in the State of Oregon, and did so absolutely alone. He had his staff to help him, of course, but there was no reviewing authority for the nearly 2,500 signed orders which he issued to the utilities of the State, except for the circuit and supreme courts. Of this large number of orders, less than 20 have been appealed to the circuit courts of Oregon.

I am informed that of these, only three were overruled by the circuit courts, and that as of this moment not a single one of Mr. Morgan's orders has been overturned by the supreme court of the State of Oregon. This is an amazing record, and when we reflect on the fact that the people of Oregon consider Mr. Morgan to be the most vigorous champion of the public interest to serve them in more than a generation, it is an almost incredible record.

It would be a simple matter for a demagog, holding the job Mr. Morgan held in Oregon, to become known as a champion of the public interest. All he would have to do would be to issue a stream of reckless orders denying rate increases to the utilities, demanding increases in their services, and in general criticizing and attacking their officials. But in Oregon we have fine courts and very capable judges; and it is not a simple matter now, nor has it ever been possible, for a commissioner to behave in such fashion and to have his orders sustained by the courts. Not only were Mr. Morgan's orders sustained; he also earned the respect of all but a few diehards among the State's utility executives.

Consider this excerpt from an unsolicited letter written after Mr. Morgan's nomination to the Federal Power Commission was announced this year. This letter is signed by the vice president and general manager of Oregon's third largest electric utility, and it reads, in part, as follows:

> While you were utility commissioner of Oregon, I recall there were on several occasions customers' inquiries and complaints involving our company. In each instance your decision was made promptly and was fair both to our customers and to ourselves, with the result that our customer relations were improved.
>
> Please accept my sincere congratulations on your appointment to the Federal Power Commission. This appointment I think will add strength to the Commission.

Or consider this excerpt from another unsolicited letter, written when Mr. Morgan announced his resignation as commissioner in Oregon. This letter is signed by the chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Oregon's second largest electric utility, and it reads in part as follows:

> During the past 2 years we have had more than a normal number of matters before you for approvals, primarily involving financial procedures, such as new bond or debenture issues, new common stock financing, and various interim bank credit arrange-

ments. It seems to me appropriate to say at this time that I have been most pleased with the consideration we have received from you and your associates. Manifestly, you had to be convinced of the merit of our petitions, but once convinced you moved expeditiously to give us the required approvals and in a most cooperative manner. I think the record should show that with respect to these matters the attention and cooperation you have given Portland General Electric Co. can only be described as excellent. We thank you.

This testimonial on my part is not new. It was volunteered in my talk before the New York Society of Analysts last May; and many times I have replied in similar vein to inquiries from investment and commercial bankers throughout the country, and particularly in such centers as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Portland.

These comments by responsible utility executives certainly do not confirm certain newspaper comments that Mr. Morgan is a zealous proponent of public power who would find himself unable to treat private power fairly. The record is clear that, while giving Oregon its first taste in more than a generation of vigorous regulation in the public interest, he treated the utility companies with scrupulous fairness, earning the respect of almost every utility executive and lawyer in Oregon.

But not quite all of them. It has been said, Mr. President, that so far as regulation is concerned, utility executives can be divided into two classes: those who demand, expect, and appreciate fair treatment, and those who are afraid that is what they are about to get. I have quoted from letters written by executives who are clearly in the first category. But we also have some who are just as clearly in the second category in Oregon, and elsewhere in this country, and I think they have had a hand in trying to stir up votes against Mr. Morgan's confirmation. These men do not want fairness and they do not respect or appreciate it when they get it.

What they want, in plain language, is a set of regulatory agencies which can be regulated by the utilities. To get this, they must have Commissioners who are weak, vacillating, lazy, or dishonest, and they know Howard Morgan is none of these things. Therefore they don't want him and from their point of view any tactics which provide the faintest hope of blocking his nomination are justified.

So far as I am concerned, the tactics which they have adopted in a vain and foolish attempt to stop Mr. Morgan's appointment are revolting and I do not intend, nor do I think it necessary, to spend more than a moment in discussing them. Mr. Morgan's enemies have indicated by their own tactics how pitifully weak is their case against him, and I do not propose, by means of a long defense, to obscure the weakness and silliness of the innuendoes and insinuations they rely on.

It has been said that Mr. Morgan would not be able to get a bond from a bonding company such, for example, as the company which was mentioned, the Maryland Casualty Co. Well, let us look at the record. The Maryland Casualty Co. bonded Mr. Morgan as public utility commissioner of Oregon, effective January 16, 1957. The bond, in the amount of $40,000 in favor of the State of Oregon, covered Howard Morgan in his capacity as payroll officer, public utility commissioner, State of Oregon. It is bond No. 90–501554, issued by the Maryland Casualty Co., Baltimore, Md.

Let me say, that was 1957. The discussion about Mr. Morgan's affairs in connection with the tire matter—which I shall come to in a moment—and the fisticuff's affair, are well known in Oregon. They have been publicized in Oregon for years, and have been a matter of political discussion in our State. I have a very high regard for the investigating ability of the Maryland Casualty Co. In 1957 it issued that bond. Of course, the bond remained in effect throughout the term of office of Mr. Morgan as a public utility commissioner.

There is another bond. Issued by what company? The Maryland Casualty Co. It was suggested this afternoon that the Maryland Casualty Co. would not bond a nominee such as Mr. Morgan. It has done so, twice. This second bond number 90–501553, the same date as the previous bond, January 16, 1957, covering Howard Morgan as public utility commissioner of Oregon, in the amount of $10,000, effective throughout his term of office, which ended January 12, 1959.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, a telegram I have received from C. M. Pratt, resident manager of the Maryland Casualty Co., Portland, Oreg., setting forth the information I gave in my statement, that the company had issued two bonds relating to Mr. Morgan.

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

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

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE C. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Confirming my telephone conversation this date with your secretary, Mr. William Berg, wish to advise we executed effective January 16, 1957, public official bond 90–501553 on behalf of Howard Morgan in favor State of Oregon in the amount of $10,000 covering his position public utility commissioner stop. We also executed effective January 16, 1957, bond on his behalf favor State of Oregon in the amount of $40,000 covering his position payroll officer public utility department stop. Both bonds terminated upon expiration of term of office January 12, 1959.

C. M. PRATT,
Resident Manager.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, here is a man who, beginning in college, has held positions of public and private trust for an almost unbroken period of 25 years, positions entrusted to him by his associates and fellow citizens who know him far better than all but a few of us who must pass judgment on him here in Washington. He has held numerous chairmanships and presidencies, has been a legislator, has been the head of his political party in Oregon during nearly 5 years of the greatest political turmoil that State has ever seen.

May I say to my Democratic colleagues here, I have met Mr. Morgan on both sides of the political platform. I know what it is to campaign against Howard Morgan and to campaign with Howard Morgan, because when I was a Republican I was engaged in political campaigns with Howard Morgan in Oregon on the other side, and I can testify to his complete fairness and complete partiality, and to his insistence that we let the facts speak for themselves. And I had the privilege of campaigning and working with Mr. Morgan in the Democratic Party during the period of time when Mr. Morgan was chairman of the party. I know whereof I speak when I talk about this man's character. This man has a fine character, and he meets the character test of the advise and consent clause of the Constitution. He has been singled out for positions of great trust and responsibility by the Governor of his State, and by such figures on the national scene as Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, and now by President Kennedy.

Is there any criticism of the way in which Mr. Morgan has handled his many and heavy burdens of trust over these 25 years? Not one word. In fact, he not only still has the unqualified support of every individual and organization which relied upon his integrity during that period, he also has the unqualified respect of many honorable men who were under political obligation to oppose him during those years. The reason Howard Morgan enjoys this kind of support from his colleagues and respect from his opponents is very simple. They know that in the positions he has held he has been subjected to every temptation and every intimidation that can be put in the path of a man in public life. And they know that never once has hope of gain or fear of harm swayed him for a moment from the energetic, thorough, and courageous performance of the duties entrusted to him.

I have watched Mr. Morgan in many battles which many might have felt he did not have to fight and which would not have brought undue criticism if he had not won, but I have never seen him take a backward step once he was convinced the fight should be made and the issue should be joined.

I have watched him handle the responsibilities of public office which it would have been child's play for him to manipulate so as to secure political and financial advantage, but neither I nor anyone in Oregon has ever seen him do such a thing. Nor have we ever heard him accused of such a thing.

He has enemies, it is true—who among us does not have enemies?—who would not hesitate to bring any charge against him—any charge, that is, which would be believed.

But the charge that Howard Morgan ever had betrayed or ever would betray a public trust is not believable in Oregon. It should not be believed here in the Senate. The fact of the matter is that such a charge has not been made here,

except by insinuation and inference. The same insinuations were made public years ago in Oregon and were so thoroughly laughed at by the people of my State that nothing more has been heard of the matter for nearly 10 years until now, when Mr. Morgan's enemies are making another try, with the same material this time, in an attempt to "bamboozle" Senators who are not aware of his record of honesty in his own State.

What Senators are being asked to do is to ignore Mr. Morgan's outstanding record of honest public service over the past 25 years and to reject him for further public service now at the age of 47, because a quarter of a century ago, when he was 22 years old, he was arrested twice: Once involving a misunderstanding so trivial and groundless that no charge was filed and no court action taken, and once involving a fist fight in which Mr. Morgan intervened to rescue his employer who had been attacked by two men, and because years later he did not make a major issue, and file a voluminous explanation and affidavit about these two incidents while filling out forms for employment with the Government and service in the Navy.

It is quite apparent that he should have done so, for his failure to do so has given his enemies an opportunity for a nit-picking attack on him so grotesquely out of proportion to the incidents themselves that many people are asking what standards of sanity and judgment prevail among grown men in our Government today.

Why did he not report these events? In his testimony before the Commerce Committee, Mr. Morgan stated candidly that he remembered one incident quite well but considered it to be so entirely the result of a misunderstanding, so totally without foundation, and so irrelevant to the rest of his life and record as to be of no possible importance, and therefore of no possible interest to the Government. The other incident, he testified, was never the subject of anything more than humorous interest on the part of anyone, including the participants, and over the course of the years was completely forgotten except at long intervals.

In fact, I very well know some of the discussion which took place in my State about the incident. It was pointed out that this was quite a little melee. The two contractors got into an altercation, which led to a fistfight, with quite a crowd standing around on the construction job.

We all know that out in the West, where men are men, this is not uncommon, even now. So long as the fight was fair, the attitude was, "Let them fight it out." When the associate of one of the contractors tried to make it two against one, Morgan did not think that was fair, so Morgan got into it and pulled the man off his employer's back. There was an exchange of blows. Morgan was successful in throwing this fellow to the ground. He did not think anything more about it. Two days later he got a summons. I am perfectly willing to waive the technicalities and to call this an arrest, but Morgan really got a summons and was told to appear before the justice court. That is what happened.

Morgan went before the justice court. The conversation went something like this: He explained what happened to the justice, who was not a lawyer, as is true with regard to many justices of the peace in my State and in many other States. Morgan said, "I was trying to maintain the peace. I was trying to stop a breach of the peace when I pulled this man off my employer's back." The justice of the peace said, "Did your employer ask you to do so?" He said, "No, he was too busy at the time. I pulled him off; that's all there was to it."

The argument of the justice of the peace, on the law, was that unless Morgan had been asked to protect his employer he ought to pay a fine of $25. He was assessed the fine. In a good nature, he paid the fine and thought no more about the incident. That is the great assault and battery case.

The other case was the tire case, Mr. President. As the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] brought out, this involves another technicality as to whether there really was an arrest. In this case Morgan worked for an employer, and had not been paid. He had wages due him. He was a student at college. He went to his employer and asked for payment. He needed tires for his car, and the employer, who was short of money, said, "I have some tires in the warehouse. Go out and see if any of them will fit your car." One of the tires was the tire which became the issue in the case. It fitted Morgan's car. The employer said, "Take it. You can at least trade it in on a new tire if you wish."

Morgan took the tire to the service station. At the service station it was discovered it was the tire reported to the service stations as being a stolen tire, and service stations were to be on the lookout for it. The tire was reported, and Morgan got another summons as a fugitive from justice.

That is simply a procedure in our State. A man is given a summons and is told to report to the jurisdiction where the crime was committed, if it was committed. Therefore, he had to go to the other county on the basis of the summons.

The employer, after finding out about the situation, explained immediately what had happened, that he had given Morgan the tire in part payment for back wages, and the whole thing was dismissed.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] made reference to the action of the Portland Chief of Police some years later, at the time Morgan graduated from Reed College. Morgan made a brilliant record at Reed College. The chief of police was looking for an administrative assistant, and he called Morgan in and offered him the position as administrative assistant to the chief of police. He, himself, to Morgan, referred to the tire incident, and said that he had taken all of the records in the case from the files because, as the Senator from Rhode Island said, there were two ways of handling the matter. Either the records could be withdrawn from the files because, after all the chief of police knew all the facts and circumstances, or Morgan could go to court to ask to have the record expunged. The chief of police decided the best thing to do was to withdraw the record from the police files, because he did not consider it to be an arrest. The record was withdrawn. After the death of the chief of police, the record was found by somebody and put back in the files.

Those are, in broad outline, Mr. President, the operative facts in regard to the incident.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I think it is pertinent to have in the RECORD Mr. Morgan's statement on this particular subject, because it is one of the real ironies of the case.

As the Senator stated, the chief of police decided that an administrative error had occurred. He said that there were two ways to handle it; either Mr. Morgan could go to court and have the record expunged, or he, the chief of police, because his department was responsible for the administrative error, could correct the error. Mr. Morgan said that he did not have the money at that time to go to court, and the chief of police said, "I will exercise my function as the chief administrative officer in the office where the mistake was made, and I will expunge the record myself." He did expunge the record. He took the file out.

I ask Senators to listen to what Mr. Morgan said, for it represents the irony in the case. He said:

> Chief Niles died, as I said, in 1946 or 1947, very suddenly. I later discovered something I am going to put in the record now so that it will be understood, but I didn't discover this until years later. When his desk was cleared out these files which he had volunteered to remove from various jurisdictions were found in a desk drawer. He had neglected to destroy them, and not knowing anything about them his men returned them to the files in Portland. What was done about the other two jurisdictions I don't know and I have never inquired.

The chief of police said he had taken them out of the FBI files and out of the State police files at Salem, Oreg.

Mr. Morgan went on to say he did not know anything about that until later. He also said:

> In 1948 I was elected to the legislature, and while that legislature was in session in 1949 I was approached by a man I had never seen before or since and threatened with reprisals involving these records if I did not vote for a slot machine bill that was on the floor.

The situation the man was in is this: The chief of police had expunged the records. What was he to do when the form 57 was before him? He had every right to believe, in my opinion, that inasmuch as an administrative error had been committed and the record had been expunged, he had no reason at all to put that on a form 57. I have said many times that I thought Mr. Morgan was entirely too contrite about this incident.

Mr. Morgan has a good case for not putting such a record on a form 57. What would he have said to his friend, the chief of police, if he had noted the incident on his form 57? The chief of police might have said:

You idiot, I took this record out of the file because it did not belong there. Now you are trying to make a fool out of me by saying you were arrested. I took the record from the file because there was no arrest and no charge should have been made.

To illustrate the point simply, may I address a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Let us assume that the Senator from Oregon is driving down a backroad in Oregon with his pickup truck, in the back of which is a hog with a white foot.

Mr. MORSE. I might very well do so.

Mr. ENGLE. Let us further assume that the sheriff drives up behind the pickup and stops it. He asks, "Mr. MORSE, where did you get the hog?"

The Senator from Oregon replies, "I got the hog from Mr. Eric. He gave it to me for working 2 days on his hay baler."

The sheriff then says, "That hog looks like the hog that was stolen from Cy Perkins over in Rabbit Hollow."

Mr. MORSE replies:

I know, it may look like that hog, but I got that hog from Mr. Eric.

The sheriff says:

That may be true, but you must turn around and follow me to the sheriff's office until I check the incident out.

So the Senator from Oregon turns around and drives 15 miles back to the sheriff's office. The sheriff picks up the telephone and calls Mr. Eric. He says:

I have Mr. MORSE in my office and he has a black hog with a white foot that I believe is a hog that belongs to Cy Perkins over in Rabbit Hollow. Did you give him the hog?

Mr. Eric says:

Yes, I gave him the hog. I gave it to him for 2 days' work on my hay baler.

The sheriff says:

I will have to go out and talk to Eric about that.

The sheriff then turns to the Senator from Oregon and says:

Mr. MORSE, I am sorry to trouble you. You will have to unload the hog and get your pay from Mr. Eric in some other way.

So the Senator from Oregon drives down the road without the hog, worrying about how he will get his 2 days' pay for the work performed on the hay baler.

I ask the Senator if he signed a form 57 long after that incident, would he record it?

Mr. MORSE. Not on the facts stated.

Mr. ENGLE. My allegory is a simple statement of the case. Let us assume further that a couple of days later some vicious employee in the sheriff's office might remember that the Senator was in the office and placed a notation on the record saying, "Mr. MORSE—investigation for hog stealing."

If someone later produced the record, I suppose the sheriff would say what the sheriff in the Morgan incident said:

The record is improperly here. You were never really investigated for hog stealing at all. You were merely asked to come in to determine what had occurred with reference to the hog that was in the back end of your pickup.

The illustration shows precisely what happened in this instance. Mr. Morgan would have been wholly justified in saying that he was not arrested at all, that no charge was made, and that a simple investigation of the type made does not rise to the dignity of arrest, and certainly does not in this instance rise to the dignity of barring Mr. Morgan from the great public office for which he has been nominated.

Mr. MORSE. Even at the risk of being charged with hog stealing, I believe the Senator from California has drawn a parallel case.

Upon the occasion of his nomination by the President Mr. Morgan did report the first incident to the White House so that no one there would be taken by surprise by its inclusion as an FBI report, but again forgot all about the second incident, the assault.

Nor for my part I see nothing important and certainly nothing sinister in all of this. These two ancient incidents were and are of absolutely no importance, the first of them showing Mr. Morgan to be completely blameless and the second actually so creditable to him that one of the Republican Senators on the Commerce Committee was quoted in the press as saying "Morgan should have had a medal for it." But beyond their lack of importance, there is complete absence from the committee record in this matter of any claim by any individual that Mr. Morgan's failure to report these incidents was damaging in the slightest degree to the Government or to the public interest or to any individual anywhere. All that is claimed is that Mr. Morgan years ago violated a very technical rule, a rule which I know many of us in the Senate feel goes too far and is unnecessarily harsh. And we are left by Mr. Morgan's attackers to infer that because of this technical violation we should permanently deprive the public of his outstanding ability to serve.

Mr. President, the Commerce Committee refused by a vote of 11 to 4 to go along with this. I do not go along with it, and I do not expect the Senate to go along with any such nonsense, when the Senate votes later in the day on confirmation of the nomination. Editorial opinion in the State of Oregon—which incidentally is 90 percent Republican—does not go along with it either. Since Mr. Morgan's nomination there have been numerous editorials concerning him and I have not seen one which is adverse to his appointment.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] quoted editorial comments from various Oregon newspapers submitted by my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] to the committee. I have a few more to which I wish to refer during my presentation.

Since the attacks on him began some 6 weeks ago there have been even more editorials than before, and every single one of these editorials strongly supports Mr. Morgan's appointment. I shall not burden the RECORD with all of these editorials, but I do want Senators to hear the words of the lead editorial for Thursday, May 18, from the Portland Oregonian, the largest paper in Oregon and the leading Republican paper of the State. It is a newspaper that claims to be an independent newspaper, but I always refer to it as the leading Republican newspaper in the State because its editorial policy, I have found on so many legislative issues, is Republican and not independent.

This editorial is in its entirety except for one sentence which has been deleted in part to remove the name of a Republican Senator to avoid a violation of Rule XIX and another sentence relating to the vote in the committee:

Howard Morgan's failure to list on military service and Government job application forms two arrests when he was a youngster—one of them an error, the other for an excusable fist fight—was a mistake in judgment, perhaps, but certainly no grounds for disbarment from appointment as a member of the Federal Power Commission many years later.

The campaign to discredit him before the Senate Commerce Committee * * * dipped into gutter politics in employing such tactics. Actually, no one is fooled. The opposition to Mr. Morgan has nothing to do with these petty incidents of long ago. It is based on Mr. Morgan's New Deal public power record, and the belief among gas, oil, and electric utility executives that he is prejudiced against them.

Now it appears that he will weather the attacks, including some from Democrats who disliked his liberalism and tactics as State party chairman, or his support of Adlai Stevenson for the nomination against John F. Kennedy last year. The Senate's decision should be on the sole basis of Mr. Morgan's capacity to serve impartially on the FPC, a position for which his education and experience qualifies him.

Oregon knows Howard Morgan as a tough political infighter, the man who had most to do with the resurgence of the Democratic Party in this State. But we doubt there is any sympathy here with the shabby tactics used against his confirmation. The Senate should seat him as the President's choice.

My colleagues in the Senate will, I am sure, have no trouble recognizing the minority views concerning this nomination for what it is: a thoroughly biased, politically motivated document, resting upon insinuations, innuendoes, and nonsequitur. I do not propose to spend more time on this document than it merits, but I do want to call attention to a few typical items in it.

For example, in his testimony, Mr. Morgan submitted a list of positions involving public trust which he has held during 23 of the 25 years which have elapsed since the episodes which led to the present attack upon. The purpose of this list, as was clearly explained, was to show the degree of confidence which his associates and fellow citizens have always reposed in Mr. Morgan. The list begins by showing within 2 years of the altercations occurring in 1936 and 1937,

his fellow students had elected him to the student council and then to the presidency of the student body at Reed College. The minority views allude to the fact that the Reed College student body at that time numbered only 563 students, thus implying that the president of the student body was of minor or no significance.

Now Mr. President, what in the name of sanity is a nonsequitur like that doing in a serious discussion on the floor of the U.S. Senate? What has the size of the student body got to do with the degree of its confidence in Mr. Morgan? The fact is that in a student body that small, Mr. Morgan was bound to be known personally to all his fellow students, whereas in a larger college he might have been known to only a fraction of those voting.

I could go on and point out with pride that Reed College is very probably the most academically distinguished undergraduate college in America, producing a higher proportion of Rhodes scholars, a higher proportion of Phi Beta Kappas, a higher proportion of graduates who continue in graduate school, and a higher proportion of graduates who achieve doctorates, than any other college or university in America. I digress long enough to testify, as one who taught at the Law School of the University of Oregon for 14 years and acted as its dean for 13 years, that in those 15 years only two students who came to us after graduating from Reed College ever ended up below the top 10 percent of the class in the law school. It is some evidence of the academic excellence of that student body. There sits at my right as I pay these deserved tributes to Reed College one of its distinguished former professors, the Senator from Illinois, PAUL DOUGLAS. He knows whereof I speak when I speak of this being a college of great academic distinction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will permit, I would say that it is probably the best small college in the country.

Mr. MORSE. I am proud to hear the Senator say that, and I am sure Reed College and its alumni will be proud to have that statement made a part of the RECORD.

These happen to be facts, and they are facts which should give Mr. Morgan justifiable pride in having been selected for the presidency of such a student body. But these facts are no more relevant to this discussion than is the grotesque suggestion of the minority report concerning the size of the student body.

The relevant fact here is that Mr. Morgan's fellow students regarded him then, just as his friends, fellow citizens and even his opponents have regarded him ever since, as a decent, trustworthy, and responsible person who might properly be singled out for positions of honor and public service. When the minority report must resort to weird and childish nonsequiturs to obscure these plain facts, it confesses, to my mind, a serious weakness in its attack against Mr. Morgan.

This weakness continues to be evident throughout the minority report. For example, the report contains a long and labored insinuation concerning Mr. Morgan's relationship with the late Joseph Eastman, a relationship in which Mr. Morgan has every reason to take pride. Everyone who remembers Mr. Eastman will remember that this very great man was constantly bringing promising young men into the government—into the Interstate Commerce Commission and into other agencies as well. These young men were proteges of Mr. Eastman's in one sense—in that he took an interest in them and followed their progress, sometimes arranging, as in Mr. Morgan's case, for their frequent transfer from one department or division to another so as to speed their accumulation of experience in government, but in all other respects these young men were strictly on their own. They did not receive especially high salaries—the reverse was usually true—nor did they receive promotions more rapidly than justified by experience and aptitude.

Mr. Morgan had the honor of being one of these young men for a few months prior to his naval service and prior to Mr. Eastman's death, because Mr. Frank Landeburg, District Director of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Pacific Northwest and an old friend of mine, secured a copy of Mr. Morgan's graduating thesis and, without his knowledge, sent it to Mr. Eastman to be read. This led, within a period of a few months, to Mr. Morgan's service in the Office of Defense Transportation under Mr. Eastman.

The thesis was a thesis in the field of administrative law agencies working; in this case, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in respect of the regulation of public transportation utilities which come under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

By a process of alleged logic which I confess is beyond my ability to understand, the minority report would have you believe there was something bad about this, and that because Mr. Morgan did not work 19 years ago at today's pay scales he is somehow not qualified for the job to which he is now nominated.

All of this, it seems to me, is far afield from the judgment we are called upon to make. I could spend the next 2 hours analyzing the absurdities contained in the minority report, but that would not get us any closer to an appreciation of the qualities of character and competence which led President Kennedy to nominate Mr. Morgan. The minority report studiously avoids any recognition of such qualities and attempts throughout to hide or deny their existence.

Fortunately those qualities of character and competence are clearly delineated in the record of this nomination, they are clearly visible to all who have participated in the hearings or who have taken the trouble to read the record, and they cannot be obscured by the misstatements of fact and distortions of logic upon which the minority of the committee relies in this report. For this reason I decline to dignify that minority report and its flimsy case against Mr. Morgan by extended discussion.

Instead, I remind the Senate that no one has been more careful and diligent than I to insure that presidential nominees seeking our confirmation possess the historic qualifications of competence and character. I have led both successful and unsuccessful fights against confirmation of persons lacking proper qualifications, and I have never apologized for those fights, whatever the outcome. There have been occasions when, upon losing such a fight, I have stood on this floor and predicted accurately that the Senate would regret its action in confirming certain nominees, and subsequent events have borne me out.

I now wish to add two more predictions to the record. First, I am certain that the Senate will not be swayed, any more than the newspaper editors of Oregon have been swayed, by the eyewash out of which this attack against an honorable man has been fabricated; and that the Senate will confirm Howard Morgan, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

Second, I am equally certain that within 6 months of its confirmation of him, the Senate will come to recognize Commissioner Morgan as one of the hardest-working, ablest, and most impartial Commissioners the public has been fortunate to secure in many years.

Mr. President, I again congratulate President Kennedy on his courageous selection of a courageous man for the Federal Power Commission and I urge the Senate to confirm this nomination.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the able Senator from Oregon for his courageous, clear, factual, and lucid presentation. I associate myself with his remarks on Mr. Morgan, whom I do not know personally. However, I have read the record, and I have read the committee report, and also the minority and separate views. I submit to my colleagues who sustain the minority report that their position reaches the height of absurdity. They dig back 25 years into a man's record and disregard his outstanding record since then as a public servant. They emphasize a minor matter, one dealing with the breach of the peace. They also refer to another matter dealing with some minor offense which would be treated as an insignificant petty larceny.

What the minority says is: "We do not mean to say that he should never hold an office of public trust, but there must be a decent interval."

I know the interval that is meant. This man is a trained public utility servant who is now going into this position of trust. Heaven knows we need someone in the Federal Power Commission like this man. By a "decent interval" the minority really means that we should appoint someone else. I am amazed that the Senate should spend this much time on minor charges against this man, when we know the desperate situation in which the Federal Power Commission finds itself today, with a great backlog of cases, and with a record that has been

assailed by every leading scholar in this field as not being in the public service. The man whose nomination we have before us has a record of fairness to both industry and the consumer.

In my humble opinion, debating such a minor matter is like straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. I commend the able Senator from Oregon for his statement.

May I ask how it happened that such a good man was persuaded to present himself?

Mr. MORSE. Oregon has many such good men.

Mr. CARROLL. There may be many in Oregon, but until recently they have not been appointed to the regulatory bodies. Such an appointment as this has been a long time coming.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I, too, congratulate the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who preceded him, for their defense of Mr. Morgan. I had not known Mr. Morgan until recently, but I knew of his reputation. His reputation has always been of the highest. He is a man of honor and ability. I thought the incident related by the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] was extremely interesting, namely the threats by the slot machine gang that they would bring out damaging material about him unless he voted with them. Mr. Morgan did not yield to blackmail. I think that is a test both of bravery and of character.

Is it not true, I ask the Senator from Oregon, that if a man is not zealous in defending the public interest, then the incidents of his past are seldom brought up; and that the mantle of forgiveness is thrown around those who protect the powerful?

Mr. MORSE. That has been my observation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On the other hand, if a man shows concern for the public interest, every effort is made to discredit him.

Mr. MORSE. His back is kept to the wall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I remember, as a young man, watching the nomination of Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court. He was one of the greatest judges, as it turned out, that the Nation ever had. But his nomination was opposed by every living president and past president of the American Bar Association and by the presidents of Harvard and of Yale. What was the charge? The charge was that Mr. Brandeis defended the public as against Mr. Mellon, Mr. Morgan, and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, together with certain incidents which reflected to his credit in the United States Shoe Machinery case.

It was a long, bitter battle. At the time I felt that if Mr. Brandeis had been a conventional corporation lawyer, there would have been no opposition whatsoever to his nomination.

I think we are now seeing a repetition of the old story. I hope the Senate, by a big vote, will confirm the nomination of Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his support of the nomination of this able man.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to add a few comments to those which have been expressed so well by my senior colleague in support of Howard Morgan. The senior Senator from Oregon has covered the main argument in support of the nomination.

It might be thought to be natural for the Senators from Oregon to speak in support of the nomination of a man from our State who has been appointed to high office. It is natural, but I do not believe we would speak in recommendation of a nominee from Oregon if we did not believe he deserved the nomination, simply because of great local pride and interest in having someone from Oregon do very well and receive national acclaim. We would speak in support of such a nomination only if it were justified.

Howard Morgan brought about a great resurgence, let us say, of the Democratic Party in Oregon, as the senior Senator from Oregon has said. During his leadership, the first Democratic United States Senator in 40 years was elected from our State.

I think the people of Oregon have showed by their support of his leadership that they have great respect for him as a leader and as a person of ability.

Mr. President, in addition to the editorial comments which the senior Senator from Oregon has placed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks two additional editorials.

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

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Jan. 30, 1961]

MORGAN CHOICE SUPERLATIVE

It would have been difficult for President Kennedy to have found a better qualified man, by knowledge, philosophy, and temperament, than Howard Morgan of Sisters for appointment to the Federal Power Commission. It was first rate.

What the FPC gains, Oregon's Democratic Party loses, even though Morgan has been officially inactive in the party since 1956, when as chairman he helped lay the groundwork for the election of Robert D. Holmes as Governor, and the reelection of WAYNE MORSE as U.S. Senator, despite the decisive majority by which President Eisenhower carried the State. Morgan's removal from the Oregon scene remains a loss because the brilliant, tough, ex-chairman reportedly had resumed his interest in Democratic politics, largely in rage over State senate shenanigans where several Democratic members openly deserted the party platform. Had Morgan resumed an active role within the party, its reemergency from the depths of intellectual dishonesty and despair would have been assured.

Morgan's will be but one voice on the FPC. Yet further appointments of his caliber to that agency, and other Federal independent agencies, can restore respect to regulatory bodies. The agencies were established by Congress to protect the public's interest; largely by virtue of industry appointments, however, they have come to be regarded as agencies aimed at protecting the interests they were supposed to regulate.

Morgan's tenure as Oregon public utilities commissioner was certainly not popular with industry. He viewed the office as one which should protect the public instead of industry. Furthermore, for the first time, he offered the use of his office to the public in matters of controversy, like the Portland transit mess, to the horror of industry and conservatives generally, but, we feel, to Morgan's credit. In fact, Morgan's precedents as public utilities commissioner may have carried over in some degree to his successor; PUC Commissioner Jonel Hill is a better incumbent for having been preceded by Morgan.

We trust Howard Morgan's philosophy of regulatory agencies is the same as it was 2 years ago. It could have a healthy effect on the Federal Power Commission.

[From the Portland Reporter, Jan. 24, 1961]

MORGAN EXCELLENT CHOICE FOR APPOINTMENT TO FPC

If Howard Morgan is named to the Federal Power Commission as reports indicate, President Kennedy will have brought into public service another vigorous, young, and competent man with high dedication for good government.

He has figured in sharp differences with fellow Democratic leaders in this State, which is not improper in his party. But his critics, be they Democrats or Republicans, cannot honestly deny that Howard Morgan fought with all his Irish tenacity and Reed College training for proper regulation of utilities when he was the people's public utilities commissioner under Governor Holmes.

For the first time in many a day at Salem, humble customers of the railroads, the bus lines, the telephone companies, the power companies, had a capable and conscientious defender. At times Commissioner Morgan looked unusually worked up at his job only because the people were not accustomed to seeing a public utility commissioner of Oregon steamed up in their behalf.

Howard Morgan would go on the Federal Power Commission at a critical time for the Northwest. For more than 2 years the Idaho Power Co. has been accused by biologists of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho of violating the Commission's directives to carry out a fish conservation program at Brownlee Dam. Much of the biologists' efforts, including those of the Federal Government, have had to be aimed at prodding the power company into complying with the Commission's license requirement for protecting fish at the dam. Biologists shouldn't be required to do such prodding, but there was no other recourse. The power company kept putting off financing emergency fish relief measures until the commission could be induced to show its teeth. Then the company took its own time again. Late in 1959, the biologists urged the three Northwest States to proceed with damage claims against the power company for permanent loss of salmon and steelhead runs. These States, in turn, put off acting on this matter which the biologists warned was very grave.

Instead of pushing the damage action, Governor Hatfield has arranged for a meeting of the Northwest Governors for passing it off on the three legislatures. The Governor was prodded by an Oregon legislative committee which called attention to the serious consequences of neglecting fish protection at Brownlee—something that Governor Holmes protested about more than 2 years ago. This situation doesn't need any more pussyfooting—it needs Howard Morgan.

Even more important to the economy of the Northwest is the proper conservation of power potentials. We cannot afford another Hell's Canyon giveaway of 500,000 kilowatts—the difference between the low dams and high Hell's Canyon Dam. Fortunately by the time the Federal Power Commission will decide which is more to the public interest, big Mountain Sheep Dam or bigger Nez Perce, there could be three vigorous, young, and competent Kennedy men, a Kennedy majority, on the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when I came into the Chamber an hour or so ago, I fully intended to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Morgan. I feel that a position on the Federal Power Commission requires the service of a strong, capable, honest citizen. Since coming to the floor of the Senate, I have had to change my mind about supporting the nomination of Mr. Morgan.

I have not changed my mind because I question his ability. I think he has the ability as attested by the Senators from Oregon and by other Senators, to fill the position. I have not changed my mind because of the opposition to his nomination by those whom he would be required, as a member of the Commission, to regulate. I have not changed my mind because of any mistakes he made in his youth, because any man who grows up without having made any mistakes in his youth probably would not be much of an administrator or a judge, in any case.

I have not changed my mind because Mr. Morgan did not fill out his form 57 exactly correctly, because I think it would be a revelation if we were to examine all the forms 57 which have been filed by applicants for positions in the Government.

I have had to change my mind because I have been reading the report of the hearings. On page 67 of the hearings, I find this colloquy:

Senator SCOTT. The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in July 1958 in another matter refused to recommend favorably, as I recall it, the nominee because the statement was made by him in the form 57 that he had a college degree, whereas, in fact, he had the necessary college credits and did, in fact, have a law degree; he claimed two degrees.

That was one degree too much in the opinion of the committee and they refused to recommend him for confirmation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I will close my questioning by reading from the message from the President on yesterday or——

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. SCOTT, may I at this point—I am sorry to interrupt you.

Senator SCOTT. That is all right, go ahead.

Mr. MORGAN. I think it is only fair to you to tell you that because mention was made within the committee of this *Flanagan* case. I have read the Flanagan transcript and the cases are not parallel. Mr. Flanagan conferred 47 units of study on himself and a university degree which he did not, in fact, have. He didn't have a law degree either. He had been thrown out of law school for bad scholarship, and the falsifications which he made in his form 57, far from being related only to a possible short delay, were crucial, absolutely crucial, to his successful appointment to the position he sought.

Mr. President, the statement which Mr. Morgan made in the hearings related to a young man who for financial reasons had to give up his college studies in Vermont, and to whom I gave a patronage job on the police force, so that he might come to Washington and continue his studies here. Therefore, I feel an interest in what Mr. Morgan saw fit to say about him.

Why Mr. Morgan ever felt called upon to make the statement, I do not know, but I am resentful because he simply did not tell the truth to the committee. He said there that Mr. Flanagan did not have a law degree. Mr. Flanagan did have a law degree. He had a law degree from Columbus University, which I understand has been merged into the Catholic University of America and is now operated by the Catholic University.

Mr. Flanagan was not thrown out of college. He had to forego his attendance at college in Vermont because he did not have the money to continue, and he had a family to take care of at the time. That is why he came to Washington.

As for Mr. Flanagan's form 57, it was incorrectly made out to begin with, but it was corrected later.

Mr. Morgan said:

The falsifications which he made in his form 57, far from being related only to a possible short delay, were crucial, absolutely crucial, to his successful appointment to the position he sought.

That is not true. It was never claimed that the form 57 material was crucial to the position Mr. Flanagan sought.

I do not debate Mr. Flanagan's qualifications for the appointment at this time. The committee disapproved him anyway, and the nomination was withdrawn. But, Mr. President, it seems to me that any person who goes before a committee and undertakes to protect or better his own position through reflection on the character of another is not qualified for high, responsible office in the Government. That is the reason why I have changed my mind since I came on the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Vermont, that in a few moments I shall recur to the Flanagan case, because it was brought into this matter, not by the nominee, but by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], in the committee; and since I played a major part, together with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in the adverse action of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the nomination of Mr. Flanagan, I think that in justice to Mr. Morgan I should state my best recollection of the facts of that case, which I have undertaken to have collected again.

I realize that when Mr. Flanagan's nomination came to the floor, a year or 2 years ago, the Senator from Vermont and I had a spirited, but nonetheless friendly, disagreement about that situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield, let me state that I believe that nomination never came to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I believe that is correct. The Senator from Vermont appeared before our committee; and there we had a spirited, but nonetheless friendly, discussion of the nomination.

Mr. President, after having read the majority report and the minority views on Mr. Morgan, and after having listened to the speeches made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the colloquy engaged in by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I have no doubt that this nomination should be confirmed; and I shall vote for confirmation.

Because my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] brought the Flanagan matter into these proceedings, however, I have asked him to be present when I make these few remarks; and I am happy to see that he is now on the floor, because I should like this record to be very clear as to my own view that there is no connection whatever between the Flanagan matter and the Morgan matters; and, in my judgment—with due reference to my friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], with whom I dislike to disagree—I think Mr. Morgan was quite justified in pointing that out before the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield, let me say that I disagree that Mr. Morgan was justified. I agree that probably there was not too close a connection between the two cases. But in concluding my remarks I stated that when one man undertakes to enhance his own position by reflecting on the character of another, and makes statements which are not true, then I believe he disqualifies himself from appointment. No one is sorrier than I am, because I want to see the strongest possible persons serve on the Federal Power Commission, because I know something of the pressures which are brought to bear upon them, and only the strongest men can stand up to those pressures. But, unfortunately, Mr. Morgan chose to make those remarks about one of my constituents; so Mr. Morgan has lost my vote.

Mr. CLARK. Of course the Senator from Vermont is entitled to his opinion, which I honor; and I also honor his loyalty to a young friend, for whom he stood up under very difficult circumstances. I regret that I feel compelled to draw a conclusion different from the one my friend, the Senator from Vermont, has drawn from the facts, on which I think he and I are agreed.

I merely wish to say I think there is no connection between the pending nomination and the Flanagan nomination. Three years ago, Mr. Flanagan was nominated to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mr. Flanagan falsified the form 57 he filled out, by stating that he had received 47 units of study and two university degrees which he had not received. Moreover, when Mr. Flanagan appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on which I then served, and when he was under critical exam-

ination by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], Mr. Flanagan attempted, to the best of his ability, to cover up—in my opinion—that situation and to persuade the committee that he had not falsified his background in filling out form 57.

On the other hand, Mr. Morgan was entirely candid with the committee, and admitted immediately the extent to which misstatements had been made by him on the No. 57 form.

It is no pleasure to me to place into this RECORD the misstatements—to use a kind word—which Mr. Flanagan made on the form 57 which he filled out, and which he attempted to justify when he appeared before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But I am compelled to say—in justice to my friend, the Senator from Vermont—that Mr. Flanagan did report 3 years attendance at Columbus University, whereas actually he had completed only two quarters of 1 year; and I believe I am correct in stating—in fact, I really am quite positive about it—that he never did receive a degree from Columbus University.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is mistaken. I have been assured, within the last half hour, that he did receive a degree. I am certain of that.

Mr. CLARK. I have the record before me. It may be wrong, but it is in accordance with my recollection; and I refer the Senator from Vermont to the transcript of the hearings of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, pages 34 and 35, where the statement to which I have just referred appears, so I am told by a staff member; and it is in accordance with my own recollection.

There are a number of other matters which I believe would be rather too painful to go into here; and I do not think it would do either Mr. Morgan or Mr. Flanagan any good to go into them now. Therefore, I shall not state for the RECORD the other misstatements of fact which, I state regretfully, Mr. Flanagan made, and which resulted in a failure to report his nomination to the floor of the Senate—which, I believe, clearly distinguishes the case of Mr. Flanagan from the case of Mr. Morgan.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on that point, will my senior colleague yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me state that I am not aware—but the senior Senator from Vermont and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania served on the committee, and they can clarify the matter——

Mr. CLARK. No; the Senator from Vermont did not.

Mr. SCOTT. Then the senior Senator from Pennsylvania had a discussion with the Senator from Vermont, apart from the committee session?

Mr. CLARK. Well, we had a friendly discussion.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, after we conclude the nitpicking, let me ask if it is not a fact that Mr. Morgan, for purposes of improving his own chances, lashed out against Mr. Flanagan, whose nomination was withdrawn by Mr. Eisenhower because of the allegation that Mr. Flanagan had overstated his college credits. At the hearing, Mr. Morgan stated—and this testimony appears on page 68 of the hearing:

> I have read the Flanagan transcript and the cases are not parallel. Mr. Flanagan conferred 47 units of study on himself and a university degree which he did not, in fact, have. He didn't have a law degree either. He had been thrown out of law school for bad scholarship, and the falsifications which he made in his form 57, far from being related only to a possible short delay, were crucial, absolutely crucial.

I am not at all aware that it ever appeared that he had been thrown out of law school, for bad scholarship. The Senator from Vermont can correct me, of course, if I am wrong.

But what malice must have suffused the mind of Mr. Morgan, who, as we have shown, is, himself, used to falsification, and is so given to concealment, that in order to hurt another man, he would make a statement which the hearings and the record do not support—namely, that that man had been thrown out of law school, for bad scholarship.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I shall put this in the form of a question, then: Does not the senior Senator from Pennsylvania think that is pretty much of a reflection on Morgan?

Mr. CLARK. I do not. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania asked me to yield, and then asked a question; and I have answered his question. Will he now answer a question from me?

Mr. SCOTT. Will the senior Senator from Pennsylvania agree that Morgan threw in something, there, which the record does not sustain?

Mr. CLARK. In substance; no.

Mr. SCOTT. But in practice, yes?

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator answer a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I am used to answering questions from my senior colleague; that is how I learn, down here.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator tell me whether I am correct in my belief that Mr. Flanagan's case was first brought into the Morgan matter by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Flanagan's name was not brought into the case by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I did not say "name"; I said "case."

Mr. SCOTT. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania—in order to avoid further embarrassment to Mr. Flanagan, who had already been sufficiently mauled by a Senate committee—referred to a case before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and was careful not to mention the name of Mr. Flanagan. But Mr. Morgan could not let it go by; he, himself—being on the defensive, and being charged with falsification—with considerable glee, in my opinion, and quite evident malice, introduced the name of Flanagan, and referred to it four times in the course of his reply.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with deep regret, I refuse to yield further to my colleague from Pennsylvania until I have completed my statement.

My statement is merely that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania indirectly brought Flanagan's name into the matter. Everybody knew he was doing it. He said everything but the name. In my judgment, Mr. Morgan was entitled to go further to answer the allegation brought in by innuendo by my colleague from Pennsylvania.

I point out, in conclusion, that my friend from Pennsylvania undertook to call Mr. Morgan a perjurer on the very floor of this body a short time ago. It is an easy thing to call a man a perjurer on the floor of the Senate, where Senators have immunity from prosecution for slander or libel. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Morgan was never indicted for perjury or convicted for perjury. In fact, he is not a perjurer, and no jury would convict him.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. SCOTT addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have known Howard Morgan for a number of years, not intimately, as have the two Senators from Oregon, but certainly enough to have a pretty good idea on which to form a judgment covering the basis of his qualifications.

I think he has done an outstanding job as a member of the Public Utilities Commission—the only member, by the way, in the State of Oregon. I think the indiscretions of his youth, if we can call them that—and I doubt it—have been gone into quite thoroughly in committee and on the floor of the Senate. I think these matters have been explained by the Senators from Oregon, by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and other Senators on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I would express the hope that we shall be able to come to a vote shortly, so this matter can be faced up to. I would express the further hope that the Senate will give Mr. Morgan's nomination overwhelming approval, because he has earned it.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor, but I feel honor bound to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I would appreciate it, since the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has leveled the charge against me that I labeled Mr. Morgan a perjurer. I would like to correct the Senator. It was Mr. Morgan himself who labeled himself as a perjurer, and I would repeat the remarks, without the immunity of the Senate floor, at any place and any time, and let the public judge whether it is perjury. Perjury is the crime—and I will give the nontechnical language; the Senator and I are both lawyers—of not telling the truth in a material matter, under oath, which is material and relevant to the investigation.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Not just at the moment.

Mr. CLARK. Why does not the Senator take the floor in his own right, because obviously he is not asking me a question.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, may I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. In my own right, since my senior colleague seems to be somewhat fatigued, I will state that perjury consists not in an indictment, not in the filing of an information, not in a conviction; perjury consists in the violation of the law which defines perjury. The law defines it as not telling the truth in a matter material to the situation as to which a statement is made, and in not telling the truth under oath.

Mr. Morgan admits that he did not tell the truth under oath. He defines himself as a perjurer. It is not Mr. Morgan's fault that for the six times he did not tell the truth he was not prosecuted. It might be the fault of the Department of Justice. It might have some relationship to the high position he held in his home State. It might have relationship to the fact that it was never discovered because of his carefulness in keeping it secret. It might have relationship to the fact that Morgan would not be indicted for perjury until the perjury was discovered.

As appears on page 67 of the hearings, I said:

But, Mr. Morgan, when you did fill out these three forms—

He was after a Government job; he wanted a Navy commission—

and deny that you had ever been arrested you were at that time under the impression, were you not, that these things had been removed from the record by a police chief and therefore they could not be discovered and brought up against you, isn't that true, factually, even though you say that wasn't your motivation?

In other words, he said he was not telling an untruth because of the fact that he thought the police chief had hiked the record out of the file.

I said:

Isn't that true, factually, even though you say that wasn't your motivation?

Mr. Morgan said:

You can say that; yes, sir. But that was not the motivation.

I asked him again:

And that is, do you feel that what you did represented some deviation from let us say irreproachable standards of behavior?

Mr. Morgan said, in branding himself again as a perjurer:

I think I can be and probably should be reprimanded or admonished for an infraction of the rules. There is no question about it.

The majority report is far less hard on Mr. Morgan than Mr. Morgan was on himself. Mr. Morgan said:

I did it. I am guilty.

The majority report says it was a childish game.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not wish to yield until I finish. The majority report says it was a childish game, that these were the offenses of youth, referring to the two criminal offenses which have nothing to do with what I have been saying. It was not a childish infraction to make six false statements under oath in order to get something in return from the Federal Government. They took place when he was between 28 and 38 years of age. If Mr. Morgan had not learned what it is to lie in a Government matter by the time he reached the age of 38, he will never learn, unless, through the exercise of mercy for which the majority pleads, there might be another soul searching and a final consulting with truth.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Did not the Senator, a short while ago, read a part of the criminal code which says, "Whoever shall willfully misstate a fact"?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is talking about motivation. Does not motivation go to willfulness?

Mr. SCOTT. Precisely. This was willful.

Mr. PASTORE. Did not Mr. Morgan say, "I did not have such a motivation"?

Mr. SCOTT. No; he did not.

Mr. PASTORE. I challenge the Senator to read the question.

Mr. SCOTT. Tell me what the Senator wants me to read.

Mr. PASTORE. The question the Senator read a short while ago.

Mr. SCOTT. I was referring to page 67 of the hearings. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. Read that again and see if the Senator did not use the word "motivation," when he said that he may not have had such a motivation, but he did it. Motivation goes to willfulness.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator is not going to confuse me.

Mr. PASTORE. But the Senator is confusing the record.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not.

Mr. PASTORE. Then read it.

Mr. SCOTT. I will read it, and in my own time and my own way. I have the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. I know the Senator has the floor, but he yielded to me, and I am saying to the Senator from Pennsylvania that he is very subtly distorting the record.

Mr. SCOTT. And I say to the Senator from Rhode Island, with all due respect, that he is mistaken.

Mr. PASTORE. Let us find out where the word "motivation" comes from.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, I will try to answer the question.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I will not yield at this time.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator——

Mr. SCOTT. I refuse to yield. The Senator from Rhode Island is very anxious that this be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I refer to page 67 of the hearings. We were speaking about whether or not Mr. Morgan would be led to make certain false statements, if he believed that, in denying that he had been arrested, the files had been removed by his friend, the police chief, from the files, so if he did not tell the truth he could not be discovered.

This is the point we are examining. In other words—

Were you influenced? Were you motivated by the fact that if you made statements under oath you could not be caught up because the files had been removed?

This is the question, from page 67:

Senator SCOTT. But, Mr. Morgan, when you did fill out these three forms and deny that you had ever been arrested you were at that time under the impression, were you not, that these things had been removed from the record by a police chief and therefore they could not be discovered and brought up against you, isn't that true, factually, even though you say that wasn't your motivation?

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator repeat that?

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will permit, I shall read the answer before I permit the Senator to confuse the question. The answer of Mr. Morgan was:

You can say that; yes, sir. But that was not the motivation.

Mr. PASTORE. That was not the motivation.

Mr. SCOTT. I have not yet yielded again, although I shall yield later to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not wish to have anybody forget that.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Morgan said:

But that was not the motivation.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. SCOTT. From which the only possible inference is that in not telling the truth he was motivated by some purpose other than the one of which I accused him; namely, that the record had been removed. He said that was not his motivation.

I read further:

Senator SCOTT. May I ask you one other question?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SCOTT. And that is do you feel that what you did represented some deviation from let us say irreproachable standards of behavior?

Mr. Morgan then, without going into motivation any more, said:

I think that I can be and probably should be reprimanded or admonished for an infraction of the rules. There is no question about it.

I now read from the Criminal Code:

Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up—

And so forth—

shall be guilty of an offense.

If any Senator wishes, I shall read the entire section of the code with reference to "knowingly and willfully."

Mr. Morgan, testifying before the Senate committee, said that he knew he had committed these offenses, that the six times did not make an admission that he had committed them.

I am sure the distinguished attorney who has asked the question, the distinguished member of the bar, is perfectly aware of what is involved in the legal terminology of "knowingly and willfully." In other words, Was he arrested? Did he know he was arrested? Did he refuse to say he was arrested? Did he do it under oath in a relevant proceeding? I say he did, and I say that is perjury.

Mr. PASTORE. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Now I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will permit, there is a further little addendum which will help him. On page 69 Mr. Morgan went further and said:

The matter—

Referring to the arrest—

The matter which I have chosen to ignore is the other matter.

Referring to the assault and battery.

If "chosen to ignore" is not willful, I do not know what is.

Mr. PASTORE. I am waiting for the floor.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It is not my disposition to discuss the matter at length. I did not hear the testimony. I have, however, read the testimony.

I was surprised to hear the senior Senator from Pennsylvania express the view that in his opinion falsification of college credits was a matter of more importance than falsification of the fact of a conviction of assault and an arrest for larceny.

It would strike me that the answer to a question with regard to one's record as to arrests or convictions, if one is going to weigh such things, is a matter of a great deal more importance, rather than of lesser importance, than a response to a question regarding the number and amount of college credits. Would the Senator agree?

Mr. SCOTT. I would certainly agree that the willful concealment of two violations of law is much more important and much more serious than the willful concealment of a failure to attain as high an educational attainment as was represented, yes. In that case the nomination was withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. In that case?

Mr. SCOTT. The latter case.

Mr. KEATING. Am I correct in my understanding that the willful and deliberate violation, no matter how motivated, occurred? It could be added that the offense of perjury is not in any way qualified by motivation. There is a question, however, of whether it was intentional and willful.

Mr. SCOTT. Precisely.

Mr. KEATING. Motivation is a side issue. One can be willful, no matter how pure one's motives are. One may steal to support a family, or for some other purpose which might have something laudable behind it, and the court would weigh that in fixing the sentence. But the act would still be larceny if one intended to take the property of another.

Mr. SCOTT. As a matter of fact, while motivation has nothing to do with willfully and knowingly doing something, it is of interest that in this case Mr. Morgan himself fixes his motivation as being his own convenience. He testified that the reason he did not say that he had been involved in criminal offenses was that he would get the jobs he desired anyway, but that such would only delay the time it took for him to get them while the FBI or the Government was investigating these things, since they would find out there was nothing to them.

I asked him—

Then you did not tell the truth because you wished to help the Government and to save the time of the investigators?

He chose to feel that that was a facetious question, with which I did not agree. I wish to say that that was his motivation. Again, as always, it is a question of his own convenience.

I wish to point out, also, a quotation from page 52 of the hearings with respect to the question of "knowingly and willfully," and motivation.

At the bottom of page 52 Mr. Morgan again made an admission in regard to why he did not tell about the two incidents. This is why I said to my senior colleague from Pennsylvania that I shall say this off the floor, by reference to the hearings and the statements made, to let the people judge what they think.

If Senators wish to listen to the interesting convolutions of a man's mind, as he shows how what he wishes to do is more important than what is right or what is wrong, I ask them to listen carefully to the words of Mr. Morgan in explaining why he did not tell the truth. He was asked if he would care to comment on one form in particular, on which he had said he had never been arrested and convicted and paid a fine. The question was:

Would you care to comment on that?

This followed a long question asked by me.

Mr. Morgan said:

Yes; I will be glad to.

These two incidents as far as I am concerned are quite different and I had and still have quite a different feeling about them.

One was the stolen tire and one was the assault and battery.

The matter involving the tire was, as I said, a comedy of errors, mistakes, misunderstanding from start to finish. There is no guilt, culpability, or blame involved in the matter as far as I am concerned and I have never felt that there was.

On the other hand, there was never any way in which I could have avoided it. It happened to me as the same sort of thing happens to many people. It was a piece of bad luck. But I have always felt that the arrest should not have been made, should never have been made. In effect I was arrested for the purpose of investigating to find out whether I should have been arrested or not, and the investigation proved that I should not have been. I have always regarded this incident with a feeling somewhere between exasperation and mild outrage and I have perhaps wrongfully felt that it was something I did not need to carry on my shoulders and explain for the rest of my life. It is quite true that on every occasion that I have filled out a form 57 I did.

I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will listen:

I did remember this case and I did refuse to report it.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to ask my colleague from Pennsylvania a question, and I wish to preface it by a statement.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. This noon I had the pleasure of being the guest of the National Press Club at a luncheon at which the new Republican chairman spoke. Incidentally, he did a very fine job.

At the luncheon I met a member of the press corps for whom I have a very high regard. This member of the press corps expressed some sympathy for Mr. Morgan in the beginning because he said that when he was 18 or 19 years of age and in college, he and some other boys tore down a neon sign and were charged with larceny. He was pretty young at the time and pleaded guilty. The childish escapade he described has always been on his record. He said:

The incident has dogged me from time to time. It dogged me when I obtained my Navy commission and in doing other things. But always I have told of the incident when I sought employment.

He either was or is an officer of the National Press Club. Since the Press Club has a liquor license, the man with whom I spoke had to relate these facts to the authorities. He has never encountered any trouble when he told the truth.

I would not for one moment oppose the nomination of Mr. Morgan because he had been convicted of an assault of a rather minor character when he was 22 years of age, and because he had been arrested for stealing a tire.

Mr. SCOTT. And neither would I.

Mr. KEATING. I ask the Senator whether there would be any issue in the mind of the Senator if there had been disclosure.

Mr. SCOTT. If he had done so, there never would have been an issue with respect to the nomination on the Senate floor. I would never have spoken on this subject. It is my judgment that I would have had no difficulty in voting for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Howard Morgan. The point is not what he did as a very young man,

because, as I said at the beginning of my speech, we have all done things like those with which Mr. Morgan had been charged. Any man who rises and says that he is guiltless of wrongdoing is immediately and ought to be promptly suspect.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator, but do not cover too much territory.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not want to include crimes that are too large. I merely say that youthful offenses, such as a youthful fist fight, are not to be taken too seriously as long as truth is told. But we are considering the nomination of a man who seeks one of the highest positions in the country, and who has said that when he lied, he lied to suit his convenience.

Mr. KEATING. He knew that he was lying when he filled out the forms.

Mr. SCOTT. Page 52 of the hearings shows that he knew he was lying when he filled out the form. He has an excellent memory, but he is a master of his memory. He can so control his memory that when he does not want an incident in his mind currently, he can put it out of his mind.

A man like that, who must write an opinion for the Federal Power Commission, could write an opinion that is not properly justified by the law under the same specious reasoning that things are what I want them to be.

At times his testimony sounded something like the colloquy in "Alice in Wonderland"—

> "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

Mr. Morgan has a highly facile way of explaining, and a highly specious way of extenuating himself. At least he did more than the majority of the committee did. He said he was guilty. I yield the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have said about everything I care to say on this subject, but I believe in view of the very broad statement made by my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, to the effect that Mr. Morgan is a self-confessed liar and perjurer, I think that the record should not stand in that fashion.

Those who have spoken on the floor of the Senate in support of the confirmation of the nomination are absolutely convinced that Mr. Morgan was a very free, frank, and sincere witness before our committee. He answered every question that we asked him. Nothing appears in the record to indicate that Mr. Morgan admitted that he either lied or perjured himself. I wish that point clearly understood.

It is true that Mr. Morgan tried to explain those incidents because he considered them a great injustice had been done him at the time that he was taken into custody because of the tire misadventure. When he had a talk with the chief of police of Portland, Oreg., the chief had said that the record had been expunged. He felt at that time that insofar as he was concerned, he was being sincere and frank in the way he answered the questions on form 57. He made that point abundantly clear.

Mr. Morgan went so far as to say that his action may have been an error. Maybe he should have done it the other way. However, he said:

> As far as my motivation was concerned, I was doing nothing wrong.

When we talk about perjury, we must include the element of knowingly having committed the act.

I submit to Senators that motivation has a great deal to do with the subject. Members of the committee know that Mr. Morgan's neighbors, who testified in his behalf, are all convinced that he is not a liar or a perjurer. If any Senator wishes to make some other interpretation of the record, of course, he is welcome to do so. But I believe for the sake of the record and the responsibility that this man is about to assume, it behooves us not to cast a shadow of doubt over the integrity of this gentleman.

I suggest to Senators that they read the record. One can actually feel the sincerity on the part of this gentleman as he testified before our committee. At no point did he ever admit that he lied or committed perjury. If someone wishes to give the record any other interpretation, that is their business. But I think the record should be straight.

As far as I am concerned, I would be the last man to support a liar or a perjurer. I believe that my colleagues, all respectable and respected Senators, would not endorse a perjurer. I believe that they have come here and supported the committee report only because they feel that in this particular case, even though someone else might think that Morgan could have acted differently, Morgan himself was free of evil and had no motivation to deceive the Government when he filled out the form in the manner he did. I believe he convinced our committee of that fact and we gave him our support.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the able Senator from Rhode Island. I believe the Senate will confirm the nomination of Mr. Morgan. He will occupy a high post in Government service, and will make decisions that will affect hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's and industry's money. To leave the connotation unchallenged in the RECORD would have been a serious mistake. Therefore I commend the Senator from Rhode Island for his statement.

How ridiculous to contend in the Senate of the United States that this man in the slightest degree was a perjurer. How I would love to defend him in a court of law. What did he say in this case? On page 52 of the hearings Mr. Morgan said:

> I have always regarded this incident with a feeling somewhere between exasperation and mild outrage.

What incident? That someone arrested him to conduct an investigation to determine whether he should be held. Such arrest has no standing in law because it is an arrest without probable cause and, as a matter of fact, in law itself it is not an arrest. It is a technical holding for investigation to determine whether or not he shall be arrested and therefore legally detained. What sort of nonsense can we charge against a man of the great ability of Mr. Morgan? I hope the Senate will overwhelmingly confirm his nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be possible to reach a reasonable agreement concerning the amount of time needed to conclude debate on the Morgan nomination. The nomination has been under consideration since about 12:35 this afternoon.

I suggest that the debate now be limited to 10 minutes—8 minutes for the distinguished minority leader, and 2 minutes on this side of the aisle.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would raise two or three questions, and I will address them to either side for an answer. The first one is this: Is the record clear with respect to whether or not the nominee, whose nomination is now before the Senate, was charged and arrested as indicated in the record? I will take an answer from the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, or I will take an answer from the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield. Just make the answer short.

Mr. SCOTT. The nomineee admitted that he had been arrested for assault and battery and fighting. He made a certain explanation. He admitted that he had been arrested for the theft of a tire. He made a further explanation indicating he did not think he should have been arrested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is there agreement on that?

Mr. PASTORE. No; there is not agreement on that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not wish to get into a long discussion.

Mr. PASTORE. I know the Senator does not wish to get into a long debate, but I feel his misunderstanding should be corrected.

Morgan was not arrested on an assault charge at the time of the fracas. Two days after that he was summoned by a subpena to appear before a justice of the peace, and he was fined $25.

Mr. SCOTT. The only question is as to the word "arrest."

Mr. PASTORE. There is a difference between an arrest and being summoned before a court. One can be fined $25. That happens in civil cases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But he was arrested?

Mr. PASTORE. He was not; he was summoned to appear before a court. If we want to get technical, he was not arrested.

Mr. SCOTT. If a man stands before a judge, and the judge says, "The fine is $25," the man is in custody at that moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The second question is: What about the tire incident? I read the record. What was involved in the tire incident, quite aside from

motivation, because I am not interested, for the moment, in willfulness or intent or motivation. In the whole body of criminal law, that is inferred from the fact of arrest or custody.

Mr. PASTORE. He was taken into custody as a fugitive from justice and never charged with larceny.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When he filed the form 57, knowing these things had happened in his life, does the record show he failed, in response to the questions, to disclose this incident?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator's question cannot be answered as categorically as that. We have been arguing all afternoon on that point. We have a printed hearing which contains I do not know how many pages—almost a hundred pages. The question cannot be answered categorically in that way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But a question appears on the form 57.

Mr. PASTORE. Morgan answered the question in the negative. Then he explained his answer before our committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then does the Senator admit that notwithstanding the fact that those items appear in the record, when he answered that question, his answer was "No"?

Mr. PASTORE. His answer was "No."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It should be said that the taking into custody as a fugitive to determine whether he should be arrested was expunged from the police record by the chief of police on the ground that it never should have been put in the record in the first place. It was an administrative error.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is not what is asked on the form 57. There are certain words which are explicit, and anyone who has had a fifth-grade education can understand what the words mean.

We have here an admission that these things happened in the life of Mr. Morgan. I would not know Mr. Morgan if he were sitting in the gallery. I would be the last to do him an injustice.

But if it is admitted that those things happened, and if it is admitted—and it is—that he failed to make a correct response under oath on his form 57, then it seems to me that the basic problem to be resolved is: What shall we say to the thousands of people in the 50 States who file forms 57 every day, when they read an account of this proceeding in the U.S. Senate? Must they say, "Oh, you can lie on your form 57. You can tell a half truth. It will not hurt you. If it is not found out, you will get by. If you are found out, you will not be hurt anyway, except your reputation."

If the character is not here, then, of course, this becomes a matter of tremendous psychological importance in the approach of thousands of people who try to secure employment with the Government of the United States, and we cannot laugh off that consideration.

Once I asked Bob Taft why he voted to confirm the nomination of a certain person for high office.

He said:

> There is only one consideration that ever deters me from withholding my approval of a nomination sent to the Senate by the President, and that is if there is a weakness in the nominee's character and if the record shows fairly clearly that there has been mischief, malfeasance, wrongdoing, or something that indicates only too clearly that the nominee's character has a weakness.

And he added:

> I am not concerned about a man's viewpoint—about how extreme it may be or the extent to which his views differ from mine on matters of public policy. But when the character is not there, that is different.

And, Mr. President, in this case, notwithstanding all the explanations I have heard—and I have heard the remarks of Senators and I have read the record—I become quite sensitive to the fact that our action on this matter is going to have a tremendous influence upon the mental outlook and the approach of people who want to climb onto the Government payroll and wish to render service to the public.

So this matter involves more than Mr. Morgan; there are these other considerations.

If, in response to my questions, it is admitted that such a record does exist, I do not know what I can do except cast a "nay" vote—reluctant though I am to do it, believe me, because I know how easy it is to "put the finger" upon a fellow citizen, and to take an action from which he will not easily recover in his home community.

But there is also a responsibility to the public service, and that responsibility is before the Senate, for the very good reason that there is conferred upon this body the necessity of consenting to a nomination before the nominee may take his place on the Government's roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me say briefly—because I know that the Senator from Illinois is speaking in limited time—that we took all that into account.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the committee did.

Mr. PASTORE. Because it bothered us, too. The situation was an extraordinary one. We had the human element to consider, as well. We took all of that into account—the nominee's character, his integrity, and his performance in public life; and we wrestled with the problem most conscientiously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may continue for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concede everything the Senator from Rhode Island has said.

Mr. PASTORE. It is true that such action might set a precedent which later might rise to plague us. But on the basis of the facts, I believe we reached the correct decision; and we did so conscientiously and in endeavoring to the best of our ability to take action in the best interests of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the particular matters referred to may be minor in character, and may, in all kindness, be called indiscretions at some period in life; but certainly it is something more than an indiscretion when the nominee had a recollection of those matters, but, when he made the application for Government employment, withheld the truth.

Mr. President, beyond that, I have no more to say.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. After I addressed the Senate today, I went to the Senate gallery; and as I proceeded there, a lady spoke to me. I do not know who she was. But she said to me:

> I am a civil service employee, and I am not in politics. But if I were to lie on form 57, and if they fired me, could you, as a Senator, get my job back for me?

I replied, "No, I could not."

She said:

> Then there is one law for the little people, and there is another law for the big people.

That incident occurred at the door to the Senate Chamber, just after I finished speaking, earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have stated my position; and the yeas and nays have been ordered, and I am now prepared to vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was interested in what the Senator from Pennsylvania said about a woman civil service employee who spoke to him as he was going to the Senate gallery. That incident must have happened half an hour ago; and in view of the fact that it is now 5 o'clock, that must have happened not later than 4:30. Let me inquire why that civil service employee was not then on the job.

Mr. SCOTT. I hope the Senator will not attempt to have her punished.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course not; but I believe my question is a valid one.

Mr. SCOTT. My point is that if action of the sort referred to by a person nominated to serve in high office is to be condoned, we wonder what will happen to ordinary civil service employees who might become involved in such troubles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have every confidence in the Committee on Commerce, which reported this nomination. As a Senator from the Northwest, I report that I know Howard Morgan.

I realize that the committee took considerable time in considering the merits of Mr. Morgan for this most important position; and I know from talking with various members of the committee that the members of the committee did wrestle with their consciences. The committee was considering what action to take in regard to a human being; and

all of us are human beings who are called upon to make decisions.

Therefore, I express the hope that the Senate in its wisdom will recognize this particular factor, and will recognize the fact that no one in this Chamber is irreproachable; and will give this nominee, who has served his State and his country well and patriotically, an overwhelming vote of confidence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Howard Morgan, of Oregon, to be member of the Federal Power Commission?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORTON. On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. Were he present, he would vote "nay"; were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are detained on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has been previously announced.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 27, as follows:

[Exec. 1]

YEAS—57

Anderson	Hickey	Moss
Bartlett	Hill	Muskie
Bible	Holland	Neuberger
Burdick	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pell
Cannon	Johnston	Proxmire
Carroll	Kefauver	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Robertson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Russell
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Long, La.	Sparkman
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	McClellan	Talmadge
Fulbright	McGee	Thurmond
Gore	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—27

Aiken	Cotton	Kuchel
Allott	Curtis	Miller
Beall	Dirksen	Mundt
Bennett	Dworshak	Prouty
Boggs	Fong	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Scott
Carlson	Hruska	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Keating	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—16

Blakley	Church	McCarthy
Bridges	Ellender	Morton
Bush	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Butler	Hartke	Wiley
Byrd, Va.	Jordan	
Chavez	Kerr	

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 212.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold C. Doyle, of South Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted unanimously by the Yankton County Bar Association relative to the nomination of Mr. Doyle.

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

"Whereas a member of the Yankton County Bar Association, Mr. Harold C. Doyle, a former State's attorney for Yankton County, S. Dak., is presently under consideration for appointment as U.S. district attorney for the district of South Dakota; and

"Whereas it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the Yankton County Bar Association that Mr. Doyle is a capable attorney whose character is beyond reproach and that he conducted the office of State's attorney for Yankton County ably and efficiently: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Yankton County Bar Association, having full faith and confidence in the integrity and ability of Mr. Harold C. Doyle and particularly in his ability to conduct the office of U.S. district attorney for the district of South Dakota in a manner that will bring credit to himself, the Yankton County Bar Association and the legal profession, endorse the candidacy and recommend the appointment of Mr. Doyle to the office of U.S. district attorney for the district of South Dakota."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Yankton County Bar Association held in the courtroom of the county court in the Yankton County Courthouse, Yankton, S. Dak., the 21st day of March, A.D. 1961.

LEE H. COPE,
President,
Yankton County Bar Association.

Attest:

DON A. BIERLE,
Secretary,
Yankton County Bar Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the arrest today of an American Foreign Service officer for transmitting classified information to the Polish Government underscores once again the need for continued vigilance against the international Communist conspiracy. Naturally, no conclusion regarding his guilt should be drawn until this man has had every opportunity which is given in our country—and denied in Communist countries—for a fair trial and a full opportunity to present evidence in his own behalf.

However, we must never forget that the Communists are working 24 hours a day, 365 days a year to carry out their

program of world domination. It is therefore incumbent on all Americans, if they cherish their freedom and independence, to keep on their guard and to report all incidents which may be related to subversive purposes.

This particular arrest shows the need for the closest possible surveillance of Government employees involved in security work.

It is related in another news account today that a junior Foreign Service officer in the American Embassy in Warsaw has resigned. This officer for a year and a half had access to the Embassy code room. It is alleged that he subscribed to the Communist Daily Worker newspaper and had an affinity for Communist causes and ideas. These facts were known; nevertheless this man had access for this period of time to the code room.

Again I would not draw any final conclusions as to his guilt. But it does seem unusual that anyone who is known to have such inclinations would have access to our codes.

Careful checks and clearances must precede the hiring of Federal personnel, and constant vigilance must be maintained over those who are dealing with matters affecting our national security.

It is the very essence of the Communist technique to get one of their agents on the inside and then work more of their people in. Communism is like a cancer, which feeds on apathy and spreads when unopposed. I hope this latest incident in the cold war will stir the American people to redoubled determination to remain free, and will result in greater alertness to the clear and present danger of the Communist conspiracy. The FBI is to be congratulated for another fine effort, but close cooperation by all of us will be needed if their continued antisubversive activities are to be successful.

MRS. CORNELIA FALES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 333, H.R. 2972.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2972) for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2972) for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after "$10,000", to insert "less the amount of the unpaid premiums that would have been payable had the national service life insurance issued to her brother, the late Sam E. Seager, effective October 24, 1942, been kept in force to the time of the death of the insured. This payment shall be in full settlement of all the claims of the said Mrs. Cornelia Fales against the United States for payment of the proceeds of the said national service life insurance issued to her brother (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC-3466817).", and on page 2, line 4 after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of the said Mrs. Cornelia Fales against the United States for payment of the proceeds of the national service life insurance issued to her brother, the late Sam E. Seager (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC-3466817), effective October 24, 1942."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short statement explaining the bill.

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

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Mrs. Cornelia Fales, of Metropolitan State Hospital, Waltham, Mass., the sum of $10,000, less the amount of the unpaid premiums that would have been payable had the national service life insurance policy been kept in force, such payment to be in full settlement of all claims she may have against the United States for payment of the proceeds of national service life insurance issued to her brother, the late Sam E. Seager.

The facts in this case are that Sam E. Seager, deceased brother of the claimant, enlisted in the U.S. Army September 16, 1942, and on October 24, 1942, he applied for and was granted $10,000 national service life insurance effective October 1, 1942, the premiums in the amount of $7.40, being paid for by a monthly allotment.

On October 26, 1942, the serviceman was transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and by reason of this transfer his allotment was discontinued effective September 30, 1942, The insurance lapsed due to the nonpayment of premiums November 1, 1942, and the grace period expired December 2, 1942. Due to the nonpayment of premiums the insurance was considered as not in force on the date of the veteran's death on February 10, 1944.

The report of the Veterans' Administration on a similar bill of the 86th Congress, H.R. 6215, discloses that the veteran made inquiry as to the status of his insurance and indicated his desire to keep his national service life insurance effective. It appears, however, that he was erroneously advised by the Army that he was not eligible for Government insurance, whereas, in fact, although his policy had lapsed, he was eligible to have the insurance reinstated. It cannot be determined, of course, whether he would have reinstated the insurance had he been properly advised, but in view of his inquiry and statement of intent it may be assumed that he would have taken the necessary steps to reinstate his insurance.

The claimant was designated by the serviceman as his principal beneficiary, and his other sister, Beatrice Field Sanderson, was named contingent beneficiary.

The Veterans' Administration stated that because of the Government's error there was no objection to the favorable consideration of the relief legislation.

The committee believes it reasonable to assume that were it not for the erroneous advice of the Army, the claimant would have been the beneficiary under the policy in full force and effect on the date of the death of the insured. Had this been the case, premiums would have been payable throughout the life of the insured, hence it is only proper that the amount of the unpaid premiums be deducted from the payment provided for in this legislation. The committee has amended the bill to that end and recommends that the bill, as amended, be given favorable consideration.

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

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

The bill (H.R. 2972) was read the third time and passed.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO REPORT NOMINATIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be authorized to report nominations during the adjournment following today's session of the Senate.

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

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

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. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report, and I wish to discuss it briefly.

The report is signed by all the conferees on the part of the House and of the Senate, and the report has been accepted by the House of Representatives.

In regard to the net money figures in the bill, the new total, as agreed to in conference, is $893,947,750, which is $14 million more than was provided in the bill as passed by the Senate. Mr. President, the total is some $60 million less than the amount requested. To find items which can be reduced in a bill of this nature is exceedingly difficult.

There are two changes among the many items of the bill that account for most of the increase referred to. First, I should like to mention the fact that subsequent to the approval of the bill by both Houses of Congress, both of the Committees on Armed Services received requests from the Secretary of Defense to provide an additional $12 million in authorization for the Department of the Air Force to be used for the construction of test facilities for its large solid propellant booster in connection with our Nation's space effort. This project was included by the President in his address to Congress on May 25, at which date he stressed the importance attached to increased efforts in our space program. This authorization is merely a token allowance of the total cost of the program proposed, and it only provides for the design and site preparation and the first increment of the construction of test facilities related to this large solid propellant motor which it is proposed to construct with a thrust in the order of 2 or 3 million pounds. That thrust would be greater than the thrust of any motor that is now being used in the space field of which we have any knowledge. The construction required to support the program will be phased over several years, and when these rocket motors are successfully developed, they will be made available by the Department of Defense to NASA for a moon vehicle and for such other Department of Defense requirements as might develop.

In view of the importance attached to this item by the administration, the conferees agreed to include it in the bill. Such action is bad practice ordinarily, but this project is important and it was so strongly stressed by the administration that we deviated from our usual policy and included it in the bill in conference.

The other item that merits special mention is the military family housing program. It will be recalled that after a considerable discussion on the floor of the Senate, that in lieu of certain Capehart housing units that were included in the housing bill, the Senate provided 2,000 units of appropriated funds housing at an average cost of $16,500 per unit. The conferees agreed to an increased unit cost by $800 to provide for additional expenses involved in site acquisition and off-site utilities.

Such action is consistent with the current cost limitations on Capehart housing, since the law currently allows up to $1,000 a unit of appropriated funds for land acquisition and on-site utilities in connection with the Capehart program. This increase added an additional $1,600,000 to the bill.

The conferees were in agreement as to discontinuing the Capehart program as it exists under present law, but in view of the emergency that exists, we did allow 3,000 units of housing that had been previously authorized by line item to be constructed under the Capehart program.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The able Senator from Georgia will remember that the junior Senator from Colorado, at the time this issue was before the Senate, discussed the situation at Lowry Field in Denver. We considered it an emergency. Approximately 100 units were provided in 1959 and 100 units in 1960. We had asked for some consideration because of the preliminary planning. Would the able Senator from Georgia say that that housing would be in the nature of an emergency and within the 3,000 units?

Mr. RUSSELL. There are 3,000 units provided, 2,700 of which are subject to allocation by the Department of Defense. The conferees allocated 300 units, but there are 2,700 units of Capehart housing and 500 units of appropriated funds housing that would be available to meet emergencies and subject to allocation by the Secretary of Defense. The emergency that the Senator had in mind should be called to their attention, because there will be available the 3,200 units of housing of both types that may be allocated for such emergency.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Georgia, because it was because of the emergency of which I have spoken that we urged, and I am sure the conferees considered, the building of 3,000 units.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Colorado discussed the subject with the Senator from Georgia not only on the floor of the Senate but earnestly in private conversation. At that time I told the Senator it was altogether likely that we would not be able to get our way entirely in conference, but there would be a small amount of so-called Capehart housing available. So there are 3,200 units of both types of housing available for allocation by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it can be seen from this relatively small increase in the amount originally approved by the Senate that in most part the Senate amendments were accepted and agreed to by the conference.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I say with the greatest respect that I think the conference report has made a most grievous and regrettable error. The U.S. Navy recommended authorization for a new military hospital in the Long Beach area to serve our men in uniform stationed there, together with their dependents. The Bureau of the Budget under the present administration recommended the hospital to Congress. The House of Representatives approved it. The members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, each of whom I esteem, did not feel that the hospital was justified. And here, I believe, they made an error.

I have been in the Senate long enough to realize full well that Senators reach their conclusion on the basis of their own honest judgment. My real regret is that my colleagues serving under the able chairmanship of my friend from Georgia were unable to accede to the request of the administration and the Navy Department in this instance, and that the hospital authorization is not included in the bill.

I wish to say, however, that I know of the particular care with which my friend from Georgia judges each of the items that are recommended to the committee.

Having made that statement, may I ask the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia whether or not he can give any indication of his views with respect to any subsequent request along the same lines by the Navy Department and the Bureau of the Budget of this administration with respect to the authorization of a military hospital in the Long Beach area which, I say with respect, would be in the interest of the military personnel and their families who serve on land and at sea in the southern California area.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, again I say that the two hospitals that were taken from the bill by the Senate committee in the first instance have caused me more concern than any of the other items in the bill. If I err on the side of generosity, I usually try to err in providing hospitals and medical aid for the people in our armed services and their dependents.

There is no doubt in my mind that a naval hospital is justified at that location. I do have grave doubts as to there being a requirement for a hospital of the size suggested at that location. The plan that was submitted to us was for a 500-bed hospital which cost almost $9 million. Of course there is available at San Diego, which is not too far from Long Beach, a hospital with 1,750 beds.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is a matter of a hundred miles in distance.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. There are other facilities available. Hospital facilities are available at Camp Pendleton, for example. There is a hospital there which has a capacity of 600 beds. Neither of those hospitals is full at all times. There is also an Army hospital facility of limited size, and there is, of course, within the corporate limits of Long Beach, a hospital ship, anchored in the harbor, which provides hospital facilities, although they are not modern, and although they should be replaced, of some 250 or 300 beds. The time is coming when we shall have to build a hospital at Long Beach. However, I wonder whether the Senator has read the statement of the managers on the part of the House on this subject. I read:

A number of medical facilities requested by the individual military departments were not approved by the conferees. Certain of these medical facilities were denied authorization because of a serious question as to their relative priority in the Defense Establishment. Therefore, the conferees requested the Department of Defense to make a thorough study of hospital facilities of the Armed Forces, especially in those areas where new hospitals, or substantial additions to existing hospitals, were required to determine the respective priorities for fulfilling the essential needs for hospital facilities for individuals entitled to medical care at Armed Forces medical facilities. These stated prior-

ities should then be reflected in the departmental requests for medical facilities in the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1963.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from California that it was unfortunate that the subject should be presented to us in the manner in which it was. I did not think that the proponents made a very impressive case for a hospital of this size.

Again I assure the Senator from California—and I am sure I speak for the entire committee—that we will give sympathetic consideration next year to any proposal that is put forward in this regard. Frankly, I hope that the Navy Department will find that they can get along with a somewhat smaller facility.

The Senator referred to the distance of 100 miles. That is no distance at all now in the evacuation of people for illness in the Navy, with the helicopters that the Navy has. They could use a couple of helicopters in moving people from Long Beach to the facility at San Diego or at Pendleton. There is no need for trying to convey the people over crowded highways in ambulances. They could take them up in helicopters several at a time. The persons who need hospitalization could be taken by helicopter to these facilities in the event that they could not be taken care of by the facilities provided by the hospital ship or by the Army facility——

Mr. KUCHEL. The Fort MacArthur hospital.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the Army hospital. There is no attempt to exclude the construction of this hospital from consideration in the future. As I said at the outset, I believe we will have to build a naval hospital at Long Beach, but I hope that it will not be of this magnitude and at the great expense that was suggested. I have not even enumerated all the hospital facilities that are available in the area at other military establishments. I can assure the Senator that it was quite a painful item for me to deal with, not only because of my friendship for the Senator from California, but also because of the affection I have for some very close personal friends who have a great interest in this item.

Mr. KUCHEL. I know that, and I appreciate it. There is no one in the Senate who arrives at opinions more meticulously than the Senator from Georgia. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank my good friend. I know I make some mistakes, but I try to limit them to mistakes of judgment as nearly as possible.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not want to take too much time of the Senator. However, the hospitals which he has enumerated as being available, while a relevant factor in the discussion, are not an adequate answer. I say that, too, respectfully. The Senator knows that the city of Long Beach has become one of the Nation's great naval centers for commissioned craft. The 11th Naval District has its headquarters at San Diego. There is a great installation, both shore based and afloat, to be serviced in that area.

Camp Pendleton, the great Marine Corps establishment, in the vicinity of San Diego, is considerably nearer to San Diego than is Long Beach. Of course that facility would overflow if we were to be confronted with an emergency condition requiring complete activation of Camp Pendleton.

Mr. RUSSELL. We cannot build hospital facilities for emergencies. If we did, we would have to construct hospitals with tens of thousands of beds. We may have to give thought to that at some time, but now we are trying to provide hospitals to meet the needs which will arise in the normal course of things. Even in a limited emergency, so far as this country being attacked is concerned, as in 1952, we have had to reopen a number of services that had been constructed in 1944 and 1945. We were compelled to build several that had some 75,000 or 80,000 beds during World War II, which were later closed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator for indicating that he and his committee would give sympathetic consideration to a subsequent request by the appropriate agencies. For the military and their families, I am grateful.

Mr. RUSSELL. We invited a review and a report next year on this item.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Georgia has so ably stated. Our committee gave this one hospital more consideration than we did almost any other hospital. We finally came to the balance that there were a number of other places where we ought to build medical facilities rather than expand the facility at Long Beach.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator from Massachusetts join in the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Georgia, indicating that a subsequent request by the Navy Department for a hospital, backed by the Bureau of the Budget, would receive "sympathetic consideration"?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would in my own right and on my own intelligent judgment in any event, but I certainly know I will because of the words of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glod to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, who is one of the great experts in military construction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The chairman of the committee has stressed the consideration that was given to the Capehart housing program. As an illustration of the problems that we face in connection with this item, there is currently pending before the Committee on Armed Services a request to approve acquisition, in the vicinity of Philadelphia, for $500,000, 27 acres of land for a Capehart housing project. I have advised the clerk of the committee that this seems to be an exorbitant price. It would figure out to between $19,000 and $20,000 an acre. Personally, I would not want to approve of it without hearings and investigation. Therefore, I have said to the clerk of the committee that I hope he will put a stop order, so to speak, on it until the committee can give it further consideration. I mention the matter at this time to illustrate the way in which some of the costs of Capehart housing do not appear in the contract for the actual construction.

To this, I think, anyone will agree. The proposal to pay up to practically $20,000 an acre for this housing project warrants further examination, and I trust that the limited amount of Capehart units authorized in the conference agreement will not be expended upon the Philadelphia Navy Yard project until the committee has had an ample opportunity to look into this land acquisition proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for bringing the matter to the attention of the entire Senate. I am certain that it will be very carefully looked into, to see if the cost is not excessive. It is a staggering amount to one who comes from a rural area such as that in which I live; but I realize that near the great cities the price of land sometimes assumes fantastic proportions.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the chairman of the committee, to have printed in the RECORD before the vote is taken a statement with respect to my disappointment and the disappointment of the people of Utah because the committee and the conference have deleted an item of $7.3 million for the construction of an air munitions surveillance facility to be located at Hill Air Force Range, Utah. I recognize that this is an accomplished fact; nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, together with the two letters , be printed at the conclusion of the statement of the chairman.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has been exceedingly diligent in bringing the merits of this project to the attention of the committee. The committee has given it the most careful consideration. We have endeavored as much as possible to prevent the construction of any facility, if any possible way could be found to avoid it. We therefore felt it was well to carry over for another year the item of the Hill Air Force Range. I emphasize the word "range" to distinguish it from Hill Air Force Base, because the committee was very generous with the Air Force base and provided for it to the extent which was requested.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah recognizes the distinction. The range, if it had been approved, would have been used for the conducting of static tests on the solid fuel missiles which are being constructed at Hill Air Force Base.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true; but the committee is still convinced that that activity can be carried out at Edwards Air Force Base. We have made no final decision. We have passed it over for a year, because we desire the Department of Defense to review the proposal again.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah desires to have the RECORD show his concern and his hope that the usefulness of the test facility at or near Hill Air Force Base, and not at Edwards, not be overlooked.

EXHIBIT I

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I am very much concerned about the action taken by the conferees on the Military Construction Authorization Bill, in deleting an item of $7.3 million for construction of an air munitions surveillance facility to be located at Hill Air Force Range, Utah.

This test site facility was requested for the specific purpose of accomplishing Air Force Logistic Command air munitions surveillance functions for all solid propellants in the Air Force inventory not capable of being tested on Hill Air Force Base due to safety restrictions. Prior to the development of large solid propellant rockets such as the Minuteman, the 2705th Airmunitions Surveillance Wing had been conducting surveillance tests on solid propellant munitions at Hill Air Force Base, Utah. Tests on smaller weapons such as the Skybolt, Bomarc, Bull Pup, Hound Dog, Genie, Falcon, and Jato Bottles have been conducted on the base for the past 4 years, but a recent accident clearly illustrated that future tests cannot be safely tested within the confines of the base. Thus, the necessity for a remote test site where large explosive masses can be tested is an urgent necessity.

During static test firings, high frequency sound waves, detonations and air-ground shock waves are generated which are intolerable to a civilian community. Explosive masses of the size of the Minuteman are capable of considerable destruction. At the Hill Air Force Range site, it is intended in the course of testing to intentionally subject the Minuteman and other weapons to stresses outside normally specified limits of heat, cold, etc., to determine safety factors in storage, transportation and shelf life of these weapon systems. Firing of rocket engines suspected of physical or chemical deterioration is also anticipated, thereby creating a hazardous situation manifestly more dangerous than is encountered in normal firings.

Because of the foregoing factors, it is considered essential by the Air Force, and this position is amply fortified by the Secretary of Defense, that the test site be located as far from populated areas as practical considerations would permit. Many sites were carefully considered and evaluated during the site selection process, before the Air Force concluded that the Hill Air Force Range in Utah offered the best possible solution to the problem of air munition surveillance of solid fuel rockets.

Consequently, I was shocked and surprised when I read the report of the Senate Armed Service Committee, and now the conference report relating to the military construction authorization bill, to find that this item, so essential to our missile program, is deleted from the bill. The deletion of this item clearly indicates that either the conferees did not understand the critical nature of this air munitions surveillance program, or that they are willing to assume the calculated risk of further delays in our ICBM program.

I have asked unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated March 29, 1961, which was sent by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, reaffirming the need for the facilities at the Hill Air Force Base Range, and certifying to the fact that no other facilities are available for this testing and that the work to be accomplished cannot be done at Edwards Air Force Base or anywhere else as economically and as efficiently as at the site selected in Utah. The letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to your letter of March 18, 1961, I have reviewed the factors which led the Air Force to decide on Hill Air Force Range as the site for surveillance of large explosives. I am satisfied that the decision is sound.

The proposal does not establish a new test center and does not duplicate existing facilities. The requested facilities will permit extension of the present Hill Air Force Base mission to explosives weighing 500 pounds or more which are too large to be fired safely on the base. The large solid propellant engines of Minuteman, in terms of safety criteria, are categorized as explosives, and should be under the cognizance of the personnel stationed at Hill Air Force Base who have been engaged in the surveillance of explosives for years. The site selected provides the necessary safety, yet is close enough to permit utilization of the surveillance technicians of Hill Air Force Base. Surveillance technicians are scarce.

Air Force surveys indicate that no other location can accommodate the mission of surveillance of large weapons without expenditures equal to or larger than those recommended for the Hill complex. With specific regard to Edwards Air Force Base, there is little similarity between the research and development activities performed there and activities to be performed at Hill Air Force Base in connection with the surveillance testing. Surveillance testing such as at Hill Air Force Base normally involves a scheduled long-range plan of inspection activities terminating in a test firing. Research and development activities such as at Edwards Air Force Base, by their very nature, move at an unpredictable pace which precludes joint use of such facilities as firing stands without detriment to each program. The Edwards complex is solely concerned with the research and development associated with missiles, fuels, and propellants. Edwards Air Force Base does not have the facilities to do long-range surveillance testing. These facilities constitute the greatest portion of the construction costs. Further, Air Force research and development programs saturate the capability of Edwards Air Force Base well beyond the period when surveillance facilities are needed.

If these facilities were to be provided at Edwards Air Force Base, additional personnel would be required. The physical separation between Edwards and Hill Air Force Bases would dictate a permanent party of surveillance personnel at Edwards Air Force Base. Also, logistic support personnel would have to be provided for the split operation.

I strongly urge approval of these projects for the Hill Air Force Range as submitted by the Air Force.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

It seems to me there may have been some confusion in the minds of the members of the Armed Services Committee concerning the possibility of using other facilities for this weapon surveillance program. For instance, statements in both the hearings and reports indicate that some members mistakenly thought the facilities planned for Hill Air Force Range were identical to R. & D. testing facilities at Edwards Air Force Base, which they are not; or that liquid surveillance facilities could be interchangeably used for testing on solid propellant weapons, which the Air Force says is impossible because of the many differences between these two types of rockets.

Likewise, it would appear that the conferees, in writing the conference report we now have before us, were uncertain about the difference between research and development facilities, and the air munitions surveillance site as requested at Hill Air Force Base Range. They wrote into the report the following language which begins at the top of page 31:

"In this connection, the conferees wish to call attention to the fact that the $12 million authorization especially requested by the Secretary of Defense for the construction of facilities necessary for the testing of solid fuel propellants should preclude the development of similar type facilities requested by the Air Force at the Hill Air Force Base Range, Utah, which appear to be basically for the same purpose."

Both the Secretary of the Air Force and the Deputy Secretary of Defense have given me assurance that these two projects are dissimilar and that there is no overlap of functions. However, in the interest of cooperation and to avoid any further delay in our vital missile program, I have written a letter to the Secretary of Defense urging that he give immediate consideration to locating the new solid fuel static test facility at the Hill Air Force Range site and combine it with the air munitions surveillance facility previously planned for this Utah location. I hope this will solve the dilemma and that the members of both the House and Senate Armed Service Committees will see the wisdom in this action. Since such matters as planning, surveying and site acquisition have been completed on the Utah project, construction could go ahead as soon as authorization and funds are provided.

My letter to the Secretary of Defense is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY MCNAMARA: It was with deep regret that I learned today that the conferees on the Military Construction Authorization bill had eliminated the ammunition surveillance facilities requested for Hill Air Force Range, Utah. This was especially disappointing inasmuch as this project had been certified as essential both by your office and by the Secretary of the Air Force. This decision also contravenes the policy of the President as stated in his special message to Congress on May 25, for an accelerated program to develop solid fuel rockets for space exploration.

As you are well aware, the Hill Air Force Range had been carefully planned and all other existing facilities eliminated as capable of performing the vital mission of surveillance testing on the Minuteman and other weapon systems. Consequently, I cannot understand why the conferees eliminated this project unles they failed to appreciate its importance, or the insurmountable problems which will be encountered if this air munitions surveillance program is moved to another location. Consequently, I hope you will use the prestige of your office to get this project restored, authorized and funds appropriated for its construction at an early date.

It was heartening to note that the conference report does give you discretionary authority for constructing $27 million of new facilities deemed to be vitally essential to defense needs. It is my understanding this

discretionary fund may be used in part for constructing the $12 million solid fuel static test facilities requested by the President to accelerate development of superboosters for the space program, and which was announced by Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric earlier this week.

Since the feasibility studies and planning on the Hill Air Force Range have already been completed I urge you to give serious consideration to locating the new solid fuel static testing facilities at this site. Although the facilities planned for the Hill Air Force Range were originally intended primarily for Minuteman and other ammunition surveillance and not for research and development purposes, it would seem logical, in view of the action of the conference committee, to combine these two facilities into one project and thus avoid any delay in providing these vital testing facilities. Since the companies which produce both the first and third stages of the Minuteman are located in Utah, and will undoubtedly play a vital role in producing rockets for the stepped-up space program, it is likewise logical that these testing facilities be readily available to these contractors and that the Air Force have the advice and counsel of scientists and engineers who are to produce these rockets. Hill Air Force Base is the site for both assembly and maintenance on the Minuteman, and is the home base of the 2705th Airmunitions Surveillance Wing which has the ordnance experts for testing, checking, and firing not only rockets but all other types of air munitions.

If the new static test facilities are located in any other State, it will be at the expense of discarding all planning on the Hill Air Force Range, and will be most inconvenient to the sources where these superrockets will be produced, assembled, and maintained. In addition, the locating of this facility at any other site will greatly increase the cost of this project and will leave the Air Force without the air munitions surveillance facilities which are so vitally needed. In the interest of time, money, and above all the good of the Nation and our defense program, I hope you will give immediate and favorable consideration to my suggestion for locating the new static test facilities at the Hill Air Force Range site and combining it with the air munitions facilities previously planned for this location.

Sincerely,

WALLACE F. BENNETT.

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

The report was agreed to.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 335, H.R. 6713.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works without amendment and subsequently reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the highway tax bill is now the pending business. However, tomorrow, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the bill will be laid aside, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Joseph Swidler to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1961

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, since the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 is now the pending business, I desire, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works which deals with Federal highway construction, to make a statement on the bill.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 authorized a new and enlarged Federal-aid highway program, one which will rank among the greatest peacetime construction programs of all time.

It was the culmination of many years of Federal interest and support in the development of an interstate network of highways in the Nation.

It continued the cooperative effort that has evolved during the life of the Federal-aid highway program since 1916.

That act recognized the Federal responsibility for the early completion of a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, a 41,000-mile system of highways of greatest importance to the Nation.

It provided that the Federal Government contribute 90 percent of the cost of this segment of our highway system.

The act authorized over a 13-year period—1957 through 1969—Federal funds totaling $25 billion, which, with State matching funds, was estimated to be sufficient to complete construction of the entire system as then designated.

Financing provisions were included in the act to finance the program over the period from fiscal years 1957 through 1972.

The Interstate System is a most important segment of the Nation's highway system.

Comprising about 1.5 percent of the highway mileage, it carries about 20 percent of the highway traffic.

It connects, as directly as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, serves the national defense; and connects with routes of continental importance in Canada and Mexico.

It will link together more than 90 percent of the cities having populations in excess of 50,000 and will connect most of the State capitals, as well as many smaller cities and towns.

It will serve well over half of the rural population of the United States.

The highway system is one of the principal bases for the economic growth of our country, including the enlargement of our industrial pace, the development of our natural resources, and the revitalization of our cities.

It is an extremely important link of our production lines, in the current pattern of plant location and dispersal, in our changing modes of living and work, and the dynamic changes taking place in urban and suburban development.

Our expanding economy is definitely tied to highway development, and our entire population is so dependent on motor transportation, that a flexible and convenient system of adequate and safe highways is essential.

The Interstate System when completed is expected to save at least 4,000 lives annually, reduce personal injuries by 150,000, and cut economic losses by $2.1 billion annually, by reduction in damages and savings in time, mileage, and cost of transportation.

The completion of the Interstate by 1972, as contemplated by the 1956 act, is essential to the economy of our Nation, because of its contribution to our security, safety, and growth.

Furthermore, the States and the construction industry are geared to the authorized program; and a cutback or slowdown in the program at this time would produce an adverse effect on the economy.

Delay in completion of the System beyond the designated period would also constitute a loss of the fight against mounting traffic needs.

House bill 6713 will provide the final authorization for completion of the Interstate System on schedule; and its enactment is believed essential.

Title I of H.R. 6713 will authorize a firm program of annual appropriations to the States, based on the most recent estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System.

Title I was reported by the Committee on Public Works as it passed the House of Representatives—without amendment.

The provisions of title I are:

First, it gives the approval of Congress to the estimate of cost for completing the Interstate System, to be used as a basis for making to the States the apportionments of the funds authorized for the Interstate System for fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966.

This estimate of cost was transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Commerce on January 11, 1961, and is published as House Document No. 49, 87th Congress.

Second, it authorizes the appropriation of additional amounts of $11.56 billion for completing the Interstate System as originally contemplated by the Congress.

Third, it amends the present law relating to the use for parking purposes of the airspace above and below the gradeline of the Interstate System by a State or other political subdivision.

It permits such airspace to be used for other purposes, as well, so long as such use will not impair the full use and safety of the highway or otherwise interfere in any way with the free flow of traffic on the Interstate System.

The interstate highway program is on schedule, in relation to the revenues now available in the highway trust fund. Almost 11,000 miles of the Interstate System are now open to traffic.

In addition, almost 5,000 miles are under construction with interstate

funds; and engineering or right-of-way acquisition is in progress on another 10,000 miles.

Thus, some form of work is underway, or is completed, on over 62 percent of the total mileage designated on the System.

While this large program is underway on the Interstate System, it still does not permit the rate of advancement necessary to complete the system by 1972, as originally contemplated.

The new 1961 Interstate System cost estimate of $41 billion, of which $37 billion is the estimated Federal share, is the same total amount as was contained in the 1958 estimate.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 authorized the completion of the Interstate System, with the Federal share of $25 billion, based on preliminary estimates of cost prepared in 1955.

H.R. 6713 includes an increased authorization of $11.56 billion needed to complete the Interstate System on schedule.

The authorizations for the fiscal years 1963 through 1969 are increased by varying amounts, and new authorizations are included for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

Interstate funds authorized for the fiscal year 1962 have been apportioned to the States.

Funds authorized for the fiscal year 1963 should be apportioned during the summer of this year. This cannot be done until the cost estimate is approved by the Congress, for use as the basis for making apportionments.

It is felt that the latest estimate of cost for completing the Interstate System is sound and reasonable, and should be approved by the Congress as a basis for making apportionments to the States.

H.R. 6713 will accomplish this purpose; and prompt enactment of the measure is recommended.

Mr. President, I submit several tables, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Relationship of 1955, 1958, and 1961 Interstate System cost estimates

[In billions]

Item	Estimated costs		
	Total	Federal share	State share
1955 estimate	$27.6	$25.0	$2.6
5 percent increase due traffic	1.3	1.2	.1
15 percent increase due local needs	3.8	3.4	.4
3 percent increase due utilities and miscellaneous	.8	.7	.1
12 percent increase due price increase	4.1	3.6	.5
Subtotal, 1958 estimate	37.6	33.9	3.7
Increase due 1,452 miles added routes	1.6	1.5	.1
Carryover and contingency	.7	.6	.1
Total to complete a 40,000-mile system, based on 1958 estimate	39.9	36.0	3.9
Additional 1,000 miles	1.1	1.0	.1
Total to complete a 41,000-mile system, based on 1958 estimate	41.0	37.0	4.0

Relationship of 1955, 1958, and 1961 Interstate System cost estimates—Continued

[In billions]

Item	Estimated costs		
	Total	Federal share	State share
Reduction in 1961 construction cost estimate	$−1.0	$−.9	$−.1
State highway planning and research	.6	.5	.1
Public roads, administration and research	.4	.4	0
Total, 1961 estimate	41.0	37.0	4.0

Estimated Federal aid and State matching costs to complete the system apportionment factors for fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966

State	Costs	Apportionment factors
	Thousands	*Percent*
Alabama	$531,804	2.089
Alaska		
Arizona	361,065	1.418
Arkansas	269,051	1.057
California	2,458,512	9.656
Colorado	340,942	1.339
Connecticut	363,097	1.426
Delaware	95,785	.376
Florida	533,542	2.095
Georgia	473,971	1.861
Hawaii	201,931	.793
Idaho	120,808	.474
Illinois	1,341,230	5.268
Indiana	636,720	2.501
Iowa	325,315	1.278
Kansas	199,335	.783
Kentucky	524,450	2.060
Louisiana	742,667	2.917
Maine	121,489	.477
Maryland	471,160	1.850
Massachusetts	550,889	2.164
Michigan	1,001,825	3.935
Minnesota	665,145	2.612
Mississippi	312,552	1.227
Missouri	657,616	2.583
Montana	240,557	.945
Nebraska	150,309	.590
Nevada	129,598	.509
New Hampshire	115,257	.453
New Jersey	670,466	2.663
New Mexico	256,695	1.008
New York	1,218,298	4.785
North Carolina	210,349	.826
North Dakota	113,654	.446
Ohio	1,754,753	6.892
Oklahoma	309,330	1.215
Oregon	446,577	1.754
Pennsylvania	1,150,087	4.517
Rhode Island	94,840	.372
South Carolina	221,927	.872
South Dakota	168,869	.663
Tennessee	647,931	2.545
Texas	1,163,335	4.569
Utah	372,224	1.462
Vermont	177,533	.697
Virginia	781,454	3.069
Washington	535,893	2.105
West Virginia	387,095	1.520
Wisconsin	227,344	.893
Wyoming	246,846	.969
District of Columbia	369,793	1.452
Total	25,461,915	100.000

Table of apportionment factors

State	Apportionment factors, fiscal years 1960–62 (1958 estimate)	Apportionment factors, fiscal years 1963–66 (1961 estimate)	Percent change
Alabama	1.972	2.089	+5.9
Arizona	1.366	1.418	+3.8
Arkansas	.993	1.057	+6.4
California	10.162	9.656	−5.0
Colorado	.775	1.339	+72.8
Connecticut	1.220	1.426	+16.9
Delaware	.352	.376	+6.8
Florida	2.591	2.095	−19.1
Georgia	2.413	1.861	−22.9
Hawaii		.793	
Idaho	.690	.474	−31.3
Illinois	5.128	5.268	+2.7
Indiana	2.884	2.501	−13.3

Table of apportionment factors—Continued

State	Apportionment factors, fiscal years 1960–62 (1958 estimate)	Apportionment factors, fiscal years 1963–66 (1961 estimate)	Percent change
Iowa	.949	1.278	+34.7
Kansas	895	.783	−12.5
Kentucky	1.758	2.060	+17.2
Louisiana	2.641	2.917	+10.5
Maine	.514	.477	−7.2
Maryland	2.253	1.850	−17.9
Massachusetts	2.785	2.164	−22.3
Michigan	3.930	3.935	+.1
Minnesota	1.885	2.612	+38.6
Mississippi	1.098	1.227	+11.7
Missouri	2.853	2.583	−9.5
Montana	1.137	.945	−16.9
Nebraska	.617	.590	−4.4
Nevada	.523	.509	−2.7
New Hampshire	.550	.453	−17.6
New Jersey	3.236	2.633	−18.6
New Mexico	1.198	1.008	−15.9
New York	4.953	4.785	−3.4
North Carolina	.542	.826	+52.4
North Dakota	.443	.446	+.7
Ohio	6.514	6.892	+5.8
Oklahoma	.909	1.215	+33.7
Oregon	1.733	1.754	+1.2
Pennsylvania	4.078	4.517	+10.8
Rhode Island	.466	.372	−20.2
South Carolina	.824	.872	+5.8
South Dakota	.424	.663	+56.4
Tennessee	2.966	2.545	−14.2
Texas	4.518	4.569	+1.1
Utah	.935	1.462	+56.4
Vermont	.943	.697	+26.1
Virginia	4.237	3.069	−27.6
Washington	1.811	2.105	+16.2
West Virginia	1.253	1.520	+21.3
Wisconsin	1.053	.893	−15.3
Wyoming	1.039	.969	−6.7
District of Columbia	.991	1.452	+46.5

Comparison of interstate authorizations under present law and H.R. 6713

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Present law	Additional	H.R. 6713
Balance	315		315
1957	1,000		1,000
1958	1,700		1,700
1959	2,200		2,200
1960	2,500		2,500
1961	2,000	−200	[1] 1,800
1962	2,200		2,200
1963	2,200	200	2,400
1964	2,200	400	2,600
1965	2,200	500	2,700
1966	2,200	600	2,800
1967	2,200	700	2,900
1968	1,500	1,500	3,000
1969	1,025	1,975	3,000
1970		3,000	3,000
1971		2,885	2,885
Total	25,440	11,560	37,000

[1] Under the provisions of sec. 209(g) of the 1956 act, only $1,800,000,000 was apportioned of the $2,000,000,000 authorized for the fiscal year 1961.

Comparison of interstate apportionments under present law and H.R. 6713

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Present law	Additional	H.R. 6713
Balance	315		315
1957	1,000		1,000
1958	1,700		1,700
1959	2,200		2,200
1960	2,500		2,500
1961	1,800		1,800
1962	2,200		2,200
1963	2,000	400	2,400
1964	1,500	1,100	2,600
1965	1,500	1,200	2,700
1966	1,600	1,200	2,800
1967	1,700	1,200	2,900
1968	1,900	1,100	3,000
1969	1,900	1,100	3,000
1970	1,625	1,375	3,000
1971		2,885	2,885
Total	25,440	11,560	37,000

Comparison of approximate apportionments of interstate funds under present law and under H.R. 6713 for fiscal years 1963 and 1964

[In millions]

State	Fiscal year 1963			Fiscal year 1964			State	Fiscal year 1963			Fiscal year 1964		
	Existing law ($2,000.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,400.0)	Difference ($400.0)	Existing law ($1,500.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,600.0)	Difference ($1,100.0)		Existing law ($2,000.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,400.0)	Difference ($400.0)	Existing law ($1,500.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,600.0)	Difference ($1,100.0)
Alabama	$41.4	$49.6	$8.2	$31.0	$53.8	$22.8	Nebraska	$11.7	$14.0	$2.3	$8.8	$15.2	$6.4
Arizona	28.1	33.7	5.6	21.1	36.5	15.4	Nevada	10.1	12.1	2.0	7.6	13.1	5.5
Arkansas	20.9	25.1	4.2	15.7	27.2	11.5	New Hampshire	9.0	10.8	1.8	6.7	11.7	5.0
California	191.2	229.4	38.2	143.4	248.5	105.1	New Jersey	52.1	62.6	10.5	39.1	67.8	28.7
Colorado	26.5	31.8	5.3	19.9	34.5	14.6	New Mexico	20.0	23.9	3.9	15.0	25.9	10.9
Connecticut	28.2	33.9	5.7	21.2	36.7	15.5	New York	94.7	113.7	19.0	71.1	123.2	52.1
Delaware	7.4	8.9	1.5	5.6	9.7	4.1	North Carolina	16.4	19.6	3.2	12.3	21.3	9.0
Florida	41.5	49.8	8.3	31.1	53.9	22.8	North Dakota	8.8	10.6	1.8	6.6	11.5	4.9
Georgia	36.8	44.2	7.4	27.6	47.9	20.3	Ohio	136.5	163.8	27.3	102.3	177.4	75.1
Hawaii	15.7	18.8	3.1	11.8	20.4	8.6	Oklahoma	24.1	28.9	4.8	18.0	31.3	13.3
Idaho	9.4	11.3	1.9	7.0	12.2	5.2	Oregon	34.7	41.7	7.0	26.0	45.1	19.1
Illinois	104.3	125.2	20.9	78.2	135.6	57.4	Pennsylvania	89.4	107.3	17.9	67.1	116.3	49.2
Indiana	49.5	59.4	9.9	37.1	64.4	27.3	Rhode Island	7.4	8.8	1.4	5.5	9.6	4.1
Iowa	25.3	30.4	5.1	19.0	32.9	13.9	South Carolina	17.3	20.7	3.4	12.9	22.4	9.5
Kansas	15.5	18.6	3.1	11.6	20.1	8.5	South Dakota	13.1	15.8	2.7	9.8	17.1	7.3
Kentucky	40.8	48.9	8.1	30.6	53.0	22.4	Tennessee	50.4	60.5	10.1	37.8	65.5	27.7
Louisiana	57.8	69.3	11.5	43.3	75.1	31.8	Texas	90.5	108.6	18.1	67.8	117.6	49.8
Maine	9.4	11.3	1.9	7.1	12.3	5.2	Utah	28.9	34.7	5.8	21.7	37.6	15.9
Maryland	36.6	44.0	7.4	27.5	47.6	20.1	Vermont	13.8	16.6	2.8	10.4	17.9	7.5
Massachusetts	42.8	51.4	8.6	32.1	55.7	23.6	Virginia	60.8	72.9	12.1	45.6	79.0	33.4
Michigan	77.9	93.5	15.6	58.4	101.3	42.9	Washington	41.7	50.0	8.3	31.3	54.2	22.9
Minnesota	51.7	62.1	10.4	38.8	67.2	28.4	West Virginia	30.1	36.1	6.0	22.6	39.1	16.5
Mississippi	24.3	29.1	4.8	18.2	31.6	13.4	Wisconsin	17.7	21.2	3.5	13.3	23.0	9.7
Missouri	51.1	61.4	10.3	38.4	66.5	28.1	Wyoming	19.2	23.0	3.8	14.4	24.9	10.5
Montana	18.7	22.5	3.8	14.0	24.3	10.3	District of Columbia	28.8	34.5	5.7	21.6	37.4	15.8

Final apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds authorized for the fiscal year 1962

State	Primary highway system	Secondary or feeder roads	Urban highways	Subtotal	Interstate System	Total
Total	$416,250,000	$277,500,000	$231,250,000	$925,000,000	$2,200,000,000	$3,125,000,000
Alabama	6,997,371	5,973,101	3,054,979	16,025,451	42,706,125	58,731,576
Alaska	22,091,082	14,764,171	119,584	36,974,837		36,974,837
Arizona	6,044,237	3,754,351	1,701,890	11,500,478	29,582,438	41,082,916
Arkansas	5,640,916	4,225,812	1,251,517	11,118,245	21,504,656	32,622,901
California	19,660,098	9,303,650	24,529,637	53,493,385	220,070,812	273,564,197
Colorado	6,303,072	4,444,053	2,299,594	13,046,719	16,783,594	29,830,313
Connecticut	2,372,021	1,342,034	3,726,671	7,440,726	26,420,625	33,861,351
Delaware	1,904,438	1,266,052	531,031	3,701,521	7,623,000	11,324,521
Florida	6,794,538	4,538,164	7,407,962	18,740,664	56,111,344	74,852,008
Georgia	9,306,864	7,453,057	3,704,530	20,464,451	52,256,531	72,720,982
Hawaii	1,776,483	1,373,625	858,573	4,008,681	12,375,000	16,383,681
Idaho	4,529,748	3,001,617	495,333	8,026,698	14,942,813	22,969,511
Illinois	13,618,919	8,299,634	14,721,936	36,640,489	111,053,250	147,693,739
Indiana	8,091,532	6,728,628	5,190,393	20,010,553	62,456,625	82,467,178
Iowa	8,625,049	6,619,922	2,397,138	17,642,109	20,551,781	38,193,890
Kansas	8,767,312	6,109,832	2,174,742	17,051,886	19,382,344	36,434,230
Kentucky	6,315,481	5,165,537	2,309,261	13,790,279	38,071,688	51,861,967
Louisiana	5,928,550	3,902,531	3,620,660	13,451,741	57,194,156	70,645,897
Maine	2,677,905	2,281,365	784,972	5,744,242	11,131,313	16,875,555
Maryland	3,235,237	2,442,528	4,182,692	9,860,457	48,791,531	58,651,988
Massachusetts	4,350,195	2,272,474	7,755,771	14,378,440	60,312,656	74,691,096
Michigan	12,752,648	7,910,128	10,490,144	31,152,920	85,109,062	116,261,982
Minnesota	10,614,871	7,284,743	3,792,222	21,691,836	40,822,031	62,513,867
Mississippi	6,471,046	5,427,160	1,358,493	13,256,699	23,778,563	37,035,262
Missouri	9,915,498	6,980,559	5,140,259	22,036,316	61,785,281	83,821,597
Montana	7,156,820	4,953,906	529,541	12,640,267	24,623,156	37,263,423
Nebraska	6,956,734	5,053,590	1,333,917	13,344,241	13,361,906	26,706,147
Nevada	4,615,457	3,126,594	348,977	8,091,028	11,326,219	19,417,247
New Hampshire	2,060,438	1,373,625	611,876	4,045,939	11,910,938	15,956,877
New Jersey	4,904,496	2,006,565	9,668,607	16,579,668	70,079,625	86,659,293
New Mexico	6,319,289	3,994,476	1,118,268	11,432,033	25,944,188	37,376,221
New York	16,630,975	7,565,208	25,788,261	49,984,444	107,263,406	157,247,850
North Carolina	8,575,231	8,515,225	3,017,790	20,108,246	11,737,688	31,845,934
North Dakota	5,040,825	3,440,815	406,366	8,888,006	9,593,719	18,481,725
Ohio	13,250,791	7,651,857	12,761,004	33,663,652	141,068,812	174,732,464
Oklahoma	7,781,061	5,477,774	2,302,990	15,561,825	19,685,531	35,247,356
Oregon	6,126,359	4,253,108	1,835,268	12,214,735	37,530,281	49,745,016
Pennsylvania	13,138,701	9,058,526	14,663,504	36,860,731	88,314,187	125,174,918
Rhode Island	1,872,058	1,223,696	1,408,207	4,503,961	10,091,813	14,595,774
South Carolina	5,291,049	4,620,450	1,656,641	11,568,140	17,844,750	29,412,890
South Dakota	5,376,276	4,121,050	420,555	9,917,881	9,182,250	19,100,131
Tennessee	7,348,321	5,900,835	3,267,337	16,516,493	64,232,437	80,748,930
Texas	22,811,515	15,071,201	12,554,875	50,437,591	97,842,937	148,280,528
Utah	4,546,375	2,949,540	1,206,623	8,702,538	20,248,594	28,951,132
Vermont	1,849,144	1,329,019	321,538	3,499,701	20,421,844	23,921,545
Virginia	7,215,143	5,300,327	4,010,378	16,525,848	91,757,531	108,283,379
Washington	6,046,144	4,260,733	3,468,233	13,775,110	39,219,469	52,994,579
West Virginia	3,884,521	3,062,586	1,176,353	8,123,460	27,135,281	35,258,741
Wisconsin	8,688,009	6,034,452	4,264,732	18,987,193	22,804,031	41,791,224
Wyoming	4,241,038	3,141,480	272,937	7,655,455	22,500,844	30,156,299
District of Columbia	1,822,103	1,246,023	1,452,072	4,520,198	21,461,344	25,981,542
Puerto Rico	1,905,505	2,276,858	1,503,266	5,685,629		5,685,629

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, more than 3 years ago the Senate adopted a highly controversial program to provide a Federal incentive to States which regulated and controlled billboards along the Interstate System.

This incentive was to consist of a payment to the individual State of one-half of 1 percent of the total cost of any projects on the Interstate System constructed with interstate funds.

The authority under which these funds can be paid expires at the end of June, unless extended by the Congress in new legislation.

With this question now before us, it is appropriate to look at some of the factors involved.

H.R. 6713, to which the billboard amendment now is to be offered, is a measure to provide for the completion of the Interstate System on schedule.

It also provides, in title II, for certain changes in automotive user taxes, to pay the cost.

For reasons of its own, the House completely ignored the billboard question in adopting this legislation and sending it to the Senate for action.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads, I felt it was my major responsibility to expedite title I of the bill, which provides authorizations for continuing the highway-construction program.

The billboard question was presented most casually before our subcommittee; and, after a very brief discussion, it was defeated by voice vote.

The full Public Works Committee then approved the bill as it had come from the House.

Personally, I believe that was a wise decision—for a number of reasons.

First, the billboard control legislation is not actually highway legislation at all. It has nothing to do with the construction of roads.

This is borne out by the fact that the funds to pay this incentive come out of the general revenues of the Treasury, not from the highway trust fund.

Furthermore, what is called an incentive to the States to adopt billboard controls is really a bribe, when we get down to cases. Apparently, some promoters of billboard legislation do not believe that the States have the ability to exercise independent action or judgment to control billboards along their highways. They seem to feel it necessary to bribe the States into compliance, with Federal funds, which I am sure could be put to much more effective use elsewhere.

Finally, it is interesting to note what has happened since this measure was first adopted in April 1958.

Since that time the legislature of every State in the Union has met, and has had an opportunity to consider a billboard regulatory program, if it so desired. I think the legislatures of most States have met at least twice since then.

At the present time only three States have passed enabling legislation and have entered into a contract with the Bureau of Public Roads. They are Maryland, North Dakota, and Kentucky.

I am informed by the Bureau that 10 other States have proposals pending before the Bureau, and that contracts are expected to be signed prior to the expiration date of the law on June 30. These States are Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Thus, despite the Federal incentive money or bribe money available in the 3 years since the law was passed, only 13 States have exerted sufficient energy to take advantage of it.

The remaining States either have shown no interest, have killed proposed legislation outright, or have it pigeonholed somewhere in the legislative mill.

In any event, general apathy over this program is rather overwhelming.

It would seem to me that if a sufficient number of additional States show sincere interest in the program, an extension of it could be considered as separate legislation at a later date.

That is what the House proposed when it was considering such legislation.

This would afford an opportunity for public hearings to give both proponents and opponents an opportunity to testify, and also an opportunity to see how the controls have operated in the States which have come under the program.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill as it came from the committee, and as it came from the House originally, with the amendments suggested by the Finance Committee in title II, will be readily adopted by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am going to make a prediction. I am going to predict that the U.S. Senate on tomorrow will approve a continuation of the Federal program to give an incentive to States of the American Union to preserve the beauty of the virgin areas of our Nation through which the Interstate Highway System will traverse the States of the American Union. I hope it does. I say respectfully to the Senator from Michigan that, in my opinion, he is wrong about opposing such a continuation.

I know something about this particular controversy. When it was first on the floor of the Senate, the original proposal was offered by the late Senator from Oregon, Mr. Neuberger, and the Senator presently speaking.

We worked out the language of the proposed amendment ourselves. Here was a new venture by the Federal Government. It was urged by the President. Here was a venture under which the Federal Government would contribute 90 percent of the money to create a superhighway system in America, for varying public purposes, which would traverse the several States.

The amendment which we offered was adopted by the Senate after vigorous debate. It was approved after a close vote. It was not written in haste. It was not an extreme measure. It recognized that the States of the Union and local political subdivisions ought to have the right to determine their own zoning legislation.

We recognized that there would be areas, thousands of miles of new highways, through which the Interstate System would run, and there we wanted to give an additional incentive to States to keep them beautiful. We recognized some areas would be zoned for industrial and commercial purposes, under local law, and that here there would be little, if any, beauty to preserve.

Mr. President, I shall want to make some more comments on this subject tomorrow. I shall list those additional States which have passed legislation to participate in this program. However, I simply say to the able senior Senator from Michigan that, as I see it, he is wrong in opposing a continuation of the present law with respect to this particular incentive offered to States of the American Union.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I certainly am aware of the position of the Senator from California, because we served together on the Senate Committee on Public Works. Since the House has made commitments to hold hearings and listen to both sides of this controversy, does not the Senator think that there is merit in the suggestion that we follow the same route so as to give interested people an opportunity to be heard? This proposal can be taken care of later this year, or even during the next session of Congress. By then we will have the benefit of the experience of the States which have elected to participate in this program and who have accepted the incentive offered by the Federal Government. I do not think the Senator would quarrel with that proposition. Actually, the Senator recognizes, does he not, that outdoor advertising is not actually a part of the highway program?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not going to quarrel with the Senator from Michigan. I am going to disagree with him, but I am never going to quarrel with him. The Senator has a right to take his position, and I respect that right, but I respectfully say, on my side, that the President, the Chief Executive of our country, President Kennedy, a Democrat, and his immediate predecessor, former President Eisenhower, a Republican, both recommend this type of legislation.

I say respectfully to the Senator from Michigan that the matter has been debated. It was debated rather long and vigorously right here in this Chamber.

All things being equal, I think the Senate would be recreant in its duty if it failed to continue the program which was established 2 years ago.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does not the Senator think it would be better to hear both sides of this controversy? Not on the floor of the Senate, where the representatives of the different interests cannot be heard, but in a committee hearing?

Mr. KUCHEL. Does not the Senator recall the long days and weeks of hearings, when we sat in the Public Works Committee, at the time the legislation was originally adopted?

Mr. McNAMARA. And there we were led to believe that the States had much more interest in this subject than they have indicated at any time since then. Now it is time for us to take another look at the matter and to find out what the attitude of the States is now. There is more to this than appears on the surface. There is great competition for the advertising dollar among various media of advertising, such as the press, radio, television, and outdoor advertising. All should have an opportunity to be heard. I do not think we should act hastily in this matter. Since the States have failed to indicate more than a meager interest in this matter, I think the subject should be reviewed.

Some States will come under the program before the deadline, which is still sometime off, and this will give us the benefit of their actual experience. Moreover, it will enable interested persons to testify for or against the proposition. I think that is the best way to arrive at good sound legislation. I hope the Senator from California will give

this suggestion very serious consideration.

I thank him very much for yielding.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the able Senator.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the hour is late. I do not know whether or not Senators read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD very carefully before they vote. I do not even know whether we shall have a full house tomorrow when we debate this matter. But, in the interest of the majority leader, if I may do so, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 14, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13, 1961:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Harold C. Doyle, of South Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of South Dakota for the term of 4 years.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Howard Morgan, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1963, vice Paul A. Sweeney.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

William I. Cargo, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commencement Day Address by Senator Bridges, of New Hampshire, at St. Anselm's College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last Thursday my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], received due recognition from St. Anselm's College in Manchester, N.H., where he delivered the commencement address and received the honorary doctor of laws degree.

The able address by Senator BRIDGES was published in detail in the Laconia (N.H.) Evening Citizen of June 9, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial comment in that newspaper, and the Senator's address, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR BRIDGES SEES BRIGHTER FUTURE

St. Anselm's College yesterday conferred a well-deserved honorary doctor of laws degree upon Senator STYLES BRIDGES. He delivered the commencement address. The speech is one we feel certain will attract wide attention. Without disclosing secrets to our enemies in the cold war, he stressed new opportunities for our young people that science has unfolded. The senior Senator's text reveals the vision of statesmanship with which he is endowed, and is inspired to bring to the fore on occasions such as a visit to a college campus. Father Placidus, the dean, reading the citation he had prepared relative to the Senator's career preceding the degree ceremony, spoke of him as "a keen observer of domestic and international affairs." Father Placidus is the son of the late William H. Riley, who was for many years State commissioner of labor and served in that department when BRIDGES was Governor. Most Rev. Ernest J. Primeau, bishop of Manchester, who introduced the Senator to the large audience assembled in St. Anselm's spacious new gymnasium, described the honored guest as "a man of talents, integrity and dedication." Bishop Primeau said Senator BRIDGES needed no introduction in New Hampshire, the United States, or in many parts of the world. Seated on the platform from which Senator BRIDGES spoke were such distinguished Democrats as Dr. James J. Powers of Manchester and former Gov. Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts. After touching upon the terrifying consequences of the actions by the policymakers behind the Kremlin walls, the Senator optimistically indicated that counterbalancing the challenge of danger facing this year's crop of college graduates is the "challenge of a bright future." Here Senator BRIDGES' approach was truly that of the world statesman. He found ground for great hopes. In the realm of material advantages and opportunity he said to the St. Anselm's graduates, "the astronautics industry may become larger than the automotive industry. As this new industry grows, it will create new jobs, thus taking up part of the slack caused by automation."

The Senator dealt with this happier aspect of the grave international situation in ample detail, more than enough to satisfy all who hunger for hints of better times ahead. As he developed the theme, he did not overlook, of course, Premier Khrushchev's boast that our grandchildren will be living under communism, nor did he fail to show the extent to which Russians go to indoctrinate their children with this notion. Convinced, however, there is a substantial area in which hardy optimists, people with profound faith in the ultimate triumph of the United States, may find foothold, the Senator devoted a good portion of an astute appraisal of world problems, to elaborating on possibilities of a brighter future. This brought him to Comdr. Alan Shepard's successful flight into space, and a listing of remarkable opportunities for citizens in the space age. In this category he discovered much that is definitely encouraging.

He pointed to changes that spell great advance which are occurring with tremendous impact in the field of science. It was appropriate that he chose St. Anselm's as the spot for these significant utterances because extraordinary progress is clearly in evidence at the college, with its six new buildings, enlarged faculty, increased enrollment. Rev. Bernard G. Holmes, O.S.B., president of the college, announced plans for further building. Under the heading, "Brighter Future" the Senator said:

"I have discussed here the challenge of our times in its concept of danger. But there is another side of the coin. That is the challenge of the bright future. Let me cite a few examples.

"As the ranking minority member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee with a knowledge of the development of these sciences I can foresee new opportunities for our young people never dreamed of before.

"Today, millions of persons are working and employed in industries producing products which were not even known a decade or so ago.

"Here, in New Hampshire, where formerly we relied on our old, stable industries of farming, recreation, shoe and textile and similar industries, we have, within a few miles of this college, new electronic plants and factories.

"Within this 20th century we have leaped from the air age of the Wright brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk on December 17, 1903, to the atomic age in 1945 when the first atomic bomb was exploded. And now in 1961 we are already existing in the space age which our neighbor, Comdr. Alan Shepard, opened to us in his recent flight.

"Commander Shepard's flight was made in the full glare of publicity for all the world to see. It was in sharp contrast to the Communist Gagarin flight which is still doubted in some quarters. We do not know how many Russian failures there were before this flight—how many luckless Russian astronauts lost their lives and disappeared into the spaceless skies. All we know is that there was an orbital flight at the time containing a human being but whether Gagarin was the person in it no one knows.

"What are your opportunities in this new space age?

"Already more than 3,200 space-related products have been developed. These are the products of 5,000 companies and research outfits now engaged in missile-space work.

"It is confidently predicted that within 20 years, the astronautics industry may become larger than the automotive industry. As this new industry grows, it will create new jobs, thus taking up part of the slack caused by automation.

"Our space agency is engaged in more than a quest to satisfy scientific curiosity. The research they are doing affects jobs, home, health, and the future.

"Let us briefly explore some of these new wonders.

"Out of these explorations has come a metal developed for the nose cone of a missile which is now going into pots and pans which can be taken from the coldest freezer and placed on the hottest flame without danger.

"A stainless steel cloth has been designed for parachuting spaceships back to earth which is almost indestructible. The body harnesses and molded seats of the spaceships—if adapted to automobiles, would serve as protection in almost any kind of highway accident.

"The power sources we are developing for space flight—solar batteries, gaseous fuel cells, lightweight nuclear reactors—may replace oil and coal for earthbound vehicles.

"Cosmic communications may eventually replace long-distance lines. Already the Navy is bouncing signals from the mainland to Hawaii by means of the moon. Project

Echo I proved the feasibility of using a satellite to relay transoceanic phone calls. Similar satellites could bring live television to a worldwide audience. In our schools and colleges, students could watch events as they happen.

"Rocket-launched, high-speed transport planes may revolutionize air travel. New supersonic transports are already in the concept stage, based on our X–15 research plane and other advanced aerospacecraft.

"Our conquest of space may also help us to conquer the weather which Mark Twain remarked people talked about but never did anything about. Now we are doing something about the weather. With a worldwide system of meteorological satellites similar to our Tiros II, still in orbit, we could issue weather forecasts for a month, or even a season. Long-range predictions of rainfall, for instance, would aid communities to control their watersheds. Farmers could decide what crops to grow and how much land to use and accurate forecasts could tell them the best time to plant, spray, or harvest.

"From satellite observations we could have early warnings of tornadoes, floods, hurricanes, and other natural catastrophes. We may be able to divert or disrupt hurricanes and typhoons, and fogs could be dispersed while rain might be diverted to drought-stricken areas.

"Through the miniature instruments devised to measure Commander Shepard's physical response in space, it will be possible for a patient in a hospital to be watched by remote control so that his condition would be recorded continuously and automatically at the desk of the head nurse and thus save lives.

"In addition, the electristatic camera perfected for our space vehicles could be used in recording a patient's condition—even 20 patients at a time—and thus furnish a vital photographic record for the doctor.

"Truly, in today's world which you are entering, the sky is no longer the limit.

"But not only is the sky opening up these marvelous possibilities—the sea—our oceans are another frontier for exploration and use. We have not dealt extensively with the ocean as yet. We are now able to desalt sea water and this will soon be possible on an economical basis. We have been exploring the depths of the ocean on our west coast and have brought up cores which have shown us valuable minerals.

"Our oceans have brought us oil; they can bring us minerals, food, and other as yet unknown products through the study of oceanography which is still, more or less, in its infancy. These are but two of the opportunities of the present and the future."

Soviet Deportation of Lithuanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, during the interwar years one of the happiest peoples in Europe were the Lithuanians. After centuries of hard struggle for their freedom, they had attained their goal at the end of the First World War, and were enjoying their freedom in their historic homeland under their democratic government. Then came the last war, ushering in the years of tragedy for the Lithuanians.

Soon after the outbreak of that war the Soviet Government made impossible demands upon Lithuanians, the acceptance of which made a mockery of Lithuanian independence. Helpless Lithuanians had no choice but to submit. By mid-June 1940, the country was taken over by the Red army and soon after made part of the Soviet Union.

These events took place in the midst of oppression and terror. At the outset several thousand prominent Lithuanians were arrested and exiled to Asiatic Russia. This went on for more than a year and by June 1941, the number of Lithuanians thus exiled to Sibera and other regions of Russia were counted in the tens of thousands. Today in observing the deportation anniversary of these patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians we express our deep concern over their tragic plight.

Abuse of Corporate Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the special report in today's Wall Street Journal on the abuse of corporate authority by officials of the Union Oil Co. and the Dillon, Read & Co. points up the need for some public surveillance of corporations engaged in interstate and international business.

The extensive article points out the manipulations by which a fortune was made from a $20,000 investment. The successful participants in this crude abuse of the free enterprise system used their corporate authority to extort fabulous profits from their position—at the expense of the stockholders to whom they owed a trust—as well as to the public.

This news roundup pointed out the manner in which an oil company director arranged for his wife and son to profit from personal transactions with the company. The profitable $20,000 investment was arranged by Dillon, Read executives, not for their corporation but for a group of 27 present and past Dillon, Read officials, stockholders, and relatives.

They formed a company, the Barracuda Tanker Corp., to build tankers with borrowed money and charter them exclusively to the Union Oil Co. of California under an arrangement that would yield almost $50,000 profit each year.

The relationship this profit "milking" arrangement by these Dillon, Read executives in their private capacities has to the Union Oil underwriting agreement with the Dillon, Read Corp. ought to be investigated by the appropriate committees of Congress.

This type of manipulation of corporate power for personal gain constitutes a serious assault upon the free enterprise system. The entire matter should be publicly aired and the culprits should be identified. The case points up a need for greater Federal authority to investigate and study the internal operations of corporations engaged in interstate or international business.

The Wall Street Journal has provided a commendable public service in bringing this case to light. The free enterprise system in America stands to gain when it can purify itself of the internal corporate corruption which permits a few corporate officials to abuse their trust at the expense of the stockholders and the public.

The Contributions of Italians and Italian Americans and Their Descendants, to America's Greatness Are Profound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Sunday last, June 11, I was privileged to address a dinner meeting celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Christopher Columbus Lodge of Fairmont, W. Va. In my remarks, I attempted to present a picture of the impact and influence which Italians of all classes have had on our civilization and, in particular, on America.

The picture I have drawn is timely, because of late a certain television program has been besmirching Americans of Italian descent again and again, characterizing them as almost the sole malefactors of the prohibition era.

Americans everywhere should be conscious of the profound debt which America owes to her sons and daughters of Italian ancestry. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks before the Christopher Columbus Lodge of Fairmont, W. Va., printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that they may be universally read and studied.

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

Fellow Americans and members of the Christopher Columbus Lodge, I think it appropriate that I preface my remarks by reading the memorable words of Woodrow Wilson as he addressed several thousand foreign-born citizens after naturalization ceremonies at Philadelphia on May 10, 1915, at a time when this Nation lay under the shadow of a foreign menace, and the freedom of the world hung in the balance—as it does today. In speaking to those who had just become citizens of the United States, the President said:

"This is the only country in the world which experiences this constant and repeated rebirth. Other countries depend upon the multiplication of their own native people. This country is constantly drinking strength out of new sources by the voluntary association with it of great bodies of strong men and forward-looking women out of other lands. And so by the gift of the free will of independent people, it is being constantly renewed from generation to generation by the same process by which it was

originally created. It is as if humanity had determined to see to it that this great Nation, founded for the benefit of humanity, should not lack for the allegiance of the people of the world.

"And while you bring all countries with you, you come with a purpose of leaving all other countries behind you—bringing what is best of their spirit, but not looking over your shoulders and seeking to perpetuate what you left behind in them. I certainly would not be one to suggest that a man cease to love the home of his birth and the country of his origin—these things are very sacred and ought not to be put out of our hearts—but it is one thing to love the place where you were born, and it is another thing to dedicate yourself to the place to which you go. You cannot become thorough Americans if you think of yourselves in groups. America does not consist of groups. A man who thinks of himself as belonging to a particular national group in America has not yet become an American, and the man who goes among you to trade upon your nationality is no worthy son to live under the Stars and Stripes."

These words of President Wilson, as are manifestly clear, were not intended to reflect, nor do they in any way reflect, upon you or any other group which meets in fraternal organization to renew ties of race and blood; to cherish the religion of the fathers; and to preserve the fond memories handed down from grandfather to father, and from father to son.

No, it is very fitting and proper that you should harbor such sentiments. The great man, and great American, whom I have just quoted at length was, for example, extremely proud of his Scotch-Irish ancestry, as he had every right to be. You, for your part, have reason to rejoice in the land of your fathers, in your magnificent artistic and cultural heritage—second to none other on earth. Who can hear the name "Italy" without summoning instantly to mind something of the history of one of the mightiest and most gifted races which have been recorded among the sons of men? The Roman Republic, the Empire, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance—glorious and imperishable; Caesar, Augustus, Virgil, Dante, Boccacio, Della Robbia, the stupendous Michelangelo, the incomparable Leonardo; Palestrina, Martini, Verdi, Leoncavallo, Mascagni, Paganini, Puccini; Lombroso, Marconi—a vast, prodigious panorama unfolds before the mind's eye. For over 2,000 years, the peninsula has produced master works in all branches of art, literature, and science—a never-ending procession of accomplishments and achievements without which our world would seem so poor that it would scarcely be the same world at all. "Know'st thou," wrote the German poet Goethe:

"* * * the land where the lemon trees bloom,
Where the gold orange glows in the deep thicket's gloom,
Where a wind ever soft from the blue heaven blows,
And the groves are of laurel and myrtle and rose?"

And as an American poet exclaimed:

"Dear Italy. The sound of thy soft name
Soothes me with balm of memory and hope."

Many and various are the contributions of Italians and, later, Americans of Italian descent, to the New World and this country of ours. Let us pause for a moment and reflect upon what Italians have meant to the Western Hemisphere.

We begin, of course, with the great admiral who in 1492 discovered the New World. Five years after that, another Italian, the navigator Amerigo Vespucci, embarked on a voyage to those far-off shores; and, through his account of those wondrous lands, gave his name to our two great continents and the isthmus which joins them. As early as 1539, Fra Marco da Niza explored the Northwest and has been called "the discoverer of Arizona." When Hernando De Soto led his famous expedition from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, there were Italians holding positions of importance under him. In the final report of the U.S. De Soto Expedition Commission we find the following statement: "The Genoese and the Sardinians, especially a Genoese engineer called Maestro Francisco, turned out to be among the most essential members of the expedition since they were relied upon to build bridges during the march and to construct the boats in which the survivors finally escaped to Mexico."

In 1571, an Italian missionary, Brother Pedro Linares, was killed by Indians on the banks of the Rappahannock River not far from the present city of Washington. Of the 52 priests of the Society of Jesus who labored in California from 1767 to 1787, eight were natives of Italy. One of the first of the great California missions was founded at Loreto in 1697 by Father Salvaterre. Four Italian missionaries in Mexico were martyred by Indians during the 17th century. Truly, sons of Italy had a hand in the exploration, discovery, and development of this country.

After long and laborious research in the muster rolls, registers, and files of the Army, the historian, Angelo Flavio Guidi, managed to extract not a few names of undoubtedly Italian origin who had contact with the American Revolution. The first name he unearthed was that of a Capt. Cosmo de Medici, attached in 1777 to the Light Dragoons of North Carolina. It was certainly, Guidi says, a name assumed by an Italian who, for some reason, probably political, as was the case with many others, wished to conceal his identity. To no one else but to an Italian, and perhaps a Tuscan only, could it ever have occurred to assume such a name.

Then there were others. In the "Register of the Massachusetts Soldiers and Sailors of the Revolutionary War" appear such names as Stefano Almero, Giuseppe Amo, Eduardo Casa, De Luce Francesco, Vincenzo Curria, Giovanni Rosso. (Rosso took part in the battle of Ticonderoga.) It is needless to speculate upon the national origin of such names. From what other land could they have been derived?

But it is to Francesco Vigo that the historian instinctively turns as the exemplar of the first Italo-Americanism. Born in Mondovi, Piedmont, in 1747, he is first found in Cuba in 1760, and he later settled in New Orleans where, first on behalf of a Dutch company, and later for himself, he became a trader with the Indians. In 1778, Vigo, together with George Rogers Clark and the Canadian missionary, Father Gibault, undertook the great adventure of conquering the vast Northwestern Territory for the United States. Vigo not only joined Clark; he also lent him his entire savings of $11,387.40—a fortune in those days—to equip a body of armed men. Captured by an Indian patrol under English command, Vigo was held as a hostage at the English fort of Vincennes; upon being released, he hastened to join the American forces; and on February 25, 1779, Federal troops with the arms, uniforms, and powder supplied by Vigo, and with Vigo himself at the side of Clark, captured Vincennes, thereby freeing the entire Middle West from Illinois to Minnesota. Vigo, himself, was made a colonel and left in command of Vincennes. His life is an epic and should be studied by all Americans interested in the history of their country, and, especially, by Americans of Italian descent.

In the War of 1812, we find that an Italian, Joseph Lametti, served as a captain in the defenses of New York City, for which a grateful government later bestowed bounty land upon his widow. In the Civil War, there were 200 officers of Italian descent in the Union Army—among them Generals de Cesnola, Spinola, Fardella, and Terrero. Several of these officers were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Army records do not break down enlistments according to national or racial groups in World War I, but we may be sure that many tens of thousands of loyal citizens of Italian descent served their country during that conflict, and many must have laid down their lives for it.

In World War II, it is estimated that there were some 845,000 men and women of Italian descent who served in the U.S. Armed Forces. Among the 400 marines who defended Wake Island, sinking one enemy cruiser and three destroyers, were 14 Italian-Americans. Twenty of the 500 Medal of Honor winners during the war were of Italian descent. There were three vessels in the U.S. Navy named for Italian-American heroes in that war: the U.S.S. *Damato,* in honor of Cpl. Anthony Peter Damato, awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously; the U.S.S. *Cabana,* in honor of Napoleon Joseph Cabana, killed in the Pacific 5 days after Pearl Harbor; and the U.S.S. *Basalone,* in honor of Gunner Sgt. John Basalone, holder of the Medal of Honor for heroic action on Guadalcanal. Italian-Americans have nothing in their combat record of which to be ashamed; but I expect you knew that already, didn't you?

Other Italian-Americans of modern times spring readily to mind. Louis Amateis, for instance, was a well-known sculptor. There is Charles Barsotti, editor, publisher, and philanthropist. Born in 1850 near Pisa, he came to the United States in 1872 and settled in New York City. Eight years later, he established Il Progresso, the first Italian daily in this country. It was an immediate and continued success with the Italian-speaking element of our greatest city and was soon housed in its own building. Its public-spirited founder, not forgetting the land of his birth, promoted the erection of statues of famous Italians and gave freely of his money to relieve suffering in his native land, thus encouraging others to cross the seas to the great Republic which opened the door to opportunity.

There is Constantino Brumidi, the "Michelango" of the Capitol, whose magnificent paintings and frescoes are the admiration of the tens of thousands of Americans who visit the Halls of Congress in Washington every year. When Brumidi commenced work on the great frieze of the Rotunda of the Capitol, he was over 70 years old. Those who stand in that great circular chamber where the Government holds state funerals for our most distinguished dead are awed by the vastness and the grandeur of the artist's conception.

On September 19, 1805, 14 Italian musicians were landed from the U.S. frigate *Chesapeake* at the Washington Navy Yard. They had been recruited in Sicily by order of President Thomas Jefferson, who desired to organize a brass band for the U.S. Marine Corps. Under the leadership of Gaetano Carusi, this was the beginning of the famous U.S. Marine Band of which the country is so justly proud. Since that time, five other Italian-Americans have served as leaders of the band: Pulizzi, Pons, Lucchesi, Scala, and Fanciulli.

In 1883, the Metropolitan Opera House was opened with Cleofanti Companini as conductor, who was succeeded in 1895 by Luigi Mancinelli. There have been many great singers at the Metropolitan Opera. Tetrazzini, Scotti, Rosa Ponselle, Rosa Raisa, Giovanni Martinelli, Guiseppe de Luca, Tito Schipa, Tito Ruffo, Beniamino Gigli, Pasquale Amato, and the never-to-be-forgotten

Caruso are numbered among those which Italy, "the land of song," has contributed.

There are many other contributions which Italy and her sons have made to this land of ours—far too numerous to be recited at any one time, if, indeed, they could ever be set down in one place.

So, my friends of the Christopher Columbus Lodge, you may well feel that you and your fathers have done yourselves proud. America is indebted to you and your ancestors with a debt of which America will ever be aware. As I pointed out at the beginning, she even owes her name to an Italian.

Since your fraternity was founded 50 years ago, two generations have reached maturity. Many changes have come to the world, including two terrible cosmic wars which have cast nation after nation of the past into limbo, evolved others, and, together with the instrumentalities of applied science—at once sublime and terrible, have altered the face of society almost beyond recognition. Now your sons face the enigmatic future. Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1812: "The boys of the rising generation are to be the men of the next, and the sole guardians of the principles we deliver over to them. Truth and reason are eternal. They have prevailed. And they will eternally prevail; however, in times and places they may be overbourne for a while by violence, military, civil, or ecclesiastical. The preservation of the holy fire is confided to us by the world, and the sparks which emanate from it will ever serve to kindle it in other quarters of the globe."

That holy fire to which Jefferson referred is the flame of liberty—of democracy. On you and yours, and on all of us devolves the sacred responsibility of keeping that flame ablaze and, when our time is done, of handing the torch to our posterity to the end that the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; of decency, dignity, and human kindness; and of "Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Dedication of the Theodore Shapiro Residence Hall at Beth-El Hospital, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 11, 1961, I had the honor to be one of the principal speakers at the dedication ceremonies of the Theodore Shapiro Residence Hall, Beth-El Hospital, Brooklyn, N.Y. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my remarks at these dedication ceremonies. My statement follows:

Believe me, it is good to be here this morning. These are dedication ceremonies, but what we rightfully emphasize are not the ceremonies but the dedication, the dedication to the service of mankind, the dedication to life, to the healing, which is life.

What made all of this possible? Consider the vast machinery of Government that turned to make it possible, the work in the committees of the Congress to amend the Housing Act of 1950 so that this sort of hospital construction could begin, the U.S. Housing and Finance Agency which enabled the hospital to borrow so much of the necessary funds. Consider the people who contributed of their time, effort, and money to raise these funds, and consider the man, Theodore Shapiro, who singly, through his generosity of heart and spirit, helped fashion a dream into reality. It is altogether fitting that the new residence hall be known as the Theodore Shapiro Residence Hall.

When we consider how our days are spent, the daily commonplace chores, the crowding of the hours given over, necessarily, to the earning of the living, to the food, care, and shelter of ourselves and of our own, then we know how very few moments we give of ourselves for others. Yet, how magnificent those few moments are when we rise above our own needs, our own indulgences. For without those few moments, we would be like the weeds in the field, growing without purpose, choking the green pastures of true humanity.

It is of more than passing interest to note that the word "hospital" springs, together with the words like "hotel," "hostel," and "hospice," from a common root. This root is the Latin word "hospes" which means both guest and host. It is easy to see the connection with the word "hospitality" and, from the earliest days, to offer hospitality was believed to be an obligation; to receive a stranger, a duty; and to welcome a passing wanderer, a sacred privilege. Thus, the hospital combines all of these elements. And so we arrive at the concept that in the establishment of hospitals man can be a little more than man, and a little less than angel.

We know, historically, that medical treatment, in early times, was associated with religious services. In fact, in the Middle Ages and prior thereto, the hospitals which were, as I have said, essentially religious rather than medical establishments, offered care rather than cure and relief for the body. By religious observations, it was hoped to elevate and discipline the character, in the belief that when the body was in decline, the soul could be strengthened for the future life. Treatment, then, was based on love and faith rather than on skill and science. Today, as we know, the ideal concept is a combination of both. I might add, as a passing note of interest, that the hospitals established in ancient, medieval, and even modern times were for the benefit of the poor. Self-supporting patients were treated in private dwellings or nursing homes conducted by individual medical practitioners.

I recall that when I was a youth, hospitals were regarded as a place where the poor went to die. Among the underprivileged of Brooklyn, at the turn of the century, the belief was that when a loved one was taken to the hospital it was the final parting. The dread word was "hospital." We have traveled a long way since then. The voluntary hospitals of today, established by different religious groups, have their roots in the past but their growth in the future. The hospitals founded by religious groups, true to tradition, are, in the United States, now available for use by the entire population. The community no longer fears the hospital but embraces its indispensable role in the life of the community.

Though I dislike throwing statistics at you, I think that they most graphically tell the story. Today, hospitals in America rank among the 12 largest American industries, representing a capital investment of billions of dollars, employing over a half million people, and operating at a cost of over $1 billion a year. Workmen's compensation laws and the rapid expansion of the health and insurance plans have both extended the range of hospital care and have made it simpler for the institutions to obtain prompt payment of bills. The facts that people are living longer, and that diseases of old age are increasing, have further added to the need for more facilities. While the number of hospital beds had increased from 1,096,721 in 1936 to 1,468,714 a decade later, and to 1,612,822 in 1959, the most recent report indicates that a shortage exists in general hospitals, alone, of 158,415 beds. This, of course, does not include the much greater lack in hospitals dealing with mental and chronic diseases. The wide use of hospitals by the average American is shown by the fact that in 1947, 1 out of every 10 persons in the United States entered a hospital as a patient and in 1959, 23,605,186 persons were admitted into the hospitals around the country.

So from the establishment in the sixth century, B.C., of the community hospital in Greece, through the early Christian hospitals in Rome, through the Arab hospitals in the eighth century, through the church hospital established by Cortez in 1524 in the New World, through America's oldest hospitals, the Philadelphia General Hospital, the Bellevue Hospital in New York City, and the Pennsylvania Hospital, through the work of Florence Nightingale in the 19th century and the work of Abraham Flexner in the United States, the modern hospital has evolved, not only concerned with the reception and treatment of the sick but also acting as training fields and teaching centers of medicine and nursing.

Thus, Theodore Shapiro Residence Hall, in a very concrete sense, keeps pace with the development and expansion of the function of a hospital for it is this resident hall which will increase the medical care and medical education of the hospital by providing housing, a medical library and meeting room facilities for the intern and residence staff.

To stand still is to go back. This the Beth-El Hospital refuses to do.

As for myself, I shall work, as in the past, with your guidance and support, to urge greater Federal participation in the construction and expansion of hospitals. I have pointed out the need for this a few moments ago. This is my pledge: Together we have begun the good work; together we will continue.

School Aid Bill a Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation pending before the Congress is the so-called Federal aid to education bill. This bill has passed the U.S. Senate and is presently before the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. It contains precious little "aid," but is a liberal education to anyone who takes the trouble to study it.

In the past I have supported a Federal aid program for schools based on proven need and a certain amount of proven inability to pay—at a time when we had a balanced budget. At the present time there is no hope for a balanced Federal budget. Our Government is carrying a staggering $290 billion debt. What it "gives" must come from the citizen either by taking another hunk out of his paycheck for income tax, borrowing more money for him to pay later, or cutting the value of his savings by printing more cheap dollars.

When money is sent to Washington and then returned to the States tied up

in a pretty package labeled "Federal aid," its true costs are deceiving. The present school bill involves expenditure of $2½ billion of the taxpayers' money. No one knows how much of this money will stick in Washington or how fast the National Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will grow.

To demonstrate this "homely truth," an economics teacher once passed a piece of ice from hand to hand around the class. It started fist size and wound up a mere marble—the more hands it passed through, the smaller it got.

Actually, the bill penalizes the many States whose taxpayers have built new schoolhouses, decreased the classroom shortages, and raised teachers' salaries.

As people throughout the country become more familiar with this legislation, they will agree with the caption on the following editorial "School Aid Bill a Fraud." Many discerning editors and publishers are familiarizing themselves with this legislation. Mr. Richard H. Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, is one of those informed publishers. I draw your attention to the editorial appearing in his paper. You will note that in his State of Missouri, taxpayers will pay $1.22 in Federal tax for every dollar returned in Federal school aid. In my own State of Ohio, $1.50 sent to Washington will get $1 back to the State for school aid. This is as silly as betting on a horse you know is going to lose.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, June 8, 1961]

SCHOOL AID BILL A FRAUD

The House Rules Committee in Congress is expected to act this week on a bill to provide what is called, with a straight face, Federal aid to education. This bill is a fraud on the public, which has largely been sold by promises that the schools will get something for nothing.

The administration bill calls for an average grant to each State of $15 a year for every child in average daily attendance in schools. This small $15 handout will still add up to $2,500 million in the next 3 years, if Congress approves the bill.

But that is just a starter. Once the precedent is set, Congress will be under irresistible pressure to up the subsidy. Eventually the country's public school burden will be dumped on Uncle Sam's shoulders. And Washington bureaucracy will dictate our education policies.

Who will benefit by this bill? Not Missourians. They will pay $1.22 in Federal taxes for every $1 of aid sent them from Washington by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Illinois won't benefit, either. Its residents will contribute $2 in Federal taxes for every $1 that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare kicks back to them.

That fact caused at least one Democratic Senator to revolt against his party's leadership on this issue. Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, figured out that his constituents would pay $55 million in Federal taxes to finance the program—and get back $15 million in Federal aid. In short, a net loss of $40 million. That's enough to build 4,000 classrooms in Connecticut at $10,000 each, or to give 40,000 Connecticut teachers a pay increase of $1,000 a year. He voted "No."

Who will profit by this bill? A handful of States, most of them in Dixie, including such oil-rich States as Texas and Oklahoma.

But the biggest winner will be Washington's already swollen bureaucracy. HEW will handle the funds, and this new Department has already mushroomed without a huge Federal aid program to administer.

HEW started out January 1, 1954, with 34,939 employees on its payroll. By the start of this year, the number had reached 65,433—almost double. Its budget in 1954 was $1,982 million. This year it's $3,716,294,000.

The U.S. Office of Education, part of HEW's empire, has increased its staff 400 percent in the last 6 years.

Given a multi-billion-dollar aid program to fatten on, HEW should grow like Jack's beanstalk.

The Globe-Democrat is not opposed to higher teachers' salaries and fine school buildings. Exactly the contrary. This newspaper was the first major daily to endorse and fight for the State's school foundation program. That program substantially raised State support of local schools and helped equalize education opportunities all over Missouri.

But the Globe-Democrat is unalterably opposed to phony Federal aid that will inevitably result in real Federal control.

School lobbyists say that Federal control is a bogeyman, invoked to frighten the timid. But is it?

Uncle Sam now subsidizes vocational training in high schools. This program began in the World War I era—to ease a critical shortage of men with mechanical training.

World War I has been over for 42 years, but the Federal program—like all Federal programs—goes on and on.

Under this Federal aid program, Washington lays down rigid rules that must be met before it pays off. Otherwise no Federal aid or subsidy.

The U.S. Office of Education has already announced its plans to develop a national policy in education by standardizing the curriculums and organization of the public schools. This statement should have an ominous ring to educators, and parents, in fact, to all Americans.

When Washington says it will give you something for nothing—with no strings attached—the public should look twice before it swallows the bait.

The U.S. Senate has already passed this costly, dishonest Federal aid bill. Its fate now rests with the House.

The Globe-Democrat hopes the Nation's Representatives will be more courageous in standing up to White House pressure and the powerful school lobby than the Senate proved.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to testi- education system, I am convinced this important matter must be handled through our State legislators and local boards of education. If the plan proposed by many States' Governors, which requires a return of a percentage of income tax paid by the citizens of each State, were adopted and the suggested minimum percentage for school support were adhered to, Ohio would have $89,633,000 for school improvements, which is $50 million more than they would get under the administration bill. Ohio is scheduled to receive $39,517,893 under the administration bill, but the proposed formula proves we would have to pay in $61 million to get the $39 million back. About the same ratio would apply to the State of Missouri. I could go on and list more fantastic figures, but there are more important issues involved in this legislation than just dollars. There are those who want aid to parochial and private schools. There are those who want to ignore the Supreme Court school integration ruling. There are those persons holding influential positions in the National Education Association who honestly and sincerely believe that the Federal Government ought to dictate our Nation's education policy. The recent report of the U.S. Office of Education expressed strong support for the further centralization and Government participation in control of the Nation's education system.

The question of need for Federal intervention is raised by the fact that fewer than 1 percent of the school districts in the Nation have to date bonded themselves to the legal limits set by local and State governments. In addition, private districts have constructed 660,000 new classrooms during the past 10 years, which is substantially more than the level of classroom construction outlined for the next decade by the Kennedy school aid bill.

This administration aid proposal has a lulling line, but poses real danger to local control of education and is merely financial hocus-pocus. The taxpayers who support it are going to be just like the man who thought he did so well in Las Vegas. He went there in a $5,000 Cadillac and came home in a $45,000 Greyhound bus.

National Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been working since 1901 toward the fullest possible development of our national water resources. The June 1961 issue of the organization's publication the Monthly Reporter, carries an editorial by the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Senator KERR, a distinguished leader in the fight for recognition of the importance of water development, explores many aspects of this program so vital for our Nation's future. Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert his fine article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES

(By Hon. ROBERT S. KERR)

Water is the economic bloodstream of our Nation's economy. As never before today's civilization requires more and more water to move its heavy cargoes, to cool its industrial plants and for disposal of its wastes. Our modern civilization could not exist without blood. And yet, far too many people are not concerned with, or do not understand the problems relating to water resources. We have all seen the expressions of public concern recently over the loss of gold. A few billion dollars in gold are shipped overseas, and the newspapers are full of the anguished wails of our monetary experts. But the facts are we could lose all our gold and it wouldn't hurt our economy nearly as much as the loss of the water we are now wasting by pollution.

To paraphrase the Great Commoner—Lose all your gold, but conserve and wisely use your water resources and you can reclaim gold as if by magic, but waste and pollute

your precious waters and there is not enough gold in the earth to buy healthy bodies for your children.

Our national water supply situation is dynamic. The magic key to open tomorrow's doors is to solve its problems today. Action to avoid water difficulties, rather than efforts to correct them after they have occurred, must be taken if economic decline is to be avoided in many areas. Now is the time for a greater effort to find solutions to the problems that are already on the horizon.

Man's nature calls for constant access to a natural environment in the out-of-doors as God made it. Man cannot remain a prisoner within industrial walls without danger of warping of mind and shrinking of spirit. Therefore, he must have long hours and days of recreation. He must satisfy the hunger of his soul for "rocks and rills, and wooded hills." He must hear and see clear pure water in its natural streams or manmade lakes. He must walk alone with his Maker in forest cathedrals or on rugged mountain terrain. These things can be, only through more complete conservation and better use of our precious water resources.

During the 2 years ending last January 31, it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. This committee included a number of the most able men in the U.S. Senate. It has completed what is probably the most extensive study of water resources and problems ever made.

The role of research in the development of water resources is being defined rapidly by spokesmen of the New Frontier. The National Academy of Sciences is being asked to undertake a thorough and broadly based study of the present state of research in the field of conservation development and use of natural resources. In addition, the White House advisers and the Federal Council for Science and Technology have undertaken a review of Federal research activity in these fields, hopeful of finding means to strengthen the total Government research effort.

The relationship of our space research programs to weather forecasting techniques and to the possible and eventual management of weather and rainfall itself has long been apparent. The Senate Select Committee on Water Resources suggested an expansion of basic research programs on subjects such as atmospheric physics, solar activity, climatic cycles, photosynthesis, ground water action, and the physical chemistry and molecular structure of water.

The committee suggested that we can learn much from more detailed evaluation of completed water projects with a view of making them and those we build in the future more efficient. Private research in these and other fields related to water must be encouraged.

Minnesota Firm's Space Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to appear before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and to place into the record of that committee a statement by Mr. G. T. Schjeldahl, the head of the G. T. Schjeldahl Co., of Northfield, Minn. It was this company which did much of the work on the recent most successful Echo I project. Because I believe the statement of Mr. Schjeldahl will be of interest to my colleagues, I am placing this testimony in the RECORD.

INFLATABLE STRUCTURES IN SPACE

(Friday, May 19, 1961)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
AND ASTRONAUTICS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10 a.m., Hon. OVERTON BROOKS (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, could I mention that we have with us the distinguished Congressman from Minnesota, Mr. ALBERT QUIE, who is here by virtue of the fact that Echo I was fabricated in Northfield, Minn., which is in the district of the gentleman from Minnesota?

I think the record should show that he is here as a visitor.

Mr. HECHLER. I would like to join in welcoming my colleague, Mr. QUIE, to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We are happy to have you this morning, Mr. QUIE.

This morning we open a 1-day hearing on the matter of the potential uses, problems and funding, and research and development on "Inflatable Structures in Space."

We have a good many witnesses this morning. I think it is entirely proper that we follow the hearings that we have had by this one on "Inflatable Structures in Space."

We have, of course, our distinguished colleague. We want to hear from him in just a moment.

We have Mr. L. K. Loftin, Jr., Technical Assistant to the Director of the Langley Research Center of NASA; Mr. William J. O'Sullivan, Space Vehicle Group, Langley Research Center, NASA; Mr. Robert W. Richardson, vice president, Goodyear Aircraft Corp.; Dr. Robert S. Ross, Goodyear Aircraft Corp., and Mr. Robert T. Madden, Goodyear Aircraft Corp., also.

We are glad to have these gentlemen here with us this morning.

Mr. QUIE, I know of your interest, because I just talked to you.

It is customary for the committee to hear the Members of Congress first. If you have a statement you would like to give us on this, we would be glad to have it at this time.

Following that, we will be glad to have you come up and sit with the committee and stay with us as long as you like.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. BROOKS.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBERT H. QUIE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. QUIE. My name is ALBERT H. QUIE, Congressman from the First District of Minnesota.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee.

I will have to decline from accepting your invitation to stay with you this morning, since our Education and Labor Committee is meeting and we have some problems confronting us there, as you so well know.

In Minnesota and in my congressional district we are indeed proud of the work that is being done by one company in Northfield. So often out in the Midwest—and I come from a little farming community next to Northfield, Minn.—we tend to think of space exploration that is being done some distance away, a long ways away, and people have wondered if they would see anything like that accomplished in their little community. We were indeed proud when the Schjeldahl Co. in Northfield, Minn., played such an important part in the construction of Echo I and now Echo II. The community is really enthused about what is being done. They feel the old pioneer spirit and their esprit de corps in these space endeavors would surely ignite one's faith in America; these people, no matter what their job is in the part of fabrication, are so enthusiastic that when called on they have been willing to practically work around the clock.

As we read of this person, Commander Shepard—people had kind of lost faith with the Americans, and he renewed their faith in themselves.

I think if you could come out there and see that company, too, you would have a renewed faith in the American people.

I feel inadequate, speaking here upon such a technical subject, because I have no technical experience, myself. For that reason I was glad I was able to speak first, because I would surely feel inadequate after hearing some of these other men like Mr. O'Sullivan, whom I have heard so much about, not only read about, since Mr. Schjeldahl speaks of him in glowing terms.

We in Minnesota and that area are indeed proud of the work being done.

At this time, I would like to include in the testimony a statement by Mr. G. T. Schjeldahl—the head of the G.T. Schjeldahl Co.:

"ERECTABLE AND INFLATABLE STRUCTURES IN SPACE

"(By G. T. Schjeldahl Co., Northfield, Minn., May 24, 1961)

"Having already ventured briefly into space, man is developing a host of vehicles and capsules to propel him and protect him as he soars into the interplanetary void. Highly complex rocket systems and compact and efficient space capsules will of course play the major role in helping man leave this earth for parts unknown.

"Yet man, as he plans for his most epic voyage, is turning his attention to the same spectacular device that enabled his predecessors to leave the ground some two centuries ago—the balloon and its modern counterpart, the inflatable satellite, or 'satelloon.'

"The inflatable structure is already in orbit

"On August 12, 1960, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shot into the heavens the largest volume satellite ever thrust into orbit—Echo I. This 100-foot diameter plastic sphere, designed and manufactured by the G. T. Schjeldahl Co. of Northfield, Minn., is still in orbit—a visible symbol of American creativity for all the world to see.

"The Schjeldahl Co. is already at work on other space inflatables. These include the forthcoming Echo II on which successful inflation tests have been concluded by NASA, Langley Research Center, and Project Rebound in which several inflatable satellites will be launched in orbit from a single rocket carrier.

"All these inflatable satelloons have a common ancestor—the balloon. But while the balloon is designed to go up and come down again within a very short period of time, the satelloon is so constructed that it will remain in orbit for extremely long periods—perhaps many years.

"The inflatable satellite, such as Echo I and Echo II and other satellites developed by the Schjeldahl Co., must be precisely engineered and sealed by means of a super adhesive that will withstand the hostile environment of space. The Schjeldahl Co. has developed such an adhesive—called Schjel-Bond 301, which has held Echo I together for nearly a year despite the ravages of extreme temperatures, radiation and low vacuum.

"An efficient and economical device

"The inflatable space satellite is an efficient and economical device that can be packed—uninflated—in a small canister, shot by rocket into space and then inflated to become a massive satellite, perhaps 100,000 times its uninflated volume. It can be pre-

fabricated in an unlimited variety of shapes and sizes to perform specific functions, such as reflecting electronic signals, gathering solar energy, providing safe shelter for man in space and for storing gases and fuels in space.

"Up to the present time, inflatable space structures have been used mainly to reflect electronic signals. Man's first space balloon, the Robin (rocket balloon instrument), is a 1-meter-diameter Mylar sphere with a built-in corner reflector for ground radar tracking. Robin was designed, developed, and built by the Schjeldahl Co. for meteorological purposes. More than 200 of these unique devices have been shot by the U.S. Air Force to altitudes of about 50 miles, inflated, and allowed to drift back to earth. The radar plots of their corner reflectors yield such meteorological information as wind direction, wind speed, air density, and air temperature.

"Passive satellites

"Robin is an example of a 'passive' communication satellite. 'Active' communication satellites carry into space a radio receiver and transmitter so that they can receive signals from one point and relay them to another point. The active satellite must carry its own power or possess the means of deriving power from external sources. (1) it cannot be repaired in space if something goes wrong and (2) its signal can be jammed.

"The passive communications satellite is in effect one or a series of electronic 'mirrors' in space which reflect signals beamed to it from the ground. Such signals, since they are beamed, cannot be jammed.

"This earth's only orbiting passive communication satellite is Echo I, launched by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration August 12, 1960, from Cape Canaveral and still circling the globe 1,000 miles out in space. Echo I was manufactured by the Schjeldahl Co.

"Echo I's chief disadvantage as a passive communication device is the low ratio of power of the reflected signal to that of the projected signal. This low response is due to the fact that it is spherical. Although Echo I is 100 feet in diameter, the effective reflective 'disk' is only a foot or so in diameter, because the surface of the satelloon is extremely shiny.

"Echo II, 135 feet in diameter, which only recently was subjected to successful ground inflation tests at Weeksville, N.C., has a duller surface than Echo I and will present a much larger reflective surface and hence will provide a greater ratio of response to input signal.

"Echo II 50 times stronger than Echo I

"This material in Echo II is 50 times more rigid than the material used in Echo I. It is a laminate consisting of two layers of aluminum foil only eighteen hundred-thousandths of an inch thick bonded to a center sheet of Mylar thirty-five hundred-thousandths of an inch thick. The rigidized spheres will weigh about 500 pounds each.

"When Echo II is inflated in space, the folds and wrinkles it receives as a result of packing will disappear. When the sphere is punctured by meteorites, releasing its inflation agent, it will not deform, for it will not 'remember' the folds and wrinkles it incurred in its 'fetal' position within the rocket's canister.

"At the present time, the Schjeldahl Co. is working with the Goddard Space Flight Center of NASA in developing a 200-foot diameter inflatable plastic sphere for rebounding signals from one satellite to another. Goal of the project—called Rebound—is to produce a new lightweight material that compares in strength to the material of Echo II. This will be accomplished by chemically 'milling' out a pattern of circular 'windows' from the aluminum, leaving the Mylar membrane intact. The network of aluminum arches remaining will preserve the rigidity with an accompanying—and desirable—reduction of weight amounting to about 30 percent.

"Several satelloons in one rocket vehicle

"Project Rebound will concentrate on placing three inflatable satellites in a circular orbit from one rocket vehicle. These will be spaced at predetermined intervals in order to test their effectiveness in bouncing radio signals from one satellite to another, thereby extending the range of radio wave propagation far beyond that of a single satellite, such as Echo I and Echo II.

"Launching of the first three Rebound satellites is scheduled during the first quarter of 1963. A launching of six Rebound satellites from a single rocket to form a string of beads around the earth will occur sometime in 1964.

"In a move to increase the signal response and directionalize it, the Schjeldahl Co. is proposing through the Wright Air Development Division to create a new and different series of inflatable passive satellites. This new inflatable will be comparable to a chandelier in space, containing a multitude of small reflective units which will vastly increase the strength of the reflected signal. Moreover, by maintaining a specific attitude with respect to the earth's surface as it orbits, the satellite will project a 'cone' with signal strength maximum at the perimeter. Thus, a passive satellite in synchronous orbit—with its orbital speed the same as the earth's daily rotation—would project its strongest signal to the horizon. Since synchronous orbits require high altitudes—approximately 22,500 miles—the 'horizon' would be perhaps 6,000 miles away. Such a device would become a tactical nonjammable communications device.

"Inflatables to aid active satellites

"The role of inflatables is by no means confined to passive satellites. They promise to be important to active satellites as well. Huge inflatable antennae, precisely constructed on the ground, will burgeon out in space to enable maximum propagation of the active satellite's signal.

"The inflatable concept also will be applied in building all types of space structures. Present thinking at Langley Research Laboratories favors a 'marriage' of inflatables and erectables so that combinations of rigid members can be folded into compact forms and 'married' to an inflatable object in space. Such a method shows great promise in the problem of creating space stations in which men can survive the space environment. Similarly, inflatable components of various structural devices will be rocketed into space and inflated and rigidized. The economy and efficiency of such a method of erecting devices in space are obvious.

"New materials being developed

"At the present time, the Schjeldahl Co. is conducting research in developing new materials to withstand the space environment for prolonged periods. These include combinations with mineral fibers that promise to be as strong as the strongest steels. Other investigations planned are for the development of plastic materials that will not burn—even in the searing blast of a plasma torch.

"We believe that inflatables will assume a constantly increasing role in the unfolding drama of the space age. Their economy and their ratio of collapsed size to inflated size command their continued application.

"Limitless number of missions

"Leonard Jaffe, Chief of NASA's communications satellite program, emphasizes that inflatables can be designed and constructed to perform an almost limitless number of missions.

" 'The feasibility of using a passive satellite as a communications reflector has been established' he says. 'The fact that Echo I did not completely collapse upon loss of its internal pressurization material has indicated that the thin wall structure is almost structurally sound enough to withstand the space environment, and that only a nominal increase in rigidity will provide long-life structures.'

"Appendix A

"The attached photographs pictorially illustrate a NASA/Langley Research Center conceptual design of an erectable space station. [The pictures in question were not of reproducible quality and have been placed on file.] Note the incorporation of an optimum combination of pneumatically and mechanically erectable segments. This combination incorporates the best advantages of each type component. The rigid sections contain all on-board apparatus. The pneumatically erectable sections made possible the deployment and interconnection of the rigid sections in a ready-to-use condition in a matter of minutes with no requirement to bolt together the parts.

"As with project Echo, the G. T. Schjeldahl Co. is following carefully the evolvement of the research done in the Langley Laboratory. Development of materials with which to accomplish this task is an area where GTS Co. will make a contribution. Fabrication techniques to translate the concept into an actual test vehicle are under study by the company.

"This is an excellent example of the close teamwork between industry and the Government-sponsored laboratories, which should lead us forward in man's conquest of space."

The CHAIRMAN. That was a great achievement. I think the people of Northfield should feel justified pride in their contribution to this major accomplishment in space.

We are happy to have you here this morning, and we will give your statement our careful consideration.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you.

What Makes a President Great?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, June 12, 1961, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], whom I admire very much, and one of the ablest and dedicated Members of the Congress, delivered an address to the members of the Suffolk University Law School alumni, at a dinner which took place in the Parker House, in Boston, Mass., the title of his address being "What Makes a President Great?"

The address delivered by our colleague, Mr. REUSS, received with enthusiasm by those present, is both informative and timely, which address I include in my remarks:

WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT GREAT?

(Address by Hon. HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, to Suffolk Law School Alumni Association, Parker House, Boston, Mass., June 12, 1961)

John F. Kennedy today completes his first 142 days in the White House. No President

assumed his office with greater public expectations. Here is the way Franklin Roosevelt was described by Walter Lippmann as he sought office in 1932:

"A pleasant man who, without any qualifications for the office, would very much like to be President."

Abraham Lincoln, when he went to the White House, was ridiculed as a "baboon."

That old aristocrat, John Adams, thought these should be the virtues of a President—birth, wealth, beauty, strength, marriage, gracefulness and eloquence. It would be difficult to name a President who has more of these than John F. Kennedy. And you can add a warrior's toughness, in the tradition of Jackson, Teddy Roosevelt, and Eisenhower.

Well, then, is Mr. Kennedy a great President? History alone will decide. There is a rule in Washington: Don't erect a statue to anyone until he's been dead for at least 50 years. So perhaps our question is premature.

But surely we can ask now what are the attributes of a great President, as history reveals them to us. Can he identify the great issues that face the Nation, and act constructively to solve them? How does he carry on his roles of Chief Executive, chief legislator, Commander in Chief, party leader, molder of public opinion, setter of public style? Is his nature adapted to his task—has he wisdom and courage, humor and compassion, integrity and energy?

Before we ask these questions of John Kennedy, it's useful to see how earlier Presidents measure up. A 1947 poll of political scientists and historians listed six great Presidents: Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and F.D.R. Clinton Rossiter of Cornell, Edward Corwin of Princeton, and Sidney Hyman have added T.R. to the list. Rossiter threw in Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower in his 1956 first edition of "The American Presidency," but dropped Ike in his second edition in 1959.

There are various categories and subcategories of Presidents on the way down—down to Warren G. Harding, who once told a friend what he thought of the Presidency:

"John, I can't make a damn thing out of this tax problem. I listen to one side and they seem right. God, I talk to the other side, and they seem just as right, and there I am, where I started. I know somewhere there is a book that would give me the truth, but hell, I couldn't read the book. God, what a job."

Or down to Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire. Mr. Pierce had not gone to the Democratic Convention at Baltimore in 1852, but instead remained at home in Concord and sent his Negro manservant down to the Western Union office to pick up the news bulletins. The news of Mr. Pierce's nomination on the 49th ballot was brought to him at lunch at home with the announcement:

"Mr. Pierce, I have the honor to inform you that you have just been nominated to the Presidency of the United States—ridiculous though it may seem."

LINCOLN

In the national indoor sport of ranking the Presidents, only one name gets everyone's vote, expert and layman alike. That is Abraham Lincoln.

Why? First and foremost Lincoln was in the mainstream of American history. The spirit of 1776 and of the Founding Fathers moved in him. He feared the weakening of the old faith. As he wrote his old friend Josh Speed:

"Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the know-nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners, and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

Loyalty to the Union was Lincoln's almost mystical aim: "Thanks to all," he proclaimed after a victory of Union arms. "For this great Republic—for the principle it lives by and keeps alive—for man's vast future—thanks to all."

As President, Lincoln ran the country. Many doubted Lincoln's qualifications when he took office. They expected William H. Seward to run the Government—the short, cigar-smoking man who had opposed Lincoln for the Presidency and whom Lincoln had named Secretary of State. Seward himself seemed to share these expectations. A month after the inaugural, he brought Lincoln a memorandum outlining an action program (one idea was to solve the upcoming secession by starting a foreign war to unite the Nation). Seward suggested that he, Seward, was the man to run the country. Lincoln read the paper over carefully. On his desk he kept a series of trays marked "Secretary of State," "Secretary of War," and so on, till the last one, which was marked "Unimportant." When he had finished reading Seward's paper, he smilingly tossed it in the last tray and explained that, like it or not, for better or for worse, he, Abraham Lincoln, was going to be President of the United States.

Seward, the enemy whom he made his Secretary of State, became his stanchest supporter. That was political shrewdness—not so different from that displayed by Mr. Kennedy when he turned his cheek on LYNDON JOHNSON'S hostility in the primaries, and chose him to be his Vice President.

Lincoln acted decisively where great issues were at stake. He rejected the idea that a President must be a prisoner of the Constitution. The Constitution, he argued, if it meant anything, must mean the preservation of the Union. A constitution wouldn't count for much if there were no union to uphold it.

On April 13, 1861, he sent relief forces to Fort Sumter, forcing the South into the role of aggressor. The next day, the South fired on Fort Sumter. As Lincoln said:

"All dreaded it, all sought to avert it. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the Nation survive, and the other would accept war, rather than let it perish, and the war came."

Should Lincoln have called on Congress to grant him emergency powers? With his Republicans in the minority, Congress would probably have refused. So he acted on his own. He increased the size of the Army. He lent $2 million to private citizens to pay for military supplies. He ordered a blockade of the South. He suspended the writ of habeas corpus. When he was criticized for his failure to consult Congress, he answered that he had no intention of letting the Union disintegrate before his eyes while Congress conferred endlessly about what to do. In the end, on July 4, 1861, he asked Congress to ratify his actions, saying:

"These measures, whether strictly legal or not, were ventured upon under what appeared to be a popular demand and a public necessity, trusting then, as now, that Congress would readily ratify them."

Lincoln was more than a President. He was a martyr who moved from the realm of history to the realm of legend. To compare Kennedy with Lincoln is a little like comparing De Gaulle to Charlemagne, or Macmillan to King Arthur. We need perspective, and we don't have it yet.

WASHINGTON

George Washington, with the majesty and prestige of his person, in a sense created the Presidency. There were those who wanted him for a king, but he fiercely rejected this suggestion. He also turned down the proposal that the Order of the Cincinnati—a sort of Revolutionary War American Legion—become our hereditary nobility.

Some thought that Washington overdid it on the pomp and circumstance. When he received Members of Congress, the public, or the press, everyone had to stand. His receptions were held in kingly drawing rooms. Washington himself usually wore velvet knee britches, yellow gloves, gold-buckled slippers, a sword in a white leather scabbard, and an ostrich-plumed cocked hat.

Washington didn't win his claim to greatness by his ability at rhetoric. His language was often so archaic and pompous that it was hard to figure out what he was trying to say. He once placed an advertisement in a newspaper for a cook, but the wording was so complicated that not a single person who could qualify as a cook could understand what was wanted:

"A cook is wanted for the family of the President of the United States. No one need apply who is not perfect in the business and can bring indubitable testimonials of sobriety, honesty, and attention to the duties of the station."

Nobody could understand, so nobody answered the ad.

Nor did Washington shine in his relations with Congress. His first appearance in the Senate ended in disaster. On August 29, 1789, Washington appeared before the Senate and bluntly told Senators that he wanted their advice and consent on seven proposals concerning a treaty—but that he would like them to simply vote "yea" or "no" on each matter. The Senators protested that this didn't give them much of a chance to provide advice—to which Washington replied that he had brought his Secretary of War with him if he needed any advice. The Senate then decided to refer the whole matter to a committee. Washington's response was anything but magisterial. According to the journal of one of the Senators:

"The President started up in a violent fret. 'This defeats my very purpose of coming here.' When he finally cooled down, he agreed to postpone the discussion and withdrew, with a very discontented air."

But the Washington that lives is Washington the Founding Father—first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

JEFFERSON

Thomas Jefferson brought to the Presidency an array of talents that has never been matched. He was an expert horseman. He played the violin. He was an architect who designed Monticello and a blueprint for Washington, D.C. He was a lawyer who wrote much of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. He was a geographer and mapper of much of Virginia. He was a most successful Ambassador to France. He was a botanist who examined every useful tree and plant in Europe. He was an inventor of numerous gadgets, both useful and ornamental. He wrote "Jefferson's Manual on Parliamentary Practice," which still governs us in the House of Representatives today.

Yet Jefferson is primarily a great man, rather than a great President. The two great achievements credited to his Presidency—the Louisiana Purchase, and establishing a strong control over Congress—are far less lustrous than his accomplishments before and after the Presidency.

When Jefferson sent his agents to buy up "the island of New Orleans," he was as much

surprised as they when it was discovered that they could buy most of the western United States in the bargain.

In dealing with Congress, Jefferson recognized both the need for leadership, and that to be effective it had to be subtle. "What is practical," he said, "must often control what is pure theory."

Jefferson lost no time in installing his Democratic supporters in control of the Congress. The Speaker of the House and the leading committee chairmen were Jefferson men. Jefferson used the secret Democratic congressional caucuses to make party policy, which then stuck on the House floor. When John Randolph, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, refused to move an important appropriation, Jefferson's agents eased him out.

Jefferson's political genius lay in his ability to get Congress to do what he wanted it to do, and at the same time let Congress think it was supreme. President Kennedy did a pretty good job of this last January. He played a key role in reforming the Rules Committee at the opening of Congress, taking away its power to block legislation from reaching the floor. But Mr. Kennedy nodded approvingly when Speaker RAYBURN, asked whether the Rules Committee was a problem for Congress, replied "Utterly."

Jefferson, for all his skill, perhaps made Congress too dependent on his leadership, too flabby an institution on its own.

So you have Jefferson—a Leonardo da Vinci, a universal genius—whose career as President actually shines less than his career before and since.

JACKSON

Andrew Jackson was no ordinary President. No campaign that had ever brought a man into the Presidency had ever been pitched on so sordid a plane. All over the country pamphlets were circulated by his opposition: "Ought a convicted adulteress and her paramour husband be placed in the highest office of this free and Christian land?" No President had ever openly threatened the life of his Vice President as did Jackson: "I will hang John C. Calhoun."

Jackson was the first President elected by a broad suffrage of the people. This popular power he used to protect the Nation, decisively and effectively. When the high tariff of 1832 was enacted, South Carolina, which opposed protectionism, adopted an ordinance nullifying the tariff, and threatened immediate secession if the Federal Government used force. Jackson wasted no time. To deal with South Carolina's grievance, he sent a message to Congress requesting a reduction in the tariff. To deal with South Carolina's rebellion, he ordered the Secretary of War to alert the forts in Charleston Harbor, and he branded secession as treason. His quick and dramatic action saved the Union: South Carolina rescinded the ordinance of nullification.

Jackson's motto may well have been: The bigger they come, the harder they fall. When he vetoed the bill setting up the second Bank of the United States, he took on almost singlehandedly the Congress, the Supreme Court, and the business community. His veto message proclaimed it as his special duty "to protect the liberties and rights of the people and the integrity of the Constitution against the Senate, or the House of Representatives, or both together."

Jackson had a hunch that future generations would be partial to his concept of a strong Presidency. He said more than once: "I shall anticipate with pleasure the place to be assigned to me in the history of my country."

T.R.

Teddy Roosevelt came to the White House after 35 years of congressional rule and executive feebleness. He regarded his years in the White House as "ripping, simply ripping," and the Presidency as a "bully pulpit." He believed in using "every ounce of power" that he could squeeze out of the Presidency. He never tired of trying to find a little more.

He never worried about finding a specific constitutional clause to authorize his action. He just acted:

"I took the isthmus, started the Panama Canal, and then left Congress to debate—not the canal, but to debate me."

He sent our Great White Fleet around the world, demonstrating that America had come of age as a world power, ready and able to fight wherever it had to in defense of freedom. He sent the fleet off even though Congress had appropriated only enough to get it to Europe. His political judgment told him that once the ships had reached Europe, Congress would come through with the money to send them the rest of the way—and he was right. I suspect that President Kennedy may have the same thing in mind when he asked Congress for the initial one-half billion dollars of what may be a $10 billion project to send a man to the moon—and back.

He practiced the "strenuous life," and asked us all to join in. "The things that will destroy America," he said, "are prosperity at any price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living, and the get-rich theory of life." These words are beginning to be heard on the New Frontier.

Teddy Roosevelt—the cattle puncher, leader of the charge up San Juan Hill, the African lion hunter—had his detractors. Senator "Fighting Bob" La Follette, bitter after his rivalry with Roosevelt over the Republican nomination in 1912, pictured his rival as a trimmer—one who proclaimed himself a great "trustbuster" and fighter against "malefactors of great wealth," but who sat idly by while the monopolies of the day multiplied. T.R. also failed to impress La Follette as a man of the soil. When La Follette called on the colonel at Oyster Bay, the colonel "appeared wearing linen knickerbockers, and after a cordial greeting, said he had just come in from pitching hay, confirming his statement by removing a liberal quantity of timothy from his person."

But, desipte his poses, T.R. was the first President who taught us that the world contains wicked men who wish us ill, and that power is the language that they understand. And he was the first to tell us that we were but the trustees of our natural resources—woods and waters, soil and wildlife—for future generations.

WILSON

Woodrow Wilson brought to the Presidency an awareness of the needs of a growing nation, a vigorous concept of his powers, shrewdness as a party leader, and an impressive rhetoric for molding public opinion.

For most of his two terms, he was remarkably successful with Congress. Meticulously constitutional, he believed in getting legal authority from Congress for what he did—unlike Lincoln's do-it-first-and-then-get-authority approach. He revived the practice of addressing Congress in person, out of use for 100 years. Following suit, President Kennedy has already made not only a first but a second state of the Union message.

Wilson eloquently articulated the role of the United States in the world. His 14 points, particularly the concept of the League of Nations, proclaimed our membership in the world community. His trip to Paris in December 1918 foreshadowed President Kennedy's last week.

It was Woodrow Wilson's overwhelming sense of self-righteousness that brought him to destruction. In the 1918 congressional elections, he proclaimed that "politics should be adjourned * * * the election will go to those who think the least of it"—though he soon retreated and urged the Nation to elect Democrats.

As his second term continued, he became increasingly self-righteous:

"I have come through the fire * * * and if I may believe my own thoughts, I have more enthusiasm for the right thing, no matter whom it hurts, than I ever had before in my life."

It was this "enthusiasm for the right thing" that led Wilson to reject all reservations to the Covenant of the League of Nations, thus killing all chances of the United States joining the League. Knowing that the covenant would not pass the Senate without the support of those who favored mild reservations, Wilson adamantly insisted that any compromise would be "a very serious mistake."

So the end was frustration and tragedy—for an intellect that places Wilson among the great.

F.D.R.

Franklin D. Roosevelt holds his rank among the great because he ruled in a time of crises—and did not flinch. The greatest depression of our history faced him. He told the Nation that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." He was Commander in Chief in the greatest war we have known. He formed the world alliance of free nations, and led it on to victory.

F.D.R. used his office to the full. He meant it when he said in 1932:

"The Presidency is not merely an administrative office. That is the least of it. It is preeminently a place of moral leadership, without leadership, alert and sensitive to change, we are bogged up or lose our way."

Preeminently, he introduced the modern concept of the President as leader of every stage of the legislative process. The White House draws the bill, and follows it through the committee and onto the floor of both the House and the Senate. We still remember F.D.R.'s first 100 days, days which produced the SEC, the TVA, the NRA. Congress later fought back. But the idea of the President's legislative leadership was firmly established.

John F. Kennedy ruled out the idea of becoming a 100-day wonder. As he said at his inaugural:

"All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

Congress has responded to Kennedy's lead in the first 100 days remarkably well: better than at any time since F.D.R.'s day. We have passed a program that includes a distressed areas bill, a minimum wage, unemployment compensation, aid for Latin America.

F.D.R. was a genius at measuring and molding public opinion. He was a master of the friendly give-and-take Presidential press conference, and of the fireside chat with the Nation. President Kennedy is off to a good start in his press conferences. But some who remember the way F.D.R. used to communicate think he would do well to take up the fireside chat.

F.D.R.'s very buoyancy and jauntiness were also his weaknesses. He devalued the dollar in 1933 in the most offhand way. The memory of it made Europeans wonder, at the time of the "gold crisis" last fall, whether similar manipulations were to be forthcoming from the new Democratic administration. Happily, they were not.

But all our great Presidents—even Lincoln—had their faults—and F.D.R., the humane, the compassionate, the courageous—is entitled to his.

KENNEDY

And, now, what of John F. Kennedy? How does he partake of the qualities of the seven Presidents who deserve the accolade of greatness?

As a legislative leader, Kennedy's performance so far can be ranked with the best of T.R., Wilson, or F.D.R. Though faced with a House of Representatives that had 20-odd fewer faithful Democrats than in the last Congress, whose accomplishments were small, Kennedy has already scored on many of his major legislative proposals.

As a political craftsman, he shines with the best. His conduct in the Rules Committee fight recalls Jefferson, and how to get what you want from Congress without actually demanding it. His calls on various Republican elder statemen—MacArthur and Hoover and Eisenhower—show Lincoln's skill at disarming the opposition.

Will Kennedy have Andrew Jackson's toughness in facing up to the pressing social issues of the day? We cannot yet be sure, but his conduct in the primary campaign is encouraging. He entered the primary in Wisconsin, where some of the wiseacres were saying that a big-city easterner couldn't win; and the primary in West Virginia, supposedly an anti-Catholic stronghold, and he won them both. He's going to need this kind of courage as President.

He has called to his side a praetorian guard of first-class men: Rusk, Stevenson, and Bowles in foreign policy; Dillon at the Treasury; McNamara in Defense; Hodges at Commerce; Udall in Interior; brother Robert as Attorney General (Attorney General Kennedy's decisive performance in the Alabama crisis fortifies the President in having rejected the advice that the public would never stand for having a brother as Attorney General).

He has used the power of rhetoric that Wilson and F.D.R. used so effectively. "Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country," has become the theme of the New Frontier. "Never fear to negotiate, but never negotiate out of fear" is one of the planks of our foreign policy.

The new President and his wife combine to carry out the magisterial function. They help set the moral, the cultural, and the intellectual trend for the whole country. They have brought poets to the inaugural, and imported the world of art into the White House. They've set an example of youthful fitness which is the essence of the Peace Corps.

And what of the man beneath the robes of office? There have been flashes of humor, as when he thanked Secretary Udall at his $100-a-plate birthday dinner last month "for handling the publicity." There has been humility: The morning after the nightmare of the Cuban invasion, he held himself alone responsible for the disaster, and the Nation gave its sympathy to the beleaguered leader who admitted his mistake.

The true test of Kennedy's greatness, however, will be not how well he administers, or how adroit is his politics, or even how successful is his congressional box score. The true test will be how he responds to the crisis of our time: Can the selfish interests of various groups be woven together into a true national fabric? Can we become a community united and unafraid, equipped to face the fearful abyss of the world today?

The President has told us the Nation's needs. We need to grow economically and to do it without a price spiral. We need truly to seek excellence in education, in science, in more widely shared opportunities in the arts. We need to make the promise of equality come true. And we need generous hearts and steady nerves for the world crisis that looms ahead as far as you and I can see.

The giant that is America seems to be stirring. But it is still asleep. Little men in big industries play around with inflation, and the devil take the consumer and our balance of payments. Soothing voices beckon us: leave the world and retire into fortress America. Others would have us believe that we can stand for equality and justice throughout the world, and yet be careless of them at home.

John F. Kennedy has identified many of the great issues that confront us. He has called on us for sacrifices to meet them. But he has yet to sketch out the road we must follow, and to detail the sacrifices we must make.

When he does, he will need not only the strength of Andrew Jackson and the courage of Franklin Roosevelt, but the almost mystical quality that spoke from Abraham Lincoln to his fellow Americans a hundred years ago.

History's verdict will be long delayed. But from the evidence so far produced, I'm betting on Kennedy.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Our Father, God, through the lowly gate of penitence we would enter the inner chamber of peace, where the harsh noises of the clamorous world are hushed and, in quietness of spirit, we face ourselves and Thee.

Thou only art our defense amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. From the terror that cometh by night, and the arrow that flieth by day, from the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and the destruction that wasteth at noonday, good Lord deliver us.

We ask Thy blessing upon the men of our generation who raise Thy standards against pagan blasphemies, the men who guard the rights of their fellow men, the men who are not neutral in time of evil, the men who turn not away their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for the mess of pottage, of petty gain or glory.

Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that, through our labors in this moment of history, we shall be in truth the living witnesses of Thy righteous will, helping to hasten the time when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of Thy truth even as the waters cover the sea.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 13, 1961, was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 13, 1961, the following executive reports of the Committee on the Judiciary were submitted during the adjournment on June 13, 1961:

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

Albert A. Ridge, of Missouri, to be U.S. circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Frank W. Wilson, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee; and

Kenneth Harwell, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Tennessee.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Edwin L. Reynolds, of Maryland, to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents;

Horace B. Fay, Jr., of Ohio, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents; and

Arthur W. Crocker, of Maryland, to be an Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Warren C. Colver, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Alaska;

Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Georgia;

Charles L. Goodson, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia;

Herman T. F. Lum, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii;

Sylvan A. Jeppesen, of Idaho, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Idaho;

Richard P. Stein, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indiana;

Claude Vernon Spratley, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia;

Ernest Morgan, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Texas;

Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas;

William W. Justice, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas;

Woodrow B. Seals, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas;

James H. Dilion, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin; and

Charles N. Bordwine, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Virginia.

By Mr. HART:

Floyd Stevens, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Michigan.

By Mr. ERVIN:

Hugh Salter, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7577) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for the fiscal year ending June