the Department of Agriculture. In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee he said:

In 1949 the Nation was consuming about 16 billion pounds of red meat, and by 1954 consumption of red meat increased to about 25 billion pounds.

He goes on to point out that, if the per capita consumption of meat continues at the rate of 1954, it will require 7 million more head of cattle, 3 million more sheep, and about 10 million more hogs to supply the increased meat that would be needed by 1962.

To provide pasture and feed for these additional animals it would require another 35 million acres of land. This land is not available, but irrigated pastures could do much to alleviate this coming situation. You can pasture several times more animals on an irrigated acre than you can on a dryland pasture.

According to the Department of Agriculture, the consumption of beef has nearly doubled since 1930.

PRODUCTION INCREASES

In addition to the importance of these crops to our diet, increased production also has been a determining factor in the increase in consumption.

We would not have been able to experience this increase in per capita consumption had it not been for irrigation.

For example, about three-fifths of our fruits and tree nuts, one-half of our commercial vegetables and one-third of the potato crop are grown on irrigated land.

Irrigation has enabled growers to take advantage of the favorable soil and climate in our Western States to make the growing of fruits and vegetables one of the leading industries of the West.

To show what percent of the commercial fruits and vegetables that are produced in the irrigated West, I have asked the Department of Agriculture to give me the pertinent figures.

Here are the figures they have supplied me:

Almonds	100
Apricots	100
Asparagus	62
Avocadoes	72
Strawberries	50
Broccoli	79
Cantaloups	80
Carrots	75
Cauliflower	61
Celery	54
Sweet cherries	85
Lemons	100
Dates	100
Figs	100
Grapes	95
Lettuce	91
Honeydews	100
Filberts	100
Walnuts	100
Olives	100
Onions	56
Peaches	58
Pears	88
Peas	42
Plums	87
Prunes	100
Rice	52
Spinach	57
Tomatoes	51

Many of the crops are produced in the late fall, winter, and early and middle spring. As recently as 20 to 25 years ago these crops were not available in the winter months.

Certainly, new methods of processing, better transportation and the introduction of frozen foods has helped considerably to provide us with these specialty and seasonal crops the year around. However, without irrigation to grow these crops in the first place they would not be available.

We can be quite thankful to irrigation and reclamation for making it possible for us to have the necessary crops to give us a nutritious and balanced diet.

We in the United States eat better than anyone else in the world. Because of this we are a strong Nation.

Our youth excel in practically every international sport. They have strong, well-developed bodies which make possible the new records in athletics which they achieve.

Their bodies are strong and well developed because they enjoy a balanced diet—a diet containing plenty of fresh fruits and vegetables, milk, and meat.

There are some who complain about the cost of Federal reclamation projects. In the past 50 years, approximately $2.6 billion has been allocated to irrigation. It has been estimated that these irrigation projects have returned to the Treasury more than $4 billion in new taxes. These Federal projects have repaid about $600 million of the original cost and are returning an average of $60 million a year to the Treasury.

Water is the lifeblood of the arid West. Water, placed on good soil at the proper time, can bring a feeling of security, of confidence, and new wealth to the community.

If we are to eat well in the future, we will need to produce more crops. The population of our country increases about 3½ million each year. They will need food. Little of the food produced on irrigated lands adds to our present supply of surplus foods. We should be thankful that we have a surplus.

Because of irrigation, we are eating well. We will continue to eat well if we wisely develop the feasible irrigation projects in our land.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, executive director, American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in these days we turn for strength to Thee. Assailed by slogans and shibboleths, we ask for power to discern. Lead us to convictions based on solicitude for America, its defense, and its survival. Inspire us to be guided by our true convictions and not by unworthy pressures.

Keep our leaders from the temptation of momentary political advantage, real or imagined. There is no compromise with the right. That opportunism which averts its face from human pain, from injustice, from cruelty, cannot be the chosen course of any nation knowing God. Preserve us from godless cynicism in the dress of diplomacy.

They cry peace, peace, but there is no peace. No peace for us while men cry out under the whip of the oppressor. No calm for mankind while one-third of earth cowers in terror.

Make us alive, dear God, to the truth: That life today is war—war everywhere between good and evil, war in hope of the good triumphant. It is war without arms; subtle, spiritual, emotional war. Give us clarity of perception to understand our foe, as he unfortunately studies and understands us.

Enable us to see not the easy way, but the right one. Help us to realize that facile appeasement, like some cosmic drug, may relieve a tension, but poison a world.

We pray for true peace, a peace of health, a peace of justice, a peace of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 1, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Mrs. Lulie M. Frick, to be postmaster at Atlas, Mich., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, considering Communist infiltration of defense plants, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials,

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine matters, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

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

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF REGISTRATION PROVISIONS OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the administration and enforcement of the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act, as amended, for the period June 1, 1954, through May 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF PALM OIL

A letter from the Commissioner, General Services Administration, Emergency Procurement Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 30 million pounds of palm oil now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Grand Council of Virginia, Order of Fraternal Americans, at Norfolk, Va., protesting against any proposed world government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two resolutions adopted by the Grand Council of Virginia, Order of Fraternal Americans, at Norfolk, Va., relating to the treatymaking power and the present immigration and naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Grand Council of Virginia, Order of Fraternal Americans, at Norfolk, Va., relating to the improvement of free public schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A copy of a minute adopted at a meeting of the Delaware County Bar Association, at Media, Pa., favoring the confirmation of the nomination of C. William Kraft, Jr., to be a judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF FOR DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution approved by the Chamber of Commerce of Garden City, Kans., relative to relief legislation for the domestic sugar industry.

Garden City is one of the large sugar-beet-producing areas, and under existing marketing provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, the expansion of the industry is impossible.

I ask that the resolution be referred to the proper committee, and be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the sugar industry is vital to the economic well-being of the Garden City area as well as the entire High Plains and Rocky Mountain States; and

Whereas the present quota and rigid marketing provisions set forth in the Sugar Act of 1948 deny the sugar industry the historic right to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas these conditions adversely affect not only the sugar industry but tend to create a depressed agricultural economy in the area in which Garden City has a keen interest: And be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic industry; and that the Congress be and hereby is petitioned to restore to the domestic industry its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the Garden City Chamber of Commerce heartily endorses and urges immediate action on Senate bill 1635 and House bill 5406, companion measures introduced to provide just relief to the sugar industry; and that the secretary-manager of the Garden City Chamber of Commerce is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Kansas congressional delegation, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by the board of directors of the Garden City Chamber of Commerce May 23, 1955.

HARRY B. ETLING,
President.
ROBERT B. DWYER,
Secretary-Manager.

FLOOD PROTECTION AND PLANNING FOR TOPEKA, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution approved by the board of directors of the North Topeka Drainage District regarding local flood protection and planning for Topeka, Kans.

The Soldier Creek cutoff is an important project in the protection of Topeka from flood damage and I sincerely hope that Congress will give early approval to the requested appropriation.

I present the resolution, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee, and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Soldier Creek has in the past, by overflowing, caused considerable damage to property by flooding in the area of North Topeka; and

Whereas there has never been more than 25 percent of the rainfall in the Soldier Creek drainage area as has fallen in other similar areas; and

Whereas the United States Army has formulated and Congress has authorized a plan known as the Soldier Creek cutoff, which, if carried out, will remove this creek from the densely populated areas and increase the channel capacity and velocity of said stream; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, in his budget, has recommended $60,000 for local Topeka flood protection and planning; and

Whereas the board of directors of the North Topeka drainage district has authorized and directed its engineer to make the necessary survey, plans, and estimates of costs to obtain the right-of-way for said project, as rapidly as possible, in order that an election may be held to vote on a bond issue to pay the expense of acquiring the necessary right-of-way for said project and perform other assurances to make said project possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Topeka drainage district petition Congress to make an appropriation for the necessary surveys and plans for the said Soldier Creek cutoff project; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the following persons: Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, Senator FRANK CARLSON, Congressman WILLIAM AVERY, Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, and Congressman JOHN J. RILEY.

Adopted by the board of directors of the North Topeka drainage district May 2, 1955.

KELLY LEWIS,
Chairman.
HOWARD JACKSON,
Secretary.
L. M. PARAMORE,
Treasurer.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 107. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, Mass., to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; without amendment (Rept. No. 407); and

S. 2078. A bill to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 406).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4294. A bill to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 409).

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3825. A bill to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 408).

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on Federal employment and pay for the month of April 1955. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, APRIL AND MARCH 1955, AND PAY, MARCH AND FEBRUARY 1955

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns. Table V is a separated report on foreign nationals who are not counted in tables I, II, III, and IV.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for April 1955 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,361,166	2,355,810	+5,356	$832,665	$754,395	+$78,270
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,178,776	1,174,295	+4,481	410,517	383,042	+27,475
Department of Defense	1,182,390	1,181,515	+875	422,148	371,353	+50,795
Inside continental United States	2,140,281	2,134,994	+5,287			
Outside continental United States	220,885	220,816	+69			
Industrial employment	717,281	717,290	−9			
Foreign nationals	340,050	341,484	−1,434	29,564	25,139	+4,425

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1955, and comparison with March 1955, and pay for March 1955, and compairson with February 1955*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	74,234	73,318	916		23,232	20,652	2,580	
Commerce [1]	44,840	44,502	338		18,248	16,173	2,075	
Health, Education, and Welfare	39,537	38,901	636		15,088	13,370	1,718	
Interior	51,215	50,546	669		20,123	17,102	3,021	
Justice	30,278	30,225	53		13,307	[2] 11,804	1,503	
Labor	4,989	4,923	66		2,239	1,954	285	
Post Office	506,896	504,434	2,462		161,933	165,419		3,486
State	20,673	20,758		85	7,585	6,349	1,236	
Treasury	82,946	82,826	120		33,309	29,127	4,182	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	281	279	2		152	131	21	
Bureau of the Budget	431	427	4		273	243	30	
Council of Economic Advisers	32	31	1		21	20	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	69	1		25	23	2	
National Security Council [3]	26	26			17	15	2	
Office of Defense Mobilization	282	288		6	161	146	15	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5			3	3		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions	3	8		5	1		1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	11	16		5	6	3	3	
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	5	4	1		2	1	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	808	797	11		103	90	13	
Atomic Energy Commission	5,982	6,036		54	3,082	2,693	389	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	589	590		1	273	235	38	
Civil Aeronautics Board	532	537		5	295	254	41	
Civil Service Commission	3,835	3,879		44	1,716	1,526	190	
Commission of Fine Arts	10	10			1	1		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	59			25	23	2	
Defense Transport Administration	17	17			9	8	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	144	143	1		82	71	11	
Farm Credit Administration	1,089	1,096		7	536	481	55	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	727	713	14		379	310	69	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,068	1,080		12	560	494	66	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,105	1,097	8		512	417	95	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	354	352	2		240	208	32	
Federal Power Commission	612	620		8	329	288	41	
Federal Trade Commission	574	581		7	327	300	27	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	163	173		10	83	67	16	
Foreign Operations Administration	[4] 6,457	6,395	62		3,115	2,719	396	
General Accounting Office	5,705	5,734		29	2,528	2,201	327	
General Services Administration	25,690	25,756		66	8,692	7,564	1,128	
Government Contract Committee	16	14	2		5	4	1	
Government Printing Office	6,814	6,834		20	2,966	2,525	441	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,821	10,815	6		4,878	4,047	831	
Indian Claims Commission	13	14		1	10	9	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,791	1,802		11	901	783	118	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown-Celebration Commission	3	3			2	1	1	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,284	7,294		10	3,375	2,910	465	
National Capital Housing Authority	276	278		2	98	87	11	
National Capital Planning Commission	21	21			11	10	1	
National Gallery of Art	315	316		1	99	89	10	
National Labor Relations Board	1,141	1,150		9	626	538	88	
National Mediation Board	113	110	3		80	70	10	

[1] April figure includes 685 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[4] Subject to revision.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1955, and comparison with March 1955, and pay for March 1955, and comparison with February 1955*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	April	March	Increase	Decrease	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—con.								
National Science Foundation	167	257		90	103	85	18	
National Security Training Commission	5	6		1	4	4		
Panama Canal	15,461	15,401	60		3,412	3,378	34	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,364	2,401		37	889	784	105	
Renegotiation Board	538	536	2		366	316	50	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	19	21		2	14	11	3	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	24	28		4	16	11	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	677	687		10	385	342	43	
Selective Service System	7,121	7,113	8		1,712	1,492	220	
Small Business Administration	741	745		4	362	366		4
Smithsonian Institution	646	635	11		232	202	30	
Soldiers' Home	1,010	988	22		204	179	25	
Subversive Activities Control Board	32	33		1	22	20	2	
Tariff Commission	199	198	1		104	99	5	
Tax Court of the United States	141	142		1	86	69	17	
Tennessee Valley Authority	20,576	21,007		431	9,604	8,463	1,141	
United States Information Agency	9,909	9,809	100		2,472	2,243	229	
Veterans' Administration	178,256	178,378		122	58,863	51,416	7,447	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,178,776	1,174,295	5,582	1,101	410,517	383,042	30,965	3,490
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			4,481				27,475	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,923	1,950		27	1,050	920	130	
Department of the Army	465,077	463,070	2,007		155,529	137,058	18,471	
Department of the Navy	409,053	409,839		786	156,708	138,118	18,590	
Department of the Air Force	306,337	306,656		319	108,861	95,257	13,604	
Total, Department of Defense	1,182,390	1,181,515	2,007	1,132	422,148	371,353	50,795	
Net increase, Department of Defense			875				50,795	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,361,166	2,355,810	7,589	2,233	832,665	754,395	81,760	3,490
Net increase, including Department of Defense			5,356				78,270	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1955, and comparison with March 1955*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	73,096	72,135	961	
Commerce [1]	41,816	41,572	244	
Health, Education, and Welfare	38,989	38,359	630	
Interior	45,244	44,621	623	
Justice	29,734	29,709	25	
Labor	4,874	4,815	59	
Post Office	504,552	502,090	2,462	
State	5,804	5,850		46
Treasury	81,959	81,829	130	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	281	279	2	
Bureau of the Budget	431	427	4	
Council of Economic Advisers	32	31	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	69	1	
National Security Council [2]	26	26		
Office of Defense Mobilization	282	288		6
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions	3	8		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	11	16		5
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	5	4	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	17	18		1
Atomic Energy Commission	5,965	6,019		54
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	589	590		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	528	533		5
Civil Service Commission	3,823	3,868		45
Commission of Fine Arts	10	10		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	59		
Defense Transport Administration	17	17		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	144	143	1	
Farm Credit Administration	1,078	1,084		6
Federal Civil Defense Administration	727	713	14	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,040	1,051		11
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,104	1,096	8	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	354	352	2	
Federal Power Commission	612	620		8
Federal Trade Commission	574	581		7
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	163	173		10
Foreign Operations Administration	1,682	1,662	20	
General Accounting Office	5,653	5,683		30
General Services Administration	25,584	25,647		63
Government Contract Committee	16	14	2	
Government Printing Office	6,814	6,834		20
Independent agencies—Continued				
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,687	10,680	7	
Indian Claims Commission	13	14		1
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,791	1,802		11
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,284	7,294		10
National Capital Housing Authority	276	278		2
National Capital Planning Commission	21	21		
National Gallery of Art	315	316		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,119	1,128		9
National Mediation Board	113	110	3	
National Science Foundation	167	257		90
National Security Training Commission	5	6		1
Panama Canal	557	472	85	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,364	2,401		37
Renegotiation Board	538	536	2	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	19	21		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	24	28		4
Securities and Exchange Commission	677	687		10
Selective Service System	6,923	6,914	9	
Small Business Administration	741	745		4
Smithsonian Institution	644	633	11	
Soldiers' Home	1,010	988	22	
Subversive Activities Control Board	32	33		1
Tariff Commission	199	198	1	
Tax Court of the United States	141	142		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	20,576	21,007		431
United States Information Agency	2,297	2,299		2
Veterans' Administration	176,983	177,108		125
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,119,294	1,115,029	5,330	1,065
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			4,265	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,867	1,896		29
Department of the Army	376,604	375,417	1,187	
Department of the Navy	377,697	378,679		982
Department of the Air Force	264,819	263,973	846	
Total, Department of Defense	1,020,987	1,019,965	2,033	1,011
Net increase, Department of Defense			1,022	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,140,281	2,134,994	7,363	2,076
Net increase, including Department of Defense			5,287	

[1] April figure includes 685 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1955, and comparison with March 1955*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,138	1,183		45
Commerce	3,024	2,930	94	
Health, Education, and Welfare	548	542	6	
Interior	5,971	5,925	46	
Justice	544	516	28	
Labor	115	108	7	
Post Office	2,344	2,344		
State	14,869	14,908		39
Treasury	987	997		10
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	791	779	12	
Atomic Energy Commission	17	17		
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	12	11	1	
Farm Credit Administration	11	12		1
Federal Communications Commission	28	29		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
Foreign Operations Administration	[1] 4,775	4,733	42	
General Accounting Office	52	51	1	
General Services Administration	106	109		3
Housing and Home Finance Agency	134	135		1
National Labor Relations Board	22	22		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Panama Canal	14,904	14,929		25
Selective Service System	198	199		1
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	7,612	7,510	102	
Veterans' Administration	1,273	1,270	3	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,482	59,266	342	126
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			216	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	56	54	2	
Department of the Army	88,473	87,653	820	
Department of the Navy	31,356	31,160	196	
Department of the Air Force	41,518	42,683		1,165
Total, Department of Defense	161,403	161,550	1,018	1,165
Net decrease, Department of Defense			147	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	220,885	220,816	1,360	1,291
Net increase, including Department of Defense			69	

[1] Subject to revision.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1955 and comparison with March 1955*

Department or agency	April	March	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,803	2,845		42
Commerce	2,232	2,173	59	
Interior	8,232	8,210	22	
Treasury	6,261	6,353		92
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	137	133	4	
Federal Communications Commission	12	13		1
General Services Administration	960	922	38	
Government Printing Office	6,814	6,834		20
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,284	7,294		10
Panama Canal	7,502	7,422	80	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,413	17,820		407
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,650	60,019	203	572
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			369	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 207,800	[2] 206,899	901	
Outside continental United States	[1] 43,400	[2] 42,935	465	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	237,299	238,129		830
Outside continental United States	6,880	6,922		42
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	157,367	157,293	74	
Outside continental United States	4,885	5,093		208
Total, Department of Defense	657,631	657,271	1,440	1,080
Net increase, Department of Defense			360	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	717,281	717,290	1,643	1,652
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			9	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose service are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of April 1955 and comparison with March 1955*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	April	March	April	March	April	March	April	March
Austria	171	171					171	171
England	7,536	7,492					7,536	7,492
France	23,416	22,599	16,216	15,657			7,200	6,942
French Morocco	5,586	4,109	203	203	858	821	4,525	3,085
Germany	127,601	125,305	103,879	101,716	1,957	1,965	21,765	21,624
Japan	156,221	155,898	94,441	[1] 94,441	18,527	18,481	43,253	42,976
Korea	17,187	23,222	17,187	23,222				
Libya	785	967					785	967
Ryukyus	246	244			246	244		
Saudi Arabia	556	690					556	690
Spain	121	142					121	142
Trinidad	624	645			624	645		
Total	340,050	341,484	231,926	235,239	22,212	22,156	85,912	84,089

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French, English, and Austrians reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of April totaling 2,361,166. This was a net increase of 5,356 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March.

This was the third increase in succession and it was the sixth increase in 33 months since July 1952. The other monthly increases were in June, October, and November of 1954 and February and March of 1955.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1955, which began July 1, 1954, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1954—July	2,387,833		5,187
August	2,375,988		11,845
September	2,355,170		20,818
October	2,359,325	4,155	
November	2,385,024	25,699	
December	2,368,072		16,952
1955—January	2,353,588		14,484
February	2,353,908	320	
March	2,355,810	1,902	
April	2,361,166	5,356	

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of April was 1,178,776, an increase of 4,481 over the March total of 1,174,295. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,182,390. This was a net increase of 875 as compared with 1,181,515 in March.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were the Post Office Department with an increase of 2,462, the Department of Agriculture with an increase of 916, the Department of the Interior with an increase of 669, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with an increase of 636.

A decrease of 431 was reported by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

While the Army reported an increase of 2,007 in civilian employment, the Navy reported a decrease of 786, and the Air Force reported a decrease of 319 in civilian employment.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 5,287 and outside continental United States civilian employment increased 69.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in April totaled 717,281, a decrease of 9 as compared with March.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,361,166 civilian employees certified to the committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 340,050 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of April who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in March was 341,484. A breakdown of this employment for April follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria	171			171
England	7,536			7,536
France	23,416	16,216		7,200
French Morocco	5,586	203	858	4,525
Germany	127,601	103,879	1,957	21,765
Japan	156,221	94,441	18,527	43,253
Korea	17,187	17,187		
Libya	785			785
Ryukyus	246		246	
Saudi Arabia	556			556
Spain	121			121
Trinidad	624		624	
Total	340,050	231,926	22,212	85,912

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I submit a unanimous report on a group of military nominations. These include the nominations of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as follows:

Adm. Arthur William Radford, United States Navy, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense.

Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining, United States Air Force, for reappointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general, for a period of 2 years ending June 30, 1957.

Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to say that the people of Missouri are very proud, indeed, that Gen. Maxwell Taylor has been appointed to this high position, because he is a resident of Keytesville, Mo.

Rear Adm. Arleigh Albert Burke, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 2 years.

The list also includes the nomination of Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Hess, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, in addition to the nominations of 4 major generals and 9 brigadier generals in the Army.

Mr. President, I request that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar as unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Also from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of routine nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, consisting of 758 promotions in the Air Force in the grades of lieutenant colonel to first lieutenant; 154 appointments in the Regular Army in the grades of captain to second lieutenant, and 10 appointments in the Navy in the grades of lieutenant to ensign.

All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2128. A bill to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board and the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Patrick K. Y. Yip and his wife Loretta Y. F. Hsu Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2130. A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Beltsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 2131. A bill for the relief of Marlene Schoepf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 2132. A bill to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station;

S. 2133. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

S. 2134. A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 2135. A bill to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes;

S. 2136. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and

S. 2137. A bill to authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2138. A bill for the relief of Dorothy May Ackermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 2139. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 2140. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey in the State of Pennsylvania for the purpose of determining possible means of improving water supplies in such State; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2141. A bill for the relief of Joe Lee (Lee Jow); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2142. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2143. A bill for the relief of Manda Pauline Petricevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2144. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2145. A bill for the relief of George Poulio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2146. A bill to amend the act providing for the naturalization of certain persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950, in order to provide for the naturalization of certain additional persons serving in the Armed Forces after such date; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 2147. A bill to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide all children an equal opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

NOTICE TO CERTAIN AGENCIES OF APPLICATIONS TO COURTS OF APPEALS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Judicial Conference of the United States, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board and the Atomic Energy Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, outlining the purpose of and need for this proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 2128) to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board and the Atomic Energy Commission, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States, I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft of a bill to amend subsection (d) of section 1006 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in reference to the notice to be given on applications to courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and subsection (b) of section 9 of the act of December 29, 1950, in reference to the notice to be given on applications for interlocutory relief against orders of the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The bill enclosed was approved by the Judicial Conference at a meeting held March 24 and 25, 1955, upon a report and recommendation by the Committee of the Conference on Revision of the Laws, consisting of Circuit Judge Albert B. Maris, of the Third Circuit, chairman, and District Judges Clarence G. Galston, of the Eastern District of New York, and William F. Smith, of the District of New Jersey.

The statutes referred to in their present form require 5 days' notice to the agency concerned and specified above of applications for interlocutory relief. The effect of the bill which is herewith submitted would be to require reasonable notice but not notice of a specified number of days. The present requirement of 5 days' notice sometimes in urgent cases prevents a court of appeals to which application is made for interlocutory relief from acting with sufficient promptness in the circumstances. The agencies concerned were consulted by the Committee on Revision of the Laws and indicated that while they would be strongly opposed to permitting interlocutory relief to be granted by courts of appeals without any notice they would not object to eliminating the 5-day waiting period if the requirement of notice was retained. Consequently, the Committee recommended and the Judicial Conference approved the provision of the enclosed bill that interlocutory relief in the nature of a temporary stay may be granted by a court of appeals upon reasonable notice without a fixed time limit.

The proposal to do away with the inflexible provision for a waiting period of 5 days emanated from the Judicial Council, consisting of the members of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia Circuit in which many of the suits to enjoin or stay actions of the administrative agencies involved are brought. Inasmuch as the offices of the agencies are in the District of Columbia, very short notice to them and to the Attorney General may suffice in urgent cases. The requirement in the bill that reasonable notice should be given would leave the discretion to determine the length of the notice in the court of appeals in which the interlocutory relief is sought which it would seem is where it should be.

Thus, the bill submitted would provide for notice reasonable under the circumstances without specifying a fixed time. This is believed to represent a sound policy in the situation. Accordingly, the bill is recommended to the Congress for consideration, and it is hoped that it may be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

SUNDRY BILLS RELATING TO THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, sundry bills relating to the armed services.

Each of these bills was requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department, explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD, immediately following the listing of "Bills introduced."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, were received, read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Armed Service, as follows:

S. 2132. A bill to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2132 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
United States Senate,

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to its transmittal to the Congress for consideration. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposal would amend section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that members of the uniformed services may be authorized, in connection with a change of station, nontemporary storage of baggage and household effects in Government facilities, or in commercial facilities whenever such storage is considered to be more economical to the Government. However, the proposal does impose two limitations; namely, that the weight stored plus the weight transported in connection with the change of station may not exceed the maximum weight limitation fixed by regulations, and also that such storage shall not be authorized for a period longer than 1 year following separation from the service, except that the respective Secretaries may authorize continuation in cases where a member is confined to a hospital or undergoing medical treatment on the date of separation.

Principally, nontemporary storage of baggage and household goods is necessary to store such goods of military personnel who are moved overseas and particularly in those cases where movement of household goods to the overseas station is restricted for military or for other reasons. As an example, shipment of household goods to the Far East Command currently is limited to 2,000 pounds or 25 percent of the authorized allowance, whichever is the greater.

Although section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 provides for the temporary storage of baggage and household goods, it makes no specific provision for nontemporary storage of such goods. The section therefore has been interpreted as prohibiting direct expenditures for nontemporary storage in commercial facilities. Consequently, such storage is affected in Government depots, resulting in considerable expense because of the necessity for packing, crating, and transporting the goods to Government depots. The proposed legislation is distinctly an economy measure since, if enacted, it would make possible the utilization of commercial storage facilities, either local or closer at hand than Government depots, thus eliminating to a large degree packing and crating as well as reducing costs for the transportation haul. The proposed legislation also is in line with current policies for performance of services on a contractual basis to broaden the mobilization base and for the extension of military contracts to small businesses.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Similar legislation to authorize the nontemporary storage of household goods in commercial facilities was proposed to the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, on June 20, 1952, as an amendment to section 632, H. R. 7391 (Public Law 488), 82d Congress, but was not enacted.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Although it is impossible to accurately estimate the fiscal impact of this proposal, if enacted, it is known that unit expenditures for this purpose would decrease. Estimated

cost per hundred pounds for packing, crating, transporting, and storing household goods during fiscal year 1955 is as follows:

Government facilities	$16.35
Commercial facilities	13.34

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 2133. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2133 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to its transmittal to the Congress for consideration. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to improve the administration of military justice in the Armed Forces. The Judge Advocates General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury appointed a board of officers to make recommendations upon changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This board was convened on June 4, 1953 and, as a result of its proceedings, submitted a report containing certain recommended amendments to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This legislative proposal is based upon the recommendations of that board of officers as approved by the several Judge Advocates General and the General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury, and those additional recommendations submitted by the Department of Defense. In essence this proposal is designed to eliminate some of the procedural difficulties and delays which have arisen under the Uniform Code of Military Justice since May 31, 1951, and to provide for more prompt and more efficient administration of military justice both from the standpoint of the individual and the Government.

The principal features of the proposed legislation are as follows:

1. Single officer courts: The proposed legislation, which is based upon rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, would permit an accused to waive trial by a multiple-member special court-martial and to elect trial before a single qualified officer. The adpotion of such a procedure will result in a reduction in both time and manpower normally expended in trials by special courts-martial. The rights of the accused in such cases are protected by the requirement that the officer acting as a special court-martial have the basic qualifications of a law officer under article 26 (a).

2. Records of trial: At the present time the use of a summarized record of trial is permitted in trials by special courts-martial when the accused is acquitted of all charges and specifications or when the sentence does not extend to a bad-conduct discharge. On the other hand all records of trial by general courts-martial are complete verbatim accounts of the proceedings thereof even though the sentence adjudged by such court is one that could have been adjudged by a special court-martial, the proceedings of which would have been reported in a summarized record. The proposed bill would correct this situation by providing for a complete verbatim record in only those cases which because of the sentence adjudged must be reviewed by a board of review under article 66 or in which the sentence adjudged by a general court-martial in excess of a sentence that a special court-martial could have adjudged. All other records of trial would contain such matter as may be required by regulations prescribed by the President.

3. Review of records of trial: The present law requires all general court-martial cases to be forwarded to The Judge Advocate General even though the sentence of the court is such that, if adjudged by a special court-martial, the record of the special court-martial would not have been so forwarded. The proposed bill would correct this situation by providing that general court-martial cases in which the sentence as approved does not include a bad-conduct discharge or does not exceed a sentence that could have been adjudged by a special court-martial, shall be transmitted and disposed of in the same manner as similar special court-martial cases.

The present law requires that all sentences extending to a dismissal or a punitive discharge, or confinement for 1 year or more be reviewed by a board of review. The proposed legislation provides that cases now required to be reviewed by a board of review only because the sentence includes a punitive discharge or confinement for 1 year or more will be examined in the Office of The Judge Advocate General in accordance with article 69 rather than by a board of review where the accused has pleaded guilty and has affirmatively stated that review by a board of review is not desired. The enactment of this provision would materially lessen the number of cases which need be reviewed by boards of review and will thereby diminish the overall time required to process court-martial cases. As this procedure upon review would be employed only in those cases where the accused has pleaded guilty and has affirmatively stated that a review by a board of review is not desired, it is believed that his substantial rights will not be prejudiced thereby.

The present law requires that in any case reviewed pursuant to article 69 in which The Judge Advocate General finds all or part of the findings or sentence incorrect in law or fact, he must refer the case to a board of review for corrective action. In a great many cases the irregularities concerned involve matters well settled in the law and in those cases the board of review's action amounts to no more than an application of these well-settled principles. This situation results in an unnecessary burden on the boards of review and unduly increases the time required to process court-martial cases. To eliminate this unnecessary reference to a board of review the proposed legislation authorizes The Judge Advocate General to correct the irregularity or injustice, vesting in him the same powers and authority with respect to those cases that a board of review has. It will be noted that The Judge Advocate General remains authorized to refer any article 69 cases to a board of review in his discretion, and it is required that any finding or sentence incorrect in law or fact be corrected either by a board of review or by The Judge Advocate General.

4. Powers of The Judge Advocate General: The proposed legislation authorizes the Judge Advocate General to dismiss the charges when the board of review or the Court of Military Appeals directs a dismissal, or when the Court of Military Appeals or the board of review orders a rehearing which The Judge Advocate General finds impracticable. It is believed that The Judge Advocate General is, in many cases, in the best position to dismiss the charges himself or to determine whether or not a rehearing is impracticable. Further, the administrative necessity of forwarding the record to the convening authority would, in many cases, be eliminated.

5. Review by the United States Court of Military Appeals: The proposed legislation reduces the time within which an accused may petition the United States Court of Military Appeals for a grant of review from 30 to 15 days. It is believed that the 30-day period is unnecessarily long and has often delayed the disposition of cases in which petitions were not filed inasmuch as the accused need not perfect his appeal within this period but need only file notice of appeal. This 15-day period is more nearly in accord with that specified in rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The chief judge of the United States Court of Military Appeals has stated that it is necessary for the court to deny approximately 85 percent of the petitions received in the court for want of good cause. To correct this situation, the proposed bill provides that the Court of Military Appeals need consider petitions for grant of review only when counsel who represented the accused at trial or before the board of review, or appellate defense counsel appointed by The Judge Advocate General if the accused was not represented by counsel before the board, or civilian counsel retained by the accused certifies that in his opinion a substantial question of law is presented and that the appeal is made in good faith.

6. Execution of sentences: Currently about 385 days elapse between the date an accused is tried by court-martial and the date his sentence is ordered executed after review by the United States Court of Military Appeals. As a result many prisoners who have completed their period of confinement or who are eligible for parole cannot be released from the service until their cases have been completely reviewed. Further, as an unsentenced prisoner is not subject to the same treatment as a sentenced prisoner, the administration of confinement facilities is unduly complicated. In some instances, delays in completion of the required review have led to complex administrative problems and loss of morale. Consequently the proposed legislation provides that a convening authority may order executed all portions of a sentence except that portion involving dismissal or dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge, thus eliminating the differences between sentenced and unsentenced prisoners.

7. Vacation of suspension: Under the present code, vacation proceedings are necessary to vacate the suspension of a sentence imposed by a special court-martial if it includes a bad-conduct discharge, or of any general court-martial sentence. The proposed bill would make unnecessary a hearing to vacate the suspension of a general court-martial sentence that could have been adjudged by a special court-martial unless it includes a bad-conduct discharge, thereby making the necessity of the hearing turn upon the gravity of the sentence rather than the type of court-martial.

8. New trial: To protect more fully the rights of an accused, the proposed legislation extends the time within which an accused may petition for a new trial to 2 years from the date the convening authority approves the sentence. Further, the board of review, the United States Court of Military Appeals, and The Judge Advocate General would be permitted to grant more comprehensive relief than is now possible.

9. Voting and rulings: The proposed bill provides that a law officer shall rule with finality upon a motion for a finding of not guilty. It is anomalous to allow the lay members of a court-martial to overrule the law officer on a question which is purely an issue of law.

10. Punitive articles: The present code does not provide specific statutory authority for the prosecution of bad-check offenses. The proposed legislation inserts an additional punitive article which contains provisions smilar to the bad-check statutes of the District of Columbia and the State of Missouri, including a provision that a failure to pay the holder of a bad check the amount due within 5 days shall be prima facie evidence of an intent to defraud. One of the difficulties arising under existing law is the necessity to prosecute bad-check offenses under 1 or 3 separate articles (121, 133, or 134), none of which may be considered as a bad-check statute. Because of technical difficulties that arise as a result of the unfortunate pleading of the wrong article, an obviously guilty person sometimes escapes punishment. The proposed legislation is desirable, because of the many difficulties inherent in obtaining a conviction of an accused for a bad-check offense without proof of specific intent, to provide specific statutory authority for the prosecution of bad-check offenses.

11. Nonjudicial punishment: Good military discipline requires that a commanding officer be given greater authority in imposing nonjudicial punishment. Consequently, the proposed legislation provides that a commanding officer may confine an enlisted member of his command for a period not to exceed 7 days, and impose a forefeiture of one-half of 1 month's pay. Under article 15, officers may be punished for minor offenses such as traffic violations by imposition of forefeitures and they are thereafter not handicapped professionally by a trial by court-martial. However, in order to achieve an effective monetary punishment for enlisted members in similar cases, it is necessary to resort to a trial by court-martial, resulting in a permanent black mark on the enlisted man's record in the form of a conviction by court-martial. The change contemplated by the proposed legislation would permit prompt and effective disposition of such minor offenses. In addition, a commanding officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction may impose on an officer or warrant officer of his command forfeiture of one-half of his pay for 3 months instead of 1 month as now provided in the code. The 1-month limitation has proved unsatisfactory to commanders in the field, and is not cured by the fact that an officer can be tried by a special court-martial. An officer's present and future value within his command is seriously and permanently impaired by the publicity attendant to trial by court-martial. When such an event occurs prompt transfer of the officer after trial is imperative, regardless of the outcome. Such a procedure is costly in time, money, and manpower, and seldom serves the best interests of the service. It is believed to be essential that commanding officers retain their present powers to try officers by special court-martial as exceptional circumstances warrant. However, it is considered desirable to increase the punitive powers of article 15 so that an adequate punishment can be imposed upon an officer for a relatively minor offense.

12. Miscellaneous: To facilitate administration of confinement facilities under United Nations or other allied commands, the proposed legislation authorizes the confinement, in United States confinement facilities, of members of the Armed Forces of the United States with the members of the armed forces of friendly foreign nations.

In addition, the proposed legislation makes other changes in the present code of a technical nature, designed generally to improve the administration of military justice within the framework of the existing code.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense but will result in economies in the utilization of manpower.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Subsection (a) amends article 1 by defining the term "convening authority."

Subsection (b) amends article 12 to provide that a member of the Armed Forces of the United States may be confined in United States confinement facilities with members of the armed forces of friendly foreign nations.

Subsection (c) amends article 15 (a) (1) (C) to provide that a commanding officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction may impose on an officer or warrant officer of his command forfeiture of one-half of his pay per month for a period not exceeding 3 months.

Subsection (d) amends article 15 (a) (2) (E) to provide that a commanding officer may confine an enlisted member of his command for a period not to exceed 7 consecutive days.

Subsection (e) amends article 15 (a) (2) to provide that a commanding officer may impose on an enlisted member of his command forfeiture of one-half of 1 month's pay.

Subsection (f) amends article 16 to provide that a special court-martial shall consist of three or more members, or of a law officer only, if, prior to the convening of such court, the accused so requests in writing upon the advice of counsel and the convening authority consents thereto and the identity of the law officer is known to the accused in advance of the date of trial.

Subsection (g) amends articles 22 (b) and 23 (b) to provide that a convening authority not subordinate in command and rank to the accuser shall be "competent authority" within the meaning thereof, and that a court may, in any case, be convened by superior competent authority when deemed desirable by him.

Subsection (h) amends article 25 (a) to provide that the officer acting as a special court-martial shall have the qualifications specified for a law officer in article 26 (a).

Subsection (i) amends article 26 (b) to provide that the law officer may consult with the court on the form of the sentence as well as on the form of the findings.

Subsection (j) extends the provisions of article 37 to include staff officers serving convening authorities and commanding officers.

Subsection (k) amends article 39 to provide that a law officer may enter a closed session of the court to assist in putting the sentence in proper form.

Subsection (l) amends article 41 (b) to provide that the one officer special court-martial may only be challenged for cause.

Subsection (m) amends article 51 to provide that the officer acting as a special court-martial shall determine all questions of law and fact arising in the course of the trial, and adjudge an appropriate sentence in the event of conviction.

Subsection (n) amends article 51 (b) to provide that the law officer shall rule with finality on a motion for a finding of not guilty.

Subsection (o) amends article 52 to make the provisions thereof inapplicable to special courts-martial consisting of one officer only.

Subsection (p) amends article 54 to provide that there shall be a verbatim record of trial in each case where the sentence adjudged requires review of the case by a board of review or in which the sentence adjudged by a general court-martial is in excess of a sentence that a special court-martial could have adjudged, and that such records shall be authenticated in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. It amends the article also to provide that if a verbatim record is not required under this article, the accused may purchase such a record under regulations which the President may prescribe.

Subsection (q) amends article 57 (b) to authorize the President to prescribe periods during which a sentence to confinement may be interrupted. Further, such periods are to be excluded in computing the service of the term of confinement.

Subsections (r) and (z) amend articles 65 (a) and 69 to provide that the record of trial of a general court-martial which adjudged a sentence not extending to a bad-conduct discharge, or not exceeding the sentence that could have been adjudged by a special court-martial, shall be transmitted and disposed of as the Secretary of the Department may prescribe by regulations. Further, article 69 is amended to provide that The Judge Advocate General in his discretion may refer any case reviewed by him to a board of review as now provided in article 69, or he himself may have the power and may take such action in the case as a board of review can take under article 66 (c) and (d). He need not affirm a finding of guilty or a sentence found correct in law and fact.

Subsections (s) and (u) amend articles 65 (b) and 66 (b) to provide that cases involving a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge or confinement for 1 year or more where the accused has pleaded guilty to each offense of which he has been found guilty and has affirmatively stated that review by a board of review is not desired need not be reviewed by a board of review. The effect of this amendment is to cause such cases to be reviewed under article 69.

Subsection (t) amends article 65 (c) to provide that upon the review of summary courts-martial and special courts-martial not involving a bad-conduct discharge a supervisory authority may, in addition to his authority to return the record to the convening authority for action, take any action on the record that is authorized for the convening authority. Further, lawyers of the Navy are made eligible to review records of trial by summary and special courts-martial.

Subsection (v) amends article 66 (e) to authorize The Judge Advocate General to dismiss the charges when the board of review so directs or when he finds that the rehearing ordered by the board of review is impracticable.

Subsection (w) amends article 67 (b) (3) to provide that the Court of Military Appeals must consider petitions for grant of review only when counsel who represented the accused at trial or before the board of review, or appellate defense counsel appointed by The Judge Advocate General if the accused was not represented by counsel before the board, or civilian counsel retained by the accused certifies that in his opinion a substantial question of law is presented and that the appeal is made in good faith.

Subsection (x) amends article 67 (c) to provide that an accused shall have 15 days, from the time he is notified of the decision of the board of review, to petition the Court of Military Appeals for a grant of review. The board of review shall not be deprived of jurisdiction over his case until the petition or other document is received in the Court of Military Appeals.

Subsection (y) amends article 67 (f) to authorize The Judge Advocate General to dismiss the charges when the Court of Military Appeals so directs or when he finds that the rehearing ordered by the Court of Military Appeals is impracticable.

Subsection (aa) amends article 71 to provide that all portions of a sentence of a court-martial may be ordered executed by the convening authority when approved by

him, except that portion of a sentence involving dismissal, dishonorable, or bad-conduct discharge. No sentence involving death or a general or flag officer may be ordered into execution until finally approved in accordance with the Code. Further, no pay or allowances shall accrue to a prisoner after the date the convening authority approves a sentence of death.

Subsection (bb) amends article 72 (a) to provide that a hearing in vacation proceedings is unnecessary where the sentence of a general court-martial, as approved, does not extend to a bad-conduct discharge, or does not exceed the sentence that could have been adjudged by a special court-martial.

Subsection (cc) amends article 73 to extend the time within which an accused may petition for a new trial to 2 years from the date the convening authority approves the sentence, and to provide that the court of military appeals and the board of review may, in addition to determining whether a new trial in whole or in part should be granted, take appropriate action under article 66 and article 67, respectively. Further, The Judge Advocate General is authorized to grant a new trial in whole or in part, or to vacate or modify the findings and sentence in whole or in part.

Subsection (dd) amends article 95 to remove all distinctions between confinement and custody.

Subsection (ee) inserts an additional punitive article similar to the bad-check statutes of the District of Columbia (title 22, D. C. Code, sec. 1410) and the State of Missouri (Revised Statutes of Missouri 561.460, 561.-470, 561.480).

Section 2 fixes the effective date of the amendments as the first day of the 10th month after the date of approval of the act.

S. 2134. A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2134 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, May 19, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "to equalize certain retirement benefits for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof. The uniformed services are defined in the draft of legislation to mean the Army, Navy (including Reserve components), Air Force, Marine Corps (including Reserve components), Coast Guard (including Reserve components), Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of title I of the proposed legislation is to authorize on a uniform basis retired personnel of the uniformed services to be advanced on the retired lists to the highest grade in which satisfactory service has been rendered while on extended active duty, and to authorize payment of retired pay computed on the basis of such grades.

Under current law personnel retired for physical disability and Reserve component personnel awarded retired pay at age 60 under title III, Public Law 810, 80th Congress, are entitled to retired pay computed on the basis of the grade in which serving, or on the basis of such higher temporary grade in which he may have served satisfactorily at any time during his entire period of service.

In addition to these general-type provisions, there are other existing laws of limited application which authorize retirement in the highest grade held. The more important of these provisions are as follows:

(a) Sections 411, 511, and 516 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 authorize award of retired or retirement pay in higher temporary or permanent grades to members of the uniformed services. Sections 411 and 511 apply only to personnel who were retired prior to October 1949. Section 516 is applicable only to retired personnel who are recalled to active duty following retirement. No authorization, however, is contained in those sections for advancement on the retired list of officers or enlisted personnel to grades corresponding to the rates of pay authorized.

(b) Public Law 305, 79th Congress, authorizes the retirement of any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps, or the Reserve components thereof, who has completed more than 20 years of active service, at least 10 years of which was active commissioned service, in the highest grade, permanent or temporary, satisfactorily held. In addition, it requires the retirement of any officer of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral, at age 62 in the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held while on active duty. This latter provision does not require a determination of satisfactory service.

(c) Advancement on the retired list to the highest temporary grade in which any Army or Air Force officer served satisfactorily on active duty for 6 months or more during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, is provided for in section 203 (a) of Public Law 810, 80th Congress. Advancement on the retired list to the higher temporary grade in which serving at the time of retirement is provided by section 203 (f) of Public Law 810, 80th Congress, for any Army or Air Force officer of the grade major general or below who retired between August 7, 1947, and January 1, 1957. This latter provision is without regard to determination of satisfactory service.

(d) Section 203 (c) of Public Law 810, 80th Congress, amends the act of August 21, 1941, to provide for the advancement of an Army or Air Force warrant officer on the retired list to the highest temporary officer, or warrant officer grade in which such warrant officer served satisfactorily during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, with retired pay based on such higher grade. The advancement is effective when the warrant officer concerned completes 30 years' service, including the sum of his active service and service on the retired list.

(e) With respect to enlisted personnel of the Army and Air Force, section 203 (e) of Public Law 810, 80th Congress, provides for advancement of the person concerned to the highest temporary commissioned, warrant, or enlisted grade satisfactorily held by him during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946, with retirement pay based on such higher grade. The advancement is effective when the person concerned completes 30 years' service, including the sum of his active service and service on the retired list.

(f) Public Law 188, 77th Congress, as amended, authorizes placement on the retired list of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and their respective Reserve components, in the highest rank or grade satisfactorily held while on active duty prior to June 30, 1946, under temporary appointments or advancements made pursuant to that act.

(g) The fifth paragraph of section 5 of the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 717), as amended (34 U. S. C. 423) provides authority to order retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to active duty in time of war or emergency, and requires their promotion on the retired list to the grade or rank, not above lieutenant commander or major, which they would have attained had they remained on the active list. Retention of this authority to order retired officers to active duty is obviously necessary and desirable. However, the promotion requirements of this paragraph are based primarily on seniority and do not fully accord with the principle of promotion by selection. Therefore, the repeal of this paragraph is recommended. The sixth paragraph of section 5 of the act of July 1, 1918, supra, authorizes the temporary advancement on the retired list to higher grades or ranks, not above lieutenant commander or major, of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty, and provides that upon relief from active duty, such officers shall revert to the grade held on the retired list prior to temporary advancement. This provision merely sets up an additional promotional authority, and does not restrict or in any way affect the temporary-promotion law of 1941. Its repeal is recommended because it is obsolete.

It is the view of the Department of Defense that legislation, applicable to all armed services, which would authorize advancement of personnel on the retired lists to the highest grade satisfactorily held at any time during a member's career, with entitlement to retired pay computed on the basis of that grade, is necessary and desirable. The attached proposed draft of legislation will accomplish this objective and at the same time provide certain safeguards designed to insure against unwarranted or untimely accrual of benefits. The limitations contained in the proposal are as follows:

(a) Advancement to any grade is conditioned on the individual concerned having served in such grade on active duty under an order or enlistment not limiting such duty to a period of less than 30 days.

(b) Advancement from enlisted status to warrant or commissioned status and from warrant officer to commissioned status is deferred until completion of 30 years including the sum of their active service and service on the retired list or in the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve.

(c) Personnel who are currently receiving retired pay computed on the basis of those pay scales which were in effect prior to October 1, 1949, and who receive an advancement in grade under the proposal will not be entitled to receive retired pay computed on the basis of the increased pay scales of the Career Compensation Act unless they exercise their right of election under section 411 of that act.

(d) Provision is made to prohibit retroactive accrual of retirement pay. If this were not done, a relatively few individuals, who have been retired heretofore, and who will receive an increase in the rate of their retired pay, would be entitled to a considerable amount of retroactive pay.

(e) A provision is also included which will remove the limiting effects of the fifth and sixth paragraphs of section 5 of the act of July 1, 1918, supra, which provides that retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps recalled to active duty cannot be promoted to a grade or rank above lieutenant commander or major.

The purpose of title II of the proposed legislation is to remedy the results of the situation existing prior to August 1, 1953, at which time there was no authority for Reserve officers of the Army and Air Force who had completed more than 30 years' active service to be retired for length of service until they had attained age 60.

Prior to August 1, 1953, the normal retirement authority for Reserve officers who had completed "not less than 20 or more than 30 years" of active Federal service of which at least 10 years was active Federal commis-

sioned service was provided in section 202, Public Law 810, 80th Congress. The limiting language "or more than 30 years" resulted in a situation in which some Reserve officers completed in excess of 30 years active service prior to completing 10 years active Federal commissioned service and accordingly were, prior to August 1, 1953, ineligible to retire under that section. The only recourse of such individuals was to be released from duty as a commissioned officer and reenlist, or be reappointed as warrant officer, and retire in that status. In such cases the individuals concerned were entitled to be advanced on the retired list to the highest grade in which they had served satisfactorily during the period September 15, 1940, to June 30, 1946. In many cases this grade was 1 or 2 grades lower than the grade in which they could have been retired under section 202 of Public Law 810.

This inequity was remedied with respect to Reserve officers who retired on and after August 1, 1953, by Public Law 126 of the 83d Congress, which removed the "or more than 30" year limitation.

It is the view of the Department of Defense that equity requires that those officers who retired prior to August 1, 1953, and who were penalized by the fact that they had completed more than 30 years' active service at time of retirement should be given benefits equivalent to those afforded officers retired subsequent to August 1, 1953. Title II of the enclosed proposed legislation would accomplish this objective by providing the following:

(a) Advancement of the individuals concerned on the retired list to the grade in which they would have been retired, but for the fact they had completed more than 30 years' service, with entitlement to retired pay based on that grade, effective from the original date of retirement; and

(b) Authorizing payment of the difference between the amount of the lump-sum payment for accrued leave which they actually received, and the amount which they would have received had they not been required to revert to enlisted or warrant status in order to be retired.

Section 304 of the proposed legislation would amend section 316 (j) of the Officer Personnel Act so as to provide that any officer serving in the grade of rear admiral or below by virtue of a temporary appointment made under any provision of law, if retired while so serving, would be retired with the rank of the grade in which serving and, if entitled to retired pay, with retired pay based on the active-duty pay to which entitled at time of retirement. This provision would be applicable to any officer so retired after August 7, 1947. Section 316 (j) as presently worded permits officers who retire while serving under temporary appointments made under Title III of the Officer Personnel Act to retire with the rank held at time of retirement and with retired pay based on their active-duty pay. The proposed amendment would extend this benefit to officers who retire while serving under temporary appointments made under the act of July 24, 1941, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

H. R. 165 and H. R. 2003 are bills which have been introduced in the 84th Congress. Those bills deal with segments of this proposal and the Department of Defense respectfully recommends that the Congress take no further action on them pending consideration of this proposal.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the enactment of this proposed legislation would result in an increased cost of approximately $2,315,000 for the Department of the Army; $138,590 for the Department of the Navy; $145,000 for the Department of the Air Force; and $16,000 for the Marine Corps, a total increased cost of $2,614,590 for fiscal year 1956.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOT.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO EQUALIZE CERTAIN RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 gives the short title of the act.

Section 2 defines "uniformed service." The phrase "(including Reserve components)" is used with respect to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard in this section and at other places in the bill, as those terms are not defined in a statute to include the reserve components. However, the terms "Army" and "Air Force" are defined in the appropriate organization acts to include the reserve components, the regular components, and those members appointed without specification of component.

TITLE I

Section 101 provides that a commissioned officer or former commissioned officer, other than a commissioned warrant officer, of a uniformed service, heretofore or hereafter retired as a commissioned officer or granted retired pay, disability retirement pay, or retirement pay of a commissioned officer, is entitled to be advanced on the retired list. Members of the regular components, members of the Reserve components, and those members appointed without specification of component are covered by this legislation. The advancement would be to the highest permanent or temporary grade in which the officer served on active duty while on the active list or under a call or order which did not specify a period of active duty of less than 30 days. The right to advancement to the permanent grade is not dependent upon a finding that his service was satisfactory, but the right to advancement to the temporary grade is so dependent.

Section 102 provides for the advancement to a higher warrant-officer grade (and pay grade) on the retired list of a warrant officer or former warrant officer, including a commissioned warrant officer, who is retired or to whom retired pay, disability retirement pay, or retirement pay of a warrant officer is granted after completing 20 years of active Federal service. The right to advancement to the permanent grade is not dependent upon a finding that his service was satisfactory, but the right to advancement to the temporary grade is so dependent.

Section 103 provides that an enlisted member of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force who is retired after completing 20 years of active Federal service, and who is transferred to the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve, is entitled to be advanced to the highest permanent or temporary enlisted grade in which he served at any time. Service in the higher grade must have been satisfactory, as determined by the appropriate Secretary, and must have been during an enlistment or call or order which did not specify a period of active duty of less than 30 days.

Section 104 provides a similar right of advancement for an enlisted member of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps who is transferred to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve after completing 20 years of active Federal service.

Section 105 provides that a warrant officer or former warrant officer, including a commissioned warrant officer, or enlisted member or former enlisted member of a uniformed service, shall, upon his request, be advanced on the applicable retired list to the highest permanent or temporary commissioned or warrant grade (and pay grade) in which he served on active duty for any period, if he has completed 30 years of service, including active service and service while on the retired list or while a member of the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve. However, he shall be advanced to the highest temporary commissioned or warrant grade (and pay grade) only if he served satisfactorily in that grade, as determined by the appropriate Secretary. In either case, the member must have served in the higher grade under a call or order which did not specify a period of active duty of less than 30 days.

Section 106 authorizes the member who has been advanced in grade or rating under this title to draw the retired pay, disability retirement pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay of the grade or rating to which advanced. If the member was entitled to such pay under a law in effect before October 1, 1949, the pay of the higher grade or rating will continue to be paid under that law, unless, under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, he is entitled to have it computed under that act.

Section 107 provides that title I of this act does not deprive any person of a higher grade or rating, or of the higher pay, to which he is entitled under any other law. This would protect the rights of a person granted retired pay under other provisions of law, such as section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, who never served on active duty in the grade to which he is entitled under that act. This section further provides that title I does not entitle a person to retired pay, disability retirement pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay unless he is entitled thereto under some other law.

TITLE II

Section 201 provides that any person who was discharged or released from active duty as a commissioned officer of a reserve component of the Army or the Air Force after June 29, 1948 and before August 1, 1953 after completing more than 30 years' active Federal service, at least 10 of which were active commissioned service, and who thereafter served as an enlisted man or warrant officer in the Regular Army or Regular Air Force prior to being retired, is entitled, at his election, to be advanced on the applicable retired list to the grade he would have been retired in, or advanced to, if he had been retired under section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507), as amended (10 U. S. C. 971b), at the time of his discharge or release from active duty as a commissioned officer. His advancement would be effective as of August 1, 1953, but he would be entitled to retired pay from the date of his retirement at the rate prescribed by section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507), as amended (10 U. S. C. 971b), for the higher grade. This section will afford relief for those persons who were discharged or released from active duty as commissioned officers between the dates indicated and and who, at that time, were ineligible for retirement under section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935, as amended by section 202 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, because they had completed "more than 30 years' active Federal service." The prohibition upon the retirement under that act of non-Regular officers having more than 30 years' active Federal service was removed by Public Law 126, 83d Congress, which became effective August 1, 1953.

Section 202 provides that the appropriate Secretary may pay any person covered by this title for leave unused at the time of his discharge or release from active duty as a commissioned officer based upon the pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the time, less any amount paid to him in settlement of unused leave at the time of his discharge or release from active duty as a commissioned officer and less any amount paid to him at the time of his retirement for unused leave carried over from his period of duty as a commissioned officer.

TITLE III

Section 301 provides that a member of a uniformed service who is retired, or who is entitled to retired pay, disability retirement pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay, and who is serving on active duty on the effective date of this act, is not entitled to advancement on the retired list under this act until he is released from active duty.

Section 302. Self-explanatory.

Section 303 clarifies the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to order retired officers or warrant officers on the retired lists to active duty during times of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President.

Section 304 would amend section 316 (j) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, so as to authorize officers who retire while serving under a temporary appointment made under any provision of law to be retired in the temporary grade in which serving at time of retirement and if entitled to retired pay, with a retired pay based on the active duty pay to which entitled at time of retirement. Section 316 (j) as presently worded permits officers who retire while serving under temporary appointments made under title III of the Officer Personnel Act to retire with the rank held at time of retirement and with retired pay based on their active duty pay. This section would extend this benefit to officers who retire while serving under temporary appointments made under the act of July 24, 1941, as amended.

Section 305:

Subsection (a) repeals sections 414 and 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Subsection (b) repeals the old authority of the Secretary of the Navy which has been clarified by the amendment set forth in section 303.

Section 306 specifies the effective date of this act.

S. 2135. A bill to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2135 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation and sectional analysis, "To provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is twofold. First, it is to provide permanent authority for members of the reserve components who are drawing retirement, disability compensation, or retired pay by virtue of prior military service, to waive such pay in order to receive active duty, active duty for training, and training pay as reservists. The existing authority for such waivers, contained in the act of September 27, 1950 (ch. 1053, 64 Stat. 1067), will expire on September 27, 1955 (10 U. S. C. 369 (b) note). That act permits members of reserve components to elect, with reference to periods of active duty, active duty for training, drill, training, instruction, or other duty for which they may be entitled to receive compensation, to receive either (1) the compensation for such duty, including travel or other expenses incident thereto when authorized, and subsistence and quarters, or commutation thereof, or (2) the pension, retirement pay, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay. Second, the proposed legislation would suspend the pension, retainer pay, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay of members of the reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force who are ordered to extended active duty in excess of 30 days in time of war or national emergency and who are found physically qualified to perform active duty, and would authorize the payment, in lieu thereof, of the pay and allowances provided by law for active military or naval service.

The Reserve components now have many members who have minor disabilities which were incurred in prior service and for which they are drawing disability benefits. In time of critical need for trained manpower, their disabilities are not of such magnitude as to prevent useful duty with the Armed Forces. This program has worked well and been of such value during the period of temporary legislation, that enactment into a permanent law to provide continuing authority for personnel with minor disabilities to serve in all of the Reserve components is essential to the full utilization of trained Reserve personnel.

Some reservists receiving disability compensation from the Veterans Administration, who were ordered to extended active duty and found physically qualified to perform that duty declined to waive their disability compensation in favor of active duty pay and allowances. When the reservist refuses to waive his disability compensation he may not receive active duty pay for his services and no expenses for or incident to travel, subsistence, quarters, or commutation thereof, may be incurred on his behalf. This action on the part of those reservists greatly limited their availability for service and has caused, in some instances, financial hardships for themselves and their families. Enactment of the proposed legislation would suspend rather than waive the disability compensation of the reservist while he is on extended active duty in time of war or national emergency. Upon termination of active duty the compensation or other benefit would be resumed and paid as provided by law.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause no increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS IN THE CASE OF MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS ORDERED TO EXTENDED ACTIVE DUTY IN TIME OF WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1: This section provides that entitlement to receive a pension, retainer pay, disability compensation, or retired pay shall be suspended in the case of Naval and Marine Corps reservists who are ordered to extended active duty in excess of 30 days in time of war or national emergency and such reservists shall receive the prescribed pay and allowances for active duty unless the disability compensation, retainer pay, or retired pay is greater than the prescribed pay and allowances for active duty.

Section 2: This section provides that entitlement to receive a pension, retirement pay, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay shall be suspended in the case of Army or Air Force reservists who are ordered to extended active duty in excess of 30 days in time of war or national emergency and such reservist shall receive the prescribed pay and allowances for active duty unless the disability compensation, retirement pay, or retainer pay is greater than the prescribed pay and allowances for active duty.

Section 3: This section amends section 3 of the act of September 27, 1950, by making the act permanent law.

Section 4: This section provides for the deletion of the term "disability allowance" wherever that term appears in the basic act.

S. 2136. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2136 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide authority for the payment of travel and transportation allowances to all members of the uniformed services who are retired for physical disability or placed on the temporary disability retired list; or are retired for any other reason, or are discharged with severance pay, after serving at least 8 years continuous active duty, to homes of selection in accordance with uniform administrative regulations, by amending sections 303 (a) and 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 813, 814; 37 U. S. C. 253). The authority for travel and transportation allowances including transportation of dependents and movement of household goods at Government expense for members of the Regular services to homes of selection was contained in administrative regulations and was recognized by the Comptroller General of the United States as legally sufficient. Those regulations were based principally on the decision of the Comptroller General (4 Comp. Gen. 954; 30 id. 169) that a member of the Regular service was regarded as not having a home during the period of his service and therefore was authorized to select a home to which he may perform travel thereto within a reasonable time after retirement. One year after retirement was considered as reasonable and thus the 1-year rule was established.

After the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, it was considered proper under the broad terms of section 303 (a) of that act to authorize travel and transportation allowances to Reserve members in the same manner as had previously been authorized for members of the Regular services since a high percentage of members of the reserve components retire after many years of service and who, like members of the Regular services, have long since ceased to have homes to which to return upon retire-

ment even though technically the records show that the homes were designated upon entry on active duty. Also it frequently happens that Reserve members retired for disability cannot, without detriment to health, live at the places listed as their homes of record. Consequently, in the Joint Travel Regulations, effective April 1, 1951, there was provided authority to select a home. These regulations were authorized to be issued under section 303 (h) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. It was believed at the time of the promulgation of these regulations that section 303 (a) provided ample authority therefor since that section authorized regulations to be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, without limitation in this respect, for the travel and transportation expenses of all members of the uniformed services upon separation from the service, placement on the temporary disability retired list, releases from active duty, or retirement, from the last duty station to home, or place from which ordered to active duty, and in addition authorized the respective Secretaries concerned to prescribe "the conditions under which travel and transportation allowances shall be authorized."

However, the Comptroller General of the United States in decisions (B-116568, September 21, 1953; B-116568, March 10, 1954; and B-117430, March 19, 1954) held that section 303 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 did not contain authority for promulgation of regulations which would authorize travel and transportation allowances for members of the reserve components to their homes selected upon retirement. These decisions stated that entitlement for such allowances for a Regular member appeared to have no application in the case of a reservist who had a home from which he was ordered to active duty and to which he may be expected to return upon release from active duty, whether by retirement or otherwise. The effect of these decisions, depriving members of the reserve components of the services of the right to select their homes on retirement in the same manner as members of the Regular services, works a distinct hardship on them and is highly discriminatory, especially as to those with many years of active service. The proposed legislation is designed to correct this inequity by providing affirmative authority for travel and transportation allowances including transportation for dependents and movement of household effects at Government expense for members of the uniformed services who are retired for physical disability or placed on the temporary disability retired list; or are retired for any other reason, or are discharged with severance pay, immediately following at least 8 years of continuous active duty, to homes of selection in accordance with uniform administrative regulations.

The proposed legislation also would validate payments in the accounts of disbursing officers made to or on behalf of members of such Reserve components for travel and transportation allowances to home of selection since April 1, 1951, the effective date of the Joint Travel Regulations, by amending sections 303 (a) and 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to make them retroactive to April 1, 1951.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would result in no increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 2137. A bill to authorize the appointment of an Assistant Chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the Chaplain and Assistant Chaplain thereof.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 2137 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To authorize the appointment of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to fix the compensation of the chaplain and assistant chaplain thereof."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize the appointment by the Secretary of the Army of an assistant chaplain at the United States Military Academy and to provide that the chaplain and the assistant chaplain shall, while so serving, be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954), as amended (65 Stat. 612), and the chaplain shall be entitled, while so serving, to receive the same basic allowance for quarters as is now or may hereafter be provided by law for a major, United States Army, and the assistant chaplain shall be entitled, while so serving, to receive the same basic allowance for quarters as is now or may be hereafter provided by law for a captain, United States Army.

The proposed legislation will authorize the appointment of a chaplain and assistant Chaplain at the United States Military Academy by the Secretary of the Army without regard to the civil service laws for a term of 4 years, and such chaplain and assistant chaplain shall be eligible for reappointment. The appointment of an assistant chaplain is believed necessary in view of the increase in the size of the cadet corps since 1896 and the attendant increase in the duties of the chaplain at the Military Academy.

While the present law provides that the duties of chaplain at the Military Academy be performed by a clergyman to be appointed by the President it is believed that the appointment of the chaplain and assistant chaplain by the Secretary of the Army seems more appropriate and is in line with efforts to limit Presidential functions to instances where compelling reasons support action by the President rather than subordinate officials.

Further, it is believed that the proposed basis for the salaries of the chaplain and assistant chaplain will not only afford flexibility but will also permit the Army, under standards approved by the Civil Service Commission, to relate their salaries to their duties and responsibilities. On this basis, it may be noted that the salaries of chaplains at Veterans' Administration hospitals have been fixed within the range of GS-14 (entrance rate, $9,600) to GS-11 (entrance rate, $5,940).

The salary of the chaplain, United States Military Academy, is fixed by statute (act of February 18, 1896 (29 Stat. 8), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1137), at $4,000 per annum, with the incumbent being entitled to the same allowances with respect to public quarters, fuel, and light as those allowed a captain. It is further provided, by the same statute, that while serving under any reappointment, the chaplain shall receive $5,000 per annum and shall be entitled to the same allowances. Under the provisions of several Federal employees pay acts, the salary of the chaplain has been increased in 1945 to $4,520 per annum; in 1946 to $5,152.80 per annum; in 1948 to $5,482.80 per annum, which is his present salary.

The salary of $5,482.80 per annum, currently being received by the chaplain, is not, however, his effective salary, as compared with the salaries of other clergymen. It is standard practice of his church for parishes to assume responsibility for payment of assessments to the church pension fund. Such practice is not feasible at the United States Military Academy where the chaplain must pay this assessment from his personal funds. This assessment was raised 50 percent on January 1, 1950, and now amounts to $959.25 per annum. Since a rectory and upkeep thereof are generally furnished civilian ministers, the actual salary of the chaplain, United States Military Academy, compares with a clergyman's salary in civilian life of approximately $4,500. In addition, civil-service retirement deductions are withheld from his pay, in accordance with pertinent law, in the amount of $329.16 per annum. While it is returnable with interest if he serves less than 20 years, this further reduces by that amount his current effective salary.

The chaplains, United States Military Academy, of the past have almost, without exception, gone on to become nationally known figures, most of them having become bishops, deans, or rectors of large metropolitan churches. It is essential that this high standard be maintained at the United States Military Academy. The required chapel attendance and the abrupt change from civilian life to the military requires a chaplain of the very highest order as a link between the civilian life and the military. He must be a man who can deliver sermons which are inspirational to the cadets and in harmony with the inspiring atmosphere of the cadet chapel. He must be a man who understands young men and can develop in cadets, during their formative years at West Point, character and the personal attributes so essential to an officer in a lifelong career in the Armed Forces. In other words, he must be a man of the proper qualifications and, therefore, the remuneration offered must be ample to obtain a man of such qualifications. It is not believed that the Military Academy can continue to attract outstanding clergymen if the remuneration falls below that received by chaplains in larger universities and ministers of larger city parishes.

In 1947, when the authorities at West Point were engaged in seeking a chaplain, many of the candidates whose names were submitted by the various major denominations withdrew their names from consideration when they learned the amount of the salary. Clergymen, particularly those with families, who are well established at churches of the caliber from which the chaplain of the United States Military Academy should be selected, cannot afford to uproot themselves and give up higher salaries and perquisites. The present effective pay of the chaplain is well below that of the upper 20 percent of the ministers of his faith, over 1,100 of whom receive remuneration greater than the take-home pay of the chaplain, United States Military Academy. The chaplains of 3 of the larger eastern universities receive salaries of $10,000; $10,000 with living quarters; and $6,500 with living quarters.

This legislative proposal is not intended to include the Air Force Academy.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Army on June 25, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. It was introduction as H. R. 9698 but no further action was taken thereon.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposed legislation would result in an annual increased cost to the Department of Defense of approximately $7,500, which can be absorbed from existing appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS RELATING TO MUTUAL MILITARY AID IN AN EMERGENCY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH and Mr. CASE], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL and Mr. BUSH], and the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend Public Law 435, relating to compacts between certain States for mutual military aid in the event of an emergency.

An identical bill is being introduced today in the House by Representative CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Public Law 435 gave approval to a compact between New York and New Jersey entered into in 1950, and entitled "An interstate compact for mutual military aid in an emergency." It provided for cooperation between the signatory States in the use of military and police forces available to such States in the event of an attack, insurrection, sabotage, and so forth. Section 2, of Public Law 435, provided that other States contiguous to the two original contracting States, could adhere to the compact without further approval by Congress. Subsequently, Pennsylvania did so adhere to this compact.

The question subsequently arose whether States having a common border with one of the signatories of this compact, but not with the others, could adhere to this same compact. This question arose when Connecticut indicated a desire to adhere to the compact. Connecticut has, of course, a common border with New York, but not with New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In any event, both New Jersey and Pennsylvania objected to the adherence of Connecticut to the compact, and New York State entered into a separate compact with Connecticut, identical in terms with that authorized under Public Law 435. Consent must now be sought from Congress for this new compact.

The amendment proposed by the bill being introduced today would add a new subsection to Public Law 435, authorizing additional compacts to be entered into, identical in terms with that approved by Public Law 435, by States contiguous to either New York or New Jersey, with New York and/or New Jersey. Such compacts would be binding only on the States entering into them, and not on any other States. These new compacts could only be entered into among States which have common borders with New York or New Jersey, but either of these two States could adhere to any such new compact, regardless of contiguity.

Thus, the proposed legislation would authorize and give consent to the recent compact entered into between New York and Connecticut, and would permit Massachusetts to adhere to this compact, if any or all of these States so desired.

This amendment would also make it possible, without further submission to Congress, for New Jersey to enter into an identical, but separate, compact with Delaware, which Pennsylvania could join, if either or both of these States so desired.

I am introducing this bill on the suggestion, and at the request of the officials of New York State—specifically, of the judge advocate general of the New York National Guard and State judge advocate, Col. Charles G. Stevenson. This proposal has the approval of the office of the Governor of New York.

The bill I am introducing was drafted by Colonel Stevenson and the counsel to the House Judiciary Committee, in consultation with Representative CELLER and myself.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Governor of New Jersey, in reply to a letter I addressed to him commenting on this proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and letter, together with a joint statement by me and Representative CELLER, to be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2142) to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (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, etc., That a new subsection (b) be added to section 2 of Public Law 435, reading as follows:

"(b) Without submission, the Congress consents to the entering into a compact identical in terms with the compact set forth in section 1 of this act, between the State of New York or the State of New Jersey, or both, and any State or contiguous States sharing a common boundary with either New York or New Jersey."

And that the present terms of section 2 be renumbered as subsection (a) of that section.

The letter and joint statement, presented by Mr. LEHMAN, are as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
Trenton, May 19, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have your letter of May 16, 1955, with respect to the proposed amendment of Public Law 435, 82d Congress.

I regret the delay in replying to earlier communications which reached me through Senator CASE. Upon receipt of Senator CASE's first letter I sought the reaction of my staff. Some concern was then felt as to whether the proposed amendment, in its original form, would have resulted in contractual obligation on the part of the State of New Jersey with such other States as might enter into an agreement with the State of New York. It seems to me that the problem which disturbed us has been eliminated by the redraft of the proposed amendment under which a new subsection (b) is added to section 2 of the statute and under which I think it clear that no obligation could be imposed upon the State of New Jersey by virtue of any compact made between or among other States. I accordingly have informed Senator CASE that I see no objection to his sponsorship of the amendment.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

JOINT STATEMENTS BY SENATOR LEHMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE CELLER

MUTUAL MILITARY AID COMPACTS FOR NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, AND ADJOINING STATES

Eight Members of the Senate headed by Senator LEHMAN, and Congressman CELLER in the House, have simultaneously introduced bills granting the consent of Congress to permit the States of New York and New Jersey, and States sharing a common border with either of them, to enter into mutual military aid compacts. In the Senate, Senator LEHMAN was joined by Senator IVES of New York, Senators SMITH and CASE of New Jersey, Senators PURTELL and BUSH of Connecticut, and Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

The proposed legislation, which is an amendment to Public Law 435 of the 82d Congress, will permit the States adjoining New York and New Jersey to enter into compacts to:

1. Provide mutual military aid in cases of emergency; and
2. Allow fresh pursuit, across State borders, of enemies, saboteurs, or other dangerous persons.

At the time Public Law 435 was being considered, the Congress was of the opinion that such mutual military aid compacts should not be extended without limitation, and therefore restricted its consent to the abovementioned States. The question subsequently arose, however, whether States having a common border with one of the signatories of the compact, but not with the others, could adhere to this same compact without the consent of all the participating States. This problem presented itself when New Jersey and Pennsylvania declined to join in an agreement permitting Connecticut to become a party to the original compact, even though it share a common boundary with the State of New York. In view of this objection, it became necessary for New York to enter into a separate compact with Connecticut. Consent must now be sought from Congress for this new compact.

The present bill will amend Public Law 435 by adding a new subsection to permit identical compacts between other States in this area of the country, without the necessity of obtaining (1) prior congressional consent, or (2) the consent of the signatories to the original compact. Such compacts would bind only the States entering into them and not any other States.

This legislation is being introduced on the suggestion, and at the request of, the Office of the Governor of the State of New York.

GRANTS TO STATES TO PROVIDE VACCINATION AGAINST POLIOMYELITIS TO ALL CHILDREN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has the responsibility of passing upon proposed legislation concerning the Salk

polio vaccine. Thus far, the proposals which have received the most attention have been designed either to assure the availability of the vaccine to children who cannot afford to pay or to provide controls, either mandatory or discretionary, over distribution and use of the vaccine.

The Democratic Members of the committee regard the President's proposal as gravely defective. That proposal has as its purpose the provision of vaccine for those children whose parents are found unable to pay. The amount of money the President asks for would provide vaccine for only approximately 11 million out of the 51 million children in the country who should be inoculated as rapidly as the vaccine becomes available. This necessarily would result in lining up many of the children of America in their schools and dividing them publicly between objects of charity and those whose parents can afford to pay for the vaccine. We do not believe that a boon to all humanity should be converted into an instrumentality of humiliation of multitudes of American children.

Consequently, it is our intention to approve legislation which will, without a means test, make the Salk vaccine available to every American child. This measure will make it possible for any community to secure free vaccine, paid for by the Federal Government, for all its children within approved age groups so long as it gives reasonable assurances that free vaccinations will be available to all children in such age groups whose parents desire the free vaccination. In communities making these assurances, free vaccine will also be available to family doctors for administration to their private patients within the priority age group.

Payment for the vaccine by the Federal Government provides a means of assuring its fair and just distribution and use and renders proposals calling for other means of control over such distribution and use less immediately necessary.

We are introducing a bill to provide this legislation.

The statement I have read is signed by all the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Senators HILL, MURRAY, NEELY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, KENNEDY, and MCNAMARA.

Mr. President, out of order, I introduce the bill for appropriate reference, and, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I announce at this time that I am calling a meeting of the committee at 10 o'clock on next Monday morning, to consider the bill and the President's proposal.

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

The bill (S. 2147) to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide all children an equal opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSING ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENT

Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2126) to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 31, 1955,

The names of the following Senators were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2113) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on May 31, 1955: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL and Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

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

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

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at a Memorial Day gathering in West Allis, Wis.

Address delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine before the National Womens Press Club of Washington, D. C., on April 21, 1955.

Address delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine at Overseas Press Club annual awards dinner, in New York City, on April 19, 1955.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Address entitled "Today's Problems Can Be Tomorrow's Accomplishments," delivered by George C. McConnaughey, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, at the annual convention of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, Washington, D. C., May 24, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 9, 1955, at 9 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan, elevated to Supreme Court;

Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Harrie B. Chase, retired, and

Kenneth P. Grubb, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge, eastern district of Wisconsin, to fill a new position.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

THE POLIO VACCINE PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial, appearing this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald on the polio vaccine situation.

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

BELATED CAUTION

The detailed statement about the polio vaccine situation which President Eisenhower made at this news conference on Tuesday would have been admirable had it been issued 6 weeks ago. It explained the need to make haste slowly in the distribution of a vaccine which had never before been manufactured on a large scale. And it set forth a clear program of priorities for vaccination while the vaccine remains in short supply—the same program that was recommended by Secretary Hobby and approved by the President 2 weeks ago. There is nothing in the present situation which could not, and should not, have been foreseen.

"Remember," said Mr. Eisenhower in explaining the delay in the vaccination program, "we are dealing in this field with the lives of our children and our grandchildren." It is something that should never have been forgotten. It now seems all too evident, however, that the mass immunization program was undertaken before the scientists knew all that they needed to know about the way viruses behave in large-scale manufacture and about the precautions that should be taken in making vaccine. It would have been better to wait until science developed the testing techniques which the President says have now been perfected.

The blame for this unhappy haste falls on a great many shoulders. The press was certainly guilty of overdramatizing the polio menace and of inflating the Salk discovery beyond its actual significance. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and the National Institutes of Health were guilty of yielding to popular impatience by releasing the vaccine before there was adequate knowledge of the problems involved in producing it commercially. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was guilty of letting distribution of the vaccine commence without any plan for giving it first to those most in need of it; the Department's incredible procrastination and indecision created nationwide confusion and anxiety.

So far as distribution goes, there are still serious ambiguities in the President's statement. Some States, he says, may provide free vaccination for all children, while other States may provide it only for children whose parents are unable to pay. Some may furnish free vaccine to schools and clinics, while others may furnish it to private physicians. The President has asked Congress to enact legislation making $28 million available to the States for the purchase of vaccine to assure that no child is denied it by reason of its cost. But he has fixed no standard for eligibility for free vaccine and made no provision for free inoculation; different

States may have entirely different ideas as to what constitutes inability to pay. The lesson of experience is that ambiguity is the mother of confusion. If Congress appropriates the requested $28 million, it will no doubt want to provide appropriate criteria for the use of the money?

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE NEED FOR AMENDMENT OF THE CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial, which appeared this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald on the subject of campaign contributions and the need for amending the Corrupt Practices Act in respect thereto. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech, delivered yesterday by Mr. Philip Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, on the general subject of the needed reforms in respect to campaign donations.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 2, 1955]

HOW TO FINANCE CAMPAIGNS

About 67 percent of the people, according to a recent Gallup poll, agree with Senator HENNINGS that the laws on campaign spending should be tightened. A large majority of those expressing an opinion believe, quite rightly, that the present limits on campaign expenditures are broadly ignored. They want a law that will be respected. What many do not realize is that the present restrictions can never win respect, for the reason that campaigns in the 1950's cannot be conducted for the small sums allowed. Even the most economical campaigns cost many times the $3 million allowed for national committees, the $10,000 to $25,000 allowed senatorial candidates, and the $2,500 to $5,000 allowed congressional candidates.

One of the major purposes of Senator HENNINGS' bill before a Senate Rules Subcommittee is to boost these obsolete limitations. He would allow national committees to spend up to $12 million, senatorial candidates up to $50,000 or 10 cents per vote cast in the last election, and candidates for the House up to $12,500 or 10 cents a vote. Even these new limits, however, are far out of line with what many candidates and political committees have found to be necessary to get the issues adequately before the people. In a large State an active candidate using radio, television, and air travel is almost certain to spend $250,000 or more. Some estimates place the cost of the 1952 presidential campaigns as high as $100 million. These vast expenditures are an emphatic argument for practical steps to shorten campaign periods along with other efforts to reduce political costs. Realism compels the acknowledgment, however, that such reforms will take some time to accomplish on a meaningful scale.

Meanwhile a great deal could be done, in our opinion, by shifting the focus from the price tag alone to the source of campaign funds. Effective democratic contests require liberal use of television, radio, printing, telephone, and similar facilities to inform the people. There is no evil in the use of money for these purposes, unless the effect is to leave the winning candidate under questionable obligations. The frightening thing, as pointed out by Philip L. Graham, the publisher of this newspaper, in a speech at the University of Chicago last night, is that so much of the financial support for political candidates comes from the underworld, special interest groups, and people expecting to be rewarded by public positions. At present candidates are virtually forced to rely upon these sources for want of any other.

Mr. Graham cited a Gallup Poll showing that only 1 family out of 20 made any political contribution in 1954. Yet 33 percent indicated that they would have given $5 if they had been asked. If 16 million families gave $5 each for the support of candidates of their choice, this would be a total of $80 million to finance the 1956 campaigns. Such an outpouring of funds for political purposes from the rank and file would do more to undercut the special interests and favor-seekers than any law Congress could pass.

The country needs a better Corrupt Practices Act with realistic limits on campaign spending. But the best way to beat corruption is to finance good candidates through small contributions from the rank and file. A skillfully planned movement of this kind should bring about a double rejuvenation of democracy at the grassroots.

THE HIGH COST OF POLITICS

(By Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, at the annual dinner, School of Business, University of Chicago, Knickerbocker Hotel, Chicago, Ill., June 1, 1955)

Ever since the 6th of August 1945, the ruling facts of our times have been fairly clear.

In stark oversimplification they are these:

1. Modern science has revolutionized warfare. It has done this so completely that war now is obsolete as a method for settling human conflicts.

2. Obviously, what is needed is some new world political arrangement that effectively eliminates the exercise of war.

3. However, the historical forces which divide mankind are so powerful that little or no progress has been made in this direction. Instead two powerful Nation-State systems oppose each other bitterly and totally, and at least appear to conduct their affairs as though war were still a practical alternative to diplomacy.

4. Progress toward the elimination of war will apparently begin only when the free nations become so united and strong that the Communist apparatus will see no chance of world domination.

5. The proper course for freemen is therefore one calling for the highest degree of skill in the conduct of affairs of incredible complexity. We must continuously strengthen our alliances; intelligently tackle the fantastic scientific and technological problems of keeping militarily strong; foster a healthy American economy; give support to the creation of a better life elsewhere in the world; maintain and develop our regard for individual liberties; and so on and so on.

Those, in broad outline, are the operative facts of our times. This is the framework within which the question of human survival will be decided.

I would like to suggest that in one respect at least we are facing up to this situation as though we were a nation of lunatics. I would also like to suggest that unless we change our habits we shall probably achieve the fate we deserve.

Now my suggestion has one refreshing aspect. It will not require this assemblage of potential cardiac cases to raise your blood pressure in anger against anyone except yourselves. I do not suggest that we can solve all our problems by denouncing Yalta, 90 percent of parity, the Dixon-Yates contract, Owen Lattimore, or high taxes.

What I put to you is simply this: We face problems that involve life and death for all of us; yet we insist on having the lowest sort of opinion of the very people we entrust with those problems; and we force them to operate under conditions which do everything to repel decent men.

Who are these people who bear this great responsibility, and whom we treat so stupidly? They are, of course, the politicians. They include Dwight D. Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, 96 Senators, 435 Congressmen, 48 Governors, the 750,000 other elective officials, and the Cabinet officers and tens of thousands of appointive officials and political workers who must live under our existing system of politics.

These are the people whose day-by-day actions will very largely determine the greatest conflict in the history of the world. Yet how do we tell them we regard them? We tell them that we consider them just a little above outlaws. Thus this spring in a nationwide Gallup poll, 7 out of 10 people with an opinion stated that they would not like to see their children enter politics as a life's work.

Let us suppose that instead of running a great Nation we were running a pickle works and that our pickle sales were dropping every month. Clearly we would not begin by telling our sales department that all salesmen were stupid and crooked and unnecessary. Yet we do treat problems which are rather more urgent than pickle sales in just that fashion. And if we continue to do so we probably have as much chance of survival as the buggy manufacturers had of licking Henry Ford.

Since you who are here tonight are men of experience, it will be obvious that fundamental problems call for fundamental solutions. And truly the problems presented by our present system of politics are fundamental. They are not going to be solved by palliatives. It will do us no good at all to resolve that for the next 30 days we shall never place the word "dirty" directly next to the word "politician." It will do us no good to make speeches or to write editorials saying we need better men and women in politics and a higher public regard for politicians.

Yet there is something—something fundamental and lasting—that can be done about the present situation. It is possible; it is urgently necessary; and it is eminently practical.

Moreover, if this thoroughly "doable" thing is, indeed, done, it should constitute the single most important political reform of our times.

But before we discuss the solution, let us diagnose the basic problem in a bit more detail. For the problem is deeper than merely a question of public attitudes. Although they are considerably more esteemed than politicians, nevertheless farmers, labor leaders, industrialists, and even newspaper people are frowned upon by a goodly number of their fellow men. Yet these people at least can operate in an environment permitting them to maintain their self-respect.

So while it is a serious matter that politicians rank close to lepers in the popularity polls, it is a much more serious matter that we force politicians to live in a system which goes a long way toward depriving them of self-respect.

The fundamental defect in our present system of politics—as is so often the case in life—has something to do with money. It has specifically to do with our habits regarding contributions for political campaigns. Even putting the best possible face on the situation, it can only be described as morally squalid, ethically shocking, and spiritually revolting.

As of 1955 the principal characteristics of our system of political finance can be accurately described in the following manner:

1. We maintain a bold-faced, official lie about the cost of political campaigns and the amounts of political contributions.

2. We almost universally fail to respond to—or even to recognize—the duties of the individual citizen in a free society.

3. We consequently force politicians to live in close connection with the filthy power of gangsters and the acquisitive power of special interest groups and favor seekers.

First, let me briefly expand on the way we maintain an official lie about political expenditures. We do this by having a Federal law which limits expenditures by a candidate for Congress to a maximum of $5,000, by a candidate for the Senate to $25,000, and by a national political committee to $3 million. Now a Senator, even in a small State, cannot run for $25,000 and in a State like Illinois he cannot run for $250,000. But the law remains on the books, the myth is maintained by a series of long-practiced manipulations and evasions, and so we force the able man entering politics to launch his career with an initial act of blatant hypocrisy. And to endure this indignity every time he runs again.

In fact, few if any people actually know what modern political campaigns do cost. One of the most respected Members of the Senate has told me that in his State (about the size of Illinois) over $3 million was spent in a recent gubernatorial election.

But the existing system perpetuates the fraudulent impression that political expenditures are but a fraction of what they are. Thus in the 1952 presidential campaign a total of $17,500,000 was reported by the national committees of the two major parties. Some students of the matter estimate that actual expenditures came closer to $100 million.

The limitations of $25,000 for the Senate and $5,000 for the House are patently laughable. For there are counties in this country where even a sheriff's race costs from 10 to 20 times more than $25,000.

So from those highlights you can see how monumentally deceitful a system of laws and reporting we maintain about campaign expenditures.

Next, let us look at how seriously the average person defaults in his duties as an individual citizen. And in doing so let us remember that with the new American economy—with our new wide distribution of wealth—we have a society wherein the average voter is in fact financially able to meet his obligations of citizenship.

We can examine the default of the citizenry by studying the 1954 congressional elections. There were 1,054 congressional candidates. Expenditures officially reported totaled $13,700,000, and we can be sure that actual expenditures were much higher.

After that campaign the Gallup Poll asked people whether they had made a political contribution, not only in congressional races but for any of the many other campaigns that year. Assuming that such contributions would be made on a family basis, the answers were computed by families. This showed that only 1 family out of 20 had made any political contribution. If the answers were computed in terms of individual citizens, this would mean that only about 2 out of every 100 citizens made any contribution.

Since the default of the individual is so obvious, let us see what forces have rushed in to fill the vacuum.

No tidy compilation of statistics is available, but anyone at all familiar with politics can document the situation for you. There are three major sources of political funds:

1. The underworld: The sums raised by the gangsters are much larger than anyone imagines. In 1948, for example, it was reported to our newspaper that the numbers operators in Washington had raised $100,000 to be spent against two Senators who had tried to investigate local gambling. One of the most profitable businesses in the United States is the illegal race wire service to illegal horse-betting establishments. It makes millions every year, has survived every sort of attempt to break it up, and clearly must be the largest single source of political funds in the country.

2. The second important source of political funds can broadly be called special-interest groups. This includes the vast array of individuals and organizations who have something direct to gain from government. They are far different from the underworld in that their aims and purposes are wholly legitimate, if sometimes a bit acquisitive or selfish. So important is this source of funds that it is practically impossible to find any Congressman or Senator, however high-minded, who has not lost his freedom of decision in some particular area. A recent, but natural and understandable, addition to this group can probably be found among some few foreign governments who are dependant upon us for monetary or political assistance. While difficult of precise proof, it seems probable that in some few cases a small part of our foreign aid has come back to us in the form of political contributions. And when one realizes that $100,000 carefully spent in a few small States can place a sizable portion of the United States Senate under obligation, it is easy to understand the temptation that exists for all special-interest groups.

3. The third group of established political contributors probably contributes the least in total amount, though their contributions are still important. They can be described as the hopefuls. They are people who contribute in the expectation of receiving high public office. Their existence explains to a large extent why in the 1954 election less than 1,000 people contributed more than one-fifth of the total amount reported by both major national political committees. Their total gifts represented $1,850,000. And although the law—that same unenforced, hypocritical law—limits individual contributions to $5,000 to any one candidate or committee, it is believed that some resourceful contributors have managed to locate or create enough committees to permit contributions of over $100,000 in a single campaign.

So dominating is the need for political money that this form of outright sale of positions of public trust is universally accepted. It had to be practiced by that old professional, President Truman, and it has also had to be practiced by that idealistic amateur, President Eisenhower.

In bygone days this particular practice probably did little harm. Government was then relatively unimportant and a rich knucklehead here or there in high office could do little harm. Today, of course, this is radically altered. There are few unimportant high public posts. And both this administration and its predecessor have been weakened by the system which we average citizens have forced upon our political leaders.

The overall problem, I would like to repeat, is both serious and simple. We need the highest possible sort of people in politics because of the awesome decisions they must make. And we shall not have this until we get rid of the rotten financial foundation upon which our political system now rests, and thus begin to demonstrate toward politicians some of that decent concern which practitioners of the arts of free government deserve.

The political financial problem, we should realize, is going to grow in size. This is inevitable because of our growth in population and growth in power of communications. Obviously politics will be expensive in a nation of 165 million with rapidly widening suffrage.

We are many, many years from 1789 when our Constitution was ratified by fewer than 100,000 people—by only some 2 percent of the population.

How to deal with this growing problem is a matter of mounting concern. To give you an idea of its dimensions let me point out that to put a presidential candidate on just one TV network for a single half-hour costs between $50,000 and $100,000.

To some these costs indicate only that modern mass communications are expensive. But that is not in fact the case, if we judge them on a per capita basis. Using mass media a candidate today probably spends much less to reach the individual voter than it cost Thomas Jefferson to feed all those horses that pulled his stagecoach, or even Theodore Roosevelt to pay for his campaign train.

The high cost of politics is a direct result of a high population and an expanding right of suffrage. And superficial attempts to solve the problem by having politicians pass rules as to what other politicians can get free TV time are only going to create new problems. Even stronger language can be employed against the suggestion, now 50 years old but constantly revived, that the Government should appropriate funds for this purpose.

There is one step toward reform now being studied by the Senate which deserves support and encouragement. That is the effort by a committee, headed by Senator HENNINGS of Missouri, to write more realistic laws about political contributions. This is the 60th congressional committee to review this subject in the last 50 years. Insofar as they are working toward full and honest accounting of all political contributions, they are working toward a desirable end. However, although present limits on expenditures will be considerably raised, the Senate hearings so far indicate that the new limits will still invite evasions by being unrealistically low. In any event, the work of Senator HENNINGS and his colleagues represents some of the most constructive work in many years. And success in their labors will be a stepping-stone toward better government.

But the major problem still remains. That is, how can we raise enough honest, untainted money to permit our politicians to run for office without becoming obligated to corrupt or selfish forces? And in doing this, how can we help to create a higher regard for the importance of politics in the American future?

The answer is, I think, not too difficult. It can be accomplished quickly enough to be effective in the 1956 campaign. And there is not a person in this room who cannot do something toward achieving this fundamental political reform.

Here are the basic facts. In the Gallup poll I referred to a few minutes ago, only 1 family out of 20 made any political contribution in 1954. But Gallup also put this question: If asked, would you give $5 to the party you prefer?

Thirty-three percent of the families—about 16 million families—said yes. A little over half said no, while some 13 percent had no views. Now $5 from 16 million families equals $80 million, and even a fraction of that amount of new, untainted money would revolutionize American politics. Moreover, it is ridiculously defeatist to assume that the other 66 percent of our families cannot be convinced of their proper obligations of good citizenship.

The problem then is how to convince millions of Americans of an obvious fact—that good citizenship requires political contributions by each individual to the party or candidates of his choice. Good citizenship requires this just as much as it requires contributions to one's church, one's community fund, the Red Cross, or other causes.

The weak at heart may tell us that even such an obvious truth cannot be quickly taught. That is not only nonsense, it is nonsense that we can prove to be nonsense.

Let's take a parallel though perhaps more difficult problem. The threatened European grain famine after World War II. The ravages of war and a severe drought had destroyed much of the European grain supply.

Obviously millions of people were going to starve to death within 6 months. And almost everyone knew that nothing could be done about it. The only possible rescue was to get us to eat less wheat in America, and this seemed impossible because rationing controls could not be imposed in the short time available.

But a few people were unresigned to failure. They assumed that the American people would respond to duty if they only knew what their duty was. So through a barrage of public service advertising, conducted by the advertising council, the people were informed. Early in 1946 a Gallup poll showed that almost nobody knew of the need to save grain. By April 1946, almost 9 out of 10 Americans knew of the problem. And most of them were doing their duty. As a result our grain shipments reached unprecedented totals and reached Europe quickly. And not a single European died from the famine that summer—the summer that the late Ernest Bevin described as the great European famine that did not happen.

The use of public service advertising is now so widespread that most of us forget that it is a new and vitally useful social tool. In the past 12 years it has been an essential part of the savings bond program, has reduced traffic accidents, prevented forest fires, created blood banks for the armed services, and aided a hundred other causes.

In 1952 public service advertising told Americans over and over again of their duty to register and vote, and helped set new records for registration and voting.

One does not have to be an Einstein to see how great a function public service advertising could perform in helping to build a new and decent foundation under our system of political finance. Through television, magazines, radio, newspapers, billboards, car cards—even matchboxes—the average decent American could be reminded and reminded again of the importance of good government. Of how good government depends on each citizen's supporting, as he can, the party or candidate of his choice. And by doing this, we can gain the larger objective of giving public recognition to the fact that there should be no more noble calling in a free society than that of public life.

A complete, well-coordinated campaign of public service advertising can create proper citizen support for political campaigns. It can do so quickly. By doing so it can, as I have said, create the most important political reform of the century.

What is needed to make this happen? What is needed to make it work? Nothing more than the support of you and other decent citizens like yourselves.

This country has in the advertising council a nonprofit, nonpartisan, public service group that annually administers $100 million worth of public service advertising donated by American business. The advertising council could provide a practical means for conducting such an educational campaign. It can be a campaign to further good government by reminding every citizen of his duty to support the party and candidates of his choice.

For my part I hope it is done. For your part, I hope you join in making it a success.

For our part, for the common concern of this country, we must end the fantastic system under which we treat our politicians as unsavory characters while at the same time we charge them with preserving our very civilization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope all Members of Congress will read Mr. Graham's speech. I am satisfied that if they do, they will have the substantiating argument in support of a position which many of us have taken for the past several years when we have urged modification and amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act. Mr. Graham performed a great educational service to the American people in the speech he made yesterday on the general subject of political campaign contributions. If we really want free men to serve in the Congress, then the American people, in order to protect that freedom, must accept the responsibility, family by family, in relation to campaign contributions, as brought out yesterday by Mr. Graham in his exceedingly able speech.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to support what the Senator from Oregon has said. I myself have suggested, in speaking in my State, as has the Senator from Oregon in many speeches he has made, that the interest of the average citizen in political matters should be just as great as his interest in civic matters generally, such as the Red Cross and other community enterprises, and in the other fine things which are parts of the American way of life.

I read with great interest Mr. Graham's speech. As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, Mr. Graham has made a real contribution, because if the American people will take the same kind of interest in political matters that they take in their various community enterprises, such as those dealing with health problems, schools, and so forth, they will go a long way toward clearing up this situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in line with the suggestion of the Senator from Washington, I wish to state that the Corrupt Practices Act, insofar as it applies to contributions to political campaigns, at the present time is conducive to lying and falsehood. It makes lying legal. That should be stopped, and the act should be amended, because under it only a small percentage of the actual expenses in political campaigns are reported. Certainly that is a shocking betrayal of the public trust. We should overhaul the act so as to put an end to that situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only that but it is the most impractical act ever placed on the statute books.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I desire to comment on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and to agree with him on the necessity of changing the law which applies to the reporting of political contributions. I hope everyone in the country will read Mr. Graham's speech of yesterday, because in it he touches on a point which I believe to be of vital import to the future of American politics. If all the American people do not participate in politics, either at the party level or in the making of contributions, then the country can well come under the control of small but powerful groups, whether they be in labor unions or in management.

So I desire to thank the Senator from Oregon for making it possible for Mr. Graham's speech to be widely read. I hope the American people will most sincerely consider the points made in the speech and the facts set forth in it. It is time that we make the conducting of politics a responsibility of all the people, rather than permit it to be managed and controlled by small groups.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to join in the statement which has been made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I read in full the speech made by Mr. Graham. I discussed the matter with him as we sat together at a dinner some weeks ago. I believe that what he suggested in his speech can be accomplished in a fair and impartial manner.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for placing the magnificent speech by Mr. Phillip Graham in the RECORD. I think we all should think about the suggestions Mr. Graham makes. The people of Missouri take great pride in the fact that my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. HENNINGS] is in the forefront of those engaged in studying the entire problem. We know that, with his guidance and help, as well as that of other outstanding Americans, there is a reasonable prospect that improvements in the law which the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon referred to will be brought about.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on the reference to the address delivered by Mr. Graham, as it relates to greater contributions to political work. I am very much impressed by the comments of the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Last February the Gallup poll indicated that the American people wished to contribute to political effort, but they do not get the opportunity. I am glad to say that in 1952, in my own State of Pennsylvania, which for many years has been making large contributions to both political parties, there were contributions to the Republican Party from more than 100,000 Pennsylvanians.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am pleased that our distinguished brethren on the other side of the aisle feel kindly and cooperative toward the Graham proposal. It has been my experience, during about 25 years in politics in the Pacific Northwest, that the distinguished "loyal opposition" spent about twice as much as the Democrats. Therefore, as a practical matter, I favor the proposal.

Mr. GOLDWATER subsequently said: Mr. President, during the morning hour the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said:

> It has been my experience, during about 25 years in politics in the Pacific Northwest, that the distinguished "loyal opposition" spent about twice as much as the Democrats.

That was in reference to an excellent speech which was delivered in Chicago yesterday by Mr. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

In order to keep the record straight, I should like to read very briefly from a statement made this year before the subcommittee of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is a member, namely, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Gov-

ernment Operations, by the chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of Michigan. I think if the Senator from Washington failed to receive campaign funds from the Democratic Party, he had better take a lead from the Democratic Party of Michigan.

I read:

In a study prepared by a researcher for the National CIO–PAC entitled "The CIO and the Democrat Party," published by the University of Chicago Press, 1952, on page 131 there is set forth a statement that in the year 1950, Michigan CIO unions contributed $200,000 directly to statewide Democrat candidates. This study shows that 64 percent of all the Democrat funds in the 1950 campaign came directly from the CIO.

Because the charge has been made that these are voluntary funds, I continue briefly from the statement:

I charge and will now prove that there is nothing voluntary in Michigan about the way that the PAC receives its funds. I refer to the audit report filed by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW–CIO, for the period from June 1, 1950 to May 31, 1951. The report contains a summary of receipts and disbursements. While it shows that the PAC made no contributions into the general fund of the union, the union on the other hand for the 12-month period ending May 1951 paid to the PAC $120,434.56.

I read briefly further:

In the report by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW–CIO for the period from June 1, 1951, to May 31, 1952, the following disbursements from the general funds of the union for political activities are set forth:

They total $1,380,872.60.

To complete my very brief reading from the statement, I quote further as follows:

In the report filed by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW–CIO for the 12-month period ending December 31, 1954, the following disbursements from the general fund of the union, the source being union dues, and the amounts being used for political purposes—in Michigan—all for the Democrat Party, both on a State and national basis, were as follows:

This is serious, Mr. President. They total $2,611,980.05.

I concur in the speech made by Mr. Graham in Chicago yesterday, and I sincerely hope that he intended in his speech to include funds such as these from all sources, namely, funds extracted involuntarily from Democrats and Republicans alike, even though the funds go for the promotion of only one party. I oppose that practice whether the party concerned is the Republican Party or the Democrat Party.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY JOHN FEIKENS, CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, ON S. 636, MAY 17, 1955

I regard it a privilege to appear before this committee to testify on S. 636. The subject matter is especially interesting to me in my capacity as chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of Michigan.

By way of introduction, I am not unmindful of the provisions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to which reference will be made hereinafter. I would like to point out that in Michigan we presently have a law which provides that "No officer, director, stockholder, attorney, agent or any other person acting for any corporation or joint stock company, whether incorporated under the laws of this or any other State or any foreign country, except corporations formed for political purposes, shall pay, give or lend, or authorize to be paid, given or lent, any money belonging to such corporation to any candidate or to any political committee for the payment of any election expenses whatever." (Sec. 196.14, Laws Relating to Elections—Revision of 1953.)

I would like to say that while I agree with the intent of this bill to seek better reporting methods, I do not believe that the problem is attacked head on either on a national level or on a State level such as in Michigan, by simply providing for more particularized reporting of campaign expenditures.

Present laws in the State of Michigan already provide that every candidate and every treasurer of a political committee shall file reports in the office of the county clerk of the county in which such candidate or treasurer resides within a specified number of days after each election, said report to give in detail every item of money received and disbursed. A political committee is defined as every combination of two or more persons who shall aid or promote the success or defeat of a candidate or a political party or principle or measure. (Secs. 196.4 and 196.19, Laws Relating to Elections—Revision of 1953.)

While this has been the law for a number of years, many political committees recently operating in the State of Michigan, as I will hereinafter refer to them, have not complied with this law, even though I have repeatedly sought aid from the attorney general of Michigan for its enforcement.

I might also state that while I am interested in your intent to limit the amount of campaign expenditures, it seems to me that the approach which is taken in the proposed bill again does not address itself to the heart of the matter.

In delineating my argument I will, of course, constantly refer to the situation as I find it to exist in Michigan, and I want to say at the outset that my remarks are limited to my knowledge of conditions in my own State. I believe it necessary to say that I want no privilege for expenditures by corporations. I believe that our present laws ought to be strengthened further in this regard and they ought also to be broadened so as to include all special-interest groups, any of which compel contributions to political parties, or to candidates as a condition of employment or as a matter of doing business, either in the pursuit of a profession or in the exchange of goods and services for value. In that connection, I wish to call the committee's attention to legislation presently before the Michigan Legislature, already approved by the senate and now pending before the house. This proposed senate bill 1401, I believe goes to the heart of the matter much more directly than does United States Senate bill 636, for it provides that "no person in the employ of another nor a person seeking employment shall be required to support financially or otherwise, any candidate or political committee as a condition of employment" and that "no organization which any person in the employ of another is required as a condition of employment to join, remain in, or support financially or otherwise, shall offer or spend any money or thing or service of value in support or opposition of any candidate, political committee, or political party."

Proposed amendments to this Michigan bill which we support would include all activities involved in the exchange of goods or services for value as coming within the prohibition of the law.

It is my firm belief that no person, whether he works for a corporation or whether he is engaged in business relationships with it, or whether he is an employee, ought to be compelled to contribute to a political party. Some of the antagonists of our proposed Michigan legislation argue that the bill is aimed at labor unions. Let me categorically state that my position is not directed against labor unions as such, nor is that the position of the Republican Party of Michigan. We are proud to be sponsors in Michigan of the most liberalized unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation laws in the United States. As a party, we are opposed to any right-to-work legislation. We are interested in minimum-wage legislation and we have as a party repeatedly voiced our position in favor of fair-employment practices legislation.

But we do believe that the present election system in Michigan, both as it affects candidates running for Federal office as well as State office, is such that greater restrictive controls are necessary and I repeat again that I refer to the proposed legislation in Michigan only because I think it goes far more directly to the heart of the problem than does the legislation before this committee. Many of its provisions could be made applicable to the areas covered by the Federal statutes.

In describing the election system in my State, I must point out that we are running into totalitarianism on the part of certain groups. In support of this statement I charge and can prove that the political bosses of the labor organizations in our State are compelling individuals as a condition of their employment to contribute to the Democrat Party.

I want this committee to understand that though much of this statement is given over to discussing involuntary support of a political party by labor unions through dues collected that I recognize the very real possibility that large business institutions may inferentially or by implication make political contributions a condition of good business relations. Extraction of funds by a corporation from those with whom it does business, even where such a contribution does not pass through the hands of officers or agents of that corporation, need not necessarily add up to a voluntary action by the contributor, and if such is the case I say without equivocation that the spirit of the proposed Michigan law would be violated. I do not believe that involuntary group or individual contributions from any source should be allowed. This committee will have before it incontrovertible evidence that unions in my State collect dues on the basis of union membership, which is a necessary condition of employment. The committee will have before it evidence that such dues, without express permisison of those duespayers, divert to a separate organization formed for political purposes part of the money thus collected. In diverting this money to the second organization for political support of a party those who direct the finances of the union have violated the fundamental rights of free American citizens and have committed their support of a political party without any obligation to be found in the union-membership requirements of the individual. I believe this committee will agree with the position I take that if this is permitted to continue it can work to the disadvantage of both political parties and might, indeed, make a mockery of the rights of individuals once they have joined the union.

I charge and can prove that the political bosses of labor unions, particularly those of the CIO, use for political candidates on partisan political purposes vast amounts of

union dues, money gathered for the purpose of advancing the cause of labor.

I charge and can prove that these funds are not used for the Republican Party in Michigan or its candidates.

I charge and can prove that many employees in Michigan who are rank-and-file members of the union are Republicans and are having such dues money taken from them contrary to their desires.

I wish to take these charges and support them with proof.

First of all—with regard to the charge that there are thousands of union members who are faithful Republicans. With your permission, I should like to draw to your attention a large study produced only last year, 1954, by election research experts at the University of Michigan and published under the name, The Voter Decides. The survey shows that 41 percent of the union members in the 1952 election preferred the Republican Party.[1] Another study of political attitudes in an industrialized city (Elmira, N. Y.) was undertaken some years ago by members of the faculty of Columbia University. This study showed that 40 percent of the unskilled union members in this city were Republican. Fifty percent of the skilled union members were Republicans.[2]

In a study published in April of last year by two leading members of the faculty of the University of Illinois, Professors Hudson and Rosen, their investigators found that 57 percent of the union members they studied definitely opposed the union telling them for whom to vote and also opposed even voluntary donations to finance union political activities.[3]

I should also like to cite a national survey made by Elmo Roper several years ago where he asked union members whether they agreed or not with the union when it took a position on candidates or political matters. According to Roper, whose objectivity has never been questioned, only 23 percent of union members generally agreed with their union on political candidates.[4]

For 20 years, Gallup has been checking after each presidential election how many union members voted for the Republican Party. He shows a steady growth in Republicanism among union members at the same time that the union leaders are using more and more of their members' money compulsorily for the Democrats:

	Percent voting Republican[5]
1936 (Landon)	20
1940 (Willkie)	28
1944 (Dewey)	28
1948 (Dewey)	26
1952 (Eisenhower)	39

A recent study of local 222 of the Oil Workers Union, CIO, showed that 44 percent of the members thought their union should not take part in politics. More than half of the members of this union who had an opinion said it was wrong for the union to endorse any political candidates. Then the members of this CIO union were asked the question: "Do you think a member should vote for political candidates endorsed by the local union?" Sixty-six percent of the members answered: "No; unless I agree with the union." Only 17 percent answered: "Yes."[6]

Another university research man has studied the teamsters local 688, of St. Louis. The union members were asked whether they approved of the union collection of a dollar from each union member to help friendly candidates. Even with this question loaded with the words "friendly candidate," more than 40 percent of the union members said "No."[7]

Another recent survey was done among the members of local 517 of the Oil Workers Union–CIO in Lemont, Ill. Forty-three percent of these union members told University of Chicago research people that the union should not be active in politics at all. Nearly two-thirds of the members did not want the union lined up with any particular political party.[8]

With reference to our own Michigan situation, among many letters that I have received from members of the UAW–CIO, I have one dated March 1, 1955, from Walter J. Brauninger, who writes me in part as follows: "I am following the newspaper accounts of GOP criticism of the UAW–CIO's political activity with more than usual interest. I am a member of the UAW and I am a Republican. There is no doubt that I am a union member, because I shall be discharged from my job as a lathe operator at the American Broach & Machine Co. when I fail to pay my dues. But there is some doubt in my mind whether I am a Republican. I voted for Mr. Leonard and a slate of Republican candidates, in secret ballot, without fear and with a free conscience. But at the same time I helped to elect Mr. Williams and I helped to defeat my own man, Mr. Leonard. I did this by paying dues to my union which, in turn, devoted its extensive radio and TV programs and its official publication, the United Automobile Worker, to the cause of the Democratic Party. My union sold me."

I will now support my charge that vast sums of money raised through the use of union dues are used solely for Democratic candidates for State and National offices in Michigan. In a study prepared by a researcher for the National CIO–PAC entitled "The CIO and the Democrat Party," published by the University of Chicago Press, 1952, on page 131, there is set forth a statement that in the year 1950, Michigan CIO unions contributed $200,000 directly to statewide Democrat candidates. This study shows that 64 percent of all the Democrat funds in the 1950 campaign came directly from the CIO. The study shows that this $200,000 came from funds contributed by union members under maintenance-of-membership and union-shop clauses.

Let me digress for a moment. I am not unmindful that the CIO Political Action Committee does not, insofar as its charter is concerned at least, fall within the prohibitions of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, for in its literature published by the committee there are asked and answered several pertinent questions: "Is the PAC a political party?" Answer: "PAC is not a political party. The CIO convention has consistently declared the CIO-PAC is directed to continue to act on an independent, nonpartisan basis, giving support to the progressive forces in the two major parties, basing its judgment of candidates upon their records and platforms." Question: "Where does the PAC get its money?" Answer: "PAC funds come from the voluntary contributions of CIO members."

I charge and will now prove that there is nothing voluntary in Michigan about the way that the PAC receives its funds. I refer to the audit report filed by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO, for the period from June 1, 1950, to May 31, 1951. The report contains a summary of receipts and disbursements. While it shows that the PAC made no contributions into the general fund of the union, the union, on the other hand, for the 12-month period ending May 1951 paid to the PAC $120,434.56.

These funds paid into PAC came from union dues. These dues were collected under maintenance-of-membership and union-shop clauses. All CIO unions then and now have such union-shop clauses in their contracts with employers. Thus rank-and-file members were forced to contribute to PAC to be members in good standing of their union. Membership in good standing is a requisite to continued employment. If a man does not pay dues he cannot keep his job. In addition, this same report shows $44,546.42 used for news broadcasting, $39,801.65 for radio, $223,198.60 for the educational fund, all of which items were directly tied into political campaigning and political statements, and these funds were largely used in Michigan.

In the report by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW–CIO for the period from June 1, 1951, to May 31, 1952, the following disbursements from the general funds of the union for political activities are set forth: PAC $200,398.85, editorial $454,079.88, radio $116,399.21, research $139,627.31, educational fund $327,977.46, citizenship fund $142,389.89, for a total expenditure in that 12-month period of $1,380,872.60.

In the report filed by Emil Mazey as secretary-treasurer of the UAW–CIO for the 6-month period ending November 30, 1952, we find this statement as to the citizenship fund: "Our citizenship fund was established at the last convention for the purpose of strengthening democracy by encouraging members and citizens generally to register and vote in community, State, and national elections, and to carry on organizational and educational programs directed toward the achievement of an ever higher understanding of citizenship responsibility * * *. Five cents of each per capita tax we receive is set aside in the citizenship fund to be used for the above objective. These funds are used to cover salary and expenses of staff members for promotion of legislation, getting out the vote, reapportionment drive, radio and television, literature, donations to State and county councils, and so forth."

In this 6-month report, we find the following expenditures: Editorial department, $281,640.11; Political Action Committee, $66,098.41; radio, $34,536.02; research, $68,122.14; educational fund, $182,014.11; citizenship fund, regular, $885,683.86; citizenship fund, PAC expense, $125,821.74; for a total expenditure for political purposes for this 6-month period of $1,643,907.39.

In the report filed by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the UAW-CIO for the 12-month period ending December 31, 1954, the following disbursements from the general fund of the union, the source being union dues, and the amounts being used for political purposes—in Michigan—all for the Demcratic Party, both on a State and national basis, were as follows: Editorial, $590,603.13; radio, $23,613.86; research, $160,390.75; educational fund, $678,882.98; citizenship fund, regular, $774,046; citizenship fund, PAC department expense, $384,443.33; for a total of $2,611,980.05.

---

[1] Campbell, Gurin, and Miller, The Voter Decides (Evanston: Row, Peterson & Co., 1954), p. 73.

[2] Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee, Voting (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 47. (The city studied was Elmira, N. Y.)

[3] Ruth Alice Hudson and Hjalmar Rosen, Union Political Action: The Member Speaks, Industrial and Labor Relation Review (April 1954), p. 408.

[4] Roper Survey: Does Labor Vote What Leaders Say? New York Herald Tribune, June 2, 1952.

[5] Public Opinion News Service, for release Jan. 8, 1954.

[6] Doris E. Mersdorf, local 222: A Study of Factors Associated With the Willingness of Its Membership To Define Political Action as a Union Function, a dissertation submitted to the faculty of the division of social sciences in candidacy for the degree of master of arts, department of political science, 1953, pp. 28–29.

[7] Arnold M. Rose, Union Solidarity: The International Cohesion of a Labor Union (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press), p. 84.

[8] How the Members of Lemont Local 517 OWIU–CIO Have To Say About Their Union: Report of a Survey of Membership Attitudes, University of Chicago, p. 23.

I might add that while I am certain that Emil Mazey was not telling the whole story, he did say at least at the recent convention of the UAW-CIO in Cleveland, as noted in the Detroit Free Press of March 28, 1955, that the union spent $250,000 in radio and television shows in Michigan and in connection with the PAC department expense item referred to in the citizenship fund, he said that that amount went to support political activities of such groups as the Wayne County and Michigan CIO Council. In that news article he admitted that union dues were being so used.

In an analysis which was prepared for the Republican Party after the 1954 campaign, the study revealed the following:

Radio (sponsored by the CIO)

Total number of year-round programs	29
Total number of stations	26
Total number of communities	25

Of these, 13 are daily, 16 are weekly, 8 are national programs, 21 are State-local programs, and 11 have Guy Nunn as moderator.

Cost for air time only (annual), $227,794.

Talent cost and production cost not known.

The UAW-CIO has one television program—aired by WJBK, which has a potential Michigan audience of 4,500,000. The station has been in frequent difficulties because of the appearance of none but Labor-Democrat candidates. Add this cost to the radio.

TELEVISION

One weekly half-hour show, Detroit.

Cost of air time only, $32,760.

Talent and production costs not known.

Then there are the shop newspapers, an examination of which shows that 80 percent of the space is used for building the Labor-Democrat political party and defaming the Republican Party. The CIO alone prints about 30 different newspapers in Michigan. The total weekly circulation amounts to 300,000.

UNION NEWSPAPERS

Thirty CIO shop newspapers, weekly circulation, 300,000.

Estimated cost for printing and mailing only, $300,000.

It would appear that our estimates are in fact lower than the figures set forth in the report of Mr. Mazey. There is other evidence also that the unions in Michigan are using union funds for Democratic candidates and the Democratic Party. Governor Williams received $1,000 on October 20, 1954, from the Railroad Brotherhood; Lieutenant Governor Hart received a direct contribution from the UAW-CIO of $5,000 on September 28, 1954; Secretary of State James M. Hare received a direct contribution from the UAW-CIO of $1,000 on October 8, 1954; Attorney General Kavanagh received a direct contribution from the UAW-CIO of $1,000 on October 14, 1954; State Treasurer Sanford Brown received a direct contribution of $1,000 on October 8, 1954, from the CIO-PAC. The aforementioned, needless to say, are all Democrats.

In this connection, I wish to report that John H. Thorpe, secretary-treasurer of the Michigan Federation of Labor, is quoted in the Detroit News on May 11, 1955, as having said: "I got many thanks from Brother PAT (Senator MCNAMARA) who said it ($1,000 check) was badly needed for his campaign expenses," adding that the Michigan Federation of Labor had contributed $10,650 during MCNAMARA's race.

The minutes of a meeting of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, September 15, 1954, show that Butchers Local 630, according to Delegate Casey, contributed $500 to the McNamara campaign.

None of the funds hereinbefore referred to have been used to support Republican candidates in Michigan. This is in accordance with the announced policy of the Michigan CIO council president, Gus Scholle, who, according to the Detroit News of February 26, 1950, stated that the CIO would never support Republican candidates.

Incidentally, in the 1954 State campaign, the Democrat State Central Committee filed a report of their expenditures totalling approximately $89,000. In that report it is stated that on May 24, 1954, they received $10,000 from the UAW-CIO; on September 21, 1954, $10,000 from the UAW-CIO, and on October 15, 1954, $8,000 from the UAW-CIO PAC. The aforementioned first two items obviously come from the general fund of the union and it is noted that they are distinguished from the funds received from the PAC. During the same period, the Republican State Central Committee expended for its entire operation for the year 1954, including the campaign for all offices at State level, and national level, approximately $450,000. I can say from personal experience that we were not able to match the opposition party in our expenditures and as has been pointed out heretofore, the great amounts that were used against us came from the labor unions and were not reported as such. On the basis of the evidence presented, I can categorically state that we were outspent by the opposition party on a ratio of $5 to our one.

I might also add that it is now clear on the basis of the evidence herein set forth that the PAC also receives its funds from union dues. To give further support to that position, however, I quote from Ford Facts, the news organ of Local 600, UAW-CIO, February 26, 1955, page 4: "At a meeting at Solidarity House on Thursday, February 3, 1955, CIO local officers unanimously agreed on a budget presented by the Wayne CIO Council to cover a tricounty area for the coming spring elections of February 21, 1955, and April 4, 1955, and it was also agreed that the elections were of such importance that the local unions contribute 15 cents per member based on the month of December 1954 to help raise the needed campaign budget.

"In connection with the preceding paragraph, approval is sought for the following action of the executive board of February 8, 1955:

"1. That Local 600 contribute to the Wayne Council CIO-PAC 15 cents per member based on December 1954 membership.

"2. That the general council PAC committee be brought out on lost time to work on the primary spring election for a period from Tuesday, February 15, 1955, through Monday, February 21, 1955, and to be paid 1 week's salary and expenses flat."

I should point out that as a result of this 15-cent assessment by the unions, there was raised in Wayne County alone approximately $75,000, as reported by the Detroit newspapers.

In summary, then, we have a pattern in Michigan where tremendous sums of money raised for the legitimate purposes of unions are being used for support of one political party. Further, those sums are required and compelled to be paid by rank-and-file workers, regardless of their political views. This is evil and totalitarian, regardless of what political party such funds support.

I therefore suggest that this committee examine into the ways and means in which present Federal legislation can be strengthened to prevent this evil, whether it exists on the part of labor organizations or corporations or any other groups of any kind.

I wish also to thank this committee for their patience in listening to this massive data. I hope that the evidence presented here will be of some assistance in this complex field.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Public Would Revise Law To Limit Election Funds," written by George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion, and published in the Arizona Republic.

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

PUBLIC WOULD REVISE LAW TO LIMIT ELECTION FUNDS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J.—A solid majority of the American public is convinced that the present Federal laws limiting the amount of money spent for election campaigns are not lived up to and that reform in the way of stricter statutes is long overdue.

The general public's view is shared by the Nation's outstanding citizen-leaders, a poll of those listed in Who's Who in America shows, although the public is stronger for reform than are the top citizens of the country.

Federal election legislation now permits a candidate for the Senate to spend money in his campaign up to a maximum of $25,000 in some cases, and $10,000 in others. Candidates for the House are limited to either $2,500 or, in some cases, $5,000.

National political committees are limited to $3 million in any one calendar year.

Institute reporters from Maine to California talked to representative citizens in all walks of life in conducting today's survey. The public was asked:

"There are present laws limiting the amount of money spent for campaigns for Congress. By and large, do you think these laws are lived up to, or not?"

The vote of the general public:

	Percent
Yes, lived up to	16
No	57
No opinion	27

The next question:

"Do you think the present laws about campaign spending should be made more strict, or not?"

The vote of the general public:

	Percent
Yes, more strict	67
No	12
No opinion	21

Sentiment is relatively uniform on the two questions among major groups in the population. Of particular interest is the fact that both Republicans and Democrats see virtually eye-to-eye on the need for stricter laws.

The Nation's top citizens were asked:

"Do you think the present laws limiting campaign expenditures are too strict, about right, or not enough?"

The largest group, 39 percent, said the present laws should be made more strict.

A California editor summed it up: "The present law is loose enough that you could drive an elephant through the holes in it."

A New York executive said "further tightening would lead to more evasion," and a Missouri educator commented that "Inflation makes a dollar limitation meaningless and today's TV costs are high."

A Massachusetts educator advocated having each party receive an equal allowance for expenditures from the public treasury.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, Missouri, chairman of the Senate subcommittee on privileges and elections, has introduced a bill to revise the Federal election laws in order to prevent corrupt practices in elections.

One provision of the bill would require regular reports and summaries of expenditures by candidates.

This requirement has the endorsement of 3 out of every 4 of the Nation's top citizens, as follows:

"Would you favor or oppose revising laws concerning campaign expenditures to make it mandatory that the expenditures of political committees, on behalf of a candidate, be reported?"

The vote of those in Who's Who:

	Percent
Favor	76
Oppose	5
No opinion	19

The Hennings bill also would establish a ceiling in presidential elections, determined by multiplying the total vote cast for President in a recent election by the sum of 20 cents. This would mean a present-day limit of over $12 million.

THE LATE HAROLD M. STEPHENS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah arises to mark the passing of Chief Judge Harold M. Stephens, of the United States court of appeals, a Utahan whose distinguished service in the halls of justice of this country has brought great honor to him, to his State, and to the country whose justice he administered.

At the age of 31 he was made judge of the third judicial court, in Salt Lake City; and at the conclusion of his 4-year term, he returned to private practice, and to the graduate study of law at the University of California and Harvard Law School. In 1933 he came to Washington to serve as Assistant Attorney General.

His sense of justice and fair play were much in evidence during his career as a Government prosecutor; and his frank acknowledgment that men were being indicted and sent to jail for violating Executive orders that were difficult to find in print led to the creation of the Federal Register, which now publishes all official regulations.

Judge Stephens was noted for his genius for developing orderly processes and procedures for the trying of cases and hearing of motions. His unflagging sense of duty and tremendous stores of energy made him a tower of strength on the Federal bench. Last year he personally handled 1,776 of the 2,500 motions and petitions filed in the court of appeals, and presided over 745 3-judge hearings on motions. He was responsible for establishing a motions-calendar system which has been successful in eliminating the previous delays and uncertainties existing in this phase of our appellate system.

He was a member of the United States Judicial Conference, where his influence and skill as a jurist were employed to aid in the improvement of the entire Federal judicial system.

Judge Stephens was always alert to injustice, and his sense of fairness caused him to investigate with exacting thoroughness each case that came before him. His opinions are noted for their detail and painstaking examination into the technicalities of the law which had a bearing on the cases.

His objectivity and reputation for independent pursuit of the facts and law won respect even from those who at times disagreed with his conclusions.

Judge Stephens had a passion for giving every man "his day in court"; and his service on the bench is living evidence of his philosophy that "those who knocked on the door of courts of justice should be heard."

Those of us who knew him personally will remember him as a brilliant jurist, a warm and understanding friend, and a fine, courteous gentleman. I extend to Mrs. Stephens, his fine wife and constant companion, my profound sympathy in her sorrow; but I am sure that her grief will be tempered by her memory of this great man and his life of distinguished service and devotion to the principles of American justice.

The judge's passing not only leaves a void in our hearts, but also leaves on the appellate bench a vacancy that will be hard to fill—for he was truly a man who left his mark upon the history of our land.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF NATHAN HALE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that on June 6, next Monday, Connecticut will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the birth of Nathan Hale.

Nathan Hale, born in South Coventry, Conn., on June 6, 1755, was a distinguished citizen of my State. This youthful hero of the Revolutionary War has been an inspiration to generations of Americans. It was he who, as he was about to be hanged, with his hands tied behind his back, uttered to his British captors that immortal sentence, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Nathan Hale Set Supreme Example of Patriotism for All Americans," published in the New Haven (Conn.) Register of May 22, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point following these remarks.

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

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH—NATHAN HALE SET SUPREME EXAMPLE OF PATRIOTISM FOR ALL AMERICANS

Numerous Connecticut communities, including New Haven, will note the 200th anniversary of the birth of Nathan Hale in June with exercises at which civic and historical organizations will pay homage to the youthful martyr-hero who unflinchingly gave his life for his country during the Revolution.

It is difficult as we roam through pages of history to come upon a person as dauntlessly fearless of death and as true to an ideal as was Nathan Hale. He was a key figure in one of the most remarkable epochs in the history of mankind—the rise of the American Nation. He represents the exemplification of youth, loyalty, and heroism.

Born in South Coventry on June 6, 1755, he was raised in a home where love of God and freedom were considered main factors in human existence. At Yale he distinguished himself as a leader and graduated in 1773.

His first job was teaching in the district school in East Haddam. Not long afterward he went to New London to teach in the Union School. One day, late in April 1775, a post rider galloped into New London with the news of the fight at Lexington. That night Hale gave a rousing speech in defense of liberty at Miner's Tavern.

WENT TO CAMBRIDGE

When the tempest of the Revolution was gathering force he left the schoolroom and enlisted in the 7th Connecticut Regiment, which went to Cambridge. General Washington later sent the regiment to New York. Hale rose to captain in Knowlton's Rangers.

Following the Battle of Long Island, General Washington needed accurate data as to the probable future action of the British commander, General Howe. He asked for a volunteer to go behind the British lines to get that information, and Hale volunteered. In accepting the mission of spy, Hale said:

"For a year I have been attached to the Army, and have not rendered any material service while receiving a compensation for which I make no return. I think I owe my country the accomplishment of an object so important and so much desired by the commander of her armies."

Accordingly, disguised as a schoolmaster whose sympathies were with the British and instructed to write his notes in Latin and conceal them in his shoes, Hale set out for Long Island, being rowed across the Sound and landing in Huntington.

After accomplishing his mission of getting plans and drawing sketches of the British fortifications Hale tried to get back to the American lines. He reached the shore successfully and in the twilight saw a boat not far away. Hale waved to it and drew near but instead of patriots it bore sailors of the British warship *Nigar*.

SENTENCED TO HANG

Taken to New York, Hale was searched and the papers found. Brought before General Howe the hero revealed his mission and identity and was sentenced to be hanged.

The night before the execution Hale asked for a clergyman and a Bible, and both were denied. At dawn, the 21-year-old youth faced his death courageously and unafraid and uttered the words known to every school boy in America, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

In New Haven, at the statue of Hale, in front of Connecticut Hall where he roomed as a student, exercises will be held by the university and the General David Humphreys branch of the Sons of the American Revolution on Friday, June 3.

The following day, June 4, the historic Hale homestead in South Coventry where Hale was born will be the scene of the most elaborate ceremonies planned. Hale's homestead was restored by the late George Dudley Seymour, of New Haven.

Also planned are ceremonies in East Haddam at the school where Hale taught; in New London where he also taught in the schoolhouse now located in Ye Ancient Cemetery; in Hartford at the statue of Hale in front of the public library; and in Norwalk at the site of the Nathan Hale fountain where the hero started his spy mission, crossing Long Island Sound.

MANY HALE ITEMS

Members of the State legislature in Hartford are expected to pay homage to Hale during the anniversary week. A statue of him stands in the rotunda of the State Capitol and many rare Hale items are in the State library.

Out-of-State exercises are planned in New York City and Washington, D. C.

In New York exercises will take place on the site where Hale was tried and the probable place where he was hanged. The trial by the British took place in what is now the fashionable Beekman Hill district, and the hanging on the East Side site not far from there. The exact location of the execution, however, is not known, although many authorities believe it to be the site of the United Nations Building.

In the Nation's Capital, before a statue of Nathan Hale located on the south side of the Department of Justice, Constitution Avenue near Ninth Street, high Government officials from Connecticut will hold brief ceremonies.

This statue was dedicated in April 1948. At that time Louis L. Hemingway, of New Haven, placed a wreath at the base of the monument, and Charles Seymour, then president of Yale, made the presentation address.

Dr. Seymour will give the principal address this year in South Coventry. The address of welcome will be delivered by Gov. Abraham

Ribicoff. The Reverend Joseph H. Twichell will give the invocation and the Reverend Truman O. Ireland, the benediction.

COVENTRY PROGRAM

A highlight of the program will be the dedication of a Revolutionary flag with a brief address on behalf of Yale students, by Edward Kent, chairman of the Yale News. Two noted Nutmeg fife and drum corps will provide music, the Mattatuck drum band of Waterbury, one of the oldest in the Nation, and the Stony Creek fife and drum corps. A flag raising will be conducted by a color guard from the Governor's foot guard, and songs of the Revolutionary period, including one written by Timothy Dwight before he became president of Yale in 1795, will be rendered by a group of Yale students.

Members of the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society of Connecticut, sponsors of the event, with Orrin P. Kilbourn, of West Simsbury, chairman, will add color to the festivities by dressing in authentic costumes of the period.

In New Haven the Reverend Harris Starr, former president of Gen. David Humphreys Branch, SAR, will give the benediction at the Hale statue at Yale. Two outstanding Yale students of the senior class, one from the Army ROTC and one from the Navy ROTC, who have won SAR medals, will lay a wreath at the base of the hero's statue. George Kebabian, president of the SAR, is in charge of the Elm City exercises.

The courage and patriotism of Nathan Hale has been cited by President Eisenhower in a letter commending the forthcoming anniversary. The text of President Eisenhower's letter which was sent to Kilbourn, follows:

"Please convey my greetings and good wishes to all celebrating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Nathan Hale.

"The courage and the words of this young patriot of the Revolutionary War are significant in American history. His story provides a supreme example of the willingness of an individual to risk death and to sacrifice himself for the common good, a quality essential to the strength and preservation of a nation. I hope this anniversary will serve to remind citizens throughout our country of this fact.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

DELINQUENT TAXPAYERS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 4, 1955, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1166, I referred to an inquiry to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in which I had requested an itemized breakdown of all delinquent taxes as of December 31, 1954. It developed that prior to that time such data had never been compiled, but that for the first time the Bureau was then in the process of tabulating this information under a newly installed accounting system. This information has been received, and, as was previously announced, it showed total delinquencies of $1,614,494,286, representing 1,725,474 different accounts. While it is thought that this represents an all-time high in delinquent accounts, in the absence of a previous tabulation a comparison is not available.

In order that in the future Congress can determine the trend of these tax delinquencies, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD a letter signed by Mr. O. Gordon Delk, Acting Commissioner, giving a breakdown of the $1,614,494,286 by class of tax, followed by a chart showing a further breakdown of these delinquent accounts by districts. With this tabulation, Congress can in the future determine not only the trend of delinquent accounts, but also the relative positions of the different collection districts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

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

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, March 14, 1955.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On December 28, 1954, we informed you that we would have more complete information as to our delinquent account position as of December 31, 1954, as the result of changes in our accounting system and reporting methods.

That information has now been obtained and tabulated. It shows that we had 1,725,474 accounts in formal delinquent status on December 31, and that the amount involved was $1,614,494,286. These accounts were divided according to class of tax through which the liability arose as follows:

Class of tax	Number	Amount
Individual income	1,249,292	$936,100,234
Corporation income	26,158	321,102,437
Taxes withheld	357,315	233,551,540
Excise taxes	58,171	70,115,910
Estate and gift	1,455	33,113,404
Unemployment	32,844	17,681,679
Carriers	239	2,829,082
Total	1,725,474	1,614,494,286

We are enclosing a photostat which shows not only how these 1,725,474 accounts are divided as to class of tax, but also how many of each are found in each district.

The list of delinquent accounts includes both active and inactive accounts. The latter are those on which collection activity has been deferred pending the outcome of court decision, audit examination, or other contingent action. There are 276,586 such accounts involving $552,238,441, or 16 percent of all accounts in delinquent status and 34 percent of all the liability for these accounts. These accounts are inactive and are not in the hands of our collection officers for collection. The following table shows the breakdown of these inactive accounts by classification:

Classification	Number	Amount
Offer in compromise cases	40,495	$193,585,254
Proof of claim cases	55,937	145,277,879
Audit adjustment cases	61,570	120,167,299
Tax Court cases pending	1,763	35,751,745
Postponement bond and escrow agreement cases	797	28,832,409
Military cases	109,979	14,763,588
Foreign cases	6,045	13,860,267
Total	276,586	552,238,441

"Offer in compromise" cases are those on which collection activity has been deferred awaiting action on the offers.

"Proof of claim" cases are claims against estates in probate, and corporations or individuals in bankruptcy. The collection or settlement of these cases must await the outcome of the pending action.

"Audit adjustment" cases are those on which collection activity has been deferred until the examination of the taxpayer's return has been completed.

"Tax Court cases pending" are those in which collection activity has been deferred pending court decision.

"Postponement bond and escrow agreement" cases are those in which taxpayers have put up bonds or entered into escrow agreements to guarantee ultimate settlement.

"Military" cases are accounts owed by persons now, or on the latest available information, in the military service. The payment of these accounts has been deferred by law on the grounds of hardship such payment would put upon the debtors.

"Foreign" cases are all of those with addresses in foreign countries and which are collected through the State Department rather than by collection officers.

For your further information we are enclosing a photostat showing how these cases are spread among the 64 districts.

In addition to the accounts in formal delinquent status we find that on December 31, 1954, there were 382,150 accounts amounting to $207,153,556 which were of delinquent age but which had not been formally moved into the delinquent classification. Generally these accounts were in process of being brought into formal delinquent status under the new accounts system.

The data presented in this letter are the first compiled under the revised system of accounting for outstanding delinquent accounts.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Acting Commissioner.

Inventory of taxpayers' delinquent accounts by class of tax as of Dec. 31, 1954

Internal Revenue, regions and districts [1]	Summary		Withholding individual income tax		Individual income tax		Corporation income tax	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Boston region	95,452	$70,446,867	21,931	$15,313,081.01	66,608	$36,871,940.61	1,639	$14,065,541.83
Augusta (Maine)	3,478	2,582,660	1,001	519,900.24	2,100	1,189,299.12	55	535,804.58
Boston (Mass.)	57,082	41,306,294	13,851	10,381,003.84	38,827	20,151,784.02	1,065	8,485,162.03
Burlington (Vt.)	1,424	644,129	570	216,620.92	708	282,843.19	16	17,623.25
Hartford (Conn.)	22,554	15,271,158	3,869	2,698,024.06	17,375	9,614,242.15	333	2,217,377.75
Portsmouth (N. H.)	2,854	3,252,731	940	419,090.32	1,711	1,465,480.61	46	1,152,741.76
Providence (R. I.)	8,060	7,389,895	1,700	1,078,441.63	5,887	4,168,291.52	124	1,656,833.46

See footnotes at end of table.

Inventory of taxpayers' delinquent accounts by class of tax as of Dec. 31, 1954—Continued

Internal Revenue, regions and districts [1]	Summary		Withholding individual income tax		Individual income tax		Corporation income tax	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
New York region	253,954	$469,723,965	81,382	$63,810,454.10	145,165	$269,037,300.03	8,057	$105,800,318.05
Albany (14th N. Y.)	13,822	15,061,055	4,215	3,275,781.50	8,286	7,625,453.17	239	3,085,817.29
Brooklyn (1st N. Y.)	88,274	106,522,490	26,584	17,101,259.12	54,170	60,904,062.05	2,012	16,978,002.36
Buffalo (28th N. Y.)	21,869	12,368,574	4,266	2,184,547.53	16,333	7,206,628.22	184	2,159,434.13
Puerto Rico	2,020	273,843	1,173	137,688.06	490	126,556.38		
Lower Manhattan (2d N. Y.)	48,155	171,309,518	20,161	16,115,345.69	20,601	102,827,332.99	2,707	46,789,577.59
Syracuse (21st N. Y.)	12,486	5,650,017	2,801	1,426,107.76	8,775	2,550,531.22	76	1,179,929.32
Upper Manhattan (3d N. Y.)	67,328	158,538,468	22,182	23,569,724.44	36,510	87,796,736.00	2,839	35,607,557.36
Philadelphia region	412,480	294,629,132	71,627	50,619,128.85	315,615	149,851,140.02	6,752	61,848,441.20
Baltimore [2] (Md. and D. C.)	120,870	68,663,284	11,349	5,872,262.18	105,762	39,118,121.93	845	20,710,973.84
Camden (1st N. J.)	16,986	10,638,780	3,271	1,881,907.63	12,675	6,205,807.73	201	1,401,191.17
Newark (5th N. J.)	122,953	92,962,952	33,143	22,327,854.61	76,098	41,472,566.86	4,829	20,408,396.10
Philadelphia (1st Pa.)	95,824	63,450,420	16,991	15,027,004.90	74,363	42,436,595.51	366	2,916,008.74
Pittsburgh (23d Pa.)	40,973	28,955,774	4,473	3,532,908.04	35,022	13,699,600.06	301	10,666,970.09
Scranton (12th Pa.)	9,414	7,948,754	1,870	1,687,892.71	6,970	4,462,207.33	114	1,039,847.61
Wilmington (Del.)	5,460	22,009,168	530	289,298.78	4,725	2,456,240.60	96	4,705,053.65
Cincinnati region	179,676	132,948,093	24,579	14,575,703.54	145,960	85,386,231.51	1,999	25,104,137.10
Cincinnati (1st Ohio)	26,545	15,128,835	3,248	1,719,632.66	22,499	10,497,806.71	160	1,569,955.35
Cleveland (18th Ohio)	49,841	42,963,755	7,537	5,097,657.02	39,960	27,208,079.68	860	9,001,421.33
Columbus (11th Ohio)	13,054	6,652,735	1,056	535,523.45	11,591	5,145,082.32	66	742,474.58
Toledo (10th Ohio)	6,072	3,317,067	873	376,266.02	4,925	2,147,669.99	66	685,057.88
Indianapolis (Ind.)	23,475	19,133,272	3,255	2,376,987.18	19,039	8,728,036.05	285	6,431,868.19
Louisville (Ky.)	12,161	11,834,161	1,654	775,113.74	9,476	8,205,003.98	123	2,219,136.32
Parkersburg (W. Va.)	15,917	12,931,609	2,822	1,712,535.21	11,942	9,798,088.97	174	914,675.92
Richmond (Va.)	32,611	20,986,659	4,134	1,981,988.26	26,528	13,656,463.81	265	3,539,547.53
Atlanta region	134,578	139,122,640	29,100	13,107,197.31	93,547	98,959,567.08	1,463	15,123,947.02
Atlanta (Ga.)	26,021	20,972,739	4,432	1,806,171.93	19,737	14,264,823.16	259	2,096,883.54
Birmingham (Ala.)	19,506	19,488,687	4,275	2,097,487.26	13,703	12,014,075.82	134	3,434,738.89
Columbia (S. C.)	14,246	7,201,701	3,385	930,405.03	9,431	4,695,179.23	122	793,553.48
Greensboro (N. C.)	22,459	26,395,319	4,812	1,839,036.66	15,298	18,848,543.85	231	4,486,037.17
Jackson (Miss.)	5,563	4,717,712	1,382	604,946.65	3,612	2,567,183.64	63	1,002,705.10
Jacksonville (Fla.)	31,020	47,883,435	7,414	4,194,076.60	20,700	37,469,907.90	474	2,347,203.18
Nashville (Tenn.)	15,763	12,463,047	3,400	1,635,073.18	11,066	9,099,853.48	180	962,825.66
Chicago region	241,495	152,141,051	38,927	22,825,542.32	190,592	85,208,093.78	2,110	32,309,386.94
Chicago (1st Ill.)	136,532	81,659,860	20,091	11,988,780.05	110,700	43 360,110.15	1,087	19,443,705.86
Springfield (8th Ill.)	14,192	9,101,127	4,183	1,724,207.43	13,573	5,487,723.59	132	644,411.24
Detroit (Mich.)	68,809	44,787,225	11,163	7,517,298.65	53,897	25,812,700.00	616	8,651,278.82
Milwaukee (Wis.)	16,962	16,592,839	3,490	1,595,256.19	12,422	10,547,560.04	275	3,569,991.02
Omaha region	68,671	64,041,543	15,404	7,522,029.56	48,188	39,447,348.64	884	12,788,008.38
Aberdeen (S. Dak.)	3,092	1,255,504	690	267,908.59	2,195	791,207.85	13	62,609.11
Cheyenne (Wyo.)	2,445	1,629,689	657	240,571.49	1,619	745,494.85	31	112,518.24
Denver (Colo.)	9,888	7,552,576	2,438	1,164,550.95	6,619	5,201,092.59	87	606,483.92
Des Moines (Iowa)	5,810	9,737,729	1,665	719,858.27	3,623	6,873,829.83	117	1,878,049.92
Fargo (N. Dak.)	2,352	1,353,482	800	296,884.50	1,373	838,528.98	34	97,421.67
Kansas City (6th Mo.)	8,155	9,021,864	1,644	828,344.28	5,993	5,754,404.42	121	2,208,771.04
St. Louis (1st Mo.)	11,539	12,267,505	1,739	842,120.44	9,025	7,952,304.53	190	2,999,403.71
Omaha (Nebr.)	3,932	4,180,447	748	510,734.06	2,908	2,587,076.21	64	755,003.04
St. Paul (Minn.)	10,916	9,725,868	2,807	1,802,585.97	7,219	4,903,164.48	157	1,670,582.68
Wichita (Kans.)	10,542	7,316,879	2,216	848,471.01	7,614	3,800,244.90	70	2,397,165.05
Dallas region	94,081	75,608,535	24,428	11,746,689.73	61,904	45,632,858.86	943	12,009,814.60
Albuquerque (N. Mex.)	5,491	2,824,810	1,822	705,144.71	3,308	1,815,596.30	30	129,632.83
Austin (1st Tex.)	22,355	20,202,903	5,111	2,740,083.94	15,514	12,801,896.85	260	3,076,651.87
Dallas (2d Tex.)	31,244	23,748,778	8,694	4,663,513.26	20,247	14,326,097.22	241	3,052,389.71
Little Rock (Ark.)	5,431	2,315,863	1,683	418,331.27	3,257	1,549,544.53	52	143,042.67
New Orleans (La.)	19,566	17,472,965	4,087	1,637,780.76	13,680	10,290,855.03	244	3,621,318.60
Oklahoma City (Okla.)	9,994	9,043,216	3,031	1,581,835.79	5,898	4,848,868.93	116	1,986,778.92
San Francisco region	245,087	215,832,461	49,937	34,031,713.74	181,713	125,705,753.61	2,311	42,052,842.20
Boise (Idaho)	3,115	2,083,834	1,012	454,040.29	1,829	1,081,854.77	23	355,683.30
Helena (Mont.)	3,214	2,863,290	1,027	426,447.09	1,951	2,057,991.72	36	65,879.30
Honolulu (Hawaii)	4,682	4,620,939	1,167	756,564.36	3,052	2,380,633.16	45	1,196,419.24
Los Angeles (6th Calif.)	86,733	88,047,147	15,654	12,546,086.15	66,491	43,038,017.62	955	26,675,012.28
San Francisco (1st Calif.)	85,750	66,858,096	16,764	10,184,342.93	64,662	41,904,125.08	726	10,430,898.87
Phoenix (Ariz.)	8,957	5,510,061	1,953	1,251,672.28	6,447	3,468,462.70	66	226,019.70
Portland (Oreg.)	14,799	15,351,352	3,771	1,901,160.48	10,054	11,554,649.66	123	1,035,802.33
Reno (Nev.)	4,576	6,043,359	1,376	1,429,653.45	2,873	3,944,060.97	25	247,283.46
Salt Lake City (Utah)	5,554	4,649,780	1,603	889,372.27	3,649	3,251,479.12	43	260,892.44
Seattle (Wash.)	27,707	19,804,603	5,610	4,192,374.44	20,705	13,024,478.81	269	1,558,951.28
Total	1,725,474	1,614,494,287	357,315	233,551,540.16	1,249,292	936,100,234.14	26,158	321,102,437.32

Internal Revenue, regions and districts [1]	Excise taxes		Estate and gift taxes		Carriers (CTA)		Unemployment (FUTA)	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Boston region	3,273	$2,615,242.78	14	$264,642.21	1	$1.39	1,986	$1,316,416.63
Augusta (Maine)	177	191,481.19	1	665.35			144	145,509.77
Boston (Mass.)	2,128	1,439,090.86	4	3,324.45			1,207	845,929.01
Burlington (Vt.)	76	10,392.68	5	92,186.48			49	24,462.48
Hartford (Conn.)	614	608,401.03					363	133,113.01
Portsmouth (N. H.)	78	27,748.84	2	145,986.58	1	1.39	76	41,681.50
Providence (R. I.)	200	338,128.18	2	22,479.35			147	125,720.86
New York region	10,596	17,581,470.52	258	7,090,284.00	35	1,725,833.07	8,461	4,678,305.23
Albany (14th N. Y.)	571	616,813.18	47	173,283.81			464	283,906.05
Brooklyn (1st N. Y.)	3,005	3,350,304.94	184	6,756,103.72			2,319	1,432,757.81

See footnotes at end of table.

Inventory of taxpayers' delinquent accounts by class of tax as of Dec. 31, 1954—Continued

Internal Revenue, regions and districts [1]	Excise taxes		Estate and gift taxes		Carriers (CTA)		Unemployment (FUTA)	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
New York region—continued								
Buffalo (28th N. Y.)	678	$529,733.48	10	$121,009.40			398	$167,221.24
Puerto Rico							357	9,598.56
Lower Manhattan (2d N. Y.)	2,208	4,068,165.58	3	1,907.74	1	$134,640.86	2,474	1,372,547.55
Syracuse (21st N. Y.)	575	329,334.32	14	37,979.33			245	126,135.05
Upper Manhattan (3d N. Y.)	3,559	8,687,119.02			34	1,591,192.21	2,204	1,286,138.97
Philadelphia region	10,826	11,640,711.58	475	16,667,529.59	17	60,345.66	7,168	3,941,835.10
Baltimore [2] (Md. and D. C.)	1,945	1,680,546.42	69	856,957.94	4	2,860.42	896	421,561.27
Camden (1st N. J.)	581	926,132.04	3	14,867.09			255	208,874.34
Newark (5th N. J.)	4,230	6,135,233.88	358	862,868.58			4,295	1,756,031.97
Philadelphia (1st Pa.)	3,078	2,199,549.84	3	197,777.08			1,023	673,483.93
Pittsburgh (23d Pa.)	735	432,000.37	35	356,281.64		(−2.26)	407	268,016.06
Scranton (12th Pa.)	194	71,545.53	2	29,815.26	13	57,487.50	251	599,958.06
Wilmington (Del.)	63	195,703.50	5	14,348,962.00			41	13,909.47
Cincinnati region	4,767	5,425,026.96	73	1,283,836.08	7	524.02	2,291	1,172,633.79
Cincinnati (1st Ohio)	448	474,564.94	7	802,411.28			183	64,464.06
Cleveland (18th Ohio)	1,044	1,322,072.81	19	159,530.78	5	516.47	416	174,476.91
Columbus (11th Ohio)	184	148,362.45	6	22,384.42			151	58,907.78
Toledo (10th Ohio)	148	54,135.50	4	37,482.92			56	16,454.69
Indianapolis (Ind.)	710	1,297,429.37	21	198,605.00			165	100,346.21
Louisville (Ky.)	542	371,839.37	1	2,663.28			365	260,404.31
Parkersburg (W. Va.)	575	215,908.41	5	49,947.16	2	7.55	397	240,445.78
Richmond (Va.)	1,116	1,540,714.11	10	10,811.24			558	257,134.05
Atlanta region	6,905	7,879,926.57	95	1,719,893.85	153	1,004,983.99	3,315	1,327,124.18
Atlanta (Ga.)	1,049	1,487,527.75	13	176,457.91	123	1,001,612.92	408	139,261.79
Birmingham (Ala.)	782	1,071,143.42	13	669,543.58			599	201,698.03
Columbia (S. C.)	956	585,019.75	10	49,290.51			342	148,253.00
Greensboro (N. C.)	1,585	987,165.40	13	56,712.55			520	177,823.37
Jackson (Miss.)	388	511,593.05					118	31,283.56
Jacksonville (Fla.)	1,358	2,782,645.89	37	597,453.20	24	895.56	1,013	491,252.67
Nashville (Tenn.)	787	454,831.31	9	170,436.10	6	2,475.51	315	137,551.76
Chicago region	7,043	9,461,759.89	98	968,190.98	13	35,588.05	2,712	1,332,489.04
Chicago (1st Ill.)	3,260	5,734,844.97	46	318,712.39	11	35,571.93	1,337	778,134.65
Springfield (8th Ill.)	902	593,923.50	22	471,096.04	1	3.75	379	179,761.45
Detroit (Mich.)	2,383	2,450,056.50	22	90,838.96	1	12.37	727	265,039.70
Milwaukee (Wis.)	498	682,934.92	8	87,543.59			269	109,553.24
Omaha region	2,688	2,884,741.03	59	714,036.75			1,448	685,378.64
Aberdeen (S. Dak.)	150	119,486.22					44	14,292.23
Cheyenne (Wyo.)	99	54,826.50	8	468,385.99			31	7,891.93
Denver (Colo.)	422	410,642.78	6	15,179.86			316	154,625.90
Des Moines (Iowa)	286	212,949.80	3	1,963.47			116	51,077.71
Fargo (N. Dak.)	98	101,453.11	4	5,658.49			43	13,535.25
Kansas City (6th Mo.)	250	136,137.41	8	37,993.98			139	56,212.87
St. Louis (1st Mo.)	361	284,752.64	5	56,658.11			219	132,265.57
Omaha (Nebr.)	146	217,887.37	4	71,534.39			62	38,211.93
St. Paul (Minn.)	438	1,187,377.16	6	35,722.69			289	126,435.02
Wichita (Kans.)	438	159,228.04	15	20,939.77			189	90,830.23
Dallas region	4,621	4,213,266.67	104	712,044.14	4	537.31	2,077	1,293,323.69
Albuquerque (N. Mex.)	239	122,049.33	3	16,428.13			89	35,958.70
Austin (1st Tex.)	943	1,227,753.58	29	74,782.31			498	281,734.45
Dallas (2d Tex.)	1,406	889,500.00	39	403,672.93	2	113.80	615	413,491.08
Little Rock (Ark.)	321	161,217.76			2	423.51	116	43,303.26
New Orleans (La.)	1,044	1,398,796.87	32	213,947.78			479	310,265.96
Oklahoma City (Okla.)	668	413,949.13	1	3,212.99			280	208,570.24
San Francisco region	7,452	8,413,763.53	279	3,692,946.08	9	1,268.83	3,386	1,934,173.01
Boise (Idaho)	209	118,267.55	4	57,739.24			38	16,248.85
Helena (Mont.)	152	289,620.76	11	13,131.67			37	10,219.46
Honolulu (Hawaii)	247	145,697.76					171	141,624.48
Los Angeles (6th Calif.)	2,188	3,457,766.60	110	1,480,338.75	1	4.95	1,334	849,920.65
San Francisco (1st Calif.)	2,646	2,414,653.25	100	1,510,987.82	7	1,231.07	845	411,856.98
Phoenix (Ariz.)	272	261,234.76	14	169,925.93			205	132,745.63
Portland (Oreg.)	551	693,948.99	12	13,234.99			288	152,555.55
Reno (Nev.)	218	150,845.04	5	221,145.97			79	50,370.11
Salt Lake City (Utah)	185	110,537.50	6	101,335.17			68	36,163.50
Seattle (Wash.)	784	771,191.32	17	125,106.54	1	32.81	321	132,467.80
Total	58,171	70,115,909.53	1,455	33,113,403.68	239	2,829,082.32	32,844	17,681,679.31

[1] District designation prior to July 1, 1953 shown in parentheses.
[2] Baltimore district includes Maryland and the District of Columbia.
[3] Seattle district includes Washington and Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Morning business is concluded.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the amendment which I contemplate offering is somewhat complicated, and in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and other members of the committee wish to study the question further, I shall not offer my amendment at this time, but will do so later in the day.

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, beginning with the word "change", in line 12, it is proposed to strike out down through the period in line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "strike out '30 percent' and insert in lieu thereof '75 percent'."

On page 13, after the semicolon in line 6, it is proposed to strike out down through the period in line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in the next to the last sentence strike out '30 percent' and insert in lieu thereof '75 percent'; and delete the last sentence."

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to reinstate the loan features in the development assistance portion of the bill. In the existing law there is a provision that at least 30 percent of the funds to be used under title II, or the development assistance portion of the law, shall be on a loan basis. The committee has deleted that provision. The reason given by the committee in the report for the deletion is that during the past year more than 30 percent of the funds dispensed for this particular item has been on a loan basis; but I submit that the reason why more than 30 percent of the funds for development assistance was on a loan basis was that we had written into the law that at least 30 percent should be on a loan basis.

I am greatly concerned that by striking this language from the law we would be taking away from the Administrator the authority to negotiate loan contracts with recipient countries.

It is interesting to note that, on a dollar basis, the item of development assistance is a more or less minor item, as compared with other items in the bill. Altogether, the amount involved in development assistance totals $165 million, of which $71 million is for Asia. Of the $71 million for Asia, $70 million is for India. Africa is allocated $73 million, and I believe $21 million is authorized for South and Central American countries. The South and Central American countries which would receive the aid would be Bolivia and Guatemala.

My amendment would reinstate the loan feature in the bill, and raise the loan requirement to 75 percent. The committee felt that the 30 percent requirement would act as a deterrent upon the administration in negotiating more loan contracts. That being the thinking of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I propose to raise the loan requirement to 75 percent. That would still leave 25 percent for special cases. I am thinking about some of the African recipient nations, and possibly Guatemala, in Central America.

The basic reason for offering this amendment is the psychological effect it would have upon recipient nations. My experience abroad has been limited. Nevertheless, I have constantly been questioned about the attitude of the United States with relation to the recipient nations. It has been described as the attitude of a rich uncle. We have been accused of adopting a paternalistic attitude toward other nations. That is particularly true with respect to the countries of South America. They want to be partners. There is no better way to develop a partnership than to operate on a contract basis, between equals. One of the best ways to do that, rather than to consider them as dependents, is to provide for loans, under a system whereby we enter into an agreement recognizing certain economic difficulties which the other countries may have, but placing the transaction on an equal basis between nations. One of the large items in the development assistance program is $70 million, for the great country of India. No one will question the fact that India has vast resources, many of them undeveloped. A part of this program will be devoted to the development of the resources of that great country. However, it is inconceivable to me that we should refuse to enter into a contract or agreement with India providing that the funds to India shall be given on a loan basis.

The language of the bill gives great leeway for the repayment of the loans. They may be repaid in local currency or in goods, and the time of repayment can be waived for an indefinite period. In other words, such latitude is given that the Administrator can enter into a contract with a nation on an equal basis. We can make the terms of the contract in such a way that the contract will not put economic pressure on the recipient country. I believe the psychological effect of such a provision would be exceedingly great.

The American people have taken great pride in the fact that because of their economic system and technical know-how they have developed a country of great abundance. However, we must reflect on history. We cannot know whether in another 100 years or 500 years, or even 1,000 years, the United States may be a dependent nation, and countries with great resources, like India may be nations of abundance.

I know that if we ever found ourselves in such a position, and had to receive assistance from another nation, Americans would not want their country to be treated as an object of charity, but would want America to be treated as an equal and as a partner.

My amendment would not take one nickel away from the program. It would accomplish the very thing the committee felt should be accomplished, namely, bringing more of the dollars authorized by this bill under the loan program. I submit that unless the amendment is adopted, the hands of the administration will be tied in dealing with the recipient countries. It will have to say to them, "Congress has said that you are not to ask for loans but, rather, that the money is to be given to you in grants."

Mr. President, this is a very minor portion of the bill. We all know that the so-called indirect military support provided for in the bill, which amounts to more than a billion dollars, is essentially economic aid. We know that even much of the so-called direct military support is in essence economic aid. I am talking about an item which is only 4.7 percent of the total amount involved in the bill. It is designated as development assistance or economic assistance. It amounts to only $165 million. The largest portion of that amount would go to India. I submit that we would not be unkind or miserly or stingy if we required that 75 percent of the $165 million be granted on a loan basis.

When I speak of loans I am not speaking of them as a banker would; neither am I speaking of contracts in the sense that a business concern would. I am speaking about a contract between nations, when one nation considers the other nation a partner in the development of the resources of an area. I believe we would be doing a great favor to the countries which would receive the assistance. I believe that is what they would want.

It is interesting to note that whenever the Soviet Union aids a country, which has been infrequently—though the propaganda machinery magnifies each occasion—the aid is given on a loan basis. I know of no instance of the Soviet Union having aided another country except on a loan basis. Not too long ago the Soviet Union provided steel mills for India. A great deal of publicity accompanied that action. Throughout the Communist world much was heard about the generosity of the Soviet Union. However, those steel mills were not a gift. They were a loan.

I well recall when India asked for wheat. It asked for wheat on a loan basis. "Oh, no," we said, "we will give it to you."

Mr. President, that is not the way to make friends. One of the greatest criticisms leveled against the United States in its international dealings is that it is a wealthy country, and that it tries to buy people and nations. We know we have no designs on other nations other than to seek their friendships. Whether it be an individual or a nation, we cannot buy friendship. We secure friendship by mutual respect. We secure friends by dealing with them as equals.

By eliminating the loan features from the bill we are, in effect, saying to a recipient country, "No, we will not deal with you as an equal. You are a dependent. You will always be a dependent. Therefore we will give this money to you. Let us take care of you."

I submit that my amendment should be adopted, and I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has contributed so much to the development of our foreign policy, to take the amendment to conference. I have no pride of authorship so far as the figure of 75 percent is concerned. Perhaps the percentage should be 50 percent, or 90 percent. But I submit that Congress would make a grave mistake if it passed the bill after striking out the loan features of the economic aid provisions.

I have talked with some of the members of the administration about the question, and there has been a division in their ranks on the point of whether aid should be extended on a loan or on a grant basis. I am sure the Senate will find that this amendment would not be strenuously opposed, but would be received wholeheartedly by certain members of the administration who work in this field.

I know that in the hearings before the committee the question was discussed, and it was the wisdom of the committee that this provision should be deleted from the bill. In the bill of last year there was a provision under which the percentage of loans was the highest ever attained in our foreign aid program. If now we should strike this provision from the bill, I submit, Mr. President, though I am aware it is not wise to prophesy, that the percentage of loans would be much less than the 30 percent which the present law prescribes.

Mr. President, I intend to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment, but I

shall wait until after the Senator from Georgia has spoken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate very much the Senator's cooperation with the leadership, but the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has a statement on the bill which he would like to make, and he is prepared to make his statement at this time. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] plans to address the Senate at some length a little later. Several committees are meeting.

Unless the Senator from Michigan insists otherwise, I should like to have his amendment pending and, before any action is taken on it and before the time is concluded, I think we will have a live quorum.

Mr. POTTER. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The leadership will protect the Senator. We will have notification sent to him, and there will be a live quorum before it is time to consider his amendment.

Mr. POTTER. That is perfectly agreeable. I know the distinguished majority leader is always most cooperative with all Members of the Senate. I shall be very happy not to force a vote on my amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator cannot be in two places at once. I am anxious to protect his rights on the floor, but I am more anxious for him to be at the Appropriations Committee meeting, and I shall see that he is protected during his absence from the floor.

Mr. President, I should like to inquire how much time the Senator from New Jersey desires.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thirty minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has given the Senate the broad outlines of the Mutual Security Act of 1955 which the committee recommends to the Senate. The details of the program as approved by the committee are covered in the committee report. Two speeches have been made on the floor with reference to the bill. I regret that I was not able to be present. Therefore, Mr. President, I am asking the privilege of making my remarks at this time.

ASIA

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has noted the changing emphasis of our aid programs over the last 7 years and observed that a large portion of the funds authorized this year are for economic type assistance to Asia. Indeed, of the some $2 billion of the nonmilitary funds in the bill, $1.4 billion is for Asia—one of the most underdeveloped areas of the world and one of the most populous. In Asia, the per capita share of the gross national product averages only $108 per person per year. In the United States the per capita share is more than 20 times as great—$2,200.

These are the countries which we are trying to assist as they progress slowly toward a better standard of living so that they may preserve their freedom. The big immediate contest in the world today is the cold war between the atheistic materialism of totalitarian communism and the freedom, independence, and self-determination for which these underdeveloped countries are yearning. I propose to direct the bulk of my remarks toward these problems which we face in Asia. I then propose to discuss in some detail the principal new element in this year's mutual-security program—the "President's Fund for Asian Economic Development." This is contained in section 8 (k) of the pending bill as amended and reported by the committee. This section reads as follows:

(a) The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to contribute to international peace and security through assisting the peoples of free Asia in their efforts to attain economic and social well being, to safeguard basic rights and liberties, and to protect their security and independence. The Congress hereby recognizes that fundamental to these goals is an expanding economic growth of the free Asia area based upon self-help and mutual cooperation and full utilization of already existing resources and knowledge. The Congress expresses the willingness of the people of the United States to support the foregoing objectives to the extent to which the countries in the area continue to make effective use of their own resources and external resources otherwise available to them.

(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, there is hereby authorized to be established a fund, to be known as the President's Fund for Asian Economic Development (hereinafter referred to as the fund), and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fund an amount of $200 million, such amount to remain available until June 30, 1958.

(c) The President is authorized to utilize the appropriations made available for the fund to accomplish in the free Asian area the policies and purposes declared in this act and to disburse them on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify to any person, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, or to any foreign government, agency, or organization or group of governments or agencies as may be appropriate: *Provided, however*, That not less than 50 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with the provisions of section 505, and not more than 25 percent of said funds may be allocated for assistance to any one nation.

(d) In utilizing the fund the President shall give preference to projects or programs that will clearly contribute to promoting greater economic strength in the area as a whole or among a group or groups of countries of the area.

It is my belief that there has been too much defeatism in this country with respect to the future of free government in Asia. Let me emphasize that every country we assist in this area is free and independent. Not one is a dictatorship; not one has its foreign policy determined by outsiders, including the United States; not one of these countries is under the domination of the Kremlin as of today. But these countries are in danger because they are underdeveloped and overpopulated and have not yet been able to release their full creative powers.

It has been inspiring to witness the growth of freedom and independence among the nations of the Far East and Asia. Since the war no less than 10 nations in this great arc of freedom extending from Korea to Afghanistan have become free. It is an impressive list—South Korea, the Philippine Republic, Indonesia, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Burma, India, Pakistan, Ceylon. Not one of these nations obtained its freedom from Russia. In fact, during this postwar period, when the democratic nations of Western Europe have freed more than 500 million human beings from the controls of colonialism, the Communist regimes have enslaved 800 million people. Communism is putting people in bondage faster than the free-world nations have been able to confer self-government on former colonial areas.

The democratic nations of this earth mean what they say when they talk of the right of self-determination—the right of peoples to govern themselves. We would assist those who have at last achieved that right in their efforts to preserve and strengthen their freedoms. A great wave of independence and nationalism has swept over the former colonial lands of Asia. Yet there linger age-old suspicions of western colonialism. As these suspicions have decreased, a new fear has been raised in the form of Communist colonialism. The young free nations of Asia do not intend to permit this new colonialism to be successful. Their new independence and nationalism will be strong weapons against any new colonialism by the Communists. Indeed, one of the strongest anti-Communist weapons that exists is the strength of nationalism. No nation given its freedom since the war has succumbed to communism. But in order that nationalism and freedom, independence, and self-determination may flourish, these underdeveloped nations must have economic and know-how assistance and the support of the Western free nations.

It seems essential that the American people realize that a nation free to determine its own form of government is a nation on the side of democracy in the cold war. If a nation is free, it has a right to disagree with the United States. Free nations are not to be measured in their freedom by a yardstick made in the United States. The test of an independent nation is not whether it agrees with the United States, but whether it is free to disagree with us—or with any other nation for that matter. When a nation has that kind of independence we know it is not in danger of casting its freedoms away.

It is in the interest of the United States to help these Asian states remain free, because free nations are strong nations. We can help them by working with them in partnership.

PRESIDENT'S FUND FOR ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I now wish to speak on the President's fund for Asian economic development, which is a new feature in the bill.

One aspect of the program which I want particularly to emphasize concerns the President's fund for Asian economic development to which I have referred.

Section 8 (k) of the pending bill authorizes the appropriation to the President of $200 million to be used by him to promote conditions in Asia that will advance the economic strength and know-how of the area. This part of the pending bill gives real life and meaning to the point I have been emphasizing—the need for us to encourage nationalist strength in Asia based upon a relationship of partnership rather than of paternalism.

Last March, Mr. President, in a speech on the floor I outlined in some detail the need for closer economic cooperation by the Far Eastern Colombo Plan Powers. I suggested that a Far Eastern Economic Conference might well help to initiate improved regional cooperation. I said:

> Such a conference, if it does nothing else, may put into motion a process of economic cooperation which could go far in alleviating the more pressing Asiatic problems. It should be emphasized that this matter will require Asian initiative and concerted action on a regional basis.

In recent months we have witnessed a considerable increase in Asian initiative, imaginative planning, and feeling of independence and confidence. Recent conferences at Bandung, Baguio, and Simla are all examples of what I believe is a new and heartening change in free Asia.

The President's Fund for Asian Economic Development is an imaginative attempt to demonstrate our interest, confidence, and willingness to assist these underdeveloped countries in their own efforts to improve their economic conditions.

There are more than 700 million free people in this area—the arc of Free Asia, as Mr. Stassen has described it. These free nations lie in a swift-moving current between the Communist world and the free states of the West. The direction in which that current moves may determine whether freedom will survive. The strong, nationalist spirit and the yearning for freedom, independence and self-determination which is now stirring within most of these nations make the people view anything foreign or especially western with suspicion. Unfortunately, the scars of Western colonialism have been etched deep in the minds of Asia. Carlos Romulo has remarked:

> The Asian has been rendered deaf and blind to the Communist menace by his determination that the white man shall not rule again.

The United States by tradition never was a part of that colonialism that still blinds many Asians to the fundamental difference between democracy and communism. This Nation, therefore, is in an excellent position to help Asia on a partnership basis to develop its own strength.

A TWO-WAY PARTNERSHIP

The President's fund will help Asia in this two-way partnership. First, it will encourage the growth of the partnership that must exist among the free Asian nations themselves—the kind of partnership that worked so well in Europe under the so-called Marshall plan. The Colombo plan nations are now moving toward joint development of Asian resources. They well know that great strength in Asia can be developed by encouraging trade among themselves and by the creation of complementary economies. Japan and Korea need the raw materials and food grains of South Asia. South Asia needs the industrial products of Japan and Korea. Partnership among these nations will be to their mutual advantage. The President's fund is designed to encourage projects that will help the Asian area to grow in strength as a unit.

The second type of partnership that will be helped by the President's fund can be the partnership of the United States, working with other free Western nations, and the free nations of Asia. The United States has capital and know-how which we can lend to our friends. The intra-Asian partnership now developing around the Colombo nations can be strengthened by this kind of partnership which we can offer.

What is needed, then, is cooperation between the threatened underdeveloped nations on the one hand, and the United States on the other. This Nation has grown great through freedom and now has the strength to help newly free nations.

It was less than 200 years ago that we were struggling to establish our freedom. We were first given help by France where the concept of liberty and freedom was strong. And then, in later years, England, the nation from which we wrested our freedom, came to our help with the capital to build our railroads and many other great industries.

We see a similar development today. The colonial nations of the 19th century are gradually giving up their colonial empires—sometimes willingly, sometimes under protest. What is happening is that the concept of individual liberty and self-government which took root in Europe and the Americas in the 17th and 18th centuries is now taking root in Asia. The new nationalism of Asia and the yearning for greater freedom, independence, and self-determination is as strong as the older nationalisms of Europe and America. There may be some differences, but fundamentally it is the movement of man toward a destiny he can only achieve if he can live as a freeman.

The Communists have no more understanding of this desire of nations to be free than they have of the right of free speech, or of the inherent power that exists in an economy based on free enterprise and the release of the creative energies of individual men and women.

The partnership of which we are speaking is not the kind of thing that we can write into law. But it is the concept which must guide the men responsible for the day-to-day administration of this new program. We must emphasize that our aid programs must be cooperative, partnership ventures. We offer assistance to these nations not because they are the white man's burden. We offer them help because it is in our interest as well as their interest for them to be strong enough to resist Communist threats from within as well as from without and to protect the sacred freedom of each individual human being. We know from experience that communism advances either by the use of force or by playing on a nation's internal difficulties in such a way as to create turmoil, strife, and weakness suited to the designs of Moscow or Peiping. If the nations of Asia can maintain their defenses against the possibility of external aggression and maintain and increase their internal economic and know-how strength, they can, in cooperation with other free nations, thwart efforts to destroy freedom.

But the United States is not able and would not want to impose these conditions from without. The strongest urge to be free and to stay free comes from within a nation. And peoples who are threatened are usually in a far better position to judge the threat and to know what to do about it than people looking on from the outside.

PRESIDENT'S FUND NOT A DEVICE FOR DOMINATION

The President's fund is not a device for domination of these areas. It is a method of helping them to help themselves. But I must emphasize that we do not propose to help these nations solely for altruistic reasons. We help them because we know that strong, free nations in Asia will not be tempted by the prolific, attractive, totalitarian promises of communism. We also know that strong, free, well-developed nations in Asia will be able to trade with this country. Many of our most important raw materials come from this part of the world. We will be able to trade many more of our industrial products with South Asia if the nations in that area have been able to develop their own resources so that they can sell too, and buy, from us.

REGIONAL AID

There may be objections here to the President's fund for Asia on the ground that Asian nations recently gathered at Simla, India, apparently misunderstood and rejected the idea of regional aid. Why, it will be asked, should the United States seek to give help on a regional basis when the states of the area have indicated they are not at this time interested in multilateral aid?

The answer is simple. Although the language of the bill is broad enough to permit programs and allocations on a regional basis, it is not contemplated that assistance would be in the form of a gift to some regional organization to use as it might see fit. Assistance from the fund is to be on a country-by-country basis. In other words, our assistance will be given to Japan, or Thailand, or India, or other countries, as the case may be. The criteria for assistance from this fund, however, will not be whether a dollar of assistance will solely help the individual country receiving the dollar. The criteria instead will be whether the project for which the dollar is allocated will benefit more than one country.

In other words, if Laos proposes the construction of a dam on the Mekong River to supply waters for irrigation purposes only in Laos, assistance from this fund would not be available. If, however, it can be shown that the dam in Laos would benefit other states such as Thailand and Cambodia, as well as Laos, we

would view that as a proper use of the President's fund. Similarly let us consider a training project in Japan. If the training project were solely for the training of Japanese nationals, assistance could not be sought from the President's fund. But if the funds were given to Japan to set up a training program open to nationals of other Asian states, that would be a proper request for consideration by the fund.

The effect of the President's fund, then, will be to establish a regional test as to whether assistance from the President's fund should be given to a particular country. The fund, therefore, should encourage individual countries to think of their development projects on a regional basis rather than a unilateral basis. If country X insists that no project be undertaken within its boundaries which would also have a favorable impact in the region, then there would be no assistance available from the President's fund. But those states that think in terms of mutual assistance—of helping not only themselves, but their neighbors as well—those states would be given consideration in the administration of the fund.

We know that States which have recently gained their independence tend to be almost exclusively concerned with internal development and internal crises. Nevertheless, it is true that chaos, crisis, and instability in one country are likely to have a serious impact on neighboring countries. It is also true that prosperity and growth in one country have a favorable impact on that country's neighbors.

This relationship has now been recognized by the nations of free Asia. In the press communique released at Simla on May 13, the conference nations stated:

> The conference was of the view that there are certain types of projects which readily lend themselves to regional treatment. Devotion of additional aid funds to programs of this kind would be welcome.

The communique also stated:

> The conference recognized that the development of every country in the region was linked with the development of the region as a whole.

The President's fund will tend to get nations of this area to think not solely of their separate interests, but of their common interests as well. We have emphasized time and time again the common threat these nations face from communism. It is time for us to emphasize the common advantages that will flow from increased prosperity in all of Asia. The President's fund will direct attention to the positive aspects of our help to Asia. It underlines the hope in the future, not simply the dangers.

LIMITATIONS ON THE FUND

There may be objections to the President's fund because there are few strings attached to it—that we are virtually giving the President a blank check. There may be insistence that we try to spell out when and where the money is to be spent and the conditions under which we will grant the aid. If we try to limit these dollars to products manufactured in America, if we try here to decide whether the funds should go into fertilizer plants, river developments, cement works, highways, tube wells, or housing developments we doom the project to frustration.

The strength of a plan such as this is found largely in the flexibility with which it is administered. We cannot hope here to load this fund down with restrictions, and then ask the President to use it on a partnership basis.

The Committee on Foreign Relations sought to balance the advantages of giving the President a comparatively free hand in the administration of this Asian Development Fund with the requirement that Congress keep a close watch on the projects that may be developed. The committee report explains the changes that were made, and I think they represent a reasonable compromise. A time limit of 3 years has been placed on the availability of the funds. This means that the administration has a reasonable amount of time to work out helpful projects, but that no blank check of indeterminate date is to be available for the Executive. The committee has asked also that 50 percent of the funds should be on a loan basis—thus encouraging the development of projects which will have self-liquidating features and which will imply the self-help spirit necessary for success.

Mr. President, I digress from my text in order to comment on a matter to which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] referred a few moments ago. So far as the fund is concerned, the committee felt a 50–50 percent basis should be established, which would mean 50 percent of the funds would be used for loans, and 50 percent for grants. It does not mean that the amount is limited to 50 percent if countries can afford to pay more, but the plan is to give flexibility in helping countries which need aid. The committee has also provided that no single country is to receive more than 25 percent of the fund. That seems to be a reasonable limitation. It would be our hope that in time we might view the loan part of the fund as a revolving fund, continuously available for worthwhile, self-liquidating projects in Asia.

THE STAGGERING CRISIS

We must not overlook the staggering crisis that is facing us. I remind my colleagues that what is going on today is a fierce struggle for the freedom of the underdeveloped countries of the world. We are in danger of losing that struggle. If that were to happen, all of free Asia might disappear behind the Iron Curtain. Most of the underdeveloped countries now in immediate danger are to be the recipients in the partnership program which is basic to this new fund. We simply cannot place too many limitations on exactly how the fund is to be spent. To do so would be to defeat its purpose. We have a golden opportunity here to meet the insidious challenge of Communist colonialism and infiltration. This infiltration is the cleverest Communist type that can be imagined.

In meeting this challenge, our military aid is important. But it is by definition negative. The economic and ideological aspects of this program are the positive means at our disposal. In the end this great struggle is one of economics and ideas. We must assist these young democracies in their fervent aspirations for greater freedom and for a better life, and in their efforts to become equal in every way with the other countries of the world, not to be looked down on, not to be exploited by anyone.

Unless we do this, unless we take up this challenge, we will lose this struggle in the Far East, and will be in great jeopardy everywhere else in the world.

In deciding on this new fund, we must realize that we are dealing with a very unique situation threatening our own security for the future. We must face the responsibility which is ours. It would be foolish, and indeed utterly tragic, to throw out this concept, which seems to be the right approach in dealing with the competition over the underdeveloped countries. These countries believe the United States is their great hope to get away from colonialism, imperialism, and the sufferings of the past.

We may lose this struggle with the Communists unless we move in on this question of the future of these underdeveloped countries and help those millions of people to help themselves in their yearning for independence and a higher standard of living.

This problem of economic development and know-how in Asia is a long-range problem. We cannot expect miracles overnight. The best we can expect is that the people of this great area may be given hope for the future and that the reasonableness of their hope will be evidenced by gradual improvements in their health, their standards of living, and their education.

In conclusion, Mr. President, one of the most powerful mainsprings of man's existence is the assurance that his sons and his sons' sons will be better off than he is. One of the most disruptive forces of society is man's fear for the future of his descendants.

As I view this program of assistance for Asia, it seems to me that it carries on the noble tradition of those pioneer missionaries who, influenced by the Christian faith, sought to build men's bodies and minds so that their souls might rest in the peace that comes when they can know that mankind moves forward and upward under the guidance of Almighty God.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without the time being charged to either side, the absence of a quorum may be suggested.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Pastore
Barrett	Holland	Payne
Bender	Hruska	Potter
Bricker	Jackson	Robertson
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
George	Martin, Pa.	Thye
Green	Millikin	Williams

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after a brief statement by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and by the author of the amendment the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], perhaps of not more than 10 minutes, I hope we may have a vote on the amendment. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I may need a little more than 5 minutes on the pending amendment, although I do not believe I will take more than that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be very happy to yield additional time to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask Senators to remain in the Chamber, because if a yea-and-nay vote is had, it will come very early, and their remaining in the Chamber would save time in calling for a quorum.

Mr. President, for the first time the pending bill definitely moves toward a loan program and away from an altogether giveaway program. In moving in that direction, however, we had to adopt what we regard as a sound policy and a sound means of approaching that goal.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has offered an amendment which calls for all mutual-assistance programs to be operated on a loan basis of 75 percent. Mr. President, if we approach the matter in that way, we might as well abandon the whole program. I say that because it will mean that the countries which need assistance, and which are unable to borrow and repay 75 percent of a loan, will not participate and only those countries which can repay loans will take advantage of the program.

Mr. President, the committee considered this matter with a great deal of care. We found that the FOA Administrator this year has made loans totaling more than 30 percent. I refer to development loans. We also found—and it was stated by the Administrator—that any limitation on the percentage required for loans would operate directly against the effort of the Administrator to increase the loans to any given country.

For instance, if under the old law we had a 30-percent requirement for loans, as soon as the 30 percent was borrowed, the recipient country would say, "Now, the balance is a grant." That is inevitable. It is the same old story of the boy who went to town to sell a load of wood. The customer said to him, "What do you want for that, boy?"

He said, "My dad said it's worth $2, but I should take a dollar if I couldn't get $2."

Identically, the same principle is involved. If a country is required to pay 75 percent or 40 percent or 30 percent or any other given percentage, as soon as it complies with the requirement, of course, it will say, "We are through borrowing, and all the balance must come as a grant."

We are trying to avoid that situation. One of the primary purposes of this bill is to shift over to a loan basis. But the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan would, in my judgment, defeat it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. In a moment.

I know the adoption of the amendment would defeat the whole purpose of this type of legislation, because the very countries which most need the help, and which we most need to help, in our own defense, are the ones that cannot borrow and pay back 75 percent of the money.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did the committee get the impression from the Administrator that it was his purpose to make loans wherever it would be feasible and still carry out the purpose of the legislation?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes. We have written it into the report, and that principle is accepted. Let me read what the Administrator himself had to say on that subject:

> The removal of this provision was intended to permit more, rather than less, lending in the future. The administration found that negotiating for a high percentage of loans for individual countries was difficult this year because of a stated percentage in the statute, which they all tend to interpret as being applicable to them.
>
> During the current year statutory minimums have in fact been exceeded (over $220 million out of all types of assistance), and it is the stated intention of the administration to put more aid on a loan basis next year.
>
> A percentage minimum of 75 percent is in any event an unreasonable target. The whole philosophy behind development assistance is to furnish it to countries which have the greatest need, not to those best in a position to repay. In fact, countries such as India, Iran, and Lebanon have been able to take considerably more than 30 percent of their development assistance on a loan basis this year. Others cannot reasonably be expected to assume even 30 percent of loans. Jordan and Guatemala are typical examples of countries in desperate economic need. They were not asked to assume any loans this year, and could not be expected to do so next year.
>
> The only way in which the average of loans could be raised to anywhere near 75 percent within 1 year, if we still follow the policy of aid where it is most needed, would be to put it on such a loose and indefinite basis that it would not insure repayment within a reasonable period, and at the same time would damage the normal operations of credit institutions such as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, and commercial banks.

In other words, if in the case of India we said, "You must pay 75 percent"—although India probably will pay 75 percent—we might be exhausting the credit of that country if it desired to approach another lending institution for aid.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that in some instances during the current year development assistance on a loan basis has reached about 41 percent, on the average, under the present law. If the law can be operated as the committee has worked it out in this bill with a great deal of care and in the report, and in accordance with the commitment given to us by the administrators, we shall rapidly approach a full loan basis in all countries which have the capacity to borrow at all.

In the case of Iran, for instance, a loan of $32 million was made out of the authorized amount of $65 million.

In the case of Israel a loan of $20 million was made out of an authorized total of $40 million. That is 50 percent.

India's loan is somewhat in excess of $45 million, nearly $50 million. Under the present law the total of loans made as against authorizations is in excess of the minimum fixed in the act; and the administrators, from the beginning, have urged that there be no minimum because it tended to defeat their efforts to

obtain a larger percentage of loans rather than to make grants.

I earnestly hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will be defeated. While its objective is the same as that which the committee has worked out in the bill, the committee, after long consideration, is of the opinion that the proper way of proceeding is to give the Administrator an opportunity to obtain a greater percentage of loans, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The whole theory of the bill is one of mutual assistance, which, of course, means mutuality of interest and security. Is it not true that many countries whose economy and stabilization from a military and economic standpoint are essential to our security would be among those who could not qualify for a loan?

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly that is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. And, therefore, the possibility of mutuality would be destroyed.

Mr. GEORGE. Unquestionably. The whole effort we are making in certain areas of the world would be defeated by a requirement that all amounts authorized under this title should be made on a loan basis of 75 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the amendment affects only the development-assistance program, which amounts to $165 million, and not the whole bill?

Mr. GEORGE. It also affects transferred funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. But only the development-assistance program.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount of money proposed to be authorized for this program is $165 million, and the amendment does not affect the other funds.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not affect the military funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Or any other funds.

Mr. GEORGE. It affects any money transferred to any mutual-assistance program or any part of it.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes. I should like to tell the Senate exactly what my amendment would do. It has nothing to do with military assistance. It has nothing to do with defense support. It has nothing to do with technical assistance. It applies only to the $165 million designated for development assistance, which is commonly referred to as economic assistance.

Mr. President, I certainly do not intend to try to match the eloquence of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, or his great knowledge and leadership in this field, but I believe I can match him in sincerity of purpose, so far as the amendment is concerned.

The very argument the Senator from Georgia made as to the loans which have been made relates to the fact that the existing law for development assistance contains a provision that 30 percent of the funds shall be on a loan basis. That the loans entered into this year were, as he stated, in excess of 30 percent is the result of the fact that the existing law has a provision for 30 percent on a loan basis.

But the committee deleted that provision; and at present, in the bill now under consideration, there is no provision for loans for economic or development assistance.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand the Senator wished to have the yeas and nays ordered on his amendment. Before some of the large number of Senators who are now in the Chamber leave——

Mr. POTTER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. POTTER. The amendment would not take away one nickel from the funds provided by the bill. It would apply only to the 4.7 percent of the total authorization which is allocated for development assistance; and it would require 75 percent of the $165 million, allocated for that purpose, to be on a loan basis rather than on a grant basis.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment which provides that additional loans could not be made to a poor nation, in the event it should fail to repay?

Mr. POTTER. Of course not.

Mr. LONG. In other words, if a nation such as Guatemala could repay its loan, we could renew the loan to them, and they would at least owe something.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct. The loans under existing law are not of the same type as bank loans. They are based on agreements whereby the borrower can pay them back in kind or can pay them back in foreign currency. They are very generous loans. They are not the kind of loans we would wish to enter into as businessmen. But they have one advantage, namely, that in dealing with the recipient nations, we deal with them as partners. We have something to say in respect to such loans. We have a voice because of the contractual agreement we have with the nation, which we would not otherwise have in the spending of the funds.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand, the Senator's amendment applies only to that provision of the bill which deals with what might be called economic or development aid. In no sense does it mean that the national defense phases are to be on a loan basis.

Mr. POTTER. Not one iota.

Mr. MUNDT. Such loans are not the kind which are necessarily drawn up with provision for a rigid series of repayments, and interest rates; they are the types of loans which a country can repay by supplying us with strategic materials, raw materials, or manufactured products which we may need.

Mr. POTTER. I shall be glad to read to the Senator exactly how the loans can be repaid. This is the provision in the existing law, and the same latitude would be given by my amendment. The existing law, which would be reinstated by my amendment, is as follows:

> SEC. 505. Loan assistance: (a) Assistance under this act may be furnished on a grant basis or on such terms, including cash, credit, or other terms of repayment (including repayment in foreign currencies or by transfer to the United States of materials required for stockpiling or other purposes) as may be determined to be best suited to the achievement of the purposes of this act.

Certainly that is not restrictive language.

Mr. MUNDT. By amending the foreign-aid program this way, very conceivably we might be rendering the countries better service than by give-away programs, because the type of program which the Senator from Michigan is proposing would maintain the self-respect of the recipient countries.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is absolutely correct. One of the great criticisms of the United States with respect to this program has been the "Rich Uncle" philosophy, that we will take care of a country if it is a dependent nation. By putting the funds on a loan basis, we will be treating the recipient nations as partners. Certainly the psychological effect is much to be desired. It removes the paternalistic influence which now exists.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that the Senator from Michigan has offered a very constructive amendment. It is difficult for me to understand how there can be much fault found with the philosophy behind it. Instead of dealing with the smaller countries as poor relations, we shall be welcoming them into the family as partners, and providing them with what they may need in money, aid, or supplies. In those circumstances, we shall be glad to help them, because they are desirous of helping the free world. It is important that they maintain their sovereignty, dignity, and self-respect, and this they would do if we made to them loans which they could repay at any time they were able to do so, and in whatever method they chose.

It is beyond my understanding how the Senate could disagree with the type of philosophy which would substitute a businesslike program for a perpetual humanitarian spending program on a global basis, which, if it should become permanent policy, as the bill proposes, would mean increased taxes for the taxpayers of America to build in other countries, plants, educational institutions, irrigation ditches, and dams which they might require. Certainly the United States cannot maintain that kind of giveaway program forever.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is absolutely correct. We have been criticised, and rightly so, by our own citizens for the giveaway program. I believe that economic assistance should be given where it is needed. The amendment does not take one nickel away from the bill. It merely provides that the United States

will enter into contracts with recipient nations, and that we will expect them to return the funds to us when they can, if they can; but, at least, there will be contractual agreements between partners, rathers than a position of dependency, which happens when the funds are given on a grant basis.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me the Senate could find some encouragement for this kind of approach by studying the relationships between Great Britain and the United States and between Finland and the United States. In both cases we have advanced money on a loan basis; and in both cases we are receiving payments not only on the interest but also on the debts. Both Finland and Britain are firm friends of the United States and they are valiant defenders of freedom.

This shows that such an arrangement will make friends. It is far better than a mere giveaway program, such as we have been engaged in, and as to which the results certainly have left something to be desired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes which the Senator from Michigan allotted to himself have expired.

Mr. POTTER. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Of the $165 million included in the development-assistance portion of the bill, $70 million is provided for India. With the great resources which India has, certainly the United States should be able to enter into a loan contract with that great country rather than to give her the money. Nehru, the leader of India, made great proclamations when the Soviet Union advanced to India on a loan basis funds for the building of a steel plant. I think it would be wise for the United States to place its relations with India on a partnership basis and to say, "We will expect some of the money back when you are able to pay it."

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. On page 22 of the report, the following appears:

> The bill repeals the requirement in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 that 30 percent of development assistance funds be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis.
>
> In fact, something more than 30 percent of these funds were used on a loan basis in the current fiscal year, and it is expected that an even greater percentage will be so used in fiscal 1956. The committee was impressed, however, with the argument that a percentage figure written into the law militates against the placement of a greater percentage of loans. Experience under the 1954 act shows that some recipient countries want to limit their borrowing to 30 percent, whereas if that figure were not in the law, they would be more readily agreeable to a higher percentage.

Is it not true, therefore, that the report of the committee shows that the intention of the committee is, not to eliminate the loan provision, but to provide a means of increasing the loan percentage about 30 percent, whereas the Senator's proposal, on the other hand, would require that it be 75 percent?

Mr. POTTER. I respectfully disagree with the Senator, because the fact that there were loan agreements above 30 percent last year was due to the fact that there was a 30-percent provision in the law. I know, from the language of the report, that it is claimed that without that provision, it might have been possible to have negotiated a higher percentage of loans; but it seems to me there should be a requirement to that effect in the law. That is why I propose to increase the figure to 75 percent.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator agree that the committee did not delete this provision on the theory that it wanted to eliminate the loan feature?

Mr. POTTER. Even though that may have been in the mind of the committee, the provision was deleted. That being so, when our officials deal with recipient nations, they will be told, "Well, the Congress deleted the loan provision. You cannot make a loan with us. It is going to be on a grant basis." A lever is taken out of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I must say to the Senator that that part of the committee report which I read, namely, "The committee was impressed, however, with the argument that a percentage figure written into the law militates against the placement of a greater percentage of loans," is exceedingly persuasive to me.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator from California will read the last paragraph under the subhead "Loans" on page 22 of the report, I think he will find it would be very helpful. That paragraph reads:

> The committee's objective in rejecting the 30-percent loan requirement is to facilitate the use of an even greater percentage of the funds available in the form of loans. The committee attaches great importance to the maximum possible use of loans, and strongly urges the executive branch to move in this direction as rapidly as practicable.

If we desire to urge the executive branch to move in the direction indicated here, the amendment gives us the opportunity to urge the executive branch to move in that direction 75 percent of the time. I can think of nothing better which an administrator could have that would enable him to handle the fund in terms of loans instead of a giveaway than a mandate from Congress that 75 percent of the money shall be handled on a loan basis. Otherwise, we are going to find Gresham's law of money operating in this field as it operates in the usual field of currency and business—the poorest loan becomes the standard for all loans just as bad money always drives good money out of circulation.

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

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. If we grant money to country A, with no limitation that 75 percent of it must be in loans, country B will say, "You gave that to country A. Why not give it to me?" Then we give it to country B. So country C, on the other side of the Mediterranean, will say to us, "How come? Because we are on the north side of the Mediterranean instead of the south side, certainly you are not going to penalize us?" Gresham's law of money will come into operation; the donations to a few countries lead to the donation to all.

There must be put into effect some kind of limitation if we are ever going to stop overburdening the taxpayers of America, who need highways, irrigation projects, schools, and hospitals. The American taxpayers should not be taxed so they must forego getting the schools and other necessities they need, but which they are asked to help build in Europe, India, Latin America, or somewhere else. We will have to dispose of our foreign-aid money on more business-like arrangements, unless we are going to run the program hopelessly into the ground.

I ask that the Senate accept the very constructive amendment which the Senator from Michigan has advocated.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished Senator from Georgia desires 3 minutes. I wanted to serve notice to that effect on the Senator from Michigan a while ago, because at the time I had the original conversation with him, I was asked to yield the time.

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware, and then I shall reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, is it not a fact that prior to incorporating the 30-percent provision into the existing law about 2 years ago, practically none of the money was used in the form of loans, and only afterward, a couple of years ago, when Congress wrote the 30-percent provision into the law, were loans made in accordance with the provision? If we repealed that provision, we would go back to the original 100-percent giveaway, would we not?

Mr. POTTER. That is correct. The very argument used in the report as a basis for striking the provision from the law is an argument in favor of my amendment, for the 30-percent provision is the very thing that brought about the loan agreements.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

POWER BEHIND THE PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. Based upon the premise that we need additional billions of dollars to build B-52's or the latest design sonic-speed bombers, which will fly from 5,000 to 7,000 miles and return without refueling, we need certain materials to build such airplanes and their production will be expensive. The greatest weight strength ratio metal known is titanium and such planes can only be produced through its use. We are producing 2,500 tons per year when we need 150,000. Because such construction would be expensive, the national-defense organization itself has hesitated to recommend that moneys be appropriated for adequate production of the metal for such purposes.

Last year the Senator from Nevada offered an amendment to a bill of the same type as that now before the Senate providing that unallocated or unexpended money, which I understand is again approximately $9 billion, and the additional money to be appropriated under the bill at that time, be transferred to the administrator of national defense so as to provide for building the necessary bombers, sonic-speed B-25's or whatever may be the latest design. Since the building of such aircraft is expensive, the only way airplanes can be built that will fly from 5,000 to 7,000 miles and return without refueling, as well as fighters, interceptors, and necessary guided missiles and bases, is by transferring the unallocated balance and new money to the administrator of national defense for that purpose.

FOR THE AMENDMENT AND AGAINST BILL

I want to tell the Senator from Michigan that I am going to vote for his amendment and against the bill, and this year I intend to again offer the same amendment I offered last year.

I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he agrees with me that history has shown that the only way there can be success at an international peace conference is to have the necessary strength behind us at the conference?

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Nevada is absolutely correct. I think he will agree with me that nations are not different from individuals in certain respects. I, as an individual, if I am dependent upon another individual, get a most uncomfortable feeling. But if I can enter into a business agreement, even though that business agreement may be in my favor, I have a feeling of partnership.

To a considerable extent in our foreign-aid programs I think there has been apparent the philosophy that we can buy friends with dollars. The Senator from Nevada knows, as well as I do, that we cannot buy the friendship of individuals or of nations with dollars. Friends are won by mutual respect.

I say that mutual respect can be gained by entering into a contractual agreement, even though the agreement may be all one-sided. At least there is a partnership arrangement, rather than the paternalistic attitude of handing out grants.

APPARENT WE CAN WIN THERE WILL BE NO FIGHT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator is exactly right, that a nation is not different from an individual, in that if one is likely to lose a battle, he will not start it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has just said that nations are like individuals. I take it that he means that if the power of the United States were so great that there would be no doubt that we would win any battle in which we became engaged, probably there would not be such a battle or such a war, if we did not start it—and of course we would not start it.

Of course, there is no record that anyone ever attacked Jack Dempsey as he was walking down the street, if it was known who he was, because there would be a doubt as to who would win.

I say to the Senator from Michigan that an economic supplemental report, which will be ready soon, to the Senate Report No. 1627 of 1954, which showed that the Western Hemisphere can be defended and that we can become self-sufficient in the production of the critical materials necessary to fight a war or live in peace.

If we should treat our taxpayers as well as we treat the foreigners and protect American jobs and investments then on the basis of fair and reasonable competition we will build up and stabilize our own economy.

If we had the number of bombers we need—perhaps 2,000 or 3,000 B-52's, the latest design—bombers which are able to fly 5,000 to 7,000 miles and drop their bombs, and return home without refueling; and if we had the number of interceptor and fighter—perhaps 10,000 to 15,000—planes we need, and guided-missile bases around North America and all the atomic-energy submarines we need—submarines which can go twice as fast as the older types—then does the Senator from Michigan believe it would be necessary for us to try to buy friends? Would we not have the necessary strength to spearhead the defense of any area necessary for the protection of this Nation?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I believe that we have, although perhaps not a responsibility, at least a desire, which is a part of the American nature, to help peoples and countries who are in need. But I believe we should do so on a businesslike basis, rather than on a handout basis.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to complete my questions of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think what I will state will be of help to both Senators.

Mr. MALONE. It merely interrupts my line of questioning.

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to point out to the Senator from Michigan something which perhaps he does not know, namely, that in the committee, although it is true that the so-called percentage amendment was rejected, it was rejected by a divided vote. Personally, I did not vote to reject or strike out the amendment.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the minority leader for that contribution to the debate. Let me say I also know that some responsible officials who are administering this program are desirous of having the loan feature retained in the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further to me?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

ASSIST OUR NEIGHBORS

Mr. MALONE. I was trying to develop the point the distinguished Senator from Michigan had brought into the debate, namely, that we do owe our neghbors something. We should give them any help we can give them—just as in the case of a person living in a community. I believe in that principle. In the community in which we live, we contribute to the Red Cross and to the other worthy causes which will assist the community. But we do not mortgage or sell our home and give the money to the community, do we?

Mr. POTTER. We contribute according to our ability.

Mr. MALONE. At the present time the United States has a national debt of $275 billion, and in addition, our country has the distinguished record, if I may term it such, of having guaranteed approximately $140 billion or $150 billion of other debts. The United States is also responsible for the guaranteed amounts exactly the same as the national debt.

Instead of having a national debt of $275 billion, we, as a nation, owe approximately directly $420 billion, an amount which added to the States and municipal debts is well in excess of the assessed value of the taxable property of the Nation.

Yet, the Members of Congress often seem impatient, when the vote is delayed through debate.

So we are virtually "selling our house" to help foreign people who, in turn, when we build industrial plants for them, first recognize our potential enemies, such as Communist China, and then sell to our potential enemies everything they need for either peace or war.

Such sales of materials are constantly being made to both Russia, the Iron Curtain countries, and to Communist China. Most of the nations we have aided have already recognized Communist China, and now the heat is on for us to not only recognize her, but to admit her to the United Nations. Many of our top officials are committed to, and are arguing for the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations, leaving Chiang Kai-shek's regime in the United Nations until he dies or resigns.

Of course the precedent has been set in Korea, Indochina, and India of dividing them in two parts, and now it is proposed that we do the same in the case of China.

USE OUR MONEY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

So I agree that this money should at the very least be handled on a loan basis.

But why not use the money for our national defense, so that there will be no question who would win any battle.

As a consequence, fights or wars involving us will not start. Does not the Senator from Michigan agree with me?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, other Senators will offer an amendment which will deal more directly with the suggestion the Senator from Nevada has made.

I am convinced that, particularly when we are dealing with the economic aid to be authorized under this bill, as much as possible of it should be handled on a loan basis. This amendment is very simple in every respect, and I cannot conceive that there will be opposition to it.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. POTTER. I promised to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who wishes to make a brief statement. But first I yield to the Senator from Wyoming, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

I intend to support the Senator's amendment; but it seems to me that the amendment is a very modest one. So I should like to ask a question about it.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, it will affect only approximately $125 million of the $165 million for development assistance, under this authorization bill.

Mr. POTTER. The 75-percent formula is to be applied to the $165 million, and would produce approximately the figure the Senator from Wyoming has stated.

Mr. BARRETT. That would mean that the amendment would affect approximately 3½ percent of the total authorization provided by the pending bill; is that correct?

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. I take it that the Senator from Michigan intended to restrict all the funds which will be available for economic assistance. How much of the remainder of the $3,400,000,000 is, in fact, economic assistance?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Wyoming of course is pertinent because we know that in the military-support portion of the bill, which authorization amounts to more than $1 billion—a majority of it is, in essence, economic assistance. We also know that even in the case of the technical assistance program, a certain proportion of it is, in essence, economic assistance. I am fearful that even in respect to the military assistance portion of the bill, a portion of it is economic assistance.

In my amendment I have entirely left alone the military phases. My amendment applies to only a small piece of this giant pie; in other words, the amendment applies only to the economic assistance portion, or to approximately 4 percent of the total authorization.

Altogether, the 75-percent loan feature applies to the $165 million portion of the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. If the Senator will yield further, I certainly agree with him that his amendment would place restrictions on a relatively small amount, approximately $125 million, whereas I am sure that if the information were available to the Senate we would know that at least 10 times that amount, or perhaps more than that, is, in fact, economic assistance, even though it may be called something else.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER rose.

Mr. POTTER. How many minutes does the Senator from Louisiana desire?

Mr. ELLENDER. Three minutes.

Mr. POTTER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is my judgment that the Senate should adopt this amendment. I have an amendment which I shall propose later, to strike out the entire authorization of $165 million for development assistance, and in due time I propose to show why that should be done.

This fund of $165 million is to be used as economic aid to supplement the technical aid program. When the technical aid program was placed upon the statute books the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] offered an amendment which was accepted by the then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Connally. That amendment read as follows:

> SEC. 509. The advancement of technical assistance or the preparation of plans for projects as authorized under this title does not constitute any obligation whatever on the part of the Government of the United States to make any loans or grants for the execution or construction of any project or for the completion of any program devised under this title. The President or the person administering this title under his direction shall give written notice to each recipient of funds or beneficiary under this title that such assistance in planning or programing shall not be construed as an obligation on the part of the United States to make funds available for the construction or execution of any project.

This language was modified later, and what now appears in the technical assistance portion of the law is this:

> Nothing in this act is intended nor shall it be construed as an express or implied commitment to provide any specific assistance, whether of funds, commodities, or services, to any nation or nations, or to any international organization.

Mr. President, in spite of that language, what is happening in connection with the program for technical aid? I have found on my inspection trips abroad that when many of these programs were started and various countries were invited to join, they accepted only on condition that funds would be available for economic development. I could cite instance after instance in which our offer of technical assistance was unacceptable to a host country unless we also agreed to provide funds to actually construct and equip the projects that our technicians determined were necessary to raise the economy of the country and improve the health of its people.

As I have stated, this development-assistance fund, which is used in conjunction with technical aid, lends itself to a violation of the spirit of the law which we wrote upon the statute books. It is nothing more than economic aid—Marshall plan aid—which our planners are seeking to extend throughout the world. The name has been changed, but the function still remains economic aid, and therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will approve the pending amendment. Even if the Senate does approve the amendment, which provides only that not less than 50 percent of the development assistance funds shall be made available as loans, in due time I shall offer an amendment to strike the entire $165 million fund from the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan has concluded, I should like 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if agreeable to the Senator from Michigan, I will yield back all my time except 5 minutes, which I will yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like 2 minutes.

Mr. POTTER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I did not intend to go into this subject any further. However, I take as my text an article just offered for the RECORD by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for printing in the RECORD. He quoted the immortal words of a great American who said that he regretted that he had but one life to lose for his country.

I remind Senators that we have only one country to lose for the life of the world. I think we must give some serious attention to what we are doing lest we lose our own freedoms and weaken our security without really achieving permanently helpful results abroad.

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

Mr. MUNDT. If I can rely on the generosity of the Senator from Michigan for an additional minute, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. POTTER. I can yield no further time.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I decline to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry. I decline to yield.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Who executed Mr. Hale?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not wish to enter into a discussion about Nathan Hale.

Mr. MALONE. Was it the British?

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to say something about the entire giveaway program. We should reappraise the entire giveaway program at this stage of the game. Remember, this program is now not something which will expire at the end of a certain period, as ECA was supposed to expire after July 1. This new program may never expire. We are now starting on a program to tax the American people permanently for foreign economic assistance. If we are not going to do it on a loan basis, we had better consider seriously the fact that we have only one country to lose for the people who live here.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Does not the Senator know that both the Secretary of State and Mr. Stassen have recently said, in public statements, that this program must become a permanent part of America's foreign policy.

Mr. MUNDT. I remember the statement made by Mr. Stassen in that connection. That is a statement which I think should give every Senator pause. We are doing this with our eyes open. Mr. Stassen says this program is permanent. It is not temporary.

I regret exceedingly that this amendment applies only to $165 million of giveaway money. I wish it applied to

the $1,278,000,000 found on page 2, which is also giveaway economic aid.

The language in this report is pretty tricky. It is devised to fool the folks back home. The $1,278,000,000 comes under the head of "Military assistance." Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that that is all for guns, planes, tanks, and so forth. I doubt it.

Then we come to an item of $1 billion for "defense support." That is the new phrase for economic aid. That is what it is. The term "defense support" is just sugarcoating on the pill. It is clothing and shoes and food and supplies. However, defense is the word to conjure with. Therefore, we call it "defense support."

The next one is called development assistance. As this program goes on year after year we will find that eventually it will be called defense-development assistance, instead of plain development assistance. It will be called defense-development assistance to fool the folks back home. We might as well face the fact that this is a global giveaway program. It is a giveaway program of at least $1,165,000,000, as to which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] now modestly suggests that 75 percent of the $165 million only should be on a loan basis. I say we should establish a real formula, a real criterion, and give a warning notice that America will not, forever, as Mr. Stassen says, continue this program and tax Americans to build schools and irrigation ditches all over the world.

I say Senators should seriously reflect on the effect on the countries that will get this money. In South America all the countries are now listed. We are giving something to all of them. The framers of the bill almost forgot Venezuela, but finally the committee included it for a few postage stamps down near the bottom of the list. They decided to give it 0.2 percent. I ask all Senators to watch that amount grow. Do any Senators think that Venezuela will be content to get 0.2 percent when some of its neighbors get as much as 2.7 percent? Naturally, Mr. President, the people of Venezuela are going to say, "How come we get only 0.2 percent, when other countries get 2.7 percent? What is wrong with Venezuela?"

How are we going to answer that, unless we have a rule of thumb or a criterion and say that part of it will be on a loan basis? If we are going to stay on the giveaway basis, we will have to set up a formula, and perhaps provide that we will give $5 to every man, woman, and child all over the world. We are not going to make friends for America by cutting the world up into little camps and saying to one little camp, "We will give you only 0.2 of 1 percent," and say to another little camp, "We are going to give you 2.7 percent."

Mr. President, this is a device for dividing our friends, not for making friends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot yield. My time has again expired. The Senate apparently is much more liberal with its money than with its minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota who drafted the program? Was it the Democratic Party or the Republican Party?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Illinois is interested in politics, primarily politics, and only politics, because he has a former governor who is trying to get back into politics. I am interested here in foreign relations, not politics. I believe it would be better if the Senator from Illinois would keep political discussions for political arenas, and not indulge in them in this arena of foreign policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back all my time except 5 minutes, if the Senator from Michigan is prepared to yield back all his time.

Mr. POTTER. I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would be the last man to inject politics into this debate. If Senators wish to defeat the bill, I ask them to defeat it openly, not underground. Senators are perfectly consistent when they say, as two Senators have said, "We are going to vote for the amendment and against the bill." That is consistency. That is perfect honesty, and it is following the rule.

Mr. President, this bill came from the executive branch of the Government. The earnest recommendation of the administration spokesman was that no limitation be put upon the development assistance funds, because development assistance is not granted upon the ability of a country to repay, but, rather, it is granted primarily upon the needs of a particular nation and upon the vital necessity of assisting it.

We provide no development assistance funds for Central or South America, I may say, with the exception of two countries, Bolivia and Guatemala. Surely no Senator who is advised of the facts believes that Bolivia would be able to repay 75 percent of a development assistance program. The primary purpose of assistance to Bolivia is to provide food for the people until they can develop their agriculture.

The administrators told us—and it is a fact of record—that in every instance where loans could be increased, they were increased. Let us take the case of India. India repaid 65 percent of the money she received under this program, although there is no such requirement in the law. However, when we write into the bill a requirement that the limitation must be 75 percent, we are taking assistance from countries that need it and giving the money to countries who are able to borrow it. Those countries should not get any grants if they can borrow the money.

We are doing our level best to make it possible for the administration—and we believe in it on this side of the aisle—to make loans, and then, so far as possible, to put the whole program on a loan basis.

That is all there is to this matter. The amendment does not apply merely to the $165 million item. My friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is in error in that respect. It applies to any funds which may be transferred from any other funds for development assistance purposes. It might be technically possible to evade that plain commitment of law by transferring funds to the development assistance program and calling it something else.

If we were to have the development assistance program operate on a loan basis of 75 percent, it would be at least honest and fair to say that any funds transferred into the development assistance program, and any part of the special fund which the President could put into that program, should also be on a 75-percent repayment basis.

The purpose of the bill is to make it possible to increase the loans. We cannot do that by inserting a provision that certain countries must exhaust themselves in their capacity to borrow from any lending institution in the world by obligating itself to pay back 75 percent of this type of money, whereas a country next to it, whose existence and continuance is vital to the defense of this country, and vital to the defense of the free world, is not able to pay back 75 percent.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment, to strike out "75 percent" and to insert in lieu thereof "50 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I will accept that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Michigan that he cannot accept the amendment, because the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified by substituting 50 percent in lieu of 75 percent.

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

Mr. JENNER. I object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not expect to take more than 5 minutes, but I think the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on my amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

In the first place, the vote in the committee to strike out the 30-percent provision was a divided vote. There were 11 members of the committee present at that particular time. The vote to strike out the provision was 7 to 4. So there was a division of opinion within the committee. I believe the Senator from

Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] came in later. He indicated that he would have been opposed to the amendment. So that would have made a 7 to 5 vote had he been present.

If Senators will turn to page 12 of the bill they will see the limitation which the committee itself wrote into the bill in regard to the President's fund of $200 million.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator knows that was done in order to prevent placing a blank check at the disposal of the President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, except the language reads as follows:

> That not less than 50 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with the provisions of section 505, and not more than 25 percent of said funds may be allocated for assistance to any one nation.

So I think it is not inconsistent with the action which the committee took in regard to the other amendment.

It appears to me that there is a considerable amount of merit in the argument that 75 percent may be too high. Personally, I hope we can get to 75 percent or to 100 percent as soon as may be possible in the case of loans for the development fund. But I recognize the validity of the argument of the Senator from Georgia and of those who represent the administration that too high a percentage would be damaging, just as too low a percentage, such as the amount written into the bill last year of 30 percent, would be damaging. Some countries might say, "When we have borrowed up to 30 percent the remainder should be a gift."

But it seems to me that a 50-percent provision would show that the Congress was moving into a more firm position in regard to loans rather than grants, and would indicate that some progress was being made from year to year.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Michigan was quite correct when he said that had it not been for the 30-percent provision in the law there would not have been the progress in regard to loans which has been apparent up to this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Michigan the Senator from Indiana entered an objection, but that the Senator from Indiana has now indicated his desire to withdraw his objection. Is there objection now to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Michigan to modify his amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have some definite ideas with reference to foreign aid. There is no question of my wishing to help foreign nations, but, Mr. President, the idea of making friends by dollar diplomacy is not good for the country. Instead of trying to make friends with foreign nations by appropriating money and giving it to them, would it not be better if the dignity of those countries was protected by recognizing that they have some responsibility? If they wish to borrow some money, all right; but let us insist that they pay. We have to pay. The appropriation for the Defense Department is $31,500,000,000, which is practically $5 billion more than the amount appropriated for all the other Departments of Government. That is an expense for which the American taxpayer will have to pay on the barrelhead. We are not making any friends by giving handouts. If they knew they had some responsibility, their dignity would be preserved. I care not whether it be a country of Latin America, Europe, or Asia, the American taxpayer should not be responsible for its upkeep. We have been buying opinion, and I do not think that is the proper thing to do.

Uncle Sam's country is so good that it is not necessary to spend the American taxpayers' money in order to make friends. Let us treat other countries with decency, with respect, no matter how poor they may be, but let us not give them handouts. I think it is unfair to the American people and it is unfair to foreign countries to follow such a policy. What respect can Latin America and Central America have for us when our approach is "We are going to give you so much money." Would we accept it under such conditions? Would not the average family like its boys and girls to have a little responsibility and work at Garfinckel's or Hecht's for a respectable sum of money for their own upkeep, or should money be handed out to them?

Mr. President, I am in favor of the pending amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a slight correction in my statement regarding the vote of the committee. The clerk of the committee informs me that the vote in the committee to strike out the provision for a limitation of 30 percent was 8 to 6. So it was a divided vote to that extent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. That vote, however, did not indicate a desire for a 75-percent provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; that is quite correct. But I think the committee itself pretty generally agreed that the policy should be toward loans rather than grants.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department also agreed with that point of view.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; that is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the majority leader controls the time in opposition to the amendment, does he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If no Senator wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for the first time in the history of America Canadian money is worth more than is the money of the United States. Such a thing never happened until we instituted our foreign-aid program.

I investigated the situation, and I found that Canada has given Great Britain nothing. Every time it sent money to England it got security at 100 cents on the dollar. That is the situation in Canada in spite of that country's relationship with England. Yet, Mr. President, we have been pouring out great sums of money.

I shall support the amendment, because I think it is a step in the right direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California are ready to yield back their time——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I am supporting the chairman of the committee and what I think is the majority view. We decided that the best way to approach this development-assistance program was not to have any limitation whatever on the division of loans and grants. I have been very much interested in the undeveloped countries of the world. I think we must have flexibility if we are going to deal with them and give them the aid which is necessary. Therefore, Mr. President, I oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now understands that the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas yield back the remainder of their time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to repeat that this particular change in the bill was recommended by the administration. It was an administration proposal. It came to the committee with the full backing of the administrative officers who appeared before us. The majority of the committee were convinced that it was the best way to increase the amount of loans from any given fund, and the best way to accomplish that objective precisely. It was the controlling consideration with the committee in placing a limitation upon the $200 million special fund, and restricting the power of the President to do as he pleased with so large a sum as $200 million without any restrictions. The limitation is that 50 percent of the total amount shall be used on loan, and that not more than 25 percent shall go to any particular country in the Asian area.

That was strictly a method of limiting the grant of the $200 million fund only.

I hope the amendment will be rejected because, in my judgment, to agree to the amendment would put the bill on the way to becoming a loan program. Any effort to do that otherwise than by means now adopted will retard our efforts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, we are speaking about $165 million out of a total of $3,408,000,000. I have always been a strong advocate of lending. I have said on many occasions that I have never seen any necessity for giving away money; the money should always be disbursed in the form of loans. I still stand on that ground.

However, in this instance we are not talking about making 100 percent loans; we are talking about 75 percent loans—and then only 75 percent of the total of $165 million. We are not speaking of a loan of 75 percent in each individual transaction.

If we were talking about 75 percent of each individual transaction being a loan, and 25 percent being a gift, the proposal might be effective.

But, frankly, what I should like to propose, and may well do later, is an amendment that the $165 million must be 100 percent in the form of a loan.

However, I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan, for the simple reason that, in my opinion, as one who has negotiated transactions in which money has been involved as loans, it is better to specify no amount at all than it is to specify, as in the bill, 30 percent or 75 percent.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think it would be more proper to say that the funds shall all be advanced in the form of loans. But unless that is to be done, I do not believe the hands of the administrator should be tied to the point where he must get back 75 percent. He may be able to get more, and it may be good business to get more in some instances. In other instances he may have to take less.

In any event, if there is to be a limitation of 75 percent, 50 percent, or 30 percent, it ought to be on each and every transaction, not 75 percent of one item. Otherwise we shall make enemies instead of friends, because one nation would get 75 percent as a loan, while another nation would get it as a gift.

The proper way to handle the situation is to advance all the funds as loans, or else to leave the amount at zero and to let the administration try to negotiate as they see fit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what we are undertaking to decide is whether in the future the United States will depend on military force alone for the protection of her people, or whether we shall invest a modest amount in the strengthening of the peoples of other countries, who naturally would be friendly to us and sympathetic to our Government and our objectives.

We shall have to decide—and we are helping to decide the question today—whether the United States in the future is to be a military nation, while it lasts, by putting every boy into the military service for no one knows how long, and making certain that he will go to foreign countries in the defense of our own country; or whether we shall, as I have said, through a modest investment in the strengthening of friendly nations try to bring about and perpetuate a lasting peace.

We do not like to spend money outside this country. However, it was not many years ago when we were investing $7 billion annually for this program. The amount has been reduced in the bill to $3,500,000,000.

I hope that neither the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan nor the amendment offered by the Senator from California will be approved. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has so ably pointed out, even reducing the requirement for loans from 75 percent to 50 percent would not help the countries which need the help most; and the nations which are able to pay 65 or 75 percent are already being required to do so, if we have been correctly informed.

I hope the amendments will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that all time has now been yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, Mr. President; I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at some later point in the discussion of the bill, I hope to express my views regarding the entire program at a little more length than I shall at this time.

To me, there is no more specious argument being urged against the measure, or any part of it, than the argument that we are trying to buy the friendship of nations and of people. We are not trying to buy their friendship; we already have their friendship. We are trying to make it possible for them to make their friendship effective, not only through military aid, but also through economic aid and aid proffered by the very section of the bill to which the amendment is offered. If we are justified in requiring that 75 or 50 percent of the fund shall be on a loan basis, it is difficult to resist the argument that the entire amount should be on a loan basis.

I imagine that after World War I, the United States never had a greater friend than the nation and the people of Czechoslovakia, a new republic, created out of the travail of that war, and whose first president was Thomas G. Masaryk. I remember hearing Woodrow Wilson say that Mr. Masaryk was the greatest man with whom he came in contact at the Versailles Conference, which resulted in the peace treaty. The people and the Government of Czechoslovakia were our friends. But they fell. I believe that if the people of Czechoslovakia could vote now, and could have their votes counted as cast, they would still be our friends, and among the best.

But they are under the domination of the ruthless, godless enemies whom we are fighting, and whom we are trying to aid our friends to fight, in order that they may help us also to win the fight.

So we are not trying to buy friendship; we are trying to make the friendship effective. Not only in any great world crisis, but in combating the gradual process of Communist infiltration, it will be futile for us to give military aid unless the recipient nations are economically strong enough to use such aid. We have had some experience in giving military aid to countries whose people were being subverted. I do not wish to name at this moment any country in which that has taken place, but we have had that experience.

Mr. President, I should also like to advert to the criticism of the Senator from Indiana against Mr. Stassen. It is not incumbent upon me to defend this administration, or any member of it, but I recall that when Mr. Stassen was before the Committee on Foreign Relations I myself asked him whether we ought to deceive the American people into the belief that this was a 1-year proposition, or whether we ought to tell them frankly that so long as the present threat against us exists, we must continue the aid. I believe they should be told. In response to that question Mr. Stassen answered in the affirmative. We do not think the aid program is permanent. It is not. We hope the time may come in the very near future when we will be able to abandon the program because we will not need it. But so long as the threat is at our door, so long as we do not have world peace, we must endure the burdens which it is necessary to carry in order to fortify the free world against a threat which may be withdrawn at one place and projected in another.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said relative to the importance of giving assistance so long as the threat to the free world endures. I do not disagree with the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont on the necessity of some economic assistance, and of not relying on military assistance alone. But I submit the amendment to the amendment which I have offered does not run contrary to either of their contentions.

In the first place, the particular section with which we are now dealing does provide economic assistance. The only thing the amendment does is to say it is the policy of the legislative arm of the Government of the United States, in the 84th Congress, that at least 50 percent of the fund in this particular title should be expended in the form of loans, whereas the public policy stated

by the legislative arm of the Government in the 83d Congress was that but 30 percent should be in the form of loans.

So, in my judgment, my amendment does not in any manner destroy economic assistance or the necessity for it, as indicated by the Senator from Vermont, nor does it destroy the fact that so long as danger exists, both military and economic, aid will be needed.

This particular amendment does not cut the total amount in the proposed legislation by a single dollar, but it does try to develop, from the viewpoint of the legislative arm of the Government, that we believe that as soon as possible the administration's own position, which is that we should extend the loan phase of the program, should be supported by legislative enactment of the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that this is not a new gimmick; that the loan provision is in the existing law, so that the language which would be restored by the adoption of this amendment is identical to the language which is in the existing law?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. What we are trying to do by the proposal is to say that under the Constitution the legislative arm of the Government, composed of the Senate and the House of Representatives, is given all legislative power. The Constitution does not say we have one-third of the legislative power. It does not say we have 50 percent of the legislative power. It does not say we have 90 percent of the legislative power. Article I of the Constitution says:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Last year, by votes of the Senate and the House, a 30-percent provision was written into the law. This year, to be sure, the administration, as it had a perfect right to do, suggested it preferred not to have the 30 percent limitation in the law. That matter was taken up in the committee. By a vote of 8 to 6, the committee supported the administration's point of view, but there was an honest difference of opinion in the committee.

The Senator from Michigan offered an amendment calling for a figure of 75 percent, which was a considerable increase from the 30 percent provision of last year.

In order to make an adjustment of the very reasoned arguments against making the figure as high as 75 percent, and somewhere between that amount and 30 percent, I offered the amendment providing for 50 percent, because I felt it was a reasonable amendment, and because the committee itself, in the section dealing with the $200 million fund of the President of the United States, wrote that at least 50 percent of the amount would have to be ultimately loaned.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Would not the objections which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has made to the loan feature of the $165 million item also apply to the $200 million in the President's fund? If the argument with regard to the $165 million has merit, it certainly would apply to the $200 million fund which was provided by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the amendment, whether it provided for 75 percent, or 50 percent, as proposed in the amendment I have offered, or the original 30 percent written into the law last year, applied to all the funds, I think valid arguments could be made against it, because military assistance to certain countries certainly could not be on a loan basis. But the amendment applies only to the approximately $165 million of the amount under the particular title to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. President, it seems to me there is nothing revolutionary about the proposal. There is nothing contrary to the established policy which the 83d Congress itself wrote into the law. It seems to me in writing the details of a bill we have a legislative responsibility to perform, and it is not unusual for us to exercise our independent legislative judgment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment providing that 50 percent of the funds in question must be loaned.

The pending bill provides for economic aid to many countries. Military aid is provided in the bill, but, as the committee well points out, the emphasis is on economic aid and economic development of Asia.

Mr. President, it seems to me that, with respect to Asia, sooner or later we will have to decide which trend we are going to follow. Are we to follow the trend which was established with regard to Latin America, or follow the approach of the Marshall plan? There are three times as many people in Asia as there were people in countries affected by the Marshall plan. I think we did much good for Latin America through the offices of the Export-Import Bank, and in other ways.

In the case of foreign aid, why not do the same thing the Government does for a down-and-out farmer who may have lost his fruit crop because of a freeze? The Government lends him money. It is probable that no bank would make a loan to a down-and-out farmer who has lost his fruit crop by reason of a freeze. Nevertheless, the Government will make a loan to a farmer on a long-term basis. If the farmer does not pay the loan off, no one looks askance. Why should we look at a sovereign nation as more deserving than a bankrupt farmer? When the loan is made to a farmer, we expect him to pay it back. If he is unable to, it is all right; but if he can pay it back, that is all right too.

We have our agents going to different nations and telling them they ought to build railroads, or dig deep wells, or erect manufacturing plants or establish small industries, and otherwise develop their economies. Our agents tell those countries they can get money under the point 4 program. Should our agents tell them that the money will be given to them from Uncle Sam's Treasury, or tell them that they can borrow the money with which to develop their economies. It seems to me this Government should decide whether we will help develop Asia in the way we helped countries under the Marshall plan, or as we helped Latin America.

For that same reason I shall support the amendment, because I think it is a step in the right direction, although I shall vote against the 50 percent provision, for I would prefer that 75 percent be earmarked for loans.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Louisiana answered my question in his concluding sentence. In other words, I understand that it is his purpose to vote against the pending amendment, in order that we can provide that at least 75 percent of the funds shall be placed under this program.

Mr. LONG. That is my hope.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the minority leader has stated a strong case for his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I think I am correct when I say that in the committee the minority leader and I voted on the same side, in terms of striking from section 201, which is under the heading "Development Assistance," the following proviso:

> Except that 30 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with section 505.

Section 505 sets forth the details.

Mr. President, when I voted to sustain that 30 percent limitation, I thought it was wise to do so, in order that the act would contain a directive that the administrators should loan at least 30 percent, rather than leave it in the form of grants. In the committee there was considerable discussion of this matter.

Mr. President, consistency has been referred to. Let me say that I do not believe one proves he is correct, merely by showing that he is being consistent, when he may be consistently wrong.

I have reexamined the vote in the committee, and I have reached the conclusion that the argument of the ad-

ministrators of the Foreign Operations Administration was a valid one. They argued that this provision of section 201, which it is now proposed to change from 30 percent to 50 percent, should be stricken out, because in their negotiations with foreign countries the percentage limitation was oftentimes looked upon as a ceiling. They testified before our committee that in the case of some countries they would like to have up to perhaps 75 percent or 80 percent of the funds handled as loans, and yet with the 30 percent provision—and sometimes up to 50 percent—looked upon by our negotiators, as well as by the other countries, as a ceiling.

I am surprised that the minority leader does not have faith in those who are administering the program. After all, they seem to be men who were selected by his responsible leader and by our responsible leader. The men who are administering the program have stated to our committee that it is their objective to get more and more of the funds for development assistance into the form of loans. The committee stated its desire to have more and more of the funds handled as loans; and I was one of the members of the committee who insisted that the administration direct its attention to long-term loans at low rates of interest. The officials replied that in some countries loans could be negotiated, and in some countries both loans and grants would be required, and in some countries more loans and less grants would be required, and in other countries less loans and more grants would be required. The responsible officials stated that they needed to have authority for flexibility, in order to get the job done.

Mr. President, we are not talking about billions of dollars. This particular section relates to approximately $160 million plus. I am convinced that the pattern which was revealed to our committee indicates beyond a shadow of a doubt that the present tendency in connection with this program is for more and more of the funds to be in the form of loans. But I believe it would be unwise to shackle the hands of our administrators, particularly in the case of Asian aid, because for many of those countries a grant frequently is necessary in order to make a loan an acceptable financial device.

In this case, do we wish to prove that we are good bankers, or do we wish to prove that we are competent foreign-policy strategists and performers? Are we seeking results, or are we seeking a paper record showing that so many dollars are on loan at a certain rate of interest?

Frankly, Mr. President, I am worried about the interest rate which the administration may determine to charge. I think it is best to permit those who are administering the program to come back before us and be subject to scrutiny about their performance in accordance with their word of honor; and their word of honor to us was that they would press to have more and more and more of this money utilized as loans.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the administrator pleaded with the members of the committee—and I leave it to the chairman of the committee to correct me, if what I am saying is not the truth—not to put them in an economic straitjacket. The officials told us that if we would permit them to have flexibility they could have more of the money put into loans, and could do a better job with the dollars authorized by Congress.

Mr. President, no Member of the Senate believes more strongly than I do in the loan principle. I say most respectfully that I spoke in favor of that principle before our good friend, the Senator from Michigan, made his statement on this matter. I spoke in favor of that principle before the program was authorized. Let me point out that earlier this year the distinguished Senator from Montana said he thought more of this money should be in the form of loans. But, Mr. President, we must trust someone. Those who are running the program say they know what they must have. They say they know they can do a better job with the taxpayers' dollars if we do not impose inflexible rules.

Mr. President, we must resolve any doubts we have in favor of the pledge of honor, given to 15 members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as to how the money will be used. I am willing to give the administrators a chance to prove to us that we can rely upon their pledge of honor. In 6 months' time they will have to report to Congress, under the provisions of the bill. In 6 months' time they will have to tell us what they have been doing. Why not let them proceed for 6 months, so that we can see whether we can really trust the word of the administrators? Mr. President, I ask my Republican friends this question: If a Democratic Senator is willing to trust their administrators, why do not my Republican friends trust them?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not trust them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I control the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, I have listened to the arguments which have been advanced by my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I wonder why the committee did not take the same position in regard to the fund of $200 million, which the bill will allow the President to dole out?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I can answer that question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because, as I understand, in that case it seems to me that it is equally desirable that we provide "that 30 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with section 505."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has a valid point, and I shall give him a valid and honorable answer.

First, the $200 million fund is not programed, and every Member of the Senate knows it. The $200 million is an Asian regional fund, a special fund that the President will be able to use to meet contingencies which as yet are not known. That matter was argued in the committee. Some members of the committee were very much disturbed that such loose authority was proposed to be given to the President.

I say again that I reconciled my doubts in favor of the Chief Executive. I, too, have plenty of criticisms of the Chief Executive, but, Mr. President, I reconciled my doubts in his favor.

What is the difference between the $200 million fund and the funds for development assistance? The funds for development assistance are for planned programs, and we know exactly where the money will go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, already negotiations are under way, under the terms of this future authorization, for loans under section 201. Those funds are an entirely different set of funds. The $200 million of the President is something that is as yet unplanned, uncharted, unscheduled, unprogramed. It is a contingency fund, to meet what may be a disastrous situation in the Asian region. In other words, we have given to the President the extra money he may need to meet a catastrophe, to meet a shift in Soviet policy, or to meet an immediate situation which may arise in that area. What we did in connection with that fund, in order to tie down the President's hands a little more, was to require a loan basis. But when it comes to the section we are now discussing, section 201, this is programing that was done 3 or 4 months ago. So we know where the money is to go. We have been in negotiations with certain countries.

My plea to my colleagues is: Do not be so suspicious. First of all, the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration told our committee that they could lend much more than 30 percent if they were left alone. They told

us that the last limitation we wrote into the law tied their hands. They told us they could have had many more millions of dollars out on loan if we had not inserted a percentage figure in the law.

I have thought this problem through carefully. I voted wrong once in committee, and I wish to correct my vote. If we write into the act the kind of limitation language now proposed, all we shall be doing will be compounding a misdeed. We shall be indicating that we have no regard for, no trust and no faith in, those administering the program; and possibly we shall be tying them down to uneconomic negotiations.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Green	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bender	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Neely
Bible	Holland	Neuberger
Bricker	Hruska	Pastore
Bridges	Humphrey	Payne
Bush	Ives	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Purtell
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The vote is on the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to take any time of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, before the vote, a statement which I have prepared pertinent to the bill.

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

ADMINISTRATION POLICY IN NEAR EAST

Debate on the mutual security program furnishes an appropriate opportunity to make a statement about the policy which the administration is now pursuing in the Near East.

I have had strong reservations about that policy for some time. I am referring to the fact that the Department of State is now furnishing arms to Iraq without requiring that Government to abandon its war against Israel. In my view—and many share this view—this prejudices the chances of obtaining an Arab-Israel peace.

There is much sentiment in the country for a bipartisan foreign policy. It is desirable to maintain a united front so that we may effectively mobilize all our resources in defending freedom from Communist aggression. But I doubt whether our current policy in the Near East responds to our best national interest, and I am therefore impelled to put my misgivings into the record.

This is not the first time I have had occasion to criticize the Department of State's policy in the Near East. Several years ago when there were powerful interests in the Department who were opposed to the establishment of the State of Israel and who almost succeeded in scrapping the U. N. partition decision, I was one of those who continually challenged that policy. That was during the days of a Democratic administration. I did not hesitate to criticize the State Department when Democrats were making mistakes. I see no reason why I should hesitate to speak out today, when it is the Republicans who are making the blunders.

Our purpose in the Near East today is to fill the vacuum in that region and strengthen it against Communist aggression or subversion. But we will not succeed in this purpose unless we enlist all the states in that area. We will not be able to do that effectively, unless these states make peace and reach regional defense arrangements.

In my view, the policy of shipping arms to Iraq strikes a blow at an effective defense arrangement in the Near East, not only because it endangers Israel, but because it alienates the other Arab States.

So far as Israel is concerned, the reason for that country's alarm is clear and manifest. If we arm Iraq or any other Arab State and we exclude Israel from our defense planning, we play into the hands of those who do not want an Arab-Israel peace; we raise the hopes of Arab extremists that they can have another round against Israel; we don't take advantage of the defense potential of the Israel army, which is by far the strongest force in the region next to Turkey; and we keep the entire region in the kind of tension and turmoil that the Communists welcome and exploit.

But Israel is not the only country in the Near East that resents our current policy. There has been a violent reaction in Egypt where the Iraq-Turkish treaty—negotiated with our blessing—was bitterly attacked. Egypt rejected an arms agreement with us, and today Egypt is more neutralist than it ever was before.

It is a mistake to think that the Arab-Israel conflict is the only source of disagreement and tension in the Near East. There are many. There are tensions within the Arab world, hostilities between families, jealousies and rivalries between states and their rulers. Our program to arm Iraq must surely be resented in Syria which may someday lose its independence and be swallowed up if Iraq's expansionist plans are ever carried out. Indeed, at this very moment there is growing tension inside Syria, as a result of apprehensions over Iraq's ambitions to dominate the fertile Crescent.

Iraq has always wanted to annex Jordan, and Saudi Arabia is in a continuing feud with both countries and it has also rejected our arms overtures. Was it really a sound decision to prefer Iraq over her Arab neighbors and to send her weapons which could be used not only against Israel but against other Arabs? Did we really gain friends this way, or did we lose more than we gained.

Now I believe that we must do everything to win the friendship of both the Arab peoples and the Israelis. But we can accomplish that by economic assistance and point 4 and do it much more effectively than by passing out guns to the palace guard. We are not likely to win many friends among the Arab peoples if we put guns into the hands of soldiers whose real enemies are the diseases endemic in their neighborhood. We should be giving the Near East the kind of weapons that will lengthen lives, not shorten them.

If anyone could prove to me that the sending of arms to Iraq would really strengthen the region against the Kremlin, I would not be on the floor here today. But the most vigorous exponents of this policy have always been frank to concede that our military buildup in the region is really political. They have repeatedly assured us that the guns we are sending to Iraq could not injure Israelis and we may assume that a military force unable to affect Israel would not be likely to cause tremors in the Kremlin. Then what is the reason for this program? Well, we are told that the reason is to secure stability; to shore up existing regimes, and to win them over to our side.

But this is dangerous policy, because we can never be sure that our arms are going to the right people. All of us remember that Mr. Dulles tossed a revolver on the desk of Prime Minister Naguib in Cairo when he visited the Middle East about 2 years ago. It was a gift from President Eisenhower. This was a curious symbol of American friendship. There are better ways of interpreting America's meaning to the peoples of Egypt. But, apart from that, we are entitled to ask, what became of that pistol? Naguib is no longer in power. He has been deposed by Nasser. He has gone the way of many Arab rulers. And that emphasizes the real danger. When our guns are used to shore up existing dictatorial regimes, which do not rest on the consent of the governed, what guaranty do we have that we are supporting the right regimes? Which coup d'etat is the right coup d'etat? How can we be sure that our guns won't be used to repel democratic change and to repress the majority? I question whether this is really the way to win the friendship of the Arab people.

One could elaborate on this issue at length. A review of the violent political changes in the Near East would demonstrate the futility and the danger of an arms program for the area at this time. Iraq's own record is not encouraging. That state has had seven military coup d'etats since 1936. It was the one state in the Near East which was so much dominated by Nazi influence that it went over to the Nazi side in 1941 and its army, which has never given any respectable account of itself, either in World War II or in the Iraqui invasion of Israel, had to be subjugated by small allied detachments. The Iraqui have never seemed to get over the effects of Nazi propaganda for they have always been virulently anti-Israel and anti-Jewish. They still refuse to sign an armistice agreement with Israel. The ancient Jewish population of Bagdad was the victim of mass murders in 1941—Jews have been publicly hanged in Iraq within recent years—and in 1951, the entire Jewish community of 120,000 which lived in the area far longer than the Arabs—fled to Israel, leaving homes and possessions behind.

While we vote to send arms to Iraq—arms which are paid for by all our taxpayers—we

should bear in mind that some of our taxpayers are not permitted to enter Iraq. No Jews—whether they be Israelis, or whether they be British Jews or whether they be American Jews—are permitted to go into this country.

I would most strongly urge the Department of State to take another look at this arms policy. I hope that it will decide to withhold further arms shipments to that country until it has publicly declared that it is ready to live at peace with Israel. There has been not the slightest sign of an improvement in Iraq's attitude since we began to send our arms to that country. On the contrary, their leaders appear to be more belligerent than ever and they make no secret of their determination to reverse their defeat of 1948. Moreover, there is already evidence that these arms shipments will not achieve their alleged purpose, for the first consignment brought us a reaction of disappointment.

Let me read a dispatch from Bagdad which appeared in the New York Times on January 14, from which I quote:

"Considerable disappointment was expressed here when the first United States shipment, said to have been composed exclusively of vehicles and engineer equipment, arrived at Basra December 19. Opposition Deputies in Parliament wanted to know why heavy weapons had not been delivered and they charged that the United States program had been cut to $25 million a year.

"The Government replied that United States material would be initially devoted to increasing the mobility and improving the communications of Iraq's forces. Negotiations on larger items are now in progress, it was said."

The way to repel the Communist menace is to give the average man and woman some stake in society, to give him food and clothing and shelter and education and some technical knowhow. If this is what America will stand for to the people of the Middle East, then we need not worry about Communist aggression and subversion. But if America stands for nothing but guns—all the military aid we can send at this time will be of no avail in the continuing war against the Communist propagandist and saboteur.

Finally, I would like to serve notice on the administration that it is my intention, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to oppose any further appropriations for military aid to the Arab States, unless and until there is some clarification and improvement in the present situation. I hope that I will be joined in this position by Members on both sides of the aisle. For I believe that many of us in both parties are agreed that our country's highest interests in the Middle East will be best served by a positive policy which emphasizes the paramount need for peace and cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MALONE (when his name was called). Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONE. The amendment of the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan reduces the amount which must be in the form of loans from 75 percent to 50 percent. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a correct statement.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—33

Barrett	Eastland	Martin, Iowa
Bible	Ellender	Martin, Pa.
Bricker	Frear	Millikin
Bridges	Goldwater	Morse
Butler	Hickenlooper	Potter
Byrd	Hruska	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Cotton	Kerr	Thurmond
Curtis	Knowland	Thye
Dirksen	Kuchel	Williams
Dworshak	Langer	Young

NAYS—50

Aiken	Hill	Mundt
Barkley	Holland	Neely
Beall	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bender	Ives	Pastore
Bennett	Jackson	Payne
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kefauver	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kilgore	Smathers
Daniel	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ervin	Malone	Stennis
Flanders	Mansfield	Symington
George	McCarthy	Welker
Green	McNamara	Wiley
Hayden	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—13

Allott	Gore	O'Mahoney
Anderson	Hennings	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Watkins
Clements	McClellan	
Fulbright	Murray	

So, Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment to Mr. POTTER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Potter amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Potter amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that all time on the Potter amendment has been yielded back. Is that correct?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The yea-and-nay vote will now be on the question of agreeing to the Potter amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yea-and-nay vote will be on the Potter amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Potter amendment the 75-percent loan limitation amendment?

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I also announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY],

the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—29

Barrett	Ellender	Millikin
Bible	Goldwater	Mundt
Bricker	Hruska	Potter
Butler	Jenner	Robertson
Byrd	Knowland	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Thurmond
Cotton	Long	Welker
Curtis	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Young
Eastland	McCarthy	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Barkley	Hill	Neely
Beall	Holland	Neuberger
Bender	Humphrey	Pastore
Bennett	Ives	Payne
Bush	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Daniel	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kuchel	Sparkman
Ervin	Lehman	Stennis
Flanders	Magnuson	Symington
Frear	Mansfield	Thye
George	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Green	McNamara	
Hayden	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—15

Allott	Clements	McClellan
Anderson	Fulbright	Murray
Bridges	Gore	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hennings	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Watkins

So Mr. POTTER's amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3990. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; and

H. R. 6499. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3990. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

H. R. 6499. An act making appropriations for the Executive office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 4, line 6, to strike out "$70 million" and insert "$35 million."

On page 4, line 8, strike out "$102 million" and insert "$51,250,000."

On page 4, line 10, strike out "$827,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$413,900,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the amendment which has just been stated is one of a series of amendments which I propose to offer, which together will cut from the bill a total of $1,013,650,000.

For the past several days I have been quite busy trying to make a complete study of the pending bill, in all its implications, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's report and other data which were available to me.

Mr. President, several months ago when it was stated that the administration proposed an economic-aid program for Asia, as I recall, there was quite a flurry among Senators and Representatives, many of whom publicly announced their opposition to such a program They took the position that they did not desire to have our Government start in Asia what had been going on in Europe since 1948; in other words, they did not feel that our Government should embark upon an economic-aid program for Asia.

A careful study of the bill will indicate that the greater portion of the funds authorized represent nothing but economic-aid expenditures. In the series of amendments which I propose to offer to the pending bill—amendments which seek to curtail the total authorization by $1,013,650,000—I have not touched the $1,278 million which is included in the bill for direct military aid. As Senators will note from the bill, and also the report, there has been no allocation made of this direct military aid authorization. There is practically no information in the report to indicate how these funds are to be used, and nothing to show to which countries they will be allocated. I concluded that since most of the data in connection with the direct military aid are of a secret nature, and has not as of this moment been revealed to us, it would be difficult for me to now suggest any specific cuts in the direct military aid authorization. It is my intention, however, to give that phase of the program very careful scrutiny when our Appropriations Committee is called upon to appropriate funds under the authority contained in the pending bill.

Mr. President, as I have stated, I have a series of amendments to offer. In these opening remarks, I shall make a general statement which will be pertinent to all of them. I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate while I discuss some of the background concerning our present foreign aid program, and present my case in support of all of the amendments which I shall offer to the bill. I hope to do this within an hour, but if I am unable to do so, I shall ask the leadership to permit me to finish my statement, provided, of course, it will not require more time than would be allotted to me if I presented each amendment and requested 1 hour on each amendment. If the leadership will cooperate with me, I can assure the Senate that I will conclude this opening statement within an hour or an hour and a half.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to travel all over the world. As a representative of the Committee on Appropriations, I have visited every country where we have undertaken foreign aid programs, and I have witnessed all of these various programs in operation. I know from first-hand experience how they work.

I believe I can state without fear of contradiction that our army of foreign-aid representatives abroad are very desirous of making this program a permanent one. As was stated in debate a while ago, the position is now being taken that our foreign policy from here on demands that we operate on a permanent basis a program similar to the one which we are now discussing; in other words, that a foreign aid program is part and parcel of our foreign policy, and that if we are to continue to maintain the friendship of the countries of the free world, we shall be obliged to continue to assist them economically.

Mr. President, among the programs that I shall seek today to curtail is, first, the development assistance program, which was under consideration a moment ago, when the Senate rejected an amendment to force loans up to 75 percent on any moneys which were made available under it. I shall offer an amendment to eliminate development assistance—which is just another name for economic aid—from the program altogether.

As I pointed out earlier in the debate on the pending bill, when the Senate enacted the so-called point-4 program, it was distinctly understood that in making technical assistance available to any country, that country should not assume and expect that if we stated that a certain program was necessary, we would thereafter furnish the money to carry through the program.

I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the amendment which was proposed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Senator RUSSELL, and adopted by the Senate, which stated clearly and concisely that under no conditions should our representatives abroad state to the host countries, in getting them to partic-

ipate in the technical-aid program, that we, in turn, would assist them financially in carrying out any program which we might recommend as a means of improving their economies. As a result of my inspection trips abroad, I pointed out to the Senate on several occasions, and I also reported directly to the Administrator of the technical-aid program 3 years ago, that, putting it mildly, our technical-aid program was then being misused. I showed by specific examples, country by country, that, in order to induce certain foreign governments to sign contracts for undertaking technical-assistance programs, some of our representatives had made promises that we would assist those countries in actually carrying out the programs if the host governments did not have the funds.

As evidence of that, Mr. President, I cited many instances in which colleges, hospitals, and other capital investment projects were erected with technical aid funds; in other words, I pointed out that economic aid projects were being undertaken under the label of technical assistance.

When I made those findings known, what happened? The technical-assistance program was divorced from capital-investment undertakings, but simultaneously the Mutual Security Act was amended and a section was added to it authorizing this so-called development assistance.

The net result has been, Mr. President, that our representatives abroad have been able to continue to give assurances to countries that, if they contract to carry on the technical aid programs, they can expect to share in the economic aid funds provided under this development-assistance program.

That is why, Mr. President, at the appropriate time today I shall offer an amendment which would have the effect of eliminating the authorization for the entire amount of $165 million for development assistance.

I want to remind the Senators that not only is this $165 million of development assistance funds to be used in that fashion, but there are other funds provided in the bill, such as funds for direct forces support and for defense support, which are to be used, by means of transfer or by the generation of counterpart funds, in order to furnish the actual construction costs of projects worked up by our technical assistance experts.

Mr. President, I am now and have always been, a strong advocate of the technical aid program. I think it is a marvelous program. If through our helping hand the underdeveloped nations of the world can be encouraged to develop their God-given natural resources and make use of them properly, as we have done in this country, I do not know of anything which would bring more contentment to this world, and which would assure mankind that the millenium of peace we so often talk and dream about is just ahead.

Mr. President, the United States has spent, since World War II, almost $50 billion in trying to assist our friends across the seas. I voted for the so-called Marshall plan because I thought it was a good program, and I still think it was a good program. Under the Marshall plan we gave generously to assist those nations which had been overrun in World War II by a cruel enemy. As a result of the long, devastating war years their economies had gone to pieces. When I voted for the program—and I am sure that I speak not only for myself, but for the other Senators who voted for it—it was our desire to restore the standard of living of our friends across the seas to its prewar level, and we hoped to raise their industrial capacity and their agricultural production to such a point that, if ever the time came when we would need them to help us maintain peace and order in the world, they would be in a position to lend us a helping hand.

Mr. President, I wish to read from the record a short excerpt from the statement of the first Administrator of the foreign aid program, Mr. Hoffman, when he appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1949. Many of us felt at that time that the amount we were being asked to contribute to this undertaking was too large. Many of us thought that the time element should be considered. So when Mr. Hoffman came before the Committee on Appropriations on June 8, 1949, we questioned him very closely. I, for one, asked him how much money it would require in order to put our friends in Europe back on their feet.

He replied:

> From $17 billion to $18 billion.

I asked him:

> How long will it take?

He replied:

> About 4 years, maybe 4½ years.

I asked him:

> What is the goal?

Mr. Hoffman stated that if we could raise the industrial production of the countries of Western Europe, assuming prewar production as 100 percent, to 125 percent, we could end the program.

Why did he say that? Let me read his exact words, as shown on page 35 of the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee when it had under consideration the foreign-aid appropriation bill of 1950, H. R. 4830.

Mr. Hoffman said:

> I would like to make one final point.

He is speaking now to the committee—

> It may at first glance seem paradoxical, but I look upon the European recovery program as our best hope for bringing Government spending down to a point where taxes will not be so oppressive—to a level at which our free economy is not in danger.
>
> I say this because I see no way in which our tax burden can be reduced substantially unless the threat of war and the consequent necessity for maintaining an abnormal Military Establishment is reduced.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

> This economy cannot go on indefinitely spending $15 billion or more a year for military defense.

Yet, as the distinguished Senator from New Mexico stated a moment ago, we have been spending over twice that much, in recent years.

I read further:

> The surest way I know of to reduce the danger of war so that we may reduce our Military Establishment is to carry on the recovery program, to the point where a free and self-sustaining and unified Europe is able to play its full role in cooperation with the United States and other free countries in maintaining the peace and prosperity of the world.

Mr. President, as I have said, when I voted for the original ECA bill, I did so on the premise that if it were possible for us to place the countries of Western Europe back on their feet and make it economically possible for them to lend us assistance in the future in our efforts to maintain world peace, then our own sacrifice in depriving ourselves in order to give to our allies would be worthwhile.

But what has happened under the European recovery program? Not only did these countries reach the 125 percent of prewar production goal, placed by Mr. Hoffman, in 4½ years, but they actually achieved it at the end of 3 years. Was any effort made to stop the program once the goal had been reached? Oh, no. Instead, our planners on the Washington level and our planners in the field sought to make the program even bigger. But instead of using the old program of ECA or direct economic aid, it was changed into a military-aid program. As I stated a moment ago, if anyone reads this bill carefully he will find that all of the $3,500,000,000 authorization, except $1,278,000,000 for military aid, is in the nature of economic aid. Under the defense-support provisions, we send goods to a country—for instance, we send them to the Near East, to Africa, and Asia—and those countries sell the goods to their own people, and thus create a fund, known as a counterpart fund, which is used to build dams, repair their railroads, erect hydroelectric plants, and the like.

As is pointed out on page 17 of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee report on the pending bill, in describing defense support:

> This type of aid consists primarily of machinery and commodities (including surplus agricultural commodities). When the goods are sold in the country being aided, the local currency received in the transactions is used for further defense purposes—sometimes for budget support or sometimes for other projects designed to increase the country's capacity to maintain armed forces of the desired size.

And again on page 9, the committee report states, in describing the defense-support program:

> It differs from economic assistance not so much in form as in purpose.

Mr. President, the Lord only knows that we cannot maintain a foreign economic aid program and expect to remain solvent, particularly when every dollar we have been making available to our friends across the seas is borrowed money.

It may be of interest to the public to know that in the past 24 years we have balanced the budget on only 3 occasions, and 2 of those were in years immediately following World War II. The budget was balanced then because World War II had ended, and we did not spend the

money which had been appropriated for carrying on the war. When the war was ended, the unspent money was returned to the Treasury. The third time the budget was balanced was in 1950, when the Korean war came on. It will be recalled that Congress imposed a 10-percent increase in the tax on individual incomes and a 5-percent increase in the tax on corporate incomes, as well as increases in various excise taxes. The additional income could not be spent immediately, because it was to be used to pay for the cost of the Korean war. The result was that it was possible to balance the budget for that year. But it was budget balancing in name only; it was not anything that we could really boast about.

Mr. President, I ask again, how long can we continue borrowing money to finance overseas give-away programs? Can we afford to make this program a part of our foreign policy, to be continued indefinitely? In my humble opinion, if we embark on a permanent economic-aid program, we will in the long run destroy our own way of life. We do not have to undergo another war, in order to have our economy destroyed. If we keep on piling up debts, we will eventually pile the debt so high that the carrying charge will become so great as to destroy incentive. It does not require any great imagination to foresee what will happen to our democratic way of life when that occurs.

Mr. President, I came to the Senate in 1937; this is my 19th year here. The amount of money Congress appropriated during the first year I served in the Senate—the amount required to run every department and agency of the Government, including the armed services, the State Department, and all the other Government agencies—was only a few hundred million dollars more than the amount now required merely to pay the interest on the national debt. All that has occurred in the past 19 years. In other words, the present carrying charge on our huge national debt, which is climbing and climbing and ever rising higher, is now almost as much as the amount Congress appropriated 19 years ago for the operation of every department and agency of the Government.

Mr. President, let us see how our neighbors have fared as a result of the economic aid we have made available to them. I have before me a table showing the degree of their recovery. The table I have assumes, for 1938, an index of industrial production equal to 100. I point out to my good friend, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], that at the end of the year 1954, the average industrial production index for all the countries of Western Europe was not 125 percent as Mr. Hoffman had aimed for, but 154 percent of prewar. Mr. President, it does seem to me that since we have assisted our friends across the seas in making so splendid a recovery, we should be able to count on them to cooperate with us in assisting the underdeveloped free countries of the world. They should come forward now and volunteer to do so, particularly in view of the fact that, in spite of the enormous debt burden resting upon us today—a debt which, as I have said, amounts to $277 billion—we are now spending for our defense purposes, in other words, in order to take care of our own military establishments, both here and abroad, 68.3 percent of our entire budget.

Take Formosa. Today who is worrying about Formosa? Only Uncle Sam. There is no one else out there. We are the only ones who seem to be interested in maintaining Korea's independence. We are the only ones who are assisting Chiang Kai-shek by furnishing him with implements of war, tanks, boats, a small navy, and other types of assistance. No one else seems to be bothered about the acute situation in the Far East.

We had what has been called "a little skirmish" in Korea. In that connection the other day I listened to former President Truman on television on Ed Murrow's program. His sweet little daughter was asking him questions. She asked him what was the toughest decision he had to make while he was President, and he replied, "The decision to send our boys to Korea."

Mr. President, our country is a member of the United Nations. All of our friends in Western Europe, whom we have been helping for many years, also belong to that great organization. But when the Korean emergency arose we were the ones who had to carry the ball. When it was all over, we had assumed more than 90 percent of the cost of that war, and we furnished more than 90 percent of the foreign soldiers who fought in Korea.

Who assumed the responsibility in Indochina? It was Uncle Sam. We ended by paying more than 80 percent of the cost of the war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, we cannot keep picking up the check for the rest of the free world, and hope to remain solvent. If ever the economy of the United States is destroyed, there will be nothing but darkness in this world. We cannot afford to continue to carry the entire load, particularly after having spent so much of our resources and having added so much to our debt burden in order to bring prosperity to the countries of Western Europe. Our allies, Mr. President, should now be at our side helping us to develop the economies of the underdeveloped nations of Asia. That is why I am asking that the Congress curtail that part of the pending authorization, which is devoted to purely economic aid.

Efforts should be made immediately to get our friends to assist us in this tremendous long-range undertaking.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can my colleague inform me how much the amendment he has offered would reduce the authorizations of the pending bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The pending amendment would reduce the authorization for defense support by about half a billion dollars. But, as I stated in my opening remarks. I have a series of 5 amendments which, if adopted by the Senate, would reduce the amount of the bill by $1,013,650,000.

I invite the attention of my colleague to the fact that because that portion of the bill dealing with direct military aid is not allocated either in the bill or the committee report and because we have not been told where it is to be used and actually know nothing about it—there is nothing in the RECORD about it—I left that out entirely, so that we could deal with that question before the Appropriations Committee when those in authority come before us to justify the one and a quarter billion dollars for direct military aid. So the amendments I am now proposing, and which would cut over a billion dollars from the bill, deal solely with economic aid programs, which are labeled in the bill "defense support" and "development assistance."

Mr. LONG. If I correctly understand, the Senator is not offering his amendments en bloc, but he is offering 1 of a series of 5.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, a moment ago I cited examples of the industrial progress made by the Western European nations. I should like to give the figures for other countries of Western Europe.

Take Belguim, as an example. As of 1954 her industrial advancement was 144 percent; Denmark, 165 percent; France, 148 percent; Greece, 167 percent. When I was in Greece last fall it had gone up to 172½ percent. That was a few months ago. The figures I am now giving are for 1954.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator mean that Greece, for example, has advanced her industrial production 68 percent over the former level, in 1938 or 1944, or does he mean 168 percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. In computing the industrial production index of a country, 1938, the year before the war, is represented as 100. In other words, we start with 100 percent as the pre-war level. As I stated a moment ago, this is an old table—it represents the 1954 level. I was in Athens last November, and I was told by our representative there that Greece had made a great recovery, and that her industrial production had increased by 72½ percent over the pre-war figure—that her present industrial production index is 172½ percent of prewar.

Mr. LONG. In other words, Greece is now 72½ percent more productive than before the war.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Still we are sending her economic aid.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I should like to state that I feel sorry for the Greeks. They are good, fine people. Here recently they experienced a little earthquake, and because of the earthquake they are asking us for $15 million. In other words, when anything happens to them, they say, "Come and help us." I am glad to help them but I believe our European allies ought to be willing to help them also.

Mr. LONG. Does my colleage agree with me that there is practically nothing the bill would do that these people could not do for themselves if they had the determination and energy to do it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am convinced of that. I am convinced also that if the leaders of those countries were briefed

on our own economic picture, on the tax burden and the debt burden on the backs of the American people, they would say to us what was said to me by two kings whom I visited last year; namely, that for us to be making available to anyone borrowed money was just plain foolishness. During the conversation I was told by these two rulers that not only was it foolish, but that if we continued such spending, sooner or later our economy would be destroyed, and if ever that occurred, the whole world would be in darkness. I am in complete agreement with that statement.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the senior Senator from Louisiana yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not my colleague agree with me that the charts which are produced to indicate that, if we had not given these countries a few million dollars, the great economic recovery would never have occurred, are misleading because those countries would have recovered anyway by hard work on their own part, and the aid we gave them accounted for only a small portion of their recovery, perhaps only 5 percent?

Mr. ELLENDER. The trouble with the program was that we went too fast with it. We gave these countries too much money. Let us take the case of Austria. I was in Vienna last November. Senators may not believe this, but the Austrian Government had in its treasury, of these counterpart funds, a half billion shillings which they did not know how to spend. They could not spend that money in accordance with the rules and regulations set by us. The money is still there.

Let us take Norway. Norway is a fine country, and the Norwegians are fine people. We let the Norwegians have $411 million, as I remember, in round figures. What did Norway do with it? $309 million of that money was used to pay off their debt. In other words, what we did was to send borrowed United States dollars to Norway so that Norway could retire some of its debt. I say that is foolishness.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Was Norway successful in paying off her whole debt with the money she received from us?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know, but she used either $289 million or $309 million—I do not remember the exact figure—of the money that we sent her to pay off her debt.

Let us take Italy, and consider the progress made there in industrial production. As of 1954, it was 171 percent of prewar; in the Netherlands it was 172 percent; in Norway, 180 percent; Turkey, 232 percent; the United Kingdom, 147 percent.

Now let us examine the progress made in agricultural production. The same method has been used in arriving at these figures. That is, we assume that for 1938 the index of agricultural production was 100 percent. As of 1954, agricultural production in Belgium had increased 14 percent; in Denmark, it had increased 22 percent; in France, 18 percent; in Greece, 26 percent.

Mr. President, all those countries are relatively small in area, and almost every acre of their land has been under intensive cultivation even prior to World War II. Notwithstanding that intensive cultivation, through our assistance and through advice from our agricultural experts, they have been able to increase their production of food and fiber percentagewise to the extent that I have indicated.

Let us examine the situation in Turkey. That is a fine country. The Turks are fine people. They are great soldiers, and they are hard workers. As I indicated a while ago, the industrial production of Turkey as of 1954 was 232 percent of prewar, and, Mr. President, her agricultural production as of 1954 was 164 percent of prewar. Yet in spite of that increase in industrial production and in agricultural production, Turkey will be given quite a large sum from the defense support funds authorized in the pending bill—$50 million. And in addition, Turkey will be given $20 million of direct forces support.

I am not asking that the entire $50 million of defense support funds allotted to Turkey be eliminated. However, I say we should give Turkey only half of what is suggested in the pending bill, in the hope that our friends in Europe will put up the other half. That is the theory on which my amendment is grounded.

I am convinced that it is sheer folly for us to inaugurate a program of this magnitude on a permanent basis, as is being suggested by our leaders on the Washington level, both in the Senate and at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. President, I could cite more figures of production increases, but I do not want to delay a vote on the pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the table from which I have been reading.

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

Country	Per capita Defense expenditures	Defense expenditures as percent of total budget	National debt	Industrial production [1]	Agricultural production [1]
Belgium	$47	23.5	$5 billion	144	114
Denmark	30	20.0	$1.2 billion	165	122
France	86	34.4	$14.6 billion	148	118
Greece	15	35.9	Not available	167	126
Italy	18	20.9	$6.2 billion	171	124
Netherlands	38	22.3	$5.8 billion	172	119
Norway	47	28.0	$1.6 billion	180	115
Portugal	8	32.4	$462 million	(2)	134
Turkey	16	43.4	Not available	232	164
United Kingdom	95	36.3	$73.5 billion	147	129
Germany	40	21.2	$9.6 billion	142	118
Spain	12	36.5	$1.8 billion	136	106
United States	287	68.3	$276 billion		

[1] Prewar = 100.
[2] Not available.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I have sought to point out, Mr. President, is that by the expenditure of these vast sums we were able to increase the productive capacity of our friends across the seas to a point far beyond our expectations at the time the program was initiated. All of us expected—I know I did—that once these countries reached their goal, then if we ever needed them in order to help us carry the burden of maintaining our freedom and as well as their own, they would join hands with us and assist us.

Mr. President, in addition to the money we spent on our European allies by way of grants and loans under ECA and other programs, the NATO agreement was entered into.

Surely when that agreement was entered into, and in the light of the healthy conditions, economically and agriculturally, in which our friends found themselves at that time, I thought, and I am sure many other Senators also thought, that those countries would conscientiously try to carry out their part of the agreement. However, what happened with respect to the cost of the NATO undertaking? Not only did we have to take care of our own defense obligations here at home until it hurt, and not only did we take care of Korea and Formosa and southeast Asia, almost single handedly, but we also had to provide from 20 to 30 percent of the money necessary for the countries of Western Europe to carry out their part of the NATO agreement.

That, Mr. President, is going beyond all reason, and in view of what has happened in the past, I am very hopeful that Congress will see the light and try to shift some of the foreign-aid burden to the friends we have assisted. There is no reason why they should not assume a part of that burden.

Let us consider southeast Asia. Who is in danger there? Is not Australia in danger? Australia is a country as big as our own, even though it does not have the population we have. Surely Australia ought to be able to contribute something toward helping in this undertaking. New Zealand ought to be able to do likewise. Surely the British, with so many interests in that area—in Malaya, Hong Kong, and in other places—ought to be willing and able to assist us in carrying the load.

However, whenever we knock on the door there is no one at home. Seemingly we are the only nation that is destined to carry the whole load. If we continue doing it ourselves, and if we listen to the planners on the Washington level and to

our representatives who administer the program throughout the world, we will continue to carry it alone from now on.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator recommend that we confine the aid recommended in this bill entirely to Asia, Latin America, and possibly the Near East and the Middle East?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what we are doing.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are other areas.

Mr. ELLENDER. There may be military aid going to other areas. I am not prepared to discuss that phase of it, for the simple reason that there is nothing in the record to show where the direct military aid is to be used, or how it is to be used.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator means the military assistance under section 2, amounting to $1,275,000,000, quite a bit of that goes to Europe.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, I believe. I hope to be able to deal with that when the proponents come before the Appropriations Committee for the money to carry out the program. It will be noticed also that the development assistance funds for the Near East and Africa are unallocated. I understand that the reason why these funds are not allocated is because in the Near East there seems to be a little tug of war going on between Israel and the Arabs, as to who shall get how much. Whether that is true or not I do not know. I was informed that it might not be a good idea to let the Arabs know how much Israel is getting, or to let Israel know how much is being given to the Arabs.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought the Senator made a good factual case with regard to production and prosperity in Europe, and that the nations in that area might well give up American aid, including military as well as economic aid, and that it might go to Asiatic countries, or to Latin America or other countries which need help. Would not that be the proper procedure?

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator, but I would go further than that and have them not only carry their own load militarily, but help us to carry the load for military and economic aid in the Near East, in Africa, and in Asia.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, words, what the Senator is recommending is that we may as well eliminate aid to those who may no longer need it, and they might help us in carrying the load in Asia, the Middle East, and the Near East.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the essence of my argument and it is the theory on which is based all the amendments I am offering.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the Senator has made an excellent factual case for his position.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I could go on and deal further with this general problem and give more facts, but I should like now to address myself for a few minutes to the impact which all these vast expenditures abroad have had on our own economy.

As I pointed out, our debt today is approximately $277 billion. I am wondering if Senators realize the size of it. When we say $277 billion no one knows what it means. The figures are so huge, so astronomical, that we cannot conceive of the size of our national debt.

Some time ago I did a little figuring on this subject. Suppose that tonight, at midnight, the 96 Senators who adorn this body were to start counting our debt. Suppose each Senator worked 24 hours a day—that is about what we are working at this time—without stopping for anything, and assume that each Senator counted at the rate of two 1-dollar bills a second, or 120 1-dollar bills a minute. How long do Senators think it would require them to count our national debt?

I do not expect an answer, because I am sure that Senators have not figured it out on this basis. But if all 96 Senators were to start counting our debt tonight at midnight, and assuming that each Senator would count at the rate of 120 1-dollar bills per minute, and worked 24 hours a day, it would take 47 years to count the debt.

I made another calculation, Mr. President. Suppose we were to take these dollar bills, attach them together, and make a ribbon of them. How many times would that ribbon of dollar bills go around the world? I do not expect Senators to answer that question now, either——

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator from Louisiana consumed an hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately an hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder how much time the acting minority leader would like to yield at this time?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Louisiana whether he wishes to have his amendments considered en bloc.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, Mr. President. What I propose to do——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary statement. I understand the minority leader controls the time in opposition to the bill, and I understand that the Senator from Louisiana is opposed to the bill. The acting minority leader has agreed with me that he would yield up to 30 minutes, so I should like to have 25 minutes of that time yielded to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have five amendments to the pending bill and I have a sixth one which I may offer. That would give me a total of 6 hours time. But I do not intend to consume that much time. I wish to conclude my general statement on all my amendments, and then reserve about 5 minutes for each amendment to explain each of them before the vote is taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, after the Senator has consumed his 30 minutes, there will be, as he calls up each amendment, an hour to each one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire again of the Senator from Louisiana, with reference to his pending amendment which is divided into three portions, whether he wishes it considered en bloc.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, Mr. President. I misunderstood the Chair's inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated a while ago, suppose we take the $1 bills represented by our $277 billion national debt and make a ribbon of them. How many times would that ribbon circle the globe? I do not expect Senators to answer that question, because they have not figured it, but it would go around the world a thousand times; it would reach a hundred times the distance from the earth to the moon.

Mr. President, we are today voting on legislation that will add more and more to our already astronomical national debt. Yet we expect also to keep solvent and to maintain our way of life. I fear that it will be impossible for us to do so.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Putting it another way, the latest figure I saw was that in terms of purchasing power our debt is more than $100 billion greater than that of all the other countries of the world combined.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know the exact figure, but I know that our entire debt is much more than the combined debts of all the other nations of the world

Mr. President, what is the effect that all this activity is having on our own economy? We have been living for many years in a state of emergency. We have been neglecting the conservation of our own soil. We have been neglecting to build dams where they should have been built years ago, so as to protect and conserve our soil. We have been neglecting the maintenance of our harbors, and of our waterways, and of other public works projects.

We seem to have forgotten that the land in this country which is suitable for cultivation—arable land—is limited. The experts tell us that today 462 million acres are arable. It is from those acres that we are able to give to the people of our time the standard of living which they are now enjoying.

It has been stated that in addition to the 462 million acres, another 45 million might be recovered—15 million acres released from the feeding of horses and mules, and another 30 million acres from reclamation.

So the entire amount of arable land we can ever hope to have in this country is only 507 million acres.

If our population is to continue to increase at the present rate, which is now

some 2,700,000 persons a year, it is estimated that by 1975, only 20 years from now, the population will be 221 million. If the people of that generation—that is, of 1975—are to have the same standard of living as we enjoy today—or, let us say, as we enjoyed in 1950—165 million more acres than we now have will be required. But the amount of our arable land is decreasing year by year while the population is increasing.

Right now, as I have just indicated, it is estimated that we are losing, through flows into the gulf and the oceans, precious topsoil in the amount of about 500,000 acres annually. It goes without saying that with an increasing population and a decreasing amount of land it will not be many years before the United States will be a have-not nation. There will be a shortage in the production of food and fiber to meet the needs of our population.

Mr. President, what has caused my heart to ache the most has been to go abroad and to see our funds being used to carry on projects in foreign lands, under giveaway programs similar to the one now before us, while we are denied funds to carry on these same kinds of projects here at home.

While we undertake ambitious flood-control, irrigation, and hydroelectric-power programs in other lands, we have a backlog of authorized flood-control projects here at home totaling $5.2 billion. Our backlog of authorized public-building projects totals $2.3 billion. According to the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, in the next 10 years there will be a gap of $54 billion between highways needs and highway facilities. In public-school construction alone we are faced with an $11 billion backlog.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read from the short memorandum which I have prepared to show what we plan on doing in various countries under the pending bill to carry on public-works projects similar to those which are being denied to our own people here at home. I shall ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

EXHIBIT IX

Spain: Financing improvement in railway lines ($6.9 million), improving Cadiz port facilities ($0.7 million), civilian airfields ($0.6 million).

Irrigation and reclamation of barren lands ($5 million), machinery for construction of irrigation dams and main canals (0.8 million), and expansion of fertilizer industry ($1 million).

Electric transmission lines, etc. ($6 million).

Yugoslavia: $35.5 million in defense support. About one-half will be used for purchase of United States surplus commodities, the counterpart funds thus generated to be used for internal improvement. (No breakdown as to these.) The remaining one-half will be used as follows: Transportation, including the purchase of United States earth-moving and highway equipment, $4 million; port and terminal facilities, $1 million; $2 million to supply spare parts, repairs, and critical equipment to industrial sectors "neglected thus far as a consequence of the foreign exchange shortage." Remaining defense support funds to be used for "critical defense sectors"—$4 million in direct force support—for aviation fuel and other items, $1 million in technical aid.

Egypt: United States and Egypt signed in November 1954 a development assistance agreement involving $40 million in United States funds, $7.5 million in form of loan. The funds would be used as follows: Highway improvement, $10,089,000; potable water supply, $7.5 million; improvement of waterways, $4.3 million; equipment for machine workshops, $1.4 million; railroad improvement, $16.2 million. There is in 1956 fiscal year justification book no indication of how much of these amounts the United States will attempt to defray next year; the development assistance involved is contained in a regional total (Near East and Africa) which is not broken down. However, it is indicated that fiscal year 1956 work will include construction on the Cairo-Aswan Highway, port improvement, grain silo construction, irrigation pumping stations, and powerplants. The high Aswan Dam, a reclamation and power project, is not included in the budget justification, but the statement is made that "it is considered by the Egyptian Government to be the most important project for the long-range development of their country." The United States has aided in the dam's planning.

The statement is also made that the United States has contributed $60 million to the Egyptian technical assistance and economic development program to date. Fiscal year 1956 will find the United States contributing $4 million for technical aid to Egypt plus a "substantially larger sum for special economic aid." It is expected that about half of the special economic funds will be in the form of commodity imports to generate local currency, including a significant amount of wheat.

Ethiopia: No development assistance schedule per se, but $1.4 million out of a proposed $3.4 million in technical assistance will be in supplies and equipment.

Greece: Defense support. $15 million, to be used to purchase wheat for the civilian economy. Local currency proceeds to be used for budgetary support. Technical assistance is contemplated in the amount of $1.5 million, $400,000 of which will be for supplies and equipment.

Iran: Defense support funds (primary local currency proceeds generated by sale of agricultural commodities) will be made available in the amount of $37.5 million. This will include $17.5 million for defense construction projects, $3.5 million for technical cooperation requirements (evidently supplies and equipment which the host government would normally supply) and $16.5 million for budgetary support.

In addition, $10 million would be made available for technical aid, $1.2 million of which involves the purchase of supplies and equipment.

Iraq: A total of $2.3 million in technical assistance would be made available, $138,000 of which involves the purchase of supplies and equipment.

Israel: No breakdown; contained in regional total, but both development assistance and technical aid will involve public-works projects of some nature.

Jordan: No development assistance breakdown, but it is indicated that the largest portion of these funds (contained in regional breakdown) will be used for highway and water development. The $2.8 million technical-aid program includes $399,000 in supplies and equipment. It should be noted that the statement is made that United States development assistance in the past has made possible the reclaiming of 5,000 acres of desert land, construction of new irrigation systems, and the building of some 83 kilometers of useful highways. An additional 69 kilometers are under construction. "Basic engineering fundamental to the proposed irrigation of the Jordan Valley is virtually complete."

Liberia: A $1.8 million technical-assistance program is contemplated for fiscal year 1956; $223,000 would be in the form of supplies and equipment.

Libya: Development assistance for fiscal year 1956 included in regional total—no breakdown available. However, during fiscal year 1955, 27,000 tons of grain were granted to Libya under title II of Public Law 480; the grain is being distributed free or in partial payment for work on public works undertaken by the Libyan Government.

Technical assistance for fiscal year 1956 totals $5 million; $3.7 million is in the form of supplies and equipment.

Saudi Arabia: No program for fiscal year 1956; in December of 1954, however, FOA authorized funds to the United States Geological Survey in the amount of $170,000 to complete work on a project previously underway in Saudi Arabia to compile geographic and geologic maps; prepare final reports on water and mineral resources of Saudi Arabia, to analyze chemical and mineralogical material collected in the field.

Syria: No aid requested thus far, but funds have been made available under the regional development assistance total (referred to previously above) in case Syria desires to participate in unified planning for full utilization of the water of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers.

Turkey: For fiscal year 1956, $50 million in defense support is proposed; this amount will be used to generate counterpart. The counterpart will be used for budgetary support, and for trucking, highway, and agricultural equipment and spare parts and for machinery needed in the development of smaller industrial plants. Some dollar funds will be placed in the Turkish Industrial Development Bank to provide dollar exchange for private producers in the industry and mining fields who desire imports from the United States.

Technical assistance totaling $2.5 million is proposed for fiscal year 1956; $580,000 would be used for equipment and supplies.

Direct forces support totaling $20 million is also proposed, to be used for petroleum, machinery, raw and semifinished products for direct consumption by the Armed Forces.

Overseas territories (Near East and Africa): Only $4 million in technical assistance scheduled for fiscal year 1956; however, justification points out that a series of projects have been completed in the Belgian Congo and recommendations have been made to Congo authorities as to setting up new divisions for vocational education, agricultural extension and agricultural economics. These have been accepted.

During fiscal year 1954 $10.3 million in surplus commodities were imported into the European metropolitan countries, with the counterpart used in the overseas territories. This amount included $5 million in France, $5 million in the United Kingdom, and $0.3 million in Italy. Eight million dollars of the total was programed for development assistance and the remainder for technical aid. These funds, it should be noted, did not become available until fiscal year 1955 and "are being use to implement fiscal year 1954 programs developed for this area." The fiscal year 1956 program will continue the expenditure of these funds.

Afghanistan: Two million dollars in technical assistance is to be made available during fiscal year 1956; $208,000 of this is for supplies and equipment. A large portion of this will be used for continued planning on the Helmand Valley development program, including health and sanitation, coal resources development, education, and community development. Assistance will also be rendered in the fields of public administration and to spur the development of small business.

India: Development assistance for fiscal year 1956 totals $70 million. Ten million dollars will be used for agriculture and natural resources, including $4 million for fertilizer, $4 million for deep irrigation wells and $2 million for valley development to assist in expanding irrigation. Five million dollars is earmarked for construction of electric power facilities with $15 million scheduled for the purchase of steel. Six million dollars will be used to better transportation facilities, primarily the rehabilitation of Indian railways. Four million dollars is earmarked for malaria control.

Of the remainder (roughly $30 million), the funds will be used to purchase agricultural commodities to be sold in India. Sales proceeds (counterpart) will be used for "agreed economic purposes such as local costs of irrigation, flood control, power, etc." (Emphasis supplied.)

Technical assistance in the amount of $15 million is also scheduled for fiscal year 1956; $4 million will be in supplies and equipment.

Nepal: One million dollars is proposed for technical aid, plus $1 million in development assistance. These latter funds will be earmarked for "development of the Rapti Valley," with the breakdown as follows: $300,000 for irrigation, land reclamation, etc.; $500,000 for transportation and communication equipment; and $200,000 for development of hydroelectric power.

Pakistan: Defense support, $63 million. This will be used primarily for improvement of transportation facilities and expansion of mining operations. It should be noted that past defense-support aid has helped rehabilitate railroads, construct irrigation dams and reclaim land, flood control. Surplus food has also been sold under Public Law 480, with the proceeds used for defense support.

The defense-support item also bears the notation that a "new long-term development plan drawn up by the Ford Foundation" will provide a comprehensive framework for future industrial and investment projects.

Technical cooperation in the amount of $9 million is scheduled; $3 million will be for supplies and equipment.

THE PRESIDENT'S $200-MILLION ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

The justification for this item lists illustrative projects. These include:

Development of the Mekong River project in Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia. This is primarily a flood-control, power-development, and irrigation plan. It would also involve navigation improvement.

Development of fisheries, including capital investment in refrigeration and other facilities, "on a country-to-country basis."

Natural-gas development, including resources in Pakistan. This would include construction of fertilizer plants in west Bengal and expansion of an existing plant at Hyderbad.

Minerals development, including exploration in the Philippines, Afghanistan, and other areas. Also contemplated is expansion of roads, short-line railroads, and harbor facilities.

Transport and communication projects, including the betterment of inland water navigation and perhaps the purchase of modern tugs, barges, and other inland water craft.

Financing of local industrial projects.

Construction of regional training centers as to agricultural techniques, management training, etc. Also contemplated is a testing laboratory for agricultural implements, operated on a regional basis.

Bolivia: The fiscal year 1956 plan totals $16 million; it will be used to implement a 1953 program which includes the purchase of roadbuilding machinery, fertilizer, transportation improvement (including highways), and similar projects.

Guatemala: Five million dollars in development assistance is proposed for fiscal year 1956. This will be used for public-works projects, including highways and roads, completion of the Roosevelt Hospital, etc.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was in Damascus, Syria, last September. I was told that every effort was being made by our technicians to have Syria take part in our program. Syria has declined; she does not want to take part. Notwithstanding the fact that Syria has refused our offer, money is provided in the bill before us today in the event that Syria can be persuaded to join in the program. I read from page 20 of the committee report:

> Although the United States has no agreements for either development assistance or technical cooperation in Syria, the bill includes funds for economic aid should Syria desire it in connection with unified planning of the project for utilizing the waters of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers. Maximum use of this water for irrigation might prevent full development of its hydroelectric-power potential in which case Syria might need external credit for thermal power development.

In Saudi Arabia, our representatives, those ambitious men who are anxious to spend the borrowed funds of this Government, tried to induce King Saud to agree to a program for technical assistance in Saudi Arabia. They thought he would probably sign a contract.

Even while the signing of a contract was being discussed, our Government was sending trucks, bulldozers, and machinery of the value of several hundred thousand dollars into Saudi Arabia, in the hope that King Saud could be induced to sign a contract. But he refused. As a result all the machinery had to be moved out of Saudi Arabia and sent somewhere else, at considerable cost to our Government. As I recall, most of it eventually found its way into Jordan.

I cite this, Mr. President, not to show the waste in our foreign-aid program—for this is just a tidbit compared to what we have wasted elsewhere—but to show how overzealous our representatives are in trying to get rid of the American taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I am not offering these amendments because I am opposed in principle to our extending the good hand of friendship to our allies across the seas, or to any nation which is seeking to aid the free world in its battle against communism. I have only sought to call to the attention of the Senate the road which we seem to be traveling. We have been generous in our aid in the past; we extended that aid in good faith, in the sincere belief that mutual strength requires mutual sacrifice. We have sacrificed a great deal—in money, in fiscal stability, and even in American blood. Now we are being asked to do more—and not on a short-term or emergency basis, but as a long-range proposition.

Even more important, we are being forced to neglect vitally important functions here at home, functions which have a direct and important bearing on our future national welfare. Meanwhile, we have seen our partners in peace grow from economic poverty to economic health. Yet they have not sought to join forces with us in our effort to raise living standards in underdeveloped countries and in building a sound foundation upon which a determined effort to repel Communist aggression can be built.

I feel, Mr. President, that it is neither just nor fair for us to embark upon public works projects in foreign lands, while we refuse to perform similar functions here at home. I believe it is foolhardy for us to continue to supply arms and weapons of war as well as American dollars to nations which refuse to spend a proportionate part of their budget for their own defense. I think it is a violation of our duty as trustees of the welfare of the American people to continue to impose back-breaking taxes upon our citizens, in order to perform domestic governmental functions for nations which are fully able to do more for themselves. Just a few months ago, in France, riots took place because tax collectors sought to collect the taxes which the Government of France imposed. The tables of foreign tax rates which are made available to the Congress seem to mean nothing, for the taxes levied are not collected—at least in France. Yet our taxpayers must groan and pay so that we can help France meet her NATO obligations, so that we can do the things that an enlightened France should be doing for herself in Indochina, and in Africa.

I frankly am concerned, Mr. President. I am worried and in fear that the seeds we are sowing today will produce fearsome results tomorrow. I wish to urge the Congress with all the strength I have to give sober thought to the situation we now face. We are losing our soil due to floods and erosion; we are failing to keep our navigable waterways up to par. We are dragging our feet on our highways, despite the fine bill which passed the Senate only a few weeks ago. Our schools, our hospitals, all are in urgent need of more funds. Whether these funds come from Federal or State coffers makes no difference; they all represent tax dollars, and we have been unable to provide the funds these functions require because so much of our tax money flows into foreign lands.

I think that it is time we got some help from our European allies, from the United Nations—and when I say help, I mean real help—not token contributions and half-hearted assistance. Our Nation has generally opened its coffers—extended its help—and yet we have met with no attempt on our allies to help us carry this burden.

They must be made to realize further aid will not be forthcoming unless we draw a firm line and say "here, we must stop." We must tell our friends and neighbors that we have done all we can, and that it is time for them to pitch in and help us get the job done.

Every now and then we read in the press reports that foreign dignitaries have stated that the United States has to continue foreign aid programs in order to maintain its prosperity. This is not true—these programs are not the basis of our present good times. Yet, if these foreigners believe that foreign spending is a road to prosperity, why do they not try it for a while. Perhaps, by taking a dose of this so-called magic

medicine, they might be able to cash in on this prosperity and do themselves and this country a good turn at the same time.

We are at a crossroads, Mr. President. We face a tremendous challenge. This program, the bill the Senate has before it today, bears all the earmarks of making permanent a program which I am sure most of us originally believed was but an emergency measure. If this is what the Senate wants, then this is what the Senate has. However, as a United States Senator, I cannot in good conscience go back to Louisiana and tell my people that we cannot complete flood-control structures because we must build levees and dams in foreign lands. I cannot tell my State's farmers that we cannot better help them conserve their soil because we must conserve soil in foreign lands. I cannot go back home and face my constituents and tell them that they can expect no real tax relief because we must use their tax dollars in order to perform domestic functions for foreign lands which either do not collect the taxes they have levied, or do not levy enough to pay their own way.

Mr. President, referring now to my amendment which is now before the Senate, I wish to point out again that it will reduce by one-half the amount which the committee bill seeks to provide in defense-support authorizations. At present it is $70 million for Europe; my amendment would reduce the amount to $35 million. For the Near East and Africa, my amendment would reduce the $102,500,000 in the bill to $51,250,000; and for Asia, the defense-support program would be reduced from $827,800,000 to $413,900,000.

If my amendment should be agreed to, it will mean that the authorization in the bill for this one phase of the program, defense support, will have been reduced in the amount of $500,150,000.

I am very hopeful that the amendment will be agreed to, because at the present time we are carrying on in an indirect way economic aid in Asia, the Near East, and parts of Europe, and the committee bill seeks to expand that economic-aid program and put it on a permanent basis.

In voting on this reduction, I ask my colleagues to take into consideration that as of June 30, 1955, according to official estimates, there will be $8.728 billion of unexpended funds remaining in mutual-security program appropriations. If we give them, as recommended by the committee bill, another $3.408 billion, this will mean that a total of $12.216 billion in foreign aid funds will be available to our planners for use in fiscal year 1956. I can well imagine the waste that will follow when this huge pie is dissipated all over the world. Why, Mr. President, as of March 1, 1955, there was unobligated a total of $4.1 billion in foreign aid funds, but we are told that as of June 30, 1955, there will remain only $100 million in unobligated balances. Just think, in 4 months they will obligate $4 billion of our money—$1 billion per month. What a picnic our exponents of a global PWA program must be having.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall conclude my remarks at this time. I again urge the Senate to adopt the amendment which I have offered and which will mean a saving of over one-half billion dollars to our taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it will be agreeable to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], I should like to yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana has not yet been acted on, and I understand the Senator from Nevada has an amendment he wishes to propose.

Mr. MALONE. I shall offer an amendment, and I expect to use a minimum amount of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it agreeable to the Senator from Nevada to permit me to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MALONE. It is agreeable to me.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am supporting the mutual security program. I always supported it in the House when I was a Member there, and I shall do so here, but I should like to offer some opinions about the problems we face in the Near East, and what we are doing to meet those problems.

I have been a strong believer in our program of economic assistance to Israel and the Arab States. Several years ago, when the late Senator Taft introduced legislation in the Senate to provide financial assistance to Israel, I was one of the first Members of the House to announce my support of that proposal. I am glad that that program was approved, for that is one example of how our foreign assistance is helping a people to meet the most critical financial difficulties and to build a sound economy. I am glad that we are continuing economic aid to Israel in the current program now before us.

Mr. President, I have always been deeply troubled by the continuing Arab-Israel conflict and I have felt that we should move most carefully in that area of the world lest we unwittingly contribute to a deterioration of the situation. That is why I have been opposed to the sending of arms into the Middle East prior to an Arab-Israel peace. Here again I have found myself in agreement with the late Senator Taft. In 1953, a month before he died, Senator Taft, who was a close student of Near Eastern problems, declared:

> It is not our desire to stimulate an arms race. Money so spent could be far better used in resettling refugees, building schools, and developing land resources.

Senator Taft felt that arms should not be sent into the area, to either the Arab States or Israel, until peace within the region was achieved, and he said:

> It is my belief that with skill and determination, peace may be established and an effective anti-Communist front developed through progressive economic cooperation.

Unfortunately, Senator Taft's views did not prevail and, at this moment, we are sending military assistance to Iraq. I believe that this is a mistake, from the standpoint of peace in the Near East and from the standpoint of America's own best interest. I am afraid that this program endangers Israel. It may lead to a costly arms race. It may make it far more difficult to secure peace there. It may play into the hands of the Kremlin.

Mr. President, I have a long and continuing interest in this problem, for I was one of the earliest Members of Congress to take a position in favor of the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Late in 1942 we first learned of the extent and horror of the Nazi program to liquidate the Jews of Europe. I remember vividly that about that time the Jewish people of the city of Cleveland gathered together in the Cleveland public auditorium to try to arouse the conscience of the world against Hitlerism. The Jews of Europe—literally millions of them—were being wiped out by Nazi barbarism. The Nazi virus was spreading everywhere. It was sweeping Europe and beyond. It was infecting the Arabs in the Middle East and, on June 1, and 2, 1941, these was a cruel pogrom in Iraq, where hundreds of Jews were killed and many were wounded. The British, yielding to Arab pressure, were stopping Jewish immigration to Palestine, and the one road to escape from the Nazi death factories was being closed off. Iraq would not even grant transit visas to Jewish women and children, refugees from Poland, who were seeking to make their way as legal immigrants to Palestine. There were many Christians as well as Jews at that meeting in the Cleveland auditorium. I was there and I joined in the protest, and I warned against British policy in the Middle East and the disastrous consequences it might have for the Jewish people.

Mr. President, I am sorry to say that our Department of State was cooperating with the British in blundering appeasement back in those days. I earnestly pray that we shall not repeat the mistakes we made at that time.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not wish in any way to reflect on the motives of our Secretary of State, and the able officials who surround him. I believe Mr. Dulles is conscientiously and sincerely working for peace throughout the world and the building of free world defense. I believe that he is deeply interested in the peace of the Near East. I know that he regards himself as a friend of Israel, that he wants to see Israel survive and progress, and that he would like nothing better than to bring about an Arab-Israel peace. I take the floor today, not to impugn the intentions or to attack the policies pursued by our distinguished Secretary. My intention is to offer constructive suggestions for the modification and revision of our policy in order to attain our goals.

I believe that the basic criticism of Western policy in the Near East, a policy of both the British and our own Government, is that we seem to take the Arabs' war against Israel for granted, and that we are too prone to accept that war as a normal and natural feature of the Middle East landscape. I do not believe

that we have done enough to make it clear to the Arabs that we most strongly disapprove of that war and that we want it brought to an end as soon as possible.

In any consideration of the problems of the Near East, we ought to keep certain fundamental facts in mind.

It was the Arab States which rejected the U. N. partition resolution of 1947, and which went to war against that resolution in an attempt to stop Israel from coming into being. They failed in that invasion attempt and they have never, to this day, given up their hope of defeating Israel. So they keep up the most intense kind of boycott and blockade of Israel. They maintain a continuing propaganda war against Israel, and they now try to rewrite history by pretending that it was Israel that flouted the U. N. resolution and that they, the Arabs, are its valiant defenders. But they make no secret of their unorthodox position. They are at war with Israel. They are officially at war with Israel. They seek to justify the Suez blockade of Israel on these grounds.

In a speech delivered here in Washington on January 29, 1955, the Egyptian Ambassador repeatedly affirmed that "a status of war" is maintained. This is a most peculiar arrangement, for the Arabs apparently feel perfectly free to maintain a status of war with Israel, but should Israel respond to their belligerency, they cry out in indignant protest. Apparently, this is a limited liability war, wherein one side only is permitted to do the fighting, while the other side is obligingly expected to do the losing. These unprecedented circumstances furnish the background for recent events in the Negev, the southern part of Israel.

The Egyptians are now occupying this narrow Gaza strip on the western coast of Palestine. Originally, this area was to have been part of the Arab State under the U. N. 1947 partition resolution. But that Arab State never came into being because the other Arab States were opposed to the creation of both the proposed Arab State and the proposed Jewish State. They wanted to divide Palestine among themselves. So Egyptian armies marched into Palestine in violation of the U. N. resolution and in defiance of a solemn decision of the U. N. Security Council. They seized the Gaza strip. They tried to take the whole Negev. They tried to take Tel-Aviv, and they got to the hills just south of Jerusalem. They would have seized much more territory, but the Israelis stopped them and turned them back. Today their armies still occupy this little strip of territory known as Gaza, an area in which they have no legal title of any kind.

The Egyptians would still like to have all the southern part of Israel if they could. Their leaders make no secret of it. They admit it. They announce it. They have publicly declared, in fact, that we ought to make Israel give up part of the Negev, an area which was given to Israel under the 1947 U. N. partition resolution. They would like to have this territory turned over to Egypt as payment to her in order to induce her to join in our Middle East defense plans. What a low opinion the Egyptians must have of our diplomacy if they think that they might pressure us to force Israel to cede territory to Egypt as a bribe to win her over to the West. In the meantime, however, the Egyptians would like to prevent the Israelis from settling in the Negev and consolidating their position there. So, from day to day, there is infiltration of the area, and raids and counterraids, and some installation or water main is blown up and some settler or guard is killed. The strategy is clear. It is to try to terrorize Israeli settlers and to force them to stop their colonization and their development inside their own territory, which Egypt would like to have for herself.

This situation will not be ended merely by trying to fix the blame for each raid and each reprisal. Wars are not brought to an end by neutral scorekeepers. This situation will be ended only when the Arab States are ready to abandon their status of war with Israel and accept her repeated offers to negotiate a settlement of outstanding differences.

I do not believe the Western Powers can compel the Egyptians to change their position, but I do insist that it is wrong, it is unmoral, it is indefensible, for the Western powers to shut their eyes to Arab belligerency and to give the Arabs the impression that we condone their anti-Israel strategy and policy as normal, natural and understandable behavior.

Mr. President, one of the major weapons in the Egyptian war against Israel is the Suez blockade, and I want to talk about it for a moment because I find a reference to the Suez Canal in the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the foreign aid bill. Ships bound to and from Israel are denied the facilities of the Suez Canal. This means American ships and British ships as well as Israeli ships. This is a highhanded and illegal practice, which the U. N. Security Council condemned as far back as September 1, 1951, when that body adopted a formal resolution ordering Egypt to stop the blockade. For Israel, this is a serious economic problem.

One of the first blows struck by the Arabs in their economic blockade against Israel was Iraq's refusal to let oil flow to the great refinery at Haifa. As a result, operation of that installation, the second largest in the Middle East, was virtually suspended and its output lost to the Western world. In recent years it has been operated at a fraction of its capacity, using crude oil imported from distant places. Egypt has played her part in this squeeze for she does not allow Israel to bring oil through the Suez even though American tankers may be involved. Accordingly, Israel must pay much higher costs for transporting its imported crude oil. It has been estimated that the Suez blockade costs Israel an additional $11 or $12 million a year. This has some significance to us here in the Senate because our country has been properly and commendably assisting Israel with economic aid, and we have been compelled to put out more money than we otherwise would have if the Egyptians had not pressed this blockade policy.

For many months, Egypt and the United Kingdom were in a bitter dispute over control of the Suez base. We helped settle that dispute. We acted as a friend of both states and played an important part in bringing about an Anglo-Egyptian agreement.

Mr. President, that was the time to insist that Egypt end the Suez blockade of Israel. If we were prepared to help Egypt and the British in their negotiations, we should have been ready to insist that Egypt meet her obligations to the international community, and agree to abide by the U. N. Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951.

There are others in this Chamber who recognized the importance of this issue. Last August, a group of distinguished Congressmen, including the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senators from New York [Mr. IVES and Mr. LEHMAN] and Representatives BRAY and JAVITS, went to the Secretary of State to talk about this particular problem. After their conference, Senator SALTONSTALL declared:

> By blockading shipping through the Suez Canal bound to and from Israel, Egypt is violating a binding decision of the United Nations Security Council in 1951 which ordered Egypt to reopen the Canal to friendly navigation. I expressed to Secretary Dulles the position that the United States should utilize the influence it has obtained through its cosponsorship of the Anglo-Egyptian Suez agreement to bring about a commitment by Egypt to end the blockade. This is a matter of central importance to United States prestige in the Middle East and the general security situation in that area.

Speaking for the delegation, the Senator from Massachusetts also raised the question whether military aid should have been promised to the Arab countries as long as they refused to negotiate peace treaties with Israel, maintained a state of belligerency, and employed such openly hostile practices as an economic boycott and blockade. Such military aid having been promised, he pointed out, the United States should at least take specific, concrete action to guarantee that the security of Israel shall not be weakened by these military agreements between the United States and Arab nations, and that the precarious balance of power in the Middle East shall not be upset.

I feel that this was not merely a responsibility we owed to Israel, a friendly democratic state. This was a responsibility we owed to the U. N. where, as the greatest democratic power in that organization, we have a duty to insist that orders by the Security Council be carried out. I am raising this issue at this point because the transcript of the hearings on this legislation makes it clear that we were holding back our economic aid to Egypt throughout this entire period in order to induce her to take a conciliatory position in the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations. On page 48 of the transcript of the hearings, the administration's spokesman, Mr. Harold Stassen, reveals that our economic-aid program has now been expanded in Egypt because, he says:

> There was a delay in the beginning of the Egyptian program at the time of the intense dispute over the Suez.

And Mr. Stassen continues:

You could not very well improve an economy at a time there was an intense issue over the Suez. When the Suez was settled, then we expanded the Egyptian program.

But, unfortunately, only one aspect of the Suez issue was supplied. The British-Egyptian dispute may have been settled, but apparently the Egyptians did not agree to keep this great international waterway open to international shipping, as they are obligated to do. Or, if they did agree, they soon forgot about it. Just as soon as the British and Egyptians signed, we released money that we were holding back, and during the current year, the administration allocated $40 million for Egypt and there is more in the coming program.

What about the Suez? Will the Egyptians keep up their blockade just as in the past? Last fall the Israelis sent a ship through the canal. The Egyptians seized it. At the U. N. Security Council the Egyptians were told to release it and let it proceed on its way. But that was many months ago. The Egyptians still have that ship. No one says or does anything about it.

Mr. President, I do not want to give the impression that I am opposed to economic aid to Egypt. On the contrary, I believe in our programs of economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, and I feel that we can do much to help Egypt and other Arab States, and to win the friendship of the Arab peoples, and to fight communism in that area by a program of economic aid. But while I favor economic aid to this area, I emphasize that I am strongly opposed to sending arms into the Near East in advance of peace.

Our attitude in this matter appears most paradoxical. We hold up economic aid to Egypt so long as it is in a dispute with the British. But the existence of the critical Arab-Israel conflict does not deter us from offering military aid to the Arab States, and at this moment we are sending military aid to Iraq, which has been so violent in her hostility toward Israel that she has never even signed an armistice with that country.

Mr. President, I am not going to take the time to review Iraq's attitude toward Israel or toward the Jews who once lived in Iraq or toward the Assyrians or the Kurds. The record is well known.

It seems to me that it would be sensible and principled and fair to say to Iraq, "We are ready to give you military assistance and training so that you can be able to defend yourself against the Communist threat, but we insist that you call off your war against Israel."

Civilized countries which belong to the United Nations and adhere to its charter are not entitled to carry on sideline wars.

Mr. President, I am going to vote for the proposed legislation, but I would do so with greater confidence if I were certain that the Western World was making a determined effort to win a peace settlement in the Middle East. The Israelis must be bewildered by our policy. They are a democratic people. They are ready to stand with the West. Here we are, arming their enemies but refusing arms to them. More than that, we are actively promoting a system of alliances in the area and Israel is excluded from membership. I call attention to the recent Turkish-Iraqi Pact. Article 5 provides:

This pact shall be open for accession to any member state of the Arab League, or any other state actively concerned with the security and peace in this region and which is fully recognized by both of the high contracting parties.

This means that anybody can join this new pact except Israel. Israel is recognized by Turkey and has the friendliest relationships with Turkey. But it is not recognized by Iraq. We may not have joined this alliance, but we have been actively promoting it and have been arming both of its principles, the while Israel is barred from membership. Moreover, while we have an arms agreement with Iraq, the British are supplying arms to Jordan, Israel's eastern neighbor. The Egyptians have the means to buy large amounts of military equipment. To the Israelis, the situation is fraught with peril, for Israel is isolated and alone, and if it were attacked tomorrow, no one would be obligated to come to its assistance. This is a most unhealthy situation, and it does not make for a peaceful settlement, because the vulnerability of the Israelis must be a source of tempting encouragement to the Arabs.

Mr. President, since we have embarked on a program of bringing the Arab States into our western defense system, it seems to me that we should be giving very serious consideration to a defense agreement with Israel. Such a defense agreement would let the Arabs know, once and for all, that we will not permit another round of fighting in that area, and that we expect the Middle East to accept Israel as a partner in development and defense. Such an agreement would strengthen the defense system of the free world because it would bring to our side trained and disciplined armed forces which believe in democracy and which are ready to fight for it.

Many people have expressed themselves along these lines. Recently I came across a splendid article by Dr. Daniel Poling, a great Christian clergyman, editor of the Christian Herald, and chaplain of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains—and a good Republican, if I may say so. The article was published in the February issue of the American Legion magazine. I want to include this excellent statement as part of my remarks today. But before I conclude, I should like to quote several striking paragraphs:

It will avail us little if in the rear of our position of strength from Turkey to Pakistan, we simply tolerate the continuation of the present hot-and-cold war on the Arab-Israel frontiers. I believe we should take steps to make it possible for both the Arab States and Israel to play their part in the defense of the Middle East by supplying them with arms and technical military assistance. But it would be criminal folly to do so before the uneasy armistice along these borders has been replaced by a genuine peace. You don't give a gun license to a man who keeps on saying he's going to shoot his neighbor before he has to go at the burglar.

Dr. Poling concludes as follows:

We must never allow Israel to feel that she has been abandoned to her fate. Beyond all else Israel has something priceless to offer the world—faith in resurrection. I do not believe that history is always on the side of the biggest battalions. Otherwise all our principles and values would long since have succumbed to the pressure of the barbarians. In adversity, we do not think of abandoning Chiang Kai-shek, who fought at our side in the most desperate struggle in our history. Similarly with Israel, whose citizens, then the Jews of Palestine, were numbered among our faithful allies.

I do not agree with those doleful souls who pessimistically think that the Arab-Israel quarrel is here to stay till doomsday. The history of the Middle East flatly contradicts that fatalistic assumption. Turk and Arab now live peaceably as neighbors after centuries of Ottoman rule. I see no reason why Jew and Arab cannot do the same after time has healed the rancors and wounds of the recent past.

For the defense of the Middle East we need the cooperation of all its peoples. Next to the Turks, Israel's capacity for self-defense has already been amply demonstrated in time of war, and simple concepts of geography dictate her participation in the overall alliance. We can, I believe, through a system of mutual guarantees, eradicate Arab fears of Israeli aggression. But, first of all, we must persuade all concerned that we do mean business, that we won't play favorites, and that we believe our record in the Middle East is clean and fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time will not be charged to either side on the Ellender amendments.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], desires to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to his amendments.

I now ask for the yeas and nays on that question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how does the time stand now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 54 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this stage I have no requests for time.

If the Senator from Louisiana desires to use some of his time, that will be satisfactory, for I have no further requests for time. Does the Senator from Louisiana care to speak now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Louisiana prepared to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that no other Senator desires to speak on the amendments.

I wish to reiterate that these amendments would cut in half the amount proposed to be authorized for the defense-support program which, as I have demonstrated, is, in my humble judgment, purely economic aid.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in further explanation of the amendments.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

DEFENSE SUPPORT AID

The amendment would cut in half the amount authorized for this program, as follows:

	Amounts authorized in committee bill	Amounts authorized by Ellender amendment
Europe	$70,000,000	$35,000,000
Near East and Africa	102,500,000	51,250,000
Asia	827,800,000	413,900,000
Total	1,000,300,000	500,150,000

"The general purpose of defense support is to enable a country to maintain a higher level of defense activity that would otherwise be possible. This type of aid consists primarily of machinery and commodities (including surplus agricultural commodities). When the goods are sold in the country being aided, the local currency received in the transactions is used for further defense purposes—sometimes for budget support or sometimes for other projects designed to increase the country's capacity to maintain armed forces of the desired size" (p. 17).

"The purpose of defense support is to make it economically possible for countries receiving military assistance to maintain larger military establishments than would otherwise be the case. It differs from economic assistance not so much in form as in purpose" (p. 9).

The $1,000,300,000 authorized in the Senate bill is allocated as follows:

Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, $379,300,000: About two-thirds of this amount will be used to help defray the internal expenses of the armed forces (p. 9).

Korea, $272 million: About two-thirds of this amount will be used to finance imports of industrial raw materials and consumer goods. The local currency accruing from the sale of these items will be used to support the Korean Government's budget. Imports estimated to be financed through Korean defense support or direct forces support funds include raw cotton, $40 million; fertilizer, $61 million; petroleum, $47.2 million; coal, $34.8 million; machinery and vehicles, $52 million; and clothing, $85.2 million (p. 9).

Pakistan, $63 million: Here the defense-support program will be aimed primarily at economic development (p. 9).

Philippines, $19,700,000: As in Pakistan, this program will be aimed primarily at economic development (p. 9).

Formosa, $62 million: The emphasis will be more on maintaining economic stability through financing the import of salable commodities to generate counterpart for armed forces budgetary support (p. 9).

Thailand, $31,800,000: Here, too, the emphasis will be more on maintaining economic stability through financing the import of salable commodities to generate counterpart for armed forces budgetary support (p. 9).

Spain, $28,000,000: The principal emphasis will be upon improvement of transportation facilities, particularly railroads, upon development of thermal-power sources to supplement hydroelectric facilities which are affected by drought, and upon an agricultural program likewise aimed at reducing the effects of drought. Principal components of the Spanish program are:

	Millions
Improvements in railroad lines supplying joint military bases	$6.9
Transmission lines and substation and switch gear for the power industry	6.0
Irrigation and reclamation equipment to make possible resettlement of underemployed agricultural workers	5.0
Imports of United States cotton	5.0

Of the local currency counterpart of $26 million, 60 percent will be used for local currency costs of the United States base-construction program, 10 percent will be used for general United States purposes, and 30 percent for agreed projects in transportation and defense production (p. 17).

Yugoslavia, $36,500,000: One million dollars is planned for technical exchange and $35.5 million for commodity imports, the most important of which would be bread grains (chiefly wheat), $11 million; cotton, $5.5 million; and machinery and vehicles for eliminating transportation and industrial bottlenecks, $7 million (p. 17).

Regional technical exchange program in Western Europe, $5,500,000; This program is aimed at promoting economic expansion through the development of improved management techniques, the encouragement of competitive business practices, and the promotion of improved collective-bargaining practices. The United States-financed program is only a fraction of the activities financed by the Europeans themselves, and a substantial portion of United States expenditures will be for the costs of small staffs to work with the Europeans in planning and arranging for activities which, in themselves, will be totally financed by Europeans (p. 18).

Greece, $15 million: "All for the import of wheat which would be sold in the civilian economy with the local currency proceeds going into the Greek defense budget. Without this aid, it appears doubtful that the Greek armed forces could be maintained at a level commensurate with NATO force goals. The committee feels that this assistance is especially necessary in view of the severe losses suffered by Greece in recent earthquakes" (p. 18).

Iran, $37,500,000: "The defense-support program in Iran will consist of $15.4 million in sugar and wheat and $22.1 million in industrial items. The local currency generated by these imports will be used to meet local costs of defense construction projects ($17.5 million), to provide budgetary support partially offsetting the increased costs of the Iranian Armed Forces ($16.5 million), and to finance a part of the local currency requirements of the technical-cooperation program ($3.5 million). Iran will not begin to receive oil revenues on a full scale until 1957, and in the meantime continued foreign assistance is necessary to help the Government meet its minimum obligations for defense and the civilian economy. Without such foreign assistance, the bright prospects for the future, which have developed in the last 2 years, would be jeopardized and the Communists would have a much better opportunity to recoup their losses in Iran" (p. 18).

Turkey, $50 million: "Will be used primarily for transportation and agricultural equipment and for machinery for development of small industrial plants. The local currency counterpart generated by these imports will be used in the Turkish defense budget to make up the difference between what the Turks themselves are able to spend and what is required to meet the defense levels set by NATO. Although the Turkish economy has made substantial progress since United States aid began in 1947, it has been handicapped by high-defense expenditures. Agricultural production suffered last year because of unfavorable weather conditions. Heavy capital investments, combined with defense spending, have contributed to inflation and to a large foreign exchange deficit" (pp. 18–19).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senator from Louisiana prepared to yield back the remainder of his time, so that the yea-and-nay vote can now be taken?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before that is done, Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield one-half minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to do so; and I yield one-half minute to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, merely for the purpose of stating the committee's position, I wish to say that the question of the amounts authorized was carefully considered by the committee. I think I can say that we went into it most thoroughly. We are opposed to any reduction, and certainly we are opposed to the amendments of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield one-half minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Alabama and the committee in opposition to these amendments. In my opinion they would be detrimental to the defense phases of the program, because the defense support is certainly a key part of the defense program in the collective-security system.

I believe the committee felt—and so recorded itself by an overwhelming vote—that such a reduction as is proposed by the Senator from Louisiana should not be made; and the committee supported the amount contained in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, on the condition that the Senator from Louisiana will yield back the remainder of his time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and I ask that the roll be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc of the Senator from Louisiana on page 4, in lines 6, 8, and 10.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

Also, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—27

Barrett	Ellender	Malone
Bricker	Ervin	McCarthy
Butler	Frear	Mundt
Byrd	Goldwater	Robertson
Chavez	Hruska	Russell
Curtis	Jenner	Thurmond
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Welker
Dworshak	Langer	Williams
Eastland	Long	Young

NAYS—56

Aiken	Beall	Bible
Anderson	Bender	Bush
Barkley	Bennett	Capehart
Carlson	Jackson	Neely
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Cotton	Kefauver	Pastore
Dirksen	Kerr	Payne
Douglas	Kilgore	Potter
Duff	Knowland	Purtell
Flanders	Kuchel	Saltonstall
George	Lehman	Smathers
Green	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Hayden	Mansfield	Smith, N. J.
Hennings	Martin, Iowa	Sparkman
Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.	Stennis
Hill	McNamara	Symington
Holland	Millikin	Thye
Humphrey	Monroney	Wiley
Ives	Morse	

NOT VOTING—13

Allott	Gore	Schoeppel
Bridges	Kennedy	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	McClellan	Watkins
Clements	Murray	
Fulbright	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendments were rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 414) to authorize an examination and survey of the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have occurred from hurricane winds and tides.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 654) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. All available funds already authorized and, in addition, the $3,408,000,000 to be authorized by this bill are hereby transferred to the National Defense Administrator to be expended in the construction and maintenance of long range sonic speed bomber fighters and interceptors, guided missiles and atomic energy driven submarines, including the necessary bases and accessories for their efficient operation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is entitled to speak for 1 hour on his amendment, and I control 1 hour of debate in opposition to the amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am prepared to yield back 30 minutes of my time if that is agreeable to the Senator from Nevada and if he is prepared to yield back 30 minutes of his time.

Mr. MALONE. That is agreeable to me. I yield back 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back 30 minutes. I ask the Senator from Nevada to permit me to yield to several Senators very briefly in order to make some insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to do so, provided the time is not charged to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The time will be charged to me. I first yield to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY AND SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE, DOCTORS OF LAWS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, yesterday one of the distinguished Members of this body, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], was appropriately honored by his alma mater where he was a student of law—Columbia University—with the degree of doctor of laws.

Knowing that this body is most proud of the senior Senator from New Jersey and grateful to Columbia University for the honor it has bestowed on one of its illustrious graduates, I ask that the citation made in the awarding of that degree be inserted in the body of the RECORD, and I invite the attention of every Member to the citation.

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

HOWARD ALEXANDER SMITH

Dr. KROUT. HOWARD ALEXANDER SMITH is presented for the degree of doctor of laws. Columbia shares Senator SMITH with Princeton, for he trod these very steps in the early years of the century as a youthful student of law. Princeton had prepared him in the liberal arts. A lawyer, a man of the people, a master of the science of politics and government, his varied career has found him always busy, ever generous, constructive in works and in philosophy, never dismayed by foreboding events. The Rocky Mountain region was for years his home. To join Herbert Hoover's United States Food Administration he returned to the East. The years that followed were devoted largely to relief of human suffering in Europe. But return to his beloved Princeton was inevitable, and his years as lecturer on international affairs and as an official of his alma mater were fruitful indeed. Today, as for more than a decade, he represents our neighbor State in the United States Senate. He does so with unchallenged integrity, with eloquence and with wisdom born of long experience.

President KIRK. HOWARD ALEXANDER SMITH: That our framework of National Government, so carefully and wisely formulated by our forefathers, should have endured to become ever stronger is due not alone to the sagacity of the founders. That men of complete devotion to our heritage so often are called by the electorate to high councils in government is defense sufficient against the willful individuals who endeavor to do us and our institutions harm. You have been a man of devotion. Yours is a career in the best tradition of our legal profession and American politics. The university which shared in your training delights

today to testify to the success of your service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to associate myself with the statement of the Senator from Maine on our beloved friend, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I believe Columbia University, in honoring him, honors itself. I am glad he is back with us today, and I hope that as a result of his presence the passage of the pending bill may be expedited.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to express to my distinguished colleagues my deep appreciation for their kind words. I could not quite hear whether the citation referred to by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] also included the citation made in awarding the same degree to her. The Senator from Maine enjoys the highest esteem and affection of all her colleagues. I am proud to have shared with her the honors at Columbia University yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that her citation may be printed in the RECORD also.

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

MARGARET CHASE SMITH

Dr. KROUT. MARGARET CHASE SMITH is presented for the degree of doctor of laws. Columbia honors this gracious lady for many reasons. She pioneers in the Nation's Capital as the first woman Senator from her native State of Maine; indeed, first of an Eastern State. A distinguished Member since 1948 of the "most exclusive gentlemen's club in the world," Senator SMITH reaffirms the growing realization, wisely recognized by her astute constituents, that ability and proven performance, rather than sex, provide the reasonable standards for political selection. Chosen first in 1940 to represent the Second Maine District in the 76th Congress, she gained quickly the respect of her colleagues of the 48 States. Elections in Maine have bothered her little since. In days that are active, she thinks less of elections than of people. The women of our Nation—happily a populous group—consider Senator SMITH as their Senator-at-large, but the record shows that she discriminates not in their favor, opposing always unfair privilege. Scholarly is the word for her utterances, moderation and integrity of the individual her philosophy, relentless industry her trait. Fear she does not know as men have learned who thunder empty phrases. She merits well, sir, the salute of this university.

President KIRK. MARGARET CHASE SMITH: With fine hand and clear mind, you are writing your chapter of history. You represent more than the people of Maine in our halls of state. You represent those Americans who, seeing well the present danger, will meet it without sacrifice of the precious principles which are our common heritage. Columbia hails you as an outstanding citizen.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the complimentary remarks the distinguished Senator from Texas has made. I wish also to compliment the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who also received her honorary doctorate at Columbia University. I am glad to see that it has not affected either one of them seriously.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not have the information that the Senator from Maine also had been honored by Columbia University. I am happy to know that she was, because for many years I have treasured her friendship and have had high respect for her as a public servant.

Mr. WILEY. This is the first time the Senator from Texas has admitted that he is not up on important questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his usual graciousness.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1956—ADDITIONAL CONFEREES

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair appoint additional conferees on H. R. 5502, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] additional conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement for the information of the Senate. I understand that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has an amendment to offer, that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has an amendment, that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has an amendment, and that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has a series of amendments. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we could have as much as 2 hours' discussion on each amendment, but because the Senators are anxious to cooperate and conclude consideration of the bill within a reasonable time, I am informed that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] will take only 30 minutes, that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] will probably take in the neighborhood of 30 minutes, and we hope not much more than that time will be taken in connection with the Knowland amendment. I have not been able to contact the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] states that on each of his amendments he will consume less than the time allotted. Therefore, Mr. President, if Senators can remain, it is possible, and very likely, I think, that we can pass the bill this evening. The leadership is prepared to ask the Senate to remain in session until a reasonable hour, 9, 10, or maybe 10:30 o'clock, if the bill can be passed. Otherwise we shall have to pass it on Friday or Saturday. The bill should be acted on by the Senate, because there is other proposed legislation scheduled for consideration beginning next week. Therefore I appeal to Senators to cooperate, and I thank all the Senators who are willing to reduce their time. I am especially thankful to the Senator from Nevada.

GLOBAL GIVEAWAYITIS VERSUS NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I oppose this bill to give additional billions of taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations.

I have been given to understand that there are approximately $9 billion unexpended dollars already authorized for this purpose and carried over from previous appropriations, which, added to the $3,408,000,000 provided in this bill would equal more than $12 billion available to be spent in foreign nations which even now, according to our administrative officials, are trading with our potential enemies.

Most of these beneficiaries of our foreign aid have recognized Communist China and are working, with the support of some of our own people, to bring about Communist China's admission to the United Nations.

EUROPE ON AMERICAN DOLE SINCE 1948

Mr. President, we have been sending money to Europe since 1948. Even before that time there was a loan of $3¾ billion to Britain. It would no doubt embarrass the Senate if I were to read what I said regarding that loan in 1948. When the loan was made I was not a Member of the Senate, but I was aware of the promises that were made when the first loan was extended. And as a Member of the Senate I have been aware of the promises which have been continually made since that time as to what would be done by those nations in the event we gave them new grants and credits such as those under the Marshall plan, the ECA, MSA, the FOA, and other trick agencies with trick names that are always cooked up a little ahead of the public's understanding as to what is happening to their tax money.

BIG PROMISES; SKIMPY PERFORMANCE

We have had big, beautiful promises, Mr. President, every time we have been sold a multi-billion-dollar bill of goods, but in return we have received only meager and minimum performance—and sometimes none at all—from the countries which have received these billions.

FREE MONEY, FREE FOOD, FREE GOODS FLOW OUT TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We have sent money continually to those nations to buy our goods. We are now sending to foreign nations, without cost, for the most part, agricultural products which we have bought and stored in the United States. We are sending them free defense materiel, most of which, I am sorry to say, is obsolete. That is all done in the interest of prosperity and peace.

Mr. President, the history of individuals and nations has been that they are heroes as long as the money holds out. When the money is gone we look around, and our so-called friends have disappeared.

WHY WASTE WEALTH ON FOREIGN NATIONS WHILE OUR OWN NATIONAL DEBT REMAINS HIGHEST IN WORLD?

Mr. President, ever since I took my oath of office in 1947 as a United States Senator I have opposed wasting America's wealth, oil, and resources on foreign nations while our national debt remains the highest in the world, our budgets go unbalanced, and our taxes remain at wartime levels.

Not only do we owe approximately $275 billion, but a few years ago a Communist British subject came to this country and persuaded our then President that the more we owed the more wealthy we would be. Those two persons are dead, but we have this $275 billion debt which we must face.

FOREIGN HANDOUTS CONTINUE WHILE UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS OWE $400 BILLION

In addition to that, we have guaranteed the payment of some $140 billion to $150 billion through other methods of allowing offshoot organizations to either bond themselves or pay out money for which the taxpayers of this Nation are just as responsible for payment as they are for the payment of the national debt in case of any default. That adds up to over $400 billion owed by our taxpayers.

Some people say they owe it to themselves, so that they should not worry. But I have been in debt to a bank, Mr. President. It was only a community bank, but it sometimes became embarrassing if I did not pay the interest on the debt. A man could go broke under those circumstances, and we can go broke as a nation.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD PUT SECURITY ABOVE WORLD SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS

The first duty of the Government, as I see it, is to look to its own welfare and security, to its own resources and economy.

If it be true, as it is alleged, that we can defend the Western Hemisphere, then, before we put out additional sums, and before we argue whether we are going to defend this or that area, should we not determine what our objectives are?

Are we trying to discharge our social obligations throughout the world, or are we trying to arrange for the security of this Nation?

That is the first decision to make. I have made my decision. I think we should determine what will contribute to the security of this Nation. A stable economy is the first point to establish. Instead, for the past 22 years successive administrations have been afflicted with what I call global giveawayitis.

GLOBAL GIVEAWAYS BEGAN IN 1934 WITH GIFT OF UNITED STATES MARKETS

In 1934 a New Deal administration and a New Deal Congress embarked on a program of giving away our markets to foreign countries, under the so-called Trade Agreements Act.

In 1940 we moved into a war economy, and the national debt limit was raised from $45 billion to $49 billion. That was about the time that our distinguished visitor from England, Lord Keynes, convinced our President that the more we were in debt, the more wealthy we were. So we threw all caution to the winds and started voting more bonds.

SOVIET RUSSIA EARLY BENEFICIARY OF UNITED STATES BILLION-DOLLAR AID

In 1941 we started giving money, goods, and munitions to foreign countries, including Soviet Russia, to which we extended an initial lend-lease credit of $1 billion. Later we were to increase this to $11,242,000,000, of which $465 million was handed to Russia after the war.

Our wartime foreign aid totaled $49 billion plus, of which Britain got the most, $35 billion plus, with Russia ranking second.

The war ended, but foreign aid has never stopped.

I predicted in 1947, when I was a freshman in the Senate, that it was not likely to stop, and it has not.

In a floor speech on April 21, 1947, I said:

> I object on principle to a policy which seeks to stampede us into further huge loans and gifts and actions which all agree will in all probability result in establishing a definite policy trend for this Nation.

That was a very modest statement, but it has proved to be correct.

GLOBAL GIVEAWAY DISEASE CHRONIC

Giving our goods and wealth away to foreign nations has become more than a trend; it is a disease. The disease is chronic. Every year about this time we break out in a new rash to give away more billions, and to give them away in a hurry. We are in so much of a hurry that we hardly understand what the legislation is about.

In the same speech, I pointed out that no adequate information or reliable information was being made available about the program, and that no opportunity was being given for the thorough investigation which is certainly justified before Congress embarks on such a policy or program.

CONGRESS KEPT IN DARK BY FOREIGN-AIDERS

That is as true now, Mr. President, as it was then. In the bill we are asked to hand out $3,530,000,000 to foreign countries for assistance of various types.

We are told the amount of money some countries will receive, and that there will be several hundred million which the President can spend anywhere and in any way he chooses. But we have no specific information about any program, what kind of military assistance, or what type of economic projects we intend to pay for in the various countries.

In other words, Mr. President, we are making out a check for $3,530,000,000 to the President to spend in foreign countries, and to spend just about as he pleases.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana reported on the Senate floor yesterday his experiences in attempting to obtain information on the foreign-aid program from Mr. Harold Stassen, the administration's Santa Claus.

DOES FOA DIRECTOR HIMSELF KNOW WHAT FOA IS DOING?

Mr. President, can we get information from a man who probably does not have it himself? I doubt if he has a list of all the projects financed since he has been at the head of the FOA, and the ECA before that.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana said that he had been attempting for the past 3 months "to obtain facts about the unexpended balances, also about the kind of projects in foreign lands which were being considered in order to compare them with projects in our own country which are being denied funds." He has not obtained the information.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator remember that it was only about a year ago when the FOA discovered that it had a billion dollars more than its books showed it had? That was how they kept track of their affairs on mutual aid at that time.

Mr. MALONE. Congress is not allowed to inspect the books. Everyone else in the world will know about the affairs of the FOA except those who furnish the money.

INQUIRY TO DIRECTOR STASSEN GOES UNANSWERED

On May 6, I requested somewhat similar information from Mr. Stassen. In a letter to Mr. Stassen, I asked the following information:

A list of all authorizations for hydroelectric, irrigation, reclamation, and flood-control projects made by the FOA.

A list of all authorizations to foreign countries made for mining and minerals developments, and for the procurement of mining equipment.

A list of all guaranties, in whole or in part, of private investment in foreign countries.

And allotments made to foreign countries by FOA to finance purchases of American-made products, farm commodities, and coal, broken down as to countries and to commodities.

INFORMATION SOUGHT NOT CLASSIFIED

Mr. President, it will be noted that none of these requests for information in any way involved military information or other material which might be classified.

All of it was material which should be readily accessible in the files of the Foreign Operations Administration, if it keeps files of its handouts to foreign nations.

All of the information should be at the fingertips of Mr. Stassen and his aides in making up their own budgets and in keeping accounts of their own expenditures.

SENATOR MALONE QUESTIONS AMOUNT OF AID REACHING SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. President, there are other questions which the Senate might well ask of Mr. Stassen before voting this $3½ billion in new aid.

One such question might well be what amount of this aid, in his estimation, winds up in Soviet Russia.

NEWSPAPER REPORT CITED

The May 27, 1955, issue of the New York Journal of Commerce touches on this vaguely in an article headed "Oils Firm as Russia Buys in Europe." I shall quote the first four paragraphs:

> The Russian bear, according to trade reports, apparently has switched his taste from honey to edible, vegetable oils, and

what are described as "huge" shipments of United States cottonseed oil sent to certain West European countries which have been transshipped behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I do not blame Russia or the Iron Curtain countries. Why blame them for something for which Congress is responsible? Those countries are simply a little smarter than we are; that is all.

I have said on the floor that European nations are the worst offenders, but that I had a high regard for the European nations. I admire the English people, especially, on two counts: First, they have brains; second, they are for England. Ours is the only nation which produces people who are not for it.

SOVIET BUYING INCREASES COSTS IN WORLD MARKET

I continue to quote from the New York Journal of Commerce:

Heavy buying by the Soviet and Soviet-bloc nations to fill their edible oils larder has contributed to a strengthening of the fats and oils market worldwide, sources reported, and is a factor in the current firm price structures here of cottonseed, soy, corn, and peanut oils.

While periodic Russian buying of CCC oil in large quantities from nations to which the United States has sent supplies at comparatively low prices has long been suspected, it has been hard to pin down—particularly as to quantity.

However, as trade circles point out, such comparatively small countries as the Netherlands, which has been taking large supplies from the United States, cannot logically be assumed to consume such quantities and the Soviet represents a willing market for transshipment.

MALONE ASKS WHAT STUDIES MADE OF FOREIGN-AID DIVERSION TO REDS

Mr. President, this is an obviously guarded report, but the implication is quite clear. The implication is that agricultural products being dumped in foreign-aided nations are going in some amounts behind the Iron Curtain.

Has the Foreign Relations Committee, which made the report urging continuation of this program and the authorization of new billions to finance it, made any study of the types and amount of foreign aid which ends up in Communist Russia or Communist-bloc countries?

Has it made any study of transshipments of such commodities by aided countries to the Reds?

Has it ever asked Mr. Harold Stassen or his agency whether it has made such a study, and if it has, what the agency has reported?

Does anybody know where our foreign aid is winding up, or that portion of it which is movable? Some of it, I remember, wound up in the hands of the Red Chinese aggressors in Korea.

RED AGGRESSORS IN KOREA FOUGHT WITH MATERIAL MADE IN U. S. A.

I made a statement while the war was in progress in Korea that 75 percent of the material being shot at our boys over there had been financed by their fathers at home through all kinds of foreign aid and other shenanigans, just as we armed Japan by sending oil and scrap iron out through the Golden Gate prior to 1941. No one could stop it; many of us tried.

Where will the aid we are asked to authorize today wind up? Will someone kindly tell me? I should like to know.

Mr. Stassen has never replied to my letter, nor has he acknowledged it. It is obvious to me that he does not want Members of the Senate to have this information. Or perhaps he thinks it is none of our business. Maybe he just does not know.

CONGRESS AND PEOPLE ENTITLED TO KNOW WHERE FOREIGN-AID DOLLARS GO

I think it is our business. I think that the Constitution of the United States intended it to be our business to know what we were authorizing funds for. I think it is vital to know what we expect to buy with the taxes we collect from the people in our 48 States, who are being denied the roads, projects, schools, and jobs they need, in order that there may be built projects and roads in foreign countries to provide payrolls and jobs for foreigners.

Every dollar and every dime this Government pays out, Mr. President, must come ultimately from our taxpayers.

Three billion, five hundred and thirty million are a lot of dollars. They are dollars the American people would like to keep in their pockets, or to pay out to their States and municipalities for public works, services, and projects that would benefit their own families, communities, or localities.

Three billion, five hundred and thirty million dollars works out to $21.51 for every man, woman, and child in the United States; to more than $100 for a family of five.

That is a big contribution, Mr. President, to foreign prosperity and welfare, when America needs so many things at home.

DEBT AND DEFICITS CONTINUE WHILE FOREIGN AID GOES ON FOREVER

But it is only a fraction of what the American people have paid out to foreign countries since the war.

As I said earlier, foreign aid has never stopped. Under one name or another, it has continued ever since it started, while our deficits continued and our national debt increased to the astronomical peak of over $275 billion to which there must be added the $240 billion or $250 billion that we have guaranteed.

Last year we temporarily lifted the debt ceiling $6 billion until tax collections came in, with a proviso that on June 30 the debt limit of $275 billion should be adhered to. Now I understand we shall again be faced with the same request. This administration is following the line of the last two administrations: "Make good time with debts. The more you owe, the wealthier you are."

UNCLE SAM FINANCING A GREEDY WORLD

The Secretary of the Treasury says that this year he will again ask for a higher ceiling on the debt limit. He will not have to if this bill giving taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations, some of them, like India, neutral, if not hostile, and most of them lacking the will to defend or help themselves, is defeated.

Foreign nations will not have that will, either, so long as we play the rich uncle, ready with handsome handouts whenever any one of them comes begging. Some of these nations, I am happy to say, are too proud to beg. So when that occurs Mr. Stassen's office forces our dollars on them. It is a strange and greedy world, and we are financing it.

Since World War II we have financed it to the tune of $52,383,000,000, to which this bill proposes to add $3,530,000,000 more. We have continued to finance it under a variety of excuses.

WORLD AID SLOGANS CHANGE WHILE BILLIONS TO FOREIGN AREAS NEVER CEASE

First the slogan was relief and rehabilitation. We all remember UNRRA. Under UNRRA we helped relieve and rehabilitate Soviet Russia and her satellites, and to some extent the Chinese Communists.

Rehabilitated Russia bit the hand that fed her, and the rehabilitated Red Chinese took over China.

There was the British loan, and some of us will remember William Dexter White, the Soviet spy, explaining to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that if we would loan England $3,750,000,000, England would be "willing to assume the risk of selling her products in fair competition with the exporters of other countries."

As I reported in the Senate in April, 1947, Mr. White told us that "England is willing to commit herself to our program of fair currency and trade practices in order to encourage an expansion of world trade."

BRITISH SLOGAN FACTORY IN CONSTANT PRODUCTION

The London bankers invented the phrase "dollar shortage." They invented the phrase "reciprocal trade." Mr. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1952, invented the phrase "Trade, not aid." The people in London just beat us on the slogans; all we do is repeat them and keep on paying the money.

In the 1947 floor speech I referred to earlier, I asked:

What is the result? (of Mr. White's assurances). British discrimination against American trade has continued in full force just as before. Her actions constitute a conspiracy of restraint against the American exporters just as surely as did those of Nazi Germany. The rigid system of licensing which is operated by the British Government is directed specifically against our trade in view of the fact that we are the great exporting Nation of the world.

I digress to say, Mr. President, that the same promises are being made today, 9 years later, and they will continue to be made.

I resume reading from that floor speech:

The sterling-bloc system is one by which the British pound is artificially overvalued—

I said this in 1947—

by more than twice and by which American goods can be successfully kept out of great world markets, which the British seek to dominate and control.

EMPIRE PREFERENCE DISCRIMINATION CONTINUES UNDER GATT

The empire preferential rate system is recognized by that great organization in Geneva known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. So a bill will come before the Senate, I suppose, which it will be said will permit the Sen-

ate to pass on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. But will the Senate pass on it? I want to say to my colleagues they are not going to pass on anything.

There is a reorganized GATT, under the name OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation. If the Senate turns it down, it will not touch GATT. If the Senate approves it, it will approve GATT. Very clever. They are just as clever as they were under the first President who started this business over 22 years ago.

WARNINGS IN 1947 EQUALLY SOUND TODAY

Every word I said in 1947 is equally true now, 8 years later, despite the promises of Mr. White, the Soviet spy; but we are still extending aid to Britain.

Relief and rehabilitation was followed by a new slogan, recovery, which became the Marshall plan. Soviet Russia was originally invited in, but declined.

The Marshall plan was supposed to be a 4-year plan, was supposed to cost the American taxpayer $17 billion, and end forever at the end of the 4 years. They just had a running start at the end of 4 years. That Marshall plan was just a start. And Marshall had just as much to do with it, I might add, as did the Members of the Senate.

When the 4 years were up it was necessary to invent a new slogan, and the giveaway bureaus were quick to come up with one. The new slogan and theme song became "rearmament" and "mutual security."

New letterheads were printed and Congress kept pouring out funds.

PROGRAM OF GLOBAL HANDOUTS ENDLESS

We have heard in the debate today that it is the program of the United States of America to continue to put taxpayers' money in countries all over the world. There is no question about it. I said it in 1947, and it is so today, 8 years later.

The old term "mutual security" has been retained in the pending bill, but I note the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations refers to the principle of collective security.

Other nations collect and we secure them.

UNITED STATES SHOULD LOOK TO OWN SECURITY FIRST

Mr. President, before we vote this $3,530,000,000 we should first look to our own security.

Recently a flight of heavy Russian jet bombers over Moscow, similar to our B-52's, caught our diplomats by surprise. It apparently has caught the Pentagon by surprise also.

Mr. President, let no one get the idea that there are no scientists in Russia. They have most of the oldtime scientists from Germany, whom they used in Russia to start the program off.

In any event since the flight plans for production of United States heavy bombers have been upped from 11 wings or 330 B-52's to 500 B-52's, we do not have 1 wing of the giant long-range Boeing aircraft now.

SENATE REPORT OF YEAR AGO WARNED OF UNITED STATES PLANE PRODUCTION LAG

A year ago estimates of the cost of one of these bombers approximated $6 million. Details of the need for increasing our strength in this type of warplane may be found on page 26 of Senate Report 1627, prepared by the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Many of my colleagues will recall that in debate on the 1954 foreign-aid bill I introduced an amendment to divert unexpended funds for foreign aid and authorizing last year's foreign-aid funds to strengthen our Air Force. The total amount available under such a program would have aggregated $10 billion. Let not anyone tell us that we do not need a great deal of money to build the long-range, supersonic speed bombers, fighters, interceptors, and guided-missile bases.

The amendment was defeated last year.

In other words, Mr. President, we preferred to spend our taxpayers' money on neutralist and other foreign countries to building up our strength at home, and in so doing permitted Soviet Russia to catch up or surpass us in B-52 type bombers. That is what we hear out of the Pentagon. Do not blame Russia; blame the Senate.

FUNDS ASKED THIS YEAR FOR FOREIGN AID WOULD BUILD 441 UNITED STATES B-52 HEAVY BOMBERS

Today's Wall Street Journal places the present estimated cost of a B-52, including tools and production equipment, at $8 million.

At $8 million the $3½ billion we propose in this bill to squander in jungles and swamps of Asia and the deserts of Africa and the Near East would buy 441 B-52's, or finance 14⅔ wings of 30 B-52's each.

For my part, I would prefer to see this money spent at home on building muscle for America. I think the taxpayers would too.

Russia, Red China, and the Communist satellites, on the other hand, would doubtlessly prefer this money to be spent on weak little countries in the shadow of the Red hammer and sickle, who, even if they had the will to defend themselves, could present no military obstacle to Red might.

What has kept these countries from being overrun is Russia's fear of America's airpower and nuclear weapons. Frittering our strength away in foreign countries will only lessen that fear, while it ripens Southeast Asia and the Near East for Soviet plucking.

Mr. President, this is an international social welfare bill that will not add one whit to our national defense.

Before we vote on it we should make up our minds whether we are trying to discharge our social obligations throughout the world, or whether we are interested in defending the United States of America—and then get to it.

If we intend to distribute the wealth and taxes of the American people throughout the world at the expense of jobs and investments in America, let us be honest about it and tell the people of our country about it; let us tell the unemployed, the ruined mine, mill and factory owners in our own country, our farmers with declining incomes, our small-business enterprises with their backs to the wall.

Let us tell them that this is an international scheme to distribute throughout the world the wealth of this country, as obtained from the taxes paid by the American people.

Let us tell them that the social welfare of the peoples of Asia, and Africa, and old Europe comes first, and the American taxpayer must be satisfied with the leavings.

Mr. President, while we propose to tap the American taxpayer for $3,530,000,000 more in foreign aid, let us examine one of the uses to which the British put the Marshall plan.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a recent article by George E. Sokolsky, which appeared in the New York Journal-American and many other newspapers throughout the United States.

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

AMERICAN AID USED WISELY IN BRITAIN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

LONDON.—There has been some talk in Congress about the use by the British of the counterpart funds for the reduction of their national debt. The talk was unfavorable. The point must be made that while the Marshall plan was very popular among the British it has run its course, and the defense aid which followed it is of value but not of the same value as the Marshall plan because of changed conditions. Also the insistence upon giving some aid in the form of agricultural material out of the stockpiles of such products as grapefruit, which is an unusual food here, does sometimes make for complication.

It is freely admitted here that some of the counterpart funds were used to reduce the national debt. It is suggested that it was a use that did not neutralize the benefit of dollar aid by creating an inflation. In a word, unless defenses were set up, the huge influx of dollars could have stimulated inflation. On the other hand, American public opinion was insistent that Marshall plan money should not subsidize the budgets of receiving countries.

PAID INTO SPECIAL ACCOUNT

It was put to me this way. This was the origin of the "special account," namely, the system by which sterling counterpart (the proceeds of selling the dollar goods by which aid was brought into the country) was paid into a special account at the Bank of England and drawings out of the account could only be made by the treasury with the approval of the United States.

One of the objects specified in the Marshall plan agreement was the extinction of debt. And as an act of deliberate policy, the British Government decided, with the approval of the American authorities, to dispose of the sterling in the special account in this way and not to spend it on the capital investment which was the pattern adopted for counterpart in continental countries. The British concept of their economy is to protect the balance of payments while avoiding inflation, and the surprising thing is that they have done it. They used our assistance under the Marshall plan to do it, but what must be said of them that cannot be said of some other countries is that they used our aid well and to their permanent advantage; it did not go down the drain.

On the continent of Europe, counterpart funds were used to increase the number and volume of state or privately owned investment projects. In Great Britain investments were restricted to maintain the internal economic balance in order to avoid inflation. Even so there were too many state investments coming out of war conditions and it

was not considered politically or economically advisable to use Marshall plan counterpart funds to aid private investments.

USED TO EXTINGUISH NATIONAL DEBT

The total of sterling counterpart funds amounted to about 560 million pounds or about $1,500 million. The United States got 5 percent of this and after making some deductions for small items the bulk of this amount was used to extinguish the national debt. Special arrangements were made that this use did not increase inflation. The debt reduction consisted of special non-interest-bearing notes in which the counterpart was invested by the Bank of England where it was lodged in a special account. It did not increase cash circulation. The Marshall aid period was 1948–51 and the amount of counterpart applied to debt extinction in each year was as follows:

	Pounds
1948–49	107,000,000
1949–50	92,000,000
1950–51	275,000,000
1951–52	55,000,000
Total	529,000,000

This amounts to $1,481,200,000.

It is not understandable why there should be any secrecy about such a matter and it undoubtedly has been published elsewhere. When I left on this trip it was spoken of as a great secret. The British have to avoid inflation because their economy rests on a fine hair. They are about 50 million people who live on islands that can produce food for about 15 million people, which, quite apart from the serious question of raw materials, metals, woods, fibers, food, takes on an importance here which it cannot have in the United States where we stockpile butter and wheat. The British can import ample food now but they want to keep it that way and all their economic maneuvering is designed to that end.

BRITAIN CUTS TAXES WHILE UNITED STATES TAX DOLLARS SENT ABROAD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, our foreign-aid program has helped to reduce Britain's debt, while our own national debt has increased under both the present and previous administrations.

And while American tax rates are continued, and will continue while we pour billions of dollars into further foreign aid, Britain, for one, has been able to materially reduce its own taxes, partially because of the generosity of the Congress with the money of the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a recent editorial entitled "British in the Black," which was published in the New York Journal-American and other Hearst newspapers.

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

BRITISH IN THE BLACK

Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer, we imagine, must be looking with a mixture of envy and astonishment at their British counterparts who have just received a sizable income tax cut, which will remove 2,400,000 persons from the tax rolls and increase personal and child allowances.

The envy and astonishment are understandable, particularly since Chancellor of the Exchequer Butler estimates a revenue surplus of $414 million this year, while our Government is limping along on a deficit as usual.

And Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer have the right to ask how come this country, which is running in the red, continues to give millions to Britain, which is in the black?

They ought to put this question real hard to their Senators and Representatives in Congress, but they ought not, we think, take a peevish attitude toward the British. It won't do Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer any good to work up ill feeling against the blasted British, when the responsibility is right here at home.

The attitude to take, it seems to us, is to try to find out why this Nation can't operate in the black, too. That involves an examination of how expenses can be cut in running this Government (the reports of the Hoover Commission indicate a huge amount of bureaucratic duplication and waste).

It involves also an examination of the millions that are being sluiced abroad. How much have they been and are they being wasted? Are they really working for us in what we want to accomplish? How much are they buying real security and how much is down the drain?

These are areas where Mr. and Mr. Taxpayer have a justifiable concern. If they express that concern often enough and vigorously enough, maybe some day we will be a surplus nation, too.

We wind up with the following lyric of dubious hope:

"Poor little taxpayer, don't you cry,
You'll have a tax cut by and by—maybe."

MALONE ADDRESS IN SENATE IN JULY 1948 RECALLED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in July 1948 I had the following to say at one point in the debate in the Senate:

It is impossible to stabilize trade or currencies in Europe as long as they continue the established practice of manipulating the value of their currencies in favor of their own particular countries, and as long as the empire-minded nations, with particular reference to Great Britain, follow their established practice of directing trade to the mother countries at empire-preferential rates and the use of the sterling bloc.

I also said:

There is grave question as to whether the Congress of the United States can create additional purchasing power by making appropriations for gifts to foreign nations above the amount required to meet the cost of our own Government each year, unless there is a comparable increase in our production. This was thoroughly illustrated in the $3,750,000,000 loan to England in 1946, when almost immediately they complained that, due to subsequent inflation, their estimate of the amount which could be purchased with the loan was almost cut in half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have been charged with some of the time which has been used by other Senators, and I believe I have about 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 4 more minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 4 more minutes.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

GLOBAL GIVEAWAYS INCLUDE NOT ONLY BILLIONS BUT UNITED STATES JOBS, INDUSTRIES, MARKETS

Mr. President, in our obsession to give out wealth and goods to foreign nations, we are also giving away our jobs, industries, and markets. In this connection I desire to call attention to several pertinent newspaper reports of this matter. We have only to examine any newspaper to find similar articles. The one I hold in my hand happens to have been published in the New York Journal of Commerce on yesterday, June 1. The headline on page 13 reads as follows: "Did Imports Injure Watch Firms?"

In short, Mr. President, we find that one who wishes to obtain a job in the United States must be able to argue for it on a national-security basis.

Another headline in the New York Journal of Commerce of June 1 is "Trade Act Conference Set—George Backs Liberals."

The article goes on to say:

Senate and House conferees are tentatively scheduled to meet later this week to see if some agreement on the Eisenhower reciprocal trade program is finally within reach.

The article states that announcement had been made by one of the Senate conferees that he would throw his support to the House Democratic conferees, led by Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, who "is battling for elimination, or at least drastic revision, of a series of protectionist amendments adopted when the Senate passed the bill May 4."

AIDED NATIONS MANIPULATE CURRENCY, TRADE, TO AMERICA'S DISADVANTAGE

On the same page we find the following headline: "Turkey Tightens Import Control."

The article goes on to show how that is done. In fact, today every nation in the world, with one or two exceptions, has exchange controls and import permits or export permits, or both. The other nations manipulate the price of their currency, in terms of the dollar, and do so for trade advantage. They engage in every possible manipulation against the United States of America.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to say that the economic approach is only one means of destroying the United States. The advocates of the pending bill or similar ones come in through the doors, through the windows, and up through the cellar floor.

CUSTOMS BILL A SCHEME TO LOWER TARIFFS

Mr. President, in the New York Journal of Commerce for May 25, 1955, we find the following headline: "Customs Bill Foes Minimize Importer Aid."

Mr. President, we know what the customs bill is. It has been before the Senate year after year. When we take out all the fishhooks, we find it is simply a means of changing the valuation, so as to lower the import fees or tariffs. That is all it is. It is advocated in the name of simplification.

If those who advocate such a move wish to simplify, all they need to do is follow the law. But, instead, they are willing to propose almost any means, so long as it looks or sounds good. They use the phrase "customs simplification," and the phrase "dollar shortage," and the phrases "reciprocal trade" and "trade, not aid," and 400 or more other catch words and phrases, which have been invented by those who wish to divide with other nations the wealth of the United States of America. Mr. President, the proposal before us today, by

means of the pending bill, is only the most recent of such schemes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. I should like to call his attention to the fact that in the course of the hearings on this particular measure, it was suggested to the Defense Establishment that perhaps it would be better for the funds under the defense title, which is title I, to be incorporated in the regular Defense Establishment budget. It was thought by the Defense Establishment officials and by the committee as a whole that to do so would be unwise, because in the way presently proposed we would achieve more for defense among our allies, and would do so at far less cost, and would also be able to achieve far greater cooperation with those with whom we are trying to make tenable agreements.

The committee went into this proposal very thoroughly, and it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that we should not consider at this time the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

So I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to use now the 3 minutes he has requested?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. FLANDERS. No, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Texas to move me across the Connecticut River.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I must apologize to the Senator from Vermont. I have just returned to the Chamber; and this is one of the few times when, in relying on the acting minority leader—on whom I know I can always rely—I have been misinformed. He said "New Hampshire." It seems that I understand the Senator from Vermont better than some Members on his side of the aisle do.

So, Mr. President, I am very glad to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator very much, indeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, in listening to the several Senators who have discussed this question, it has seemed to me that there is a radical difference of opinion which needs to be considered.

It seems to be the opinion of many Members that the only threat from the other side of the Iron Curtain is a military threat. I wish to urge a contrary opinion, which is that the great advances and the most dangerous efforts from the Soviet side of the curtain are coming from the political angle. The greatest advances have been made politically, always with the background of armed might, but with the political policies and successes making the actual advances.

We made one great political effort in Europe with the Marshall plan. Without the Marshall plan, today France would be Communist; Italy would be Communist; and they would not have become Communist by force of arms. They would have become Communist by political action, in which the Soviet Government is skilled beyond the imagination of any one of us who sit here, politicians though we may be.

We must oppose the Communist menace both militarily and politically; and if we do not realize the political menace, we shall wake up to find ourselves surrounded by a Socialist world, in Latin America, Europe, Asia, and Africa, without a shot being fired. We shall then sail the seas and trade with other nations only by the permission of a stronger power. Let us not for a moment discount the ability and strength of the Soviet political offensive.

The pending bill applies both to the military and to the political objectives. We must not, in the national interest, minimize the political purposes and the political effectiveness of the bill. We may very properly require of the administration that it give an account of the usefulness and effectiveness of the bill, and an account of the details of the expenditure of the funds provided to it for fighting our battle on the political front; but let us not cramp the administration. Let us encourage it and support it in its work on this most critical aspect of the Communist conquest of the world.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee and other members of the committee if they desire any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator that the Senate is still in the process of developing a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object, unless we have an understanding that there will be a quorum call thereafter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There will be quorum calls all during the afternoon.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains to the opponents of the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has exhausted his time. The Senator from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to have a minute or two to tell what the amendment is about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. However, I wish to say that the amendment I have offered proposes to transfer all available funds already authorized and, in addition, the $3,408,000,000 to be authorized by this bill to the National Defense Administrator, to be expended in the construction and maintenance of long-range sonic speed bomber fighters and interceptors, guided missiles, and atomic-energy-driven submarines, including the necessary bases and accessories for their efficient operation.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], would like to make a motion to recommit the pending bill, and would like to make the motion now, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I move that S. 2090 be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Indiana has 1 hour of debate on his motion, and I control 1 hour of debate in opposition to the motion. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Indiana, I should like to yield 5 minutes of my time to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. JENNER. That is agreeable to me.

MILITARY PAYMENT CERTIFICATES IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, nobody has ever seriously claimed that our soldiers like to be drafted. If they did the volunteer system would be quite sufficient to man the services. We have a draft Military Establishment today simply because the United States is faced by a mortal enemy, the Communist Axis, and we have to draft men whether they like it or not.

We all understand this.

But, Mr. President, I find it hard to understand how the United States Government can justify drafting a man and then sweating him out of part of his pay.

It appears that that is exactly what we are doing in the Far East—specifically in Japan, Korea, and the Philippines.

My understanding of the situation is this:

American servicemen stationed in these three countries are not paid in dollars at all. They are paid in a special sort of currency known as military payment certificates.

By United States agreement with each of these countries, an American serviceman must exchange these military payment certificates for the local currency at the official rate of exchange.

That is to say, despite the fact that a black market is flourishing right down the street, wherever the serviceman happens to be in these countries, the soldier or the sailor cannot swap his dollar pay for currency in the black market. It would obviously be to the soldier's private and personal advantage to do so, but he is not permitted to do it.

In the first place he is not paid in dollars at all.

In the second place his military payment certificate pay—"monkey money" is the phrase commonly used to describe it—can be exchanged only at the official rate. I suppose that his allotments for back home would be deposited in dollars in the United States bank of his choice, but I am talking about the portion of his pay that he gets in the country in which he serves. Since he can only exchange this certificate money at official rates, he loses anywhere from 15 percent to 50 percent of this share of his pay.

As I understand, we do this at the demand of the countries in question because they have currency restriction laws and are trying to control black-market operations. Of course, by doing this we are adding a hidden subsidy to those governments, who are only too eager to get dollars. To all other forms of foreign aid we add this hidden subsidy, but, in this instance, we sweat it out of a serviceman's pay.

I am told that $17 million a month is spent in Japan in servicemen's pay and a considerable share—how much, I cannot guess—goes to buy yen at the official rate.

How much of our military expenditures—apart from the pay of personnel—goes through the same operation I do not know either, but I am told that the United States forces in Japan alone require $50 million worth of yen a month.

Various accounts are given of the efforts of the Government to handle this soldier's pay problem. In Korea, for instance, the official rate of exchange is 180 hwan to the dollar. In the open market the rate in April, a few weeks ago, was somewhere between 750 and 800 hwan to the dollar. The contrast is startling. It is said that in the effort to square the situation the United States authorities bought Korean money in a sort of open market transaction and then sold it to United States personnel, as long as the supply lasted, at 500 hwan to the dollar. This apparently eased the situation on our people somewhat, but the easement did not last long.

In the case of the Philippines it has been contended, I believe, that dollars turned loose on the black market have a tendency to move to Hong Kong and from there to the Chinese Communists. Nobody wants to add to the Chinese Red's stock of dollar exchange, but why put the squeeze on American servicemen in the process?

In substance, I suppose that the sum total of our foreign policy these days is this: Anything to bolster the free world.

In the course of this bolstering, we send troops around the globe, give money and goods to foreign governments, educate alien scholars, train technicians, build roads, and do a thousand other things at the expense of the American taxpayer. If, while doing these other things, we accede to the rules of the countries where our forces are stationed in respect to currency restriction, then it ought to be done on the level. A serviceman should get his pay at the open market rate of exchange. Let the United States Government get this exchange openly by direct negotiation with the governments of the countries and quit this sort of hidden subsidy.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared some remarks on the question of foreign aid to Israel and the Middle East, but the hour is late. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM WITH REGARD TO ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

We have before us a bill providing for certain military and economic aid to the countries of the free world—to help them help themselves build up strength to resist the encroachments of communism, to create conditions of greater internal stability and to discourage aggression from without, and when I say aggression, I mean—as we all have in mind—the threat of Communist aggression.

I should like to address a few words to the situation in the Middle East. This is an area to which the American people have, in my judgment, devoted insufficient attention. Less has been said about it and less has been thought about it than of most other areas of the world. Yet the Middle East is one of the most critical areas of the world, in my opinion. It is critical in the sense of its strategic importance. It is critical in the sense of its potentialities for disturbing the peace of the world. It is critical also because of the tensions which exist there.

I do not at all agree with all the aspects of our present policy in that area. Since the present administration took office in 1953, the situation in that area has grown worse. The tensions have increased. The dangers to world peace have increased. Conflicts have increased.

There has been some progress and some improvement—mostly in the economic sphere. In the political sphere the most marked change has been the improvement in relations between England and Egypt as a result of the Suez settlement. Whether this represents a real forward step in strengthening the free world remains to be seen. It has reduced tension as between Egypt and the Western World.

But the tensions surrounding the little democracy of Israel, in the very heart of the Middle East, have increased.

The little democracy that we helped to establish—that we were the first to recognize—has survived and even prospers. The economic situation of Israel has greatly improved, year by year. The help which Israel has received from outside her borders—some of it in the form of governmental aid from the United States—reflects itself in the increased level of production in that country and in the steady reduction of that country's unfavorable trade balance.

Democracy itself thrives in Israel. In a few months there will be an election—a free election—a brilliant demonstration of democracy in the midst of a feudalistic area. There is no other country in this part of the world in which free elections are held—with the exception of Turkey—which is not really part of the Middle East. Israel is the show-window of democracy in this part of the world. It is to our utmost advantage, to our greatest self-interest, to preserve and promote the welfare of Israel, the well-being of its people, the strength of its democracy.

But meanwhile our Government has not effectively discouraged the irredentist hopes of Israel's Arab neighbors, few of whom disguise their desire and expectation that Israel will one day—soon perhaps—cease to exist.

While with one hand we have helped Israel economically, at the same time we have done nothing, or virtually nothing, to really discourage the irreconcilable attitude adopted by Israel's neighbors. We have not insisted that they accept Israel and make peace with Israel.

We have proclaimed a policy of so-called impartiality which, in the face of facts, is something less than impartiality.

Our attitude has given strength to the hope of Israel's neighbors that they may one day engage in a second round, without fear of reprisal from the United States.

We have undertaken a program of providing arms for one of the nearby Arab States, Iraq. We have been and are shipping arms to Iraq.

I am opposed to this policy. I am opposed to it with all my heart. I am opposed to any provision of arms to Iraq. I do not believe that the provision of arms to any of the Arab States strengthens the conditions of stability in that area. I do not think it strengthens the cause of peace. I do not think it enables any of those countries more adequately to resist Communist aggression. Supplying arms to Arab States can only help to upset the balance of strength in that area and lead to an arms race. Such a program can only help to endanger the existence of Israel.

But if we are going to continue to furnish arms to Iraq—as long as we have furnished arms to Iraq—I believe strongly that we should furnish arms to Israel, too. I believe strongly that we should provide Israel with a flat guaranty of her territorial integrity. I believe that we should say to the world that we will defend Israel against external aggression. That, in my judgment, is an obligation we owe to a sister democracy—to a country which holds the hope for democracy and for progress in the Middle East.

I note that the bill before us—the foreign-aid bill—does not provide any specific amount for Israel. It provides an amount for economic aid to the Middle East. I hope that our officials will deal justly with Israel. I hope that Israel will be given all the economic aid that her position justifies. I hope that economic aid will not be used as a

means of applying political pressure to Israel in favor of her Arab neighbors.

I hope that our Government will furnish Israel a security guaranty, as I have said, and that we will do everything in our power to urge the Arab States to enter into permanent peaceful relations with Israel.

I strongly support the Johnson plan for a Jordan River Valley authority to develop the potentialities inherent in the Jordan River for power and irrigation—for the benefit of all the peoples of this area. For sponsoring the study that led to this report and for its good support of the whole Johnson project, I commend the Department of State. Of this aspect of our foreign policy in the Middle East, I wholly approve.

I hope the other aspects of our policy will be brought into line with our policy on the Johnson plan. I hope we will do everything within our power to hold the Arab States and Israel together, to call off the Egyptian blockade at the Suez Canal, to ease all possible points of tension between Israel and her neighbors, to encourage economic interchange between Israel and her neighbors, leading finally to the establishment of peace in that area.

In this way we will best serve the interests of the United States. In this way we will best serve the cause of peace, strength, and world security.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly to a point of personal privilege.

Yesterday morning, Mr. Drew Pearson, in his column Washington Merry-Go-Round, made a completely false report to the effect that the distinguished Representative from Michigan, Mr. GEORGE DONDERO, and I engaged in a petty wrangle as to who would present to President Somoza, of Nicaragua, a gift which had been sent to him by Vice President NIXON. This incident was alleged to have occurred during the visit to Central America recently made by a congressional delegation in connection with the dedication of two new links in the Inter-American Highway.

I note that Representative DONDERO made an effective reply to the false report contained in the Pearson column, which reply is reported on page 7383 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I also note that Mr. DONDERO attached to his statement letters from two other Representatives who were present during the trip to Central America, namely, Representative TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, and Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland. The statement of Mr. DONDERO and the letters of Mr. STEED and Mr. FALLON correctly reflect the situation which was falsely reported by Mr. Pearson. Mr. DONDERO and I each requested the other to speak for all of us in presenting Vice President NIXON's gift to President Somoza, and the atmosphere of complete good will and mutual accord which was present on that occasion was also present throughout our visit to Central America.

It was disappointing, however, to find Mr. Pearson so completely irresponsible in reporting a matter which, while small in itself, was part of a successful nonpartisan effort to build greater good will between our country and our neighbors in Central America and to give greater impetus to the early completion of the Inter-American Highway.

The trip to Central America was organized by the Departments of State and Commerce in the effort to build greater friendship in the Central American area, and to help speed the highway to completion. The Members of Congress who made the trip were the invited guests of the Departments of State and Commerce and were also designated to represent the several committees of the two Houses of Congress which are charged with handling the Inter-America Highway. The two new links of the highway which were dedicated are in highly sensitive locations, one at the border between Nicaragua and Costa Rica, where bloody violence raged but a few months ago, and the other in Guatemala, where only recently communism has been forcibly replaced by a Democratic administration which is friendly to the United States, and which has the active support of all the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

The uniformly friendly reaction to our visit extended by the Latin-American press and by the public in the three friendly nations most directly affected, that is, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, showed clearly that our mission had succeeded in accomplishing good results. I have already made an informal report of our visit, which is printed on pages 6452–6455 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, May 17, 1955. It is unfortunate that Mr. Pearson, alone, in his typically destructive manner, should have engaged in what appears to be a deliberate effort to falsely picture members of the delegation as engaged in petty bickering, when, as a matter of fact, the delegation performed its mission without friction of any kind and with the single-minded purpose of performing a worthwhile service to the cause of inter-American unity and solidarity.

Mr. President, in closing, I cannot speak too highly of the completely constructive, cooperative, patriotic, and warmly friendly attitude which was unfailingly manifested throughout our mission by each of the able Members of the House of Representatives who was a member of our delegation, namely: Mr. GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan; Mr. GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland; Mr. WALT HORAN, of Washington; Mr. WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon; and Mr. TOM STEED, of Oklahoma.

I thank the distinguished majority leader.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to recommit the bill.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, there has just been called to my attention a press release with reference to the conference between Tito and representatives of the Kremlin. It is quite a long release, but I think it may be of interest to the Senate, since we are discussing mutual-security funds. Tito will receive some of these funds. I do not know how much, and I do not think anyone else knows. The release says:

The declaration was read to a press conference of some 150 newspaper correspondents. It contained no really concrete recommendations, although it was 2,000 words long.

It did recommend that—

1. Communist China "receive its legitimate representation in the United Nations" and that its "legitimate rights" on Formosa should be "satisfied."

Mr. President, I am sure that there are Senators present who would want to increase aid to Tito.

In the Mutual Security Act of 1955, the Congress is confronted with a proposal for the spending of $3,530,000,000 of our earnings, for foreign nations.

Before voting any such fund, the Members of this body are bound by their solemn oath to consider certain facts.

The Members of Congress know that they have, in fact, lost the legislative power.

The nonelected officials of the executive branch draft most of the legislation, and even build up the public support for it.

The members of our committees work hard, but their time is spent usually in making changes in details of the executive department's proposals.

So long as the executive branch has 2½ million employees and the Congress has a few thousands, that practice will continue, though it is contrary to the Constitution.

There still remain, however, some powers which the Congress cannot delegate, without loss of all right to exist.

Congress cannot escape full responsibility for raising and equipping the Armed Forces.

It must draft American youth if they are called to serve in their country's Armed Forces.

And Congress cannot escape full responsibility when it takes by compulsion part of the earnings of our people to give them to governmental agencies.

Through the power of the purse, Congress is responsible for the right of Americans to keep what they earn and spend it as they wish.

No part of the earnings of a free people can be taken from them and used for Government activities unless such diversion is an absolute necessity.

Congress alone is the judge.

Congress cannot permit the executive branch to decide how much money it would like to take from our people, and spend for its own ends.

That is the sign of arbitrary government.

We cannot forget that responsibility, unless we are willing to surrender our rights and duties as a coordinate branch of a government limited by a constitution.

The Members of this body cannot vote three and a half billions of the earnings

of our people, to be spent to help foreign nations, without considering the following basic facts:

First. The executive branch will have on hand as of June 30, 1955, the sum of $8,828,000,000 appropriated for mutual security activities, but not yet spent.

That is enough for 3 years work.

Second. The sum we are asked to vote this year will be largely for expenditures 3 or 4 years from now—unless the rate of spending is to be greatly stepped up.

But spending in fiscal 1958 is the responsibility of a Congress not yet elected.

We are committing a Congress, not yet elected, to expenditures on a program conceived years ago, which they may or may not be willing or able to continue.

The Constitution expressly forbids one Congress to bind another Congress not yet elected.

If we ignore that prohibition, we are saying that elections do not matter.

We are saying that American people are no longer sovereign.

Third. The American Government is operating this year with an expected deficit of $3 billion or more.

This authorization for $3½ billion, above the agency's present $8.8 billion, which is unexpended, is approximately equal to the current deficit.

Meanwhile, the foreign nations we have aided are balancing their budgets and cutting taxes.

Fourth. The cumulative debt of the United States is now nearing $280 billion.

We have reached the stage where we are borrowing money to pay the interest on 20 years of riotous giving.

If we add new billions to the deficit in a year of peace and record prosperity, what is the outlook for our financial stability in a war or an economic depression?

I need not remind you, Mr. President, that, in addition to the formal debt, we have contingent liabilities for homes, farms, business loans, and social-security credits, which add an untold number of billions to our fiscal responsibilities.

We know the Soviet theorists have always counted on destroying our economy as a means of weakening our military potential.

Are we certain that this huge increase in our national debt in peacetime is not in itself a serious military hazard?

The Soviet strategists will know only too well how to take advantage of such weakness.

Fifth. In 1948 when the program for gifts to foreign nations was started, we were told in the most solemn fashion, by Mr. Acheson, General Marshall, Senator Connally, and other advocates, that this was an emergency effort, to carry Europe over the tribulations of war devastation, and that it would last, at most, 4 years.

This morning I made reference to the fact that Harold Stassen had said that foreign aid had now become a permanent part of our Government's policy. I think the Senator from Kentucky said he had asked the question, and that Mr. Stassen had replied, "Well, as long as the great problem of communism confronts us."

But that was not what Mr. Stassen said. Let me quote what he said:

> The time when foreign aid was an emergency program is a thing of the past. It has shown its success, and we must now regard it as an integral, permanent part of our policy.

Now we are asked to appropriate for 3 years ahead to what will be the 10th year of operations.

We are informed by Mr. Stassen that the program is a permanent part of our foreign policy, and that foreign spending will never be abandoned.

Sixth. The foreign spending program was quietly extended from Europe to European colonies in Asia, then to Asian nations, and next year, in fairness, it will have to be extended to Africa.

I suppose we shall have to extend aid to Mars and Venus as soon as we perfect our rockets and space ships.

Is Congress here voting a commitment to carry on indefinitely the spending of perhaps three billions a year for the benefit of foreign nations?

Are the American people ready, willing, and able to promise three and a half billions a year to support the economy and the military establishments of 50 or more nations?

It is cruel and unjust to make promises to other nations which we may not be able to perform.

It is the ultimate stupidity in foreign policy.

Seventh. What is the military strategy implicit in this proposal for financial support for other nations?

That is, perhaps, the most important question of all.

The American people have always understood the underlying strategic pattern of their national defense from the days of Indian fighting and the early years of the Republic, when sailing ships could win our wars, to the later years when we needed a complete theory of seapower and bases for seapower in the age of steam.

They knew Billy Mitchell and Charles Lindbergh heralded the new air age.

Does anyone know the military theory on which this mutual security program rests for its results?

It is not right or proper to conceal the Nation's basic strategy of survival from its people.

Grand strategy cannot be kept from the enemy.

It must not be kept from Americans.

Eighth. The mutual security program obviously has not won for us any additional air bases.

Mutual security was proposed in mid-1947 and debated all during the fateful year when the Soviet Union was planning the final attack by the Red Chinese on the Nationalist Government of free China.

But let us recall why American security was so deeply involved in the civil war in China.

The northern border of China is in contact, over almost the entire width of Asia, with the southern border of Siberia.

Air bases in north China would have been air bases a few flying minutes from the industrial heart of Soviet Russia, from the steel and machinery plants Stalin erected in the Siberian wastes to protect them from invasion through Europe.

With China free and strong the back door to Russia was wide open.

The Russians never forgot their danger for a moment.

China in the hands of the Nationalists meant that American planes could be based a stone's throw from the Soviet Union's munitions industry.

American armies were already operating on the mainland.

The American Navy had a strong naval base at Tsingtao in the north, opposite Korea.

How well the Communists would have behaved without any mutual security spending, if only we had held onto those friendly air bases along the rim of Red Siberia.

It is very curious that the American people were seduced into abandoning their friendly allies on the Soviet border, in the very year when mutual security was started.

The newspapers did not tell us the real issue.

They fed us intellectual sleeping pills, political hasheesh, about the Red Chinese agrarian reformers.

It is very curious that Secretary Acheson should have shifted the discussion of American security from Asia to Europe in those critical years.

We lost the chance to have friendly air bases in north China.

We were not permitted to accept the offer of bases in Spain, a near island, protected by her Pyrenees.

We were given air bases in England and France which we could have had equally well, without mutual aid spending.

Ninth. The mutual security program was obviously not designed to protect our security against atomic attack.

The richest prize of uranium ore fell to the Soviet Union when it was given East Germany at Yalta.

That enabled the Soviet Government to obtain a contract from the Socialist Government of Czechoslovakia for its valuable uranium mines.

Soviet Russia obtained its atom scientists when we approved forced labor for the Germans at Potsdam.

The loss of China meant the building of atom plants in Sinkiang, west China, that desert area which is the farthest spot on the globe from reach of our planes.

We hear a great deal of talk, at present, about protection against atomic war, but the best protection would have been to keep China and Czechoslovakia out of the hands of the Communists, and to protect the German scientists from enslavement.

I do not wish to dwell on past mistakes, except as they are significant in the present.

We totally missed the military issues in 1947 and 1948 when we started mutual aid—ERP.

I wish to be sure we are not equally blind to our military situation today.

Tenth. This program obviously does not rest on the military strategy of winning allies with fighting hearts.

The Koreans are held down to a 2- or 3-day supply of ammunition.

Remember, our fighting men will pay the penalty if the Communists suddenly attack through North Korea, as General Chennault predicts, and the Koreans cannot return their fire.

The Nationalists have not been given jet fighters equal to the Communist planes being assembled opposite Quemoy. They are not being given weapons of attack and amphibious equipment.

What a silly theory, that they must wait, like sitting ducks, until the Communists hit them, and never, never, never hit the Communists on the mainland.

Free China is bound hand and foot by a treaty which says, in effect, that she cannot defend her own people on the mainland unless the United Nations—including Soviet Russia—is willing to support her.

In her defense treaty with us, Free China is not to attack the mainland except with our consent.

Under the U. N. Charter, we are forbidden to start a move against anyone for any reason unless it has the approval of the U. N., which includes Red Russia, with the veto. That puts Free China in a neatly constructed boobytrap, in which it cannot move against Red China unless Red Russia approves.

What does this arrangement mean to our security?

It means that America will stand by, idle, while the Red Chinese take over, one by one, the remaining islands off the China coast. Then the Reds will be completely free to move arms and supplies up and down the coast of Asia at their own sweet will.

We must stand idle while they render homeless an army of 500,000 free Chinese, eager to fight Communists in defense of their own homes. This dismantling of this free Chinese rampart against Communist advance in the Pacific will bring the Communists one critical step nearer to Pearl Harbor and California.

When the barriers in the western Pacific are no longer manned by free Chinese, new barriers will have to be set up in short order, manned by Americans.

This foreign aid program does not solve the strategic problem of Vietnam. Oh, yes, the bill provides many millions in aid to the Vietnamese, but what is that aid to be? Is it to be almost everything they really need? Is it to be guns without ammunition or tanks without parts? Or defense weapons like those we gave poor little Korea in 1950, which consisted of light weapons and $200 worth of bailing wire, and also gave Formosa more recently?

The newspapers are filled with dismal reports of conditions in Vietnam. Political influence is split between French and Vietnamese, between the emperor and the premier, between supporters of Premier Diem and supporters of various sects. The Communists have left their soldiers, without uniforms, in the villages to form local guerrilla forces in free areas, as they did in China.

The small Vietnamese army, being slowly trained and equipped by the Americans, will perhaps be able to hold the cities, but certainly cannot cope with the planned uprisings in the villages which will occur before the time for nationwide elections next year.

That is a dismal, hopeless picture, is it not, my friends?

The answer is "No." It is not dismal. It is not hopeless.

The answer to the confusion in Indochina is to be found in Washington, in the curious absence of a national strategic policy.

The right strategic policy for defense of Vietnam is not hard to find, even through the obscurity of the propaganda fog.

The only sound military policy, to save Indochina from planned Red conquest, is to equip the soldiers of Chiang Kai-shek with a model air force, including the best jet planes, and with the best amphibious equipment our industries can produce. They will keep the Red Chinese in order.

Free China is held down by its mutual defense treaty with us, which, as I have just stated, prevents her from moving onto the mainland unless Red Russia consents.

But that treaty does not mean merely the permanent enslavement of the Chinese. It means the permanent enslavement of the people of Indochina, because the Nationalist Chinese could keep the Red armies so busy they could not supply Ho Chih Minh. It may mean the enslavement of the rest of Korea, or the recall of our men to service if the Free Chinese cannot hold the Red divisions from rushing north to Korea, as they did in 1950–51.

When the Chinese Reds strike at Vietnam next year, we shall hear demands from Government officials that we send American forces into Vietnam. We shall have loud protests from our allies that we must not help because that might start a world war.

We shall have another carefully dramatized Dien Bien Phu, to show, in an atmosphere of heroics, that it is impossible to stop the Reds. Then we shall have more wringing of hands by our officials because more millions of free people are going behind the Iron Curtain.

The Red Chinese will shoot in cold blood most of the 700,000 refugees from north Vietnam whom our Navy transported to the south, if the pitiful refugees do not first kill themselves.

The blame for our stupidity and weakness will be trumpeted all over Asia, while our officials say, "We couldn't do anything. Our allies would not let us help, because a little show of courage might start a world war."

If this sounds familiar, it is where we came in, in Vietnam, a year ago. Let us not be fooled if that act is played out before us again, Mr. President. The time to stop Red China's 1956 invasion of Vietnam is now.

The place is in Washington, and the means have long been pointed out by our best military men, and I refer to men like Van Fleet, Clark, Chennault, and Radford.

We must establish a peaceful blockade of the Red China coast until every American held by the Chinese is freed, and Red China learns once more to respect the American flag, without any "please" from a secretary of the U. N.

Big news. Four American fliers were freed just yesterday by Red China. Big news. Red China held those boys, in violation of the peace negotiated at Panmunjom. Where are the other American fliers who have been imprisoned by Red China? What has happened to this country?

We must equip Nationalist forces to threaten the Reds with amphibious guerrilla attacks at times and places of their own choosing.

The Nationalist Government of China reports that Chinese Communist publications admit famine has now spread to half of mainland China.

The Communists estimate that 180 million mainland Chinese are suffering from hunger. Starvation is widespread, not in the cities, but among farmers. That can mean only one thing. The government's forcible grain collections must be so severe that they take from the farmers the very food they need to live. We are witnessing all over again the cruel Soviet famine from forced collectivization of the farmers. Reports say farmers are selling or abandoning their farms.

What does that little fact mean? It is as grim, Mr. President, as any death's head. It means that famine will be greater next year.

Is this the time for appeasement, Mr. President? Is this the time to buy the good will of anti-Communist nations, while we meekly accept the abuse of Chou En-lai?

We know from students of Soviet politics that the Russian leaders are not happy over the threat of Red China 10 or 20 years from now. They are not going to give the Red Chinese the arms and equipment with which to make themselves the fighting leaders of all Asia.

It is a safe forecast that the Chinese Reds cannot today produce their own arms, and they will not long continue to get them from Red Russia, unless they learn humility. It is true that Red China is building up a vast and threatening arms concentration opposite Quemoy. But that is the typical Communist strategy. By concentrating planes and guns in that area of high visibility, they keep all the capitals of the world in a state of jitters, for fear a world war might break out. The Red Chinese believe that if they are allowed to attack, they will get Formosa. If they are not allowed to attack, they will get Formosa by another Yalta. If they do not get Formosa just yet, they will have had the fun of keeping the world in turmoil and spreading fear and appeasement.

This is bogey-man stuff, Mr. President. It should frighten children, but it should not frighten adults.

The air bases opposite Formosa are Red China's showcase. Obviously the Red Chinese are going to put their best planes and guns at the spot where the

whole world is looking. But we cannot build our national defense on such tricks.

Mr. President, why do we never ask ourselves the right questions? How much airpower do the Red Chinese have in places where we are not looking? Do they have effective control of south China, of west China, of the countryside? Or is everything they possess kept on display in Manchuria, in North Korea, and near Amoy, so we shall be hypnotized with fear? Are south and west China the soft underbelly of the Chinese mainland seething with rebellion? I believe they are, Mr. President. I believe that the proof of this fact lies in the way the propaganda of the pro-Communists is skillfully directed to make us scared to death of Red China, without asking questions. I believe that the propaganda designed to put Nationalist China under wraps is all the proof we need that Red China is tottering from internal rebellion. It is totally unable to resist a properly planned pincers squeeze, with no risk of war.

I repeat, Mr. President, we have no military defense of the free world in Asia. Does any Member of this body seriously believe that spending untold billions of dollars will achieve security for the United States, if it is tied to such folly?

I repeat that a military strategy is available to us, as of now. It includes only the two simple steps: American arms and training for nations in Asia, and an American peaceful blockade of the China coast until all our men are released and until the Red Chinese learn international manners.

I am not a military expert, Mr. President. I have never attempted to act like one.

I say that our military security planning is hamstrung by an administrative monstrosity. I say the security, perhaps the very survival, of the United States, depends on our ability to rescue our military planning from the global welfare boondoggling confusion into which it has been locked.

Our spending in Europe has left us almost as vulnerable as we are in Asia.

Austria has just committed herself to a neutralist policy. But neutralism is not neutrality. A nation which is neutral retains its sovereign right to go to war with either side. A nation which is neutralist has surrendered its sovereignty. It cannot go to the aid of neighbor nations, no matter how shocking the attack made against them.

Germany was outraged at the Austrian treaty. She was surprised and angry at the clause which forbids return of German property above a minimum so low that it means all German industrial and financial property there is lost. The German Minister at Vienna was hastily recalled home, and then went on a long vacation.

The senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has warned us that Soviet Russia plans a belt of neutralist states from Sweden to the Mediterranean. The Soviet leaders will persist until they have set up, if they can, a circle of neutralist states in Europe, in the Near East, and across south Asia to Japan. All these neutralist states are subtracted from the free world. No one talks seriously of a belt of neutralist states including Poland, the other Soviet satellites in Europe, and Red China. But our danger is greater than that. The Soviet Russian plan for a belt of neutralist states really means the Soviet Union has invented a new kind of satellite. These neutralist states will never resist the Soviet Union, no matter what it does. They will never be able to do so.

What has all our mutual defense spending done to protect us against this subtle expansion of the Soviet Union? What has it done to unite the two parts of dismembered Germany? What, Mr. President, in simple terms, is the military strategy on which our mutual security spending rests?

Is there the slightest reason to think we have learned anything since 1947–48, when this global spending plan began?

I repeat that the barriers to a strategy for our national security lie not in Peking, or London, or Paris, but in Washington. They are embedded in the treaties and agreements for mutual defense and in the governmental machinery for control of military aid.

Our spending is not geared to any plan for our security as a Nation. It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to speak of military aid as if it were a label to be pasted on a package, regardless of the contents.

I have pointed out, in a speech with the title "Let Us Safeguard America First" that our military planning has been hamstrung since Harry Hopkins decided in 1939 that welfare was "small potatoes" and that in foreign policy and military policy he would meet such interesting people.

Harry Hopkins controlled our military policy through international agencies for control of munitions assignment. Dean Acheson took over and exercised the same predominance through misuse of the doctrine of civilian control.

Now, Harold Stassen controls much of our military policy through the FOA, together with the international-minded lawyers in the Defense Department.

Two of these international-minded lawyers have recently departed from our midst, namely, Mr. John Adams and Mr. Struve Hensel.

But we cannot be too happy about that small gain, because Mr. Stassen has recently elevated himself to a new position, at the summit of the summit, from which he will have more control over our military policy than ever before.

Have you noticed, Mr. President, what very interesting fields of activity Mr. Stassen will control in that attractive-sounding new position, the Secretary for Peace?

Mr. Stassen will have control of "peaceful" uses of atomic energy, including the training of foreign experts, but note this little fact. There is no essential difference between the knowledge acquired for peaceful use of atomic energy, and military uses of such energy. There is certainly no difference in the first 85 percent of the technology.

So Mr. Stassen is now to train foreign scientists and technicians, including those from Iron Curtain countries, in at least 85 percent of the knowledge essential for military uses of atomic energy.

What part will our professional military men and our Cabinet Secretary for Defense play in these very, very dangerous activities?

Mr. Stassen is also to be responsible for disarmament. But "disarmament" is another field of action filled with danger to our national security. The American plan for U. N. limitation of atomic weapons was worked out by Dean Acheson and David Lilienthal. It presupposes our willingness to submit our basic decisions of national security to the U. N., which includes the Soviet Union, to permit full inspection of our defense and atomic plans, and to trust that full inspection will be carried out honestly with respect to our potential enemies.

We were saved from imposition of that dangerous plan, for a world-control of our Military Establishment, only by the Soviet veto.

Is the new disarmament program to start from the old concept? Will our Military Establishment and our military security be even more tightly locked into U. N. and subject to decisions by a world body in which Communist power is paramount by reason of the veto?

Will our Defense Department and our professional military men be free to oppose such a potential danger? Will they be free to propose quite different plans?

In his third activity, Mr. Stassen is apparently to direct the new program for aid to Asia. But that, too, is competitive with our military security.

Aid to Asia belongs with the schemes to stop the onrush of communism in the free world by spending money for a world WPA in needy areas. Is that a tried and tested basis for our national security, Mr. President?

Our military establishment is under a Secretary of cabinet rank whose powers and duties are set down in statute law. Mr. Stassen will operate with funds and agents we cannot see. He will be handicapped by no statutory restrictions on his powers or his funds. I am very doubtful whether any agency operating under statutory restrictions can compete with him.

You may tell me, Mr. President, that Mr. Stassen is leaving the mutual security program, but I am not sure. This may be only a strategic retreat.

It looks to me strikingly like the way in which Harry Hopkins separated himself from lend-lease and gave it to Mr. Stettinius. Senators will recall that circumstance.

But we did not notice that Hopkins gave Stettinius all the areas of lend-lease which he wanted Congress and the public to see. He kept to himself, vast, indefinite, and secret powers which have distorted our foreign and military policies to this very day.

Mr. Stassen tells us he has teams of experts from the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission working for him.

This is an appropriation, Mr. President, as truly as if it were made by Congress. The President has general funds and secret funds from which he can give Mr. Stassen what he needs.

He is asking for a special fund of $100 million in this bill. The President's fund of $200 million for Asian development is subject to only slight limitation.

To sum up, Mr. President, this appropriation of more than $3 billion is a financial hazard in the present state of our budget. I have said that I cannot find that this expenditure would contribute in any way to our military security.

So far as I can find, from long and diligent research, this mutual security program has seriously interfered with our national security by tying our defense planning into knots which in turn bind it close to U. N., including the Soviet Union.

I have said that the new Secretary of Peace, who is to administer some of the funds here appropriated, has three new programs, each and all of which pose new dangers to our security by tying our military operations more tightly into world agencies which operate above our law.

We are responsible in this body for raising and supporting the Armed Forces needed to defend our country.

We are responsibile for devising administrative machinery which will strengthen, not weaken, our security.

I believe we cannot in conscience vote for this vague, indefinite, potentially dangerous bill.

Therefore, I propose, Mr. President, that S. 2090 be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, with the request that they report two separate bills.

One bill should assign all funds and powers which relate to defense and to military security, to the Secretary for Defense, who is a Cabinet officer with statutory authority, so that we can see whether his responsibility is discharged.

The second bill should assign all other funds and powers to the Secretary of State, a Cabinet officer with statutory power, so that we, as the representatives of the people, can see whether his responsibilities are discharged, or to some other official, whose agency and whose powers and duties are defined in the statute law.

This idea of a personal government cannot be tolerated. We saw it under Harry Hopkins. I have had enough of it.

The Mutual Security Agency is not short of funds. There will be no delay if the bill is recommitted and if, then, the committees report two bills, one relating to the defense and security of the United States, and the other to aid. Let us not handicap entirely the military defense and security of our country in a world-boondoggling, give-away program. What delay would there be if two bills were reported from the two committees which are supposed to be acquainted with this very important subject? It could not hurt anyone. Almost $9 billion in unspent funds are available. It would take 2 or 3 years to spend that amount of money. The Mutual Security Agency is not short of funds.

Congress can properly ask for more time in which to draft a better bill for an agency which has a backlog of nearly nine billions.

Congress must, I believe, ask for time to draft a better bill for the protection of the military security of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Indiana, and if he will yield back his remaining time——

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me about 4 minutes before he yields back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Maryland desire to speak on the motion to recommit?

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Indiana desires to have a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote on his motion to recommit, and I am trying to accommodate him. A number of other Senators wish to offer amendments to the bill. If we could have a vote on the motion to recommit, the Senator from Maryland could obtain some time from other Senators who will offer amendments, if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. BUTLER. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the article to which I referred in my speech.

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

STASSEN'S VIEW—FOREIGN AID REGARDED AS FIXED POLICY

(By Henry Raymont)

Harold E. Stassen, retiring foreign-aid director, said yesterday that old time conservative capitalism in the United States has evolved into a "peoples' capitalism" shared by all.

This, he said, has confounded the Communists.

He also said in an exclusive interview that the most significant development in the postwar idealogical struggle between the Communist and capitalistic philosophies is that the free world is well ahead of the Communist nations in providing a better life for the average man.

To maintain this advantage, he continued, the United States must press forward with its program of economic cooperation with Asia and Latin America as a permanent feature of its foreign policy.

"The time when foreign aid was an emergency program is a thing of the past," he asserted. "It has shown its success and we must now regard it as an integral, permanent part of our policy."

Stassen formally surrenders his foreign aid post June 30, and at the request of President Eisenhower, will devote all his energies to developing basic United States disarmament policy.

Beginning with the Marshall plan, Stassen recalled that the United States embarked on an "honest effort to share its wealth and power with the free nations of the world."

He said that through its enlightened postwar policies, both under Democratic and Republican administrations, the United States has helped bring about these conditions:

Europe is in the midst of an unprecedented industrial upsurge.

Asia is making tremendous progress in expanding food production.

Latin America has made vast strides in developing natural resources and stabilizing monetary policies.

Plans are forming to begin more elementary forms of economic aid to Africa.

Meanwhile he saw the Communist nations suffering severe economic setbacks. He cited the internal convulsions of the Soviet Union—which resulted in the Kremlin shakeup—and pointed out that Russia has had to import sugar for home consumption.

Likewise, he said, Communist China is suffering grave food shortages.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time is remaining in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine minutes remain to the opposition to the motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be taken out of my time on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, with regard to the motion of the Senator from Indiana, I merely wish to say, that the Committee on Foreign Relations made a long and thorough study of the subject. It studied the recommendations of the highest ranking military authorities of our Nation and of all the civilian authorities from the President down. The bill represents the best judgment of the committee as a whole. I do not believe anything could be gained by having the bill recommitted.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that the Committee on Armed Services, by a vote of the committee, decided that it did not care to have the bill referred to it after the Committee on Foreign Relations had completed its work on it. Therefore I urge most strongly, and the Committee on Foreign Relations urges most strongly, that the motion be rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time remains to my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the Senator from Indiana desires to have the yeas and nays on his motion.

Mr. JENNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to recommit the bill. All time has been yielded back; the yeas and nays have been ordered and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator

from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—16

Barrett	Hruska	Mundt
Curtis	Jenner	Welker
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Williams
Eastland	Langer	Young
Ellender	Long	
Goldwater	McCarthy	

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Neely
Barkley	Hill	Neuberger
Beall	Holland	Pastore
Bennett	Humphrey	Payne
Bible	Ives	Potter
Bricker	Jackson	Purtell
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Butler	Kefauver	Russell
Byrd	Kerr	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kilgore	Scott
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Douglas	Mansfield	Stennis
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Symington
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Thurmond
Frear	McNamara	Thye
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—18

Allott	Clements	Malone
Bender	Flanders	McClellan
Bridges	Fulbright	Murray
Capehart	Gore	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Hayden	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Watkins

So Mr. JENNER's motion to recommit was not agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana.

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

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, such provisions shall not be construed to authorize the appropriation for the fiscal year 1956, for the purposes of titles I, II, and IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, of amounts (exclusive of unexpended balances of prior appropriations authorized to be continued available under such provisions) aggregating in excess of $2,918,040,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back all but 15 minutes of my time, if the opposition will do likewise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back a similar amount of time. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, each side now has 15 minutes on the Long amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time except 15 minutes on each side has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope all Senators will remain in the Chamber, because there will be a yea-and-nay vote at the end of 25 or 30 minutes of discussion on the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this is a simple amendment. It is based upon the theory that it would be a mistake for us to increase the foreign-aid program in any single year.

The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the overall appropriation authorized by the bill by $318 million. I have arrived at that figure because I believe a ceiling should be set on the military aid and the economic aid, other than the point 4 program. If we authorize a larger figure than that for which my amendment provides, we shall be appropriating more money for foreign aid next year than was appropriated last year.

Senators know that budgets are prepared years in advance. Recommendations for appropriations must be studied more than a year in advance. The world situation has improved since these recommendations were made.

Unless the proposed authorization becomes law, this will be the first year the Senate and the House of Representatives have not seen fit to reduce the amount recommended by the administration for foreign military aid. It will be the first year since 1951 in which the Senate will have appropriated more for that purpose than it provided in the previous year.

I am not proposing to reduce the amount provided in title III, which is the so-called point 4 technical assistance program. I am completely prepared to concede that title III, the technical assistance program, is here to stay; and that the United States will be providing more technical assistance throughout the world so long as any of us have the pleasure to serve in the Senate.

On the other hand, I think most Senators recognize that the large amounts of funds for foreign aid generally have not yet been wholly expended. I believe most Senators share my desire that, year by year, there should be a gradual reduction in the foreign-aid program.

How does it happen that, although the administration has requested less money this year than it requested last year, yet the Senate is prepared to vote on final passage for a committee bill which authorizes $318 million more than was proposed to be authorized last year in the bill reported by the committee.

The reason is that last year the committee that studied the foreign aid bill, which called for about $3,567,000,000, cut out almost $500 million before the bill was reported to the Senate. Then the Senate saw fit to adopt an amendment which I offered to reduce the amount another $500 million, which made the overall reduction almost $1 billion below the administration's request. Of course, much of that amount was restored by the House; nevertheless, some of the cut remained.

It seems to me we should insist that there be no expansion of the foreign-aid program, which already has on hand a balance approximating $9 billion beyond what was in the previous year. To do so would be to prolong the life of the program and to call for greater appropriations year by year. For that reason, I hope that Senators will agree with me that it would be a mistake for the Senate to appropriate more money this year for foreign aid than was appropriated last year.

As of March 31, 1955, there was on hand, unexpended, $9,909,800,000. If the bill shall be passed, even with the amendment I propose, there will be an additional $3,090,000,000 added to that amount. In other words, there would be approximately $13 billion unexpended.

The expenditures under the foreign-aid program are being made at the rate of $4,800,000,000 a year. Certainly that is sufficient to carry on the program.

My amendment proposes a reduction of less than 10 percent—a very modest reduction. It would be the smallest reduction that Congress has made since the foreign military aid program was established.

For example, in 1951, $8,500,000,000 was requested. Congress authorized $7,483,000,000, a reduction of $1 billion.

In 1952, $7,900,000,000 was requested. Congress authorized $6,447,000,000, a reduction of $1,500,000,000.

In 1953, $5,474,000,000 was requested. Congress authorized $5,057,000,000, a reduction of $325,000,000.

In 1954, last year, a request was made for $3,676,000,000. Congress authorized $3,252,000,000, a reduction of $425 million.

If my amendment shall be agreed to, for a reduction of $318 million, the cut will be the smallest that Congress will have made in the history of the foreign military-aid program.

I submit that my amendment proposes a very modest reduction, far less than that which was made last year.

The argument has been made that we should support the President. I believe we should support the President, but also we should discharge our own responsibilities. President Eisenhower has given us his views, but he expects us to accept our responsibility. Surely that responsibility is to vote our judgment in these matters.

For example, last year, President Eisenhower recommended $3,500,000,000. After the request was made, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, without a single amendment, proceeded to reduce it to $3,100,000,000. In their judgment, the members of the committee thought that was wise. The Senate cut it an additional amount. I saw no evidence that the President felt that we had not supported him.

The mechanics of the program would work in this manner: There would be an overall ceiling on the amount which could be appropriated. The bill would authorize in additional items, more than the ceiling would permit to be appropriated. It would then be the responsibility of those in charge of the program to go before the appropriations committees of both the House and the Senate and explain to them where they believed the reduction of $314 million could best be absorbed. That is the procedure which the Senate adopted, by a vote of 45 to 41, last year, involving a reduction of $500 million, after the committee had already reduced the amount by almost $500 million.

It seems to me that such a procedure would be in order, due to the fact that the committee has not reduced the program by 5 cents. I believe we should proceed to make what would be a very modest reduction, which I believe would bring the amount to that appropriated last year, a reduction of $314 million.

As I say, that would leave an authorized appropriation for this year of $3,090,000,000. There would be on had, in addition, almost $10 billion of unexpended funds.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I hope very much the distinguished chairman of the committee will not feel obliged to oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Georgia such time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is predicating his case on the unexpended balances in this bill. Last year the Committee on Appropriations defined "unexpended balances," and gave it a statutory interpretation, and under that statutory interpretation of unexpended balances—and that is the law which is applicable to this bill for this year, at least—the unexpended balances are very small. In fact, according to the testimony of Mr. Hensel, and according to the other testimony which was adduced before the committtee, they are approximately $100 million; and all of that is contracted for, or is allocated, or the Defense Department has placed orders in that amount, in order to expedite the furnishing of arms and military material to the countries to whom we are obligated to furnish them.

When such orders are given, the FOA—that is the name of the organization this year—is called upon and is asked to allocate to the different departments an amount necessary to pay the bill when the "hardware" is delivered. That represents all the unexpended balances here involved.

In order to make that certain, the very last provision of the pending bill provides that unexpended balances in excess of $200 million not continue available after June 30, 1955. If there is more than $200 million, it is not to be reappropriated for the use of the mutual security program. In other words, it is cut off at $200 million.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I am speaking under limited time, but I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell us why the provision was placed in the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I am trying to tell the Senator. It was placed in the bill because the testimony was undisputed and it was unquestioned that every dollar of this money had been allocated under the statutory definition made by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, which was binding upon that committee. It was stated there was remaining only $100 million. It was first proposed that only $100 million of the unexpended balances should be carried over. It is true we did reappropriate the unexpended balances, but in accordance with the testimony, and we limited the carryover to $200 million.

So do not worry about the unexpended balances or the unallocated balances. That is all there is to the question. More than $200 million cannot be carried over. There is no way for more than that amount to be carried over. There are no unexpended balances, other than the amounts reserved to take care of military orders placed by the Defense Department in order to expedite the furnishing of arms.

The bill does not provide for a greater amount than did the bill of last year, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana. Much has been said to the effect that the bill does so provide. The pending bill carries the total cost of the Army in Korea. Heretofore a large percentage of the appropriation necessary to support our Armed Forces in Korea has been borne by the Military or Defense Establishment. One hundred twenty-two million dollars of it is an item for infrastructure, the building of bases in Spain. That amount is reappropriated. All that money is to be added, to make the bill appropriate approximately $3,480,000,000.

The unexpended balance is the item which seems to have troubled some of us. There will always be an unexpended balance in this bill, and in every other bill, when orders cannot be filled the first year the appropriation is made. There is a large unexpended balance in the military defense appropriation. It is unavoidable, because orders cannot be filled in a year. Some of them take 2 years. Some of the orders take more than 2 years.

So far as the military items are concerned—and they are a big part of the bill, in fact three-fourths of the bill—it is true that such items do not encompass military "hardware" alone but encompass military "hardware" plus direct support, which includes the clothing soldiers must wear. It means that Korea and Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa can support, all told, nearly 1 million soldiers, which can be used for our defense. Those soldiers cannot be supplied with shoes, coats, hats, and other necessary articles which soldiers in an army must have, unless we see that they are supplied. The pending bill must take care of, if it is to be taken care of at all, the total cost of maintaining an army in Korea, of maintaining all the armed forces in Korea, an obligation to which the Defense Department, during the Korean war and up until this year, has largely contributed.

More than $400 million will go to the armed forces in Korea, or for their benefit or support. There are 500,000 Korean soldiers who are trained to come to our rescue. In Formosa there are another 400,000 to 500,000 troops, or some such number; and there are many soldiers in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, do we want any allies? Do we want any help?

I do not believe it wise for us to undertake to cut the authorization provided by this bill below that recommended by the committee.

So far as the unexpended balances are concerned, I am perfectly willing now, if Senators wish to do so, to provide that only $100 million of unexpended balances shall be carried over; and that will end all the unexpended balances, except for those which will be allocated or held in reserve to meet the bill which this fund will owe to the Defense Establishment which is putting up its own money in order that it may order the necessary "hardware," the necessary munitions, the necessary arms, to support the Armed Forces abroad to which we are making a contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me at this time?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Georgia will recall that in the hearings before the committee, the witnesses representing the armed services and the mutual-aid program, as well as the State Department, seemed to have gone into greater detail in outlining the need for all these items than had previously been done in respect to any other bill with which I ever had any connection; and

the Senator from Georgia will also recall that many of the Members of the Senate, including himself and myself, asked Mr. Hensel, particularly, if they had screened this request for authorizations to the point where it represented the minimum assistance we could safely provide to our friends throughout the world. Does the Senator from Georgia recall that that is true?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly so. We went into it at great length, and made every possible effort to have them explain what is meant by these unexpended balances.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Hensel impressed me as a very able and a very sincere man. Surely he has no ulterior motive in making these recommendations. He has since resigned from the Government, and the President has accepted his resignation.

It seems to me that, as I recall, no bill was ever explained in greater detail or was worked on more thoroughly than the pending bill.

So, Mr. President, I believe, with the Senator from Georgia, that the amendment proposed by our good friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], should not prevail.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; if I have sufficient time to do so. Let me inquire of the Chair how much time remains to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator from Georgia will yield only briefly to me, I should like to state, for the record, what Mr. Hensel said.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Hensel, then the Assistant Secretary of Defense, said:

> A dollar abroad buys more frontline defense than a dollar spent at home.

He also said:

> Our security could not be better and more economically preserved if we spent on our own forces the money we are now spending on allied forces.

Let me say that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said:

> The mutual-defense assistance program is an integral part of our own national-security program.

He also said:

> Such a program can hardly be labeled a giveaway program.

A little later he said:

> It is more advantageous for us to assist our allies in maintaining their own national forces, especially ground forces, than it is for us to provide United States soldiers.

He also said:

> Our security and that of our allies are in reality one and the same.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Louisiana have 7 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Georgia desires to have any further time.

Mr. GEORGE. No. I was going to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have arranged to have time yielded to the Senator from California.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will use his 7 minutes at this time, then we are prepared to yield to the Senator from California the 2 minutes remaining to our side.

Mr. LONG. Very well, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if I should have the honor to serve for a great many years in the Senate I would never expect to enjoy the esteem with which the Senator from Georgia is held by the Senate, or to approach the eloquence with which he speaks. But in my 7 years of service in the Senate, I have gained a decided impression of the way that such budget items are prepared.

In years gone by I have found that I could agree with the Senator from Georgia because he has advocated, in connection with foreign aid expenditures reductions which I myself have advocated. Last year we agreed that the cost of the foreign-aid bill could be reduced, and the distinguished chairman of the committee and a majority of the committee agreed on the making of such a reduction.

I read now from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1954; the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] then said:

> Therefore, I said to the committee, as I said to the representative of the executive branch of the Government, that if we cut the authorization bill to not exceeding approximately $3 billion in new money, I felt I could go along with it. We did cut it.
>
> The House authorized $3,566,908,000. We cut it down to $3,100,000,000; $10 million has been added on the floor for Latin American countries. I think that was a very wise decision by the Senate. Therefore, we reduced substantially the amount of new money in the bill. That is what we are now asked to authorize.

A little later the Senator from Georgia said:

> If we cut the amount by another half billion dollars, perhaps we could get by; but if we cut it by a billion dollars, as I first thought we should cut it, we would serve notice upon the world that the United States at least was withdrawing so far as our NATO program was concerned, so far as all our efforts in Southeast Asia are concerned, and so far as any protection in the Far East, in the Middle East, and in all of Europe is concerned.

At that time the Senator from Georgia was referring to a $1 billion amendment which was being offered by me; and the Senator from Georgia was agreeing that perhaps we could make another $500 million reduction, in addition to the $500 million reduction which he himself had recommended.

So at that time the Senator from Georgia felt that a $1 billion reduction in a bill calling for $3½ billion would not be too great a reduction to make.

Let me point out that the persons who prepared that budget are the same ones who prepared this budget. Although today the Senator from Georgia is more impressed by their testimony than he was then, I have concluded that the officials who prepared this budget did so in about the same way that they prepared the budget last year.

Mr. President, if we can take at face value the assertions of the administration, I believe the administration intends gradually to reduce the amount of the overall foreign-aid program.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say that this budget has been made up in a way in which no other budget for foreign aid has been made up. I sat in on the committee meetings when the first foreign-aid bill was prepared, following which it was brought to the floor of the Senate. We then agreed upon a $17 billion program for a little more than 4 years, and we made the appropriations year by year. The late Senator Vandenburg, who then was chairman of the committee, agreed with me; and that was the position we took.

This budget is a very well prepared one. It is the best prepared and best presented budget I have seen come from the Mutual Security Administration. It is a very thoroughly prepared budget, and is the best of any budget I have seen submitted by any Administration or under any Administrator.

Last year the unexpended balances were in serious question. Actually, about $6 billion was unexpended.

But now that entire picture has changed. The unexpended balances represent nothing on earth except either allocated funds or reserve funds within a statutory definition fixed by the Appropriations Committee, as I have already said, except in the case of approximately $100 million; and then we have assumed all the cost of caring for the Korean soldiers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me say a word in regard to the allocation or obligation of the funds. It is easy enough for someone to write in a book that it is expected that certain funds will be spent in certain ways. But this Administration has on hand almost $10 billion of unexpended funds, to which we propose to add $3 billion.

Let me say that I had the privilege of serving on the Armed Services Committee when this program was initiated. I recall very well that we were told, sometimes behind closed doors, and sometimes in public, that the great year of danger was 1954, and that we had to appropriate $7 billion or $8 billion in 1 year because we had to aid our friends, and because we were expecting that war would break out in that year. 1954 came and went. We appropriated the money. We armed our allies. In some places they have arms running out of their ears. Yet the experience we have is that, far from the program tapering

off, in some respects it is being expanded. Far from merely arming our allies, we are now asked to buy their uniforms, to feed them, and to pay the soldiers in the field. There is not a nation in the world that cannot put uniforms or some sort of clothing on its own soldiers. There is not a nation in the world that cannot feed its own soldiers. There is not a nation in the world that cannot pay the modest sums which these nations pay to take care of their troops, particularly in peacetime. Yet the United States is picking up the check for all of them. In addition, here comes a great economic program, in the name of foreign aid, and in the name of military support.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. In just a moment.

We are being asked to build factories in those countries, to rehabilitate their railroads, and to build transmission lines across those countries, all in the name of defense.

This budget can be reduced. If the Senate will accept this amendment, we shall have very good and sound advice from the Foreign Operations Administration itself, and from its able officers, on how we can make the very modest reduction I am recommending.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Louisiana said that any nation could afford to clothe and feed its soldiers. Korea was at war less than 3 years ago. Korea was devastated.

Mr. LONG. Korea is perhaps the exception.

Mr. THYE. She is trying today to rehabilitate herself, and she is facing serious economic problems.

Mr. LONG. Korea is perhaps an exception; but there is involved only $400 million in this bill affecting Korea.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG. I cannot yield further at this time. I must answer the Senator. There is involved only approximately $400 million for Korea, out of an-overall total of $3,400,000,000. There is no reason why this amendment need affect Korea. If it should affect Korea, it would be because, when a modest reduction was made, the administration itself would proceed to recommend that perhaps in some of the Korean items there could be a reduction. I will agree that Korea has a better case than other countries so far as concerns supporting her troops and paying her soldiers.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished chairman [Mr. GEORGE] also referred to Formosa. Every available man who can wear a uniform and serve in the armed forces is in the armed forces of that country. Therefore its economic condition is strained, and if we do not in some sense support that army, it will not stand as a part of our national defense.

Mr. LONG. Some may pick out strong points in this program and emphasize them. Others may pick out weak points, such, for example, as the building of a railroad for India. India could take care of the railroad for herself. If we did not give her any money, she would build it any way.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I complete my thought?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I merely wish to say that there are thousands of items throughout the world involving far greater amounts than does the pending bill, running to the extent of perhaps $50 billion or $100 billion, which would be equally as desirable as items in this bill, if Congress saw fit to make that much money available to our friends throughout the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time, which is less than 3 minutes, I believe, to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], not only for the very cogent reasons which have been presented by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, but for some additional reasons as well.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia has had more experience in this body than any of the others of us. He was quite correct when he said that among all the bills which have come to the Senate from the Foreign Relations Committee—certainly during the period of time I have served on that committee, and previously on the Armed Services Committee—there has never been a more detailed breakdown of the facts and figures relating to any bill than that relating to the bill now before the Senate.

We must deal realistically with the situation in the world today. It is quite true, as the Senator from Louisiana pointed out, that the previous administration, as well as this one, had pointed out the necessity of building a system of selective security against the menace of communism in the event the Communists should decide to move in 1952, 1953, or 1954. It is true that they did not move, but, in my opinion, one reason they did not move is that the free world, largely supported by the United States, which furnished leadership, had presented a formidable barrier to their moving. Certainly in 1955, when matters may be coming to a critical head, this is not the time to pull the stopper on the situation in the Far East.

It is extremely important not only that we provide military support for our allies in that part of the world but that they also have the defense support items. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], it is extremely necessary that there be such defense support items for Korea, because it does no good to give the troops guns if they are not properly clothed. Winterized clothing is necessary in order to meet aggression which may come during the winter months.

Korean troops are in much larger force than a country of that size would normally maintain. The number is far beyond the economic possibility of their maintenance by that nation. There are approximately 600,000 Korean troops there. The fact that they are there provides a stanch part of the defense in the Pacific.

On the island of Formosa there are approximately half a million Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel. Those two small countries together account for 1,100,000 men. Certainly at this particular point in the history of the world it would be most disadvantageous—and it might even be fatal—to pull the stopper on that situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired. All time has been exhausted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would note "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—27

Barrett	Ellender	Martin, Pa.
Bible	Frear	Mundt
Bricker	Goldwater	Robertson
Butler	Hruska	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Curtis	Kerr	Thurmond
Daniel	Langer	Welker
Dworshak	Long	Williams
Eastland	Magnuson	Young

NAYS—53

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Morse
Barkley	Hill	Neely
Beall	Holland	Neuberger
Bennett	Humphrey	Pastore
Bush	Ives	Payne
Capehart	Jackson	Potter
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kilgore	Scott
Dirksen	Knowland	Smathers
Douglas	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ervin	Mansfield	Sparkman
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Symington
George	McCarthy	Thye
Green	McNamara	Wiley
Hayden	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—16

Allott	Fulbright	Murray
Bender	Gore	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Watkins
Chavez	Malone	
Clements	McClellan	

So Mr. LONG's amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, between lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

(f) At the end of the chapter add the following new section:

"SEC. 515. During any period during which any American citizen is held prisoner by Communist China, none of the funds authorized by this act, or by any act authorizing the appropriation of funds for providing financial assistance to foreign countries, shall be obligated or expended for providing assistance to any foreign country which (a) exports or knowingly permits the exportation of materials or products from such country to Communist China, or (b) ships or knowingly permits the shipment of materials or products to any port in Communist China on a vessel carrying the flag of such country or owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the nationals of such country."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand it is agreeable to the Senator from Wisconsin that we yield back all but 3 minutes on each side and ask for the yeas and nays. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Wisconsin, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back all but 3 minutes of my time.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, it will take me less than 3 minutes to discuss my amendment. However, in case I am questioned, I might require more than 3 minutes. Is that agreeable to the Senator?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should prefer to yield back all time but 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that each side has yielded back all but 5 minutes. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senate Investigating Committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] held hearings 2 or 3 weeks ago with regard to the American uniformed men who are still being held in Communist China. We had before us officials of the Air Corps, the Army, the Navy, and the State Department, and it was admitted by them that 481 uniformed men are still being held by Communist China. This makes the administration claims that there are only from 11 to 15 being held very deceptive in the extreme. Since that time four men have been released, which means that there are still 477 uniformed men being held.

As to civilians, there are apparently 20, although there is an estimate given of 35. That is a total of 477 uniformed men still being held in Communist China, and perhaps 20 or 25 civilians.

My amendment simply provides that no country which ships the sinews of military strength to Red China or permits the shipment of such materials to Red China shall receive any mutual security aid.

Mr. President, I do not believe any argument is required. The amendment is self-explanatory. Either we continue giving aid to countries that ship to Red China while Red China is holding Americans prisoners of war, or we do not.

I wish to say to the majority leader that I appreciate his help in getting the yeas and nays on this particular amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if any Senator desires time to speak in opposition, I shall be glad to yield it to him.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this amendment. It sounds plausible and good, but it is a very unwise step to take.

We are making progress in getting prisoners released. Four of them have been released recently. The chances are that in a short time 11 or maybe more may be out of Red China. This amendment would impose a burden upon other peoples in that area who may do some little trading with Red China and to whom we must extend help if we are to maintain anything like stability in the entire Far East.

Suppose, Mr. President, that Japan should buy a little material from Red China. She must buy from someone. Suppose Japan should ship some goods into Red China; soft goods or any other kind of goods. It would be most embarrassing to our whole program in that area if we should take the position that such an act alone and of itself would result in Japan forfeiting all the aid and assistance we might find it necessary to provide her under this program and which should be provided if we are to have any stability in the Far East. That stability must come primarily, let us say, through the Philippines, through Japan, through Korea, through Formosa, and some other countries, including India, if India should become militantly on our side or should even be strictly neutral.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no time, but I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. With the great respect I have for the able Senator from Georgia, I hesitate questioning him on the floor of the Senate. However, does the Senator realize that even though the war in Korea has been ended for more than 2 years, according to testimony taken by the committee there were 481—the number is now 477—uniformed men who have not been returned and who are being brain-washed into eternity in Communist dungeons? Does the Senator realize the figure was 944 after the exchange of prisoners, and that now some 463 have disappeared? I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that we should not give money to allies while they are strengthening Red China which, in turn, is torturing into eternity American young men. It would seem to follow as the night follows the day.

Mr. GEORGE. I cannot answer the Senator's question, because it is an argument or a thesis. But I would say that, under this bill, if England does any trading whatever with Red China, then any aid or assistance—military assistance, because there is nothing else going to England—would be cut off. The Senator's amendment would make the program impossible. It is just as well for us to be frank about it and, if we do not want to continue the program, to say so directly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator know that under our rules and regulations no American ship can carry goods to Red China and no American businessman can sell goods to Red China?

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite a different thing. But I have no further time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—18

Barrett	Hruska	McCarthy
Curtis	Jenner	Potter
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Thurmond
Dworshak	Kerr	Welker
Frear	Knowland	Williams
Goldwater	Langer	Young

NAYS—60

Aiken	Bennett	Byrd
Anderson	Bible	Capehart
Barkley	Bush	Carlson
Beall	Butler	Case, N. J.
Cotton	Jackson	Neely
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Douglas	Kefauver	Pastore
Duff	Kilgore	Payne
Eastland	Kuchel	Purtell
Ellender	Lehman	Robertson
Ervin	Long	Saltonstall
Flanders	Magnuson	Scott
George	Mansfield	Smathers
Hayden	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Maine
Hennings	Martin, Pa.	Smith, N. J.
Hickenlooper	McNamara	Sparkman
Hill	Millikin	Stennis
Holland	Monroney	Symington
Humphrey	Morse	Thye
Ives	Mundt	Wiley

NOT VOTING—18

Allott	Clements	McClellan
Bender	Fulbright	Murray
Bricker	Gore	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Green	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Chavez	Malone	Watkins

So Mr. McCARTHY's amendment was rejected.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out through line 25 on page 12, as follows:

(k) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 418. President's fund for Asian economic development: (a) The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to contribute to international peace and security through assisting the peoples of free Asia in their efforts to attain economic and social well-being, to safeguard basic rights and liberties, and to protect their security and independence. The Congress hereby recognizes that fundamental to these goals is an expanding economic growth of the free Asia area based upon self-help and mutual cooperation and full utilization of already existing resources and knowledge. The Congress expresses the willingness of the people of the United States to support the foregoing objectives to the extent to which the countries in the area continue to make effective use of their own resources and external resources otherwise available to them.

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, there is hereby authorized to be established a fund, to be known as the 'President's fund for Asian economic development' (hereinafter referred to as 'the fund'), and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fund an amount of $200 million, such amount to remain available until June 30, 1958.

"(c) The President is authorized to utilize the appropriations made available for the fund to accomplish in the free Asian area the policies and purposes declared in this act and to disburse them on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify to any person, corporation, or other body of persons however designated, or to any foreign government, agency, or organization or group of governments or agencies as may be appropriate: *Provided, however,* That not less than 50 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with the provisions of section 505, and not more than 25 percent of said funds may be allocated for assistance to any one nation.

"(d) In utilizing the fund the President shall give preference to projects or programs that will clearly contribute to promoting greater economic strength in the area as a whole or among a group or groups of countries of the area."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is this the amendment on which the Senator desires to have the yeas and nays, and on which he is agreeable to 5 minutes' time for debate on each side?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield back all of my time except 5 minutes, if the Senator from Louisiana will do likewise.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back except 5 minutes on each side. The senior Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I made a rather lengthy statement regarding the reasons why I thought the five amendments I proposed to submit should be adopted.

The pending amendment seeks to strike from the bill the item of $200 million which is provided for the President to spend in Asia as he sees fit.

Mr. President, under the law as it now exists, the President has the right to spend $150 million, and that amount is to be taken from moneys which are available and appropriated for mutual-security programs. The bill seeks to cut the $150 million to $50 million, but it restores the $100 million, in the form a direct appropriation to the President's special fund and the bill also adds another $200 million to be available for expenditure by the President for economic-aid programs in Asia.

As I stated earlier this afternoon, I attempted to cut the direct forces support authorization, which is the nature of economic aid, by $500 million. My amendment did not carry. The item we are now considering provides for economic aid pure and simple.

I should now like to read excerpts from the committee report regarding the $200 million fund:

> Primarily for projects contributing to economic development of the Asian region as a whole * * *
>
> Not less than 50 percent of the appropriations made to the fund shall be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis, and no more than 25 percent of the funds may be allocated for assistance to any one nation.
>
> Among examples of projects for which the fund might be used are regional development of water and mineral resources, transportation, and communications projects, and regional training centers.
>
> It seems to the committee that an investment of $200 million in the President's discretion for purposes of peaceful economic development in Asia is at least as justified and worthwhile as the earlier investment of much larger sums in the President's discretion for purposes of military assistance and direct forces support.

Mr. President, I have read from excerpts taken from the committee report. I believe, as I stated earlier this afternoon, that there are ample funds provided elsewhere in the bill to take care of such developments as are proposed by the President, without his being allotted the

additional sum of $200 million. To say the least, my amendment seeks to cut a relatively small sum from the bill, and I hope the Senate will vote favorably on it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Georgia desire time to speak in opposition to the amendment? If so, I yield him such time as he may desire.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall speak, unless some other Senator desires to speak. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana to what his amendment relates? Does it propose to eliminate the $200 million special fund?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is all my amendment provides for.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in the committee we gave to this particular provision a great deal of consideration. It was the earnest desire of most members of the committee that the fund should not be in the form of a blank check, but there was no real opposition to providing the $200 million.

I should like to say, Mr. President, there are a great many matters it is difficult to explain, because they are not supposed to be talked about, since, if they were, there would be disclosed to an enemy, if there be an enemy, certain information. But, beyond all doubt, the President will be called upon to do a great deal for Japan, and he will be able to do it primarily through this fund.

We have restricted the use of the fund. We have required that at least $100 million of the total amount be used in the form of loans. Most of the money can be put out on the basis of commercial loans and in the case of Japan they would be good loans.

We have restricted the use of the fund further by providing that not more than 25 percent of the $200 million shall be either granted or loaned to any one country in the Asian area. Furthermore, the President is required every 6 months to report what he has done with the fund and how it has been used and expended.

There are conditions in the Far East which, when they were explained to the committee in strictly executive session, as they had to be, seemed to the committee to justify the grant of this additional sum of money to be used in the Asian area.

Mr. President, I hope this provision will not be stricken from the bill. I referred to Japan, because I thought that country could be mentioned with a degree of safety; but there are certain other purposes, which I am not at liberty to discuss on the floor of the Senate, for which the fund may be used in the Far East.

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I simply wish to say, in answer to my good friend from Georgia, that the $150 million special fund of the President which is now provided for by transfers from any of the Mutual Security programs could be used, I am sure, to the same extent and for the same purposes as could the $200 million of direct appropriations provided in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been either exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Masssachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—17

Byrd	Hruska	Russell
Curtis	Jenner	Thurmond
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Welker
Eastland	Langer	Williams
Ellender	Long	Young
Goldwater	Mansfield	

NAYS—63

Aiken	George	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hill	Neely
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Humphrey	Pastore
Bricker	Ives	Payne
Bush	Jackson	Potter
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Carlson	Kerr	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kilgore	Scott
Cotton	Knowland	Smathers
Daniel	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Magnuson	Sparkman
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Stennis
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Flanders	McCarthy	Thye
Frear	McNamara	Wiley

NOT VOTING—16

Allott	Fulbright	Murray
Bender	Gore	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Green	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Watkins
Chavez	Malone	
Clements	McClellan	

So Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "Not less than 50 percent of."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to state, for the information of the Senate, that some four or five amendments remain to be passed upon. I do not anticipate that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on more than one of them, and perhaps there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the question of final passage of the bill.

So, Mr. President, if we obtain the cooperation of the Members, we should be able to end today's session a little after 8 p. m.

I have an understanding with the Senator from Louisiana that I will yield back all my time on the amendment except for 2 minutes, on the condition that he will do the same.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is acceptable, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides have agreed to yield back all time available to them, with the exception of 2 minutes each.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say that I wish to cooperate with my good friend, the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the amendment would strike out of the bill the words "not

less than 50 percent of." The amendment affects the $200 million we have been discussing.

Under the bill, 50 percent of the $200 million must be made by loan. My amendment will make the entire $200 million available to the President, provided all of it is handled on a loan basis. That is the object of the amendment, which I submit to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this amendment would make this fund unavailable for the purposes for which the administration expects to use it in the Far East; in fact the amendment would utterly destroy the fund. We have already restricted 50 percent to loans, but we have left the President with some power to dispose of 50 percent of it to meet emergency conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time available on the amendment has either been used or been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, on page 12, in line 15.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and to redesignate subsections (b) to (k), inclusive, as (a) to (j), respectively.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as agreed to previously, I yield back all but 2 minutes of the time available to me on the amendment, on the condition that the Senator from Louisiana will do likewise.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana has been yielded back, with the exception of 2 minutes for each side.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I indicated awhile ago, in discussing the $200 million amendment, this amendment will eliminate the $100 million direct appropriation to the President's special fund which he could use at his discretion.

Under the law as it now stands the President may use up to $150 million for those purposes he thinks particularly pressing, but he must take this money from other funds provided in the bill. The pending bill would eliminate this transfer authority as to $100 million of the $150 million, and make that amount available as new money, appropriated directly to the President.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Georgia desire to speak?

Mr. GEORGE. I desire only a minute, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, within the year the President had to use money which he was able to borrow to hold Iran in being, standing next to Russia, face to face with Russia, and with no means in the world of defending herself. She would have gone to the Communist group if the President had not used a little money. This fund is the only available fund he will have to use in any part of the world, except for transfers.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not true that under the law as it now stands—without the benefit of the committee amendment—the President has the use of $150 million, which he can take from other funds we are now authorizing?

Mr. GEORGE. I think he may take some money from other funds, under certain circumstances.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the law.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is exhausted or has been yielded back.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement concerning my amendment.

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

President's special fund: Eliminates the $100 million of authorization for direct appropriation to the President's special fund, and retains provisions of existing law which permit the President to transfer from other mutual-security funds, up to $150 million, to be used by him "without regard to the requirements of this act (Mutual Security Act) or any other act for which funds are authorized by this act, in furtherance of any of the purposes of such acts, when the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States." Not to exceed $100 million can be spent on "any selected persons" who are residing in or escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. Up to $50 million can be spent by the President without vouchers to substantiate the expenditures.

The committee bill would appropriate $100 million direct to the special fund, and continue the President's authority to transfer funds from other programs, up to the sum of $50 million.

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

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, it is proposed to strike out lines 5 to 24, inclusive, and renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back all my time except 2 minutes, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back all my time except 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time except 2 minutes on each side is yielded back.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment quite fully earlier in the day. As I stated this afternoon, when the Sentate first enacted the technical-aid program some years ago, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] offered an amendment which was accepted by Senator Connally, who was then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to the effect that under no conditions should any representative of our Government go to a foreign country and propose development schemes, and then promise to assist financially in the development of such schemes.

Since the technical-aid program is worked in conjunction with the development aid provided for in this bill, it lends itself to the very abuse the Senate sought to eliminate by adopting the Russell amendment. We sought to do away with this possibility—a possibility which has now become a reality—that is, that the administrator of the fund might go to a certain country and propose to give financial assistance in connection with any project proposed if the country should sign an agreement for technical assistance. That is the way this fund might be used, and has been used in the past. Let me quote from page 10 of the committee report:

The $1 million development-assistance program proposed for Nepal this year is intended to supplement a technical-cooperation program and to begin meeting the needs for better transportation and communication facilities and for development of isolated areas.

This is just one example, Mr. President. I am sure there are more.

I wish to emphasize that I am in full accord with our technical-aid program. But when point 4 is combined with development assistance, as it has been, and will be in the future, it no longer represents a real technical-aid program as envisioned by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a further explanation of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Amendment eliminating $165 million of development assistance:

The money is broken down as follows:

Asia:	
India	$70,000,000
Nepal	1,000,000
Total	71,000,000
Near East and Africa	[1] 73,000,000
Western Hemisphere:	
Bolivia	16,000,000
Guatemala	5,000,000
Total	$21,000,000

[1] Not allocated by countries.

Uses by countries:

India, $70 million: Thirty million dollars in surplus agricultural commodities, the local currency proceeds from which will be used for local costs of irrigation, flood control and power projects (p. 9).

Other uses:

Fertilizer	$4,000,000
Deep irrigation wells	4,000,000
River valley development to assist in further expansion of irrigation	2,000,000
Construction of electric power facilities	5,000,000
Steel	15,000,000
Transportation, principally rehabilitation of Indian railways	6,000,000
Malaria control	4,000,000

Nepal, $1 million: One million dollars will be used to supplement a technical cooperation program and to begin meeting the needs for better transportation and communication facilities and for development of isolated areas (p. 9).

Near East and Africa, $73 million: "The existing situation in the Near East makes it inadvisable to specify the amounts of development assistance allocated to individual countries in that area" (p. 19).

"In Egypt, program is designed to help the Egyptian Government carry out its overall 10-year, $2 billion economic development plan which is aimed principally at achieving maximum agricultural production, increasing the amount of arable land, expanding industrial production, and introducing new industries. United States assistance will consist chiefly of equipment for highway construction and port improvement, and construction of grain silos, irrigation pumping stations, and powerplants" (p. 20).

Israel: "Surplus agricultural commodities will account for a large part of the development assistance program, about half of which will probably be on a loan basis. Although Israel has made significant economic progress, and American assistance has been reduced, it is not yet feasible to terminate that assistance" (p. 20).

Lebanon: "The program would concentrate on agricultural development, improvement of village water supplies, and public roads. A primary object is to encourage local capital formation through reducing the need for expenditures on food imports and through improving transportation facilities. It is contemplated that most of the assistance for Lebanon would be on a loan basis and that part of it would be in the form of commodities" (p. 20).

Syria: "Although the United States has no agreements for either development assistance or technical cooperation in Syria, the bill includes funds for economic aid should Syria desire it in connection with unified planning of the project for utilizing the waters of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers. Maximum use of this water for irrigation might prevent full development of its hydroelectric power potential in which case Syria might need external credit for thermal power development" (p. 20).

Bolivia: $16 million: "The development assistance program for Bolivia for fiscal 1956 includes $10 million in food and agricultural imports, principally bread grains ($7 million) and fats and oils ($2 million), and $6 million in machinery and vehicles, chiefly agricultural and road-building equipment. Local currency accruing from the sale of the commodities will be used to carry out additional portions of the Bolivian development plan" (p. 21).

Guatemala: "The development assistance authorization in the bill includes $5 million for Guatemala to be used principally for financing the construction of roads and other public-works projects. These activities will not only alleviate unemployment but should also stimulate economic activity generally by opening up hitherto isolated sections of the country. Part of the money will also be used for completion of Roosevelt Hospital in Guatemala City. The Committee has some doubts that the $5 million authorization in the bill for Guatemala is sufficient. It is possible, depending upon future developments, that perhaps as much as $10 million more may be required to help the Castillo Armas liberation government repair the economic damage left by the Communist regime. In this connection, the committee calls attention to the authorization in section 8 (a) of $100 million for a world-wide contingency fund and urges the administration not to hesitate to use this fund to provide additional assistance to Guatemala, should such action prove necessary" (p. 21–22).

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I thought everyone agreed that the technical assistance program was a good program. It frequently happens that we go into a backward country and offer a small amount of money to obtain material in order to carry out the program if the country agrees on a certain project. Only a small amount of money is involved.

The entire technical assistance program is not large. It is really pitiably small when we consider the totals involved.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is exhausted or yielded back.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$65,000,000" and insert $16,500,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if we may have the same understanding as before, I yield back all but 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on either side is yielded back, except for 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment seeks to cut from the bill $48,500,000 from the total authorized to assist in providing new homes for Palestine refugees in Jordan. It was my privilege to visit that place. While I admit that the places where the refugees live are awful, yet we are embarking on a program under which we put up 70 percent of two projects which will cost in excess of $150 million.

I think we ought to draw the line somewhere—and now is the time to do it. I do not believe we shall ever satisfy the Arabs by building housing in Jordan. What they want, of course, is to return to Palestine. To my way of thinking, it is a waste of funds for us to obligate ourselves to spend as much as 70 percent of the cost of erecting this $150 million project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a further explanation of the amendment.

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

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (UNRWA)

Eliminate $48,500,000 from total authorized for this agency, the amount representing the agency's assessment against the United States for commencing construction in 1956, of permanent rehabilitation centers for Arab refugees.

The agency has budgeted $61.5 million for these rehabilitation centers in fiscal 1956, of which the United States would contribute $48.5 million, or 70 percent of the cost.

The Ellender amendment would not touch the $16.5 million in the bill for the United States' contribution to UNRWA to carry on relief activities in fiscal 1956. The total annual cost to UNRWA is approximately $25 million, with the United States contribution in 1956 amounting to $16.5 million, or approximately 60 percent.

The committee report describes the permanent rehabilitation project as follows: "A permanent solution of the Arab refugee problem can only be found through rehabilitation and resettlement, and the committee has repeatedly expressed its deep concern over the lack of progress in this direction. The committee was therefore encouraged to learn that final negotiations are nearing completion for two large-scale resettlement projects. One of these will provide for 60,000 to 70,000 people in Sinai at an estimated cost of $50 million. The other is the Jordan River Valley development which will benefit about 150,000 refugees at an estimated cost of 90 million. Both of these projects will take a number of years to complete but the administration is hopeful that a start can be made on them during the course of fiscal 1956, and UNRWA has tentatively budgeted $61.5 million for this purpose. The committee believes that if projects of this character can be brought to fruition, a great contribution will have been made to reducing the tensions that now disturb the area. In view of the great benefits which would flow from such a development, the committee feels the United States contribution here proposed of 70 percent of the total is justified, but at the same time it believes that greater effort might be made to increase worldwide participation in the program" (pp. 31–32).

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia such time as he may desire.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am sure it would not be wise to cut the very heart out of the refugee program. According to all the reports we receive, this program is just now beginning to become effective. Everyone knows more or less about the problems between Israel and the Arab countries. I certainly hope that this refugee program will not be cut. It is purely a housing program, to take care of refugees who have no homes.

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, beginning with the word *"Provided"* in line 25, it is proposed to strike out through the period in line 3 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That until January 1, 1956, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the employment of not to exceed 200 persons at rates of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of GS-9 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, transferred from the Foreign Operations Administration to any other agency pursuant to Executive order, may be terminated, but this authority shall not be applicable to persons entitled to veterans' preference for Federal Government employment.

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

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will yield further, let me say that I had an amendment designated "6-1-55-A," but in view of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, I shall not offer my amendment tonight, but will support his amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this amendment would authorize a waiver of the civil-service laws with respect to the termination of employment of not to exceed 200 persons with rates of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of GS-9 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but would not authorize the waiver of veterans' preference laws.

The operations of the FOA are to be transferred to another agency under the State Department. I believe it is only fair and good business practice and good business management to give the head of the new agency the right to terminate the services of at least 200 of approximately 1,500 employees without reference to civil-service laws. The employees of the FOA are not career employees. They have been hired in the past few years. I know many of them. They are all sorts of people. I feel that in the best interest of economy and in the best interest of good management, and in the best interest of government, we ought to give the new director of the new agency, whoever he may be, the right to reduce his force by 200 employees. I cannot help but feel that that would be the proper procedure to follow.

The administration has asked for this authority. The new director who would head the new FOA-type agency has requested this authority. The administration is in favor of it. It seems to me to be good business to take the action suggested.

I do not wish anyone to say that this proposal has any politics in it, because no politics is involved. I have not the slightest idea what the politics of any of these employees may be. However, I believe we ought to give the new management—and that is what it amounts to—the right to dispense with the services of at least 200 of those now working for FOA. If we are ever to reduce the number of Federal employees, here is an opportunity to do so.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear. I believe this amendment has great merit. It covers one of the most important elements of the bill, and that is the administration of our foreign operations. All the amendment would do would be to provide that when the new administrator takes over—and we expect that the new agency will be reorganized somewhat under the State Department—he will have an opportunity to dismiss 200 of 1,500 employees who are in excess of the GS-9 classification. It would affect only 200 of 1,500 employees. Those employees are presumedly in the top echelon, and it would be their responsibility to carry out the program. As I understand, there are four or five thousand persons in the agency, although I cannot give the exact number.

It is unthinkable to me that an administrator would be asked to accept a responsibility for a vast undertaking of this kind, operating all over the world, and not be given the right to change or alternate or dismiss even one employee.

I think the amendment is a reasonable one. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that when we took a look at the information program a few years ago we gave the new administrator of the new agency the same power over employees above GS-9. No harm was done, but on the contrary, we got a better information program than we ever had before. The new administrator of the information agency was given the opportunity to put some square pegs in square holes and some round pegs in the round holes.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have only 3 minutes. If I have some time left after I have made my statement, I shall be glad to yield. This is not only a reasonable amendment, Mr. President, but I think it is essential for the purpose of giving the administrator the responsibility, and the right to exercise the responsibility, of selecting at least many of the key personnel in his agency. It would affect only 200 out of 1,500 whose classification is above GS-9.

If I have any time remaining, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana or the Senator from Iowa would agree, for the purpose of the RECORD, that, if we permitted this change, appointments could be made without regard to political affiliations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator ask that question in all seriousness, or is it a facetious question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am very serious.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not understand the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask whether, regardless of political affiliation, the agency would then be free to appoint the employees. Can we agree to that?

Mr. CAPEHART. I still do not understand the question. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am trying to say that I would hope the agency would appoint at least 50 percent Democrats and 50 percent Republicans.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said a moment ago that I did not have the slightest idea of who these employees are.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator would not object to a few Democrats being put in these jobs, would he?

Mr. CAPEHART. The chances are that they are all Democrats now, because FOA has been in existence for many years. I have no particular objection, though.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agreed to the last proposal when it was in the Committee on Appropriations, and we made a similar change with reference to the Information Service. However, I have yet to find even one Democrat in that Service or in the State Department.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to testify to some personal knowledge on that point. I can assure the Senator that there are plenty of Democrats in the Information Service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the State Department?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the Information Service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This agency will be placed in the State Department.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator naive enough to believe that the State Department is not filled with Democrats? The overwhelming number of employees in the State Department are Democrats.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not known of even one being appointed in this administration. If the Senator will name one Democrat who has been appointed in the State Department by this administration I shall be glad to take back what I have said. I ask the Senator to name one Democrat who has been appointed to the State Department under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can name dozens of them; but I do not have the names with me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am willing to go along in this instance as I did in the case of the Information Service when that matter came before the Committee on Appropriations; but I want the record to show that I hope this will not be a political patronage amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sure it will not be. That was the effect in the case of the Information Service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all I am asking. I do not want to offer an amendment to that effect. I merely wish to get the assurance of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Indiana that the amendment, if agreed to, will not operate as a political patronage proposal.

Mr. CAPEHART. I want to say that I was hopeful that politics would not enter into this matter. [Laughter.] It was not intended to be political.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not being political. I am asking for a fair share.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I will yield myself 1 more minute. Then I shall be glad to yield to other Senators. I should like to say that I was never more sincere in my life than when I offered the amendment. I did not have in mind that the new administrator would discharge or sever from the service Republicans or Democrats. It never entered my mind that he would hire either Democrats or Republicans. It did enter my mind that he ought to have the right to get rid of deadwood or employees he does not need or who are inefficient. My observation has been—and I think it has been fairly extensive—that most of those who work for FOA never have been political and have never held political jobs. They come from business and from universities all over the United States. Most of them do not even know whether they are Republicans or Democrats. That has been my observation of the people who work in that agency. Some Senators may feel that this amendment is political, but I certainly do not think so. If I had had that thought, or if I had thought that the administration was asking for this amendment in order to make it political, I would not have offered it. I do not think it is political at all. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Indiana give me assurances that at least one employee will be appointed from North Dakota? [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for an insertion in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] by John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, who supported language similar to that which I was going to offer in the form of an amendment.

The amendment which I had intended to offer and which lies at the desk, as the distinguished Senator from Iowa has pointed out, would have provided authority in the new agency to terminate the employment of up to 1,500 employees. When the distinguished Senator from Indiana said he felt it would be a more reasonable request that the employment of not more than 200 could be terminated by the administrator, if the administrator felt it was necessary to do so for the proper administration of his agency, I thought, frankly, that that kind of amendment would be accepted by the committee, particularly because the original language suggested by the State Department had been stricken in committee by a rather close vote, and I was still hopeful that perhaps the distinguished chairman of the committee would be able to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both the letter I have referred to and the text of my proposed amendment be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

MAY 18, 1955.

The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I am advised that in your committee hearings of the Mutual Security bill for the next fiscal year certain questions have been raised, or will be raised, concerning the administration of the mutual-security program for fiscal year 1956, pursuant to the recent Executive order of the President and his letter to me of April 15, 1955. As you know, the President's decision involves the continuation of the essential functions of the FOA through transfer of those functions to the Department of State and the Department of Defense. It is the purpose of this letter to outline to your committee what is intended with regard to the future administration of the International Cooperation Administration, in order that your committee may have a basis for its decisions respecting certain provisions of the proposed legislation, including the provision for administrative expenses and the provision involving the transfer of personnel from the FOA.

As I said in my opening statement to the committee on May 5, I feel that the way in which these programs have been administered under FOA has been admirable. I expressed the hope that when the functions are transferred to the State Department we can carry on with equal effectiveness.

It is my belief, which is shared by the President's nominee for Director of the International Cooperation Administration, Mr. John B. Hollister, that the present internal organization of FOA should be studied carefully before any changes are made in it. In view of the importance of the programs which the International Cooperation Administration will be responsible for executing, nothing should be done which might weaken the effectiveness of that Administration. It is possible that as the result of consolidations, eliminations, and personnel reductions certain savings can be realized. It is, however, impossible at this time to estimate what the extent of such savings might be or even to indicate plans for consolidation, elimination, or personnel reduction. No reliable blueprint can be made prior to further study of the operation of the program in its new relationship to the Department of State.

From this it follows that the estimate of administrative expenses for fiscal year 1956 contained in the legislation before you is, in my judgment, a sound approximation. The estimate was prepared by the FOA and represents an amount judged necessary to administer the program presented in the President's message of April 20, 1955. In the circumstances it seems to me that reliance should be placed upon Governor Stassen's judgment in this respect. As you know, funds under the bill will be appropriated to the President, and the division of administrative funds will follow the division of functions, including additional operating functions in the Department of Defense.

Section 525 authorizes the administrator to terminate the services of employees grade GS-9 and above without regard to certain aspects of present law. The purpose of this section is to avoid widespread disorganization within the ICA should a reduction in force become necessary. This provision seems essential if the administrator is to maintain an efficient organization with sufficient flexibility to take full advantage of its new relationship to the Department of State.

Two years ago the American personnel of the Department of State and Foreign Service were reduced by 13 percent, some 1,400 people. The process of the reduction resulted, however, in approximately 5,600 people being affected. For every person terminated three others were transferred between units, downgraded, or transferred between posts overseas. For example, an economist in Singapore might bump an economist in London who had a secondary skill in accounting and thus might bump a fiscal officer in Brazil. This process went on for 10 months before reduction was complete. The morale of all employees was affected, none of whom were immune from its effect, regardless of ability. The actual cost to the Government to accomplish the reduction, $3.8 million, was almost a half year's salary of the personnel it was necessary to terminate.

The FOA is composed of numerous small units of specialized personnel located not only in Washington, but in 60 foreign posts. Regular RIF procedures make little allowance for their individual abilities or for their background experience outside of government. These procedures are much more disruptive to an organization of this character than to one which employs large numbers of employees in each of a more limited number of fields.

It is intended in seeking this authority to avoid the sustained disruption of an organization whose continued efficient functioning is of vital importance to the accomplishment of United States foreign policy. It would not be used in a manner which would override the basic principles of maintaining skilled, experienced, and efficient personnel in the International Cooperation Administration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

AMENDMENT INTENDED TO BE PROPOSED BY MR. KNOWLAND

On page 14, line 25, strike out all after the word *"Provided,"* through the word "Preference" on page 15, line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"That until January 1, 1956, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the employment of any person at a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of GS-9 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, transferred from the Foreign Operations Administration to any other agency pursuant to Executive order, may be terminated, but this authority shall not be applicable to any person entitled to veterans' preference for Federal Government employment."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, because I think we should turn the functions of the mutual security program over to the armed services and the State Department in as good and clean a condition as may be possible. I am sorry that politics has been injected into the question, although I might have assumed it would be. I think most of the persons working for the FOA are probably neither strong Republicans nor Democrats. However, there are a few square pegs in round holes; there are undoubtedly a few misfit characters without whom, perhaps, the armed services and the State Department would be better off. The new administrator should have the right to clean up the outfit before undertaking to make it operate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] asked if any Senator on this side of the aisle knew of a Democrat who had been hired by Mr. Stassen during

the past 2 years. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if he knows of any Republican who has been hired within the past 2 years. Many of the employees have no strong political affiliations whatever.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not trying to be facetious or political in connection with the matter at all. I know that last year we did the same thing in the case of the Information Service. I know that during the previous Democratic administrations we tried to put into the State Department, in the Information Service, as many competent persons as it might be possible to secure. The present administration has tried to clean out some square pegs from round holes. I agree with the Senator about that. But I have yet to see it take into the policymaking groups members of the opposite political party, as was done during the Democratic administration.

I merely express the hope that if we adopt this amendment it will be entirely agreeable to Senators on the other side of the aisle that the appointees will not necessarily be cleared by the Republican National Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. If the amendment is adopted, I hope that the most competent persons will be kept, regardless of party affiliations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana has some 12 minutes remaining. If it is agreeable, I will yield back all my time except 12 minutes, if he yields back his time.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to keep about 2 minutes, if there is any Senator who wishes to speak. If not, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back all but 12 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought we were going to vote. Under the circumstances, I reserve 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana reserves 2 minutes.

The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this amendment is an insult to Mr. Stassen who has come before the committee and told us he has reduced personnel in the almost 2½ years in which he has been Administrator of the FOA and of its predecessor, the Mutual Security Agency, to the extent of 30 percent.

I think the new administration, which has been in power for almost 2½ years, has had plenty of time to weed out deadwood. I am not going to be so naive as is the Senator from Indiana and say I do not think there is politics involved in the amendment, because there is. What the Republicans want are jobs.

The amendment to the Mutual Security bill now under discussion, would empower a department head to summarily dismiss 200 employees of FOA without veterans' preference in grades GS–10 and above who are transferred. This is clearly an unwarranted invasion of the integrity of the civil-service program.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to yield when I have finished my statement.

There is no existing justification for such blanket disregard for the normal civil-service rights of Federal employees. The purpose can only be to permit the administration to replace personnel with new employees cleared by the Republican National Committee. The grades involved are not limited to policy positions. They go down sufficiently low that they would apply to ordinary routine staff employees without any policy-determining functions.

The first time a provision similar to this appeared in Federal law was in the State and Commerce appropriation bill for fiscal 1951. Senator McCARRAN proposed an amendment which permitted termination of employment in these Departments regardless of civil service or veterans' preference laws when found to be in the best interests of the United States. This power was considered necessary because of the national security situation and no other authority existed for summary dismissals in such situations.

In 1953 the President issued Executive Order 10450, April 27. Under this order the Departments and agencies have full power to dismiss employees under certain circumstances when required by national security interests. Since this time there has been no justification whatsoever for such blanket authority as is now requested.

In 1953 an effort was made again to insert this termination authority in the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bills. Since the right to fire veterans was included, the veterans organizations immediately protested vigorously and pointed out that the power was no longer needed since the issuance of Executive Order 10450. On a rollcall vote the effort was defeated. This year the attempt is changed. Veterans are to be excluded—obviously in order to avoid the powerful interference of veterans organizations. In addition, the authority to dismiss is not even conditioned by the customary limitation that it must be in the best interests of the United States. This attempt to destroy the proper protections of the civil-service system for relatively low-level Federal employees should be defeated. It is a patently unnecessary and partisan project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the logical argument in rebuttal to the argument made by the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Vermont has already been made; but I feel that the record should be clear.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana does not provide for the reduction of personnel in the Foreign Operations Administration. There were those who listened and who heard words to the effect that the proposal would reduce—and I took down the exact words—would reduce the number by 200. Not at all. What it will do will be to prepare the way for the dismissal of 200 persons who have been trained at Government expense, for whose training the Government has spent thousands upon thousands of dollars, and to open up those 200 positions and make 200 jobs available for Republicans. That is exactly what it will do.

If Senators wish to call the amendment what it really is, then let us say that it is a part of a full employment program for the precinct organizations of the Republican Party. That is exactly what the amendment amounts to. There is no use trying to disguise the proposal at all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the same time, will it not throw fear into 1,500 persons, all of whom will believe that they will be dismissed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to my good friend from South Carolina that the amendment certainly offers that possibility.

I feel that the Senator from Indiana is much more charitable in a bipartisan way than was the State Department. I wish the State Department would recognize today that the bill which they favor, the administration bill, which has had to be defended on the floor, has had more support from this side of the aisle than from the other side.

I wish the State Department would be a little more charitable when it comes to the matter of preserving the merit system and the civil-service system in the operation of the law.

If it is desired to have a bipartisan foreign policy—and that is a wish I heard expressed day after day from the White House and the Secretary of State—then let bipartisanship be taken out of the personnel administration of the policy.

This is a blatant, open attempt to try to provide the Foreign Operations Administration, under a new administrator—who, by the way, is a known Republican, having a record of not too much sympathy toward even the objectives of the program—an opportunity to give 200 top jobs to the new administrator.

I agree with what the junior Senator from Montana has said. If Mr. Stassen, President Eisenhower, and Secretary Dulles, along with all the corps of assistants of the White House and the State Department, have not been able for 2½ years—almost 3 years—to clear out the so-called square pegs in round holes, or vice versa, there is no use trying to patch up the situation now. If they have not been able to do the job which was necessary to be done to get rid of those who are "unfit and undesirable," then I say it is hopeless to try to give them additional authority.

What we should do is to stand up and protect the civil service, veterans' preference, and merit system. Any policy job can be filled under schedule C as an outright political appointment. Every Senator knows that to be so. Furthermore, any incompetent person can be dismissed. Furthermore, as the Senator

from Montana has pointed out, any employee who is declared to be unfit or undesirable in terms of the national security can be summarily dismissed without a hearing.

Moreover, I might point out, quite candidly, that the administrative expenses provided for in this bill do not contemplate any reduction in force. For the administrative cost of operation of the FOA the bill provides some $400,000 more this year for employment than was provided last year.

So it is pretty obvious, I may say to my friends who wish to get economy into the bill, that no economy is provided in terms of personnel administration. Four hundred thousand dollars more is provided for administrative costs. I submit that no Member present can prove that the employment rolls will be reduced by one person. What will be done will be to discharge trained personnel and to bring in more of Operation Reindeer. Trained personnel in the field, persons who have traveled around in their work on the program, will be discharged. They will be replaced by persons who will say, "My! I would like to see Washington," or maybe Iraq, or maybe India, and maybe Afghanistan.

I honestly feel it is about time that the trained, experienced talent was used. If it has not been possible to train a cadre of competent public officials since the beginning of the mutual security program, the program ought to be stopped now. This is not the time to interfere with the integrity of the service which has made this program possible.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say. I think we ought to set a good example by protecting the integrity of the civil service merit system of our Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota, in my opinion, was never more wrong in his life. The amendment does not affect veterans' preference, in spite of the fact that there has been an intimation by at least two able Senators that it does. They know that the question of veterans' preference is not affected at all.

There is not a single Senator who does not know that good business practice dictates that when the Foreign Operations Administration is transferred to the Military Establishment and to the Secretary of State, not nearly so many employees will be needed. Good business dictates such a policy to each and every one of us, regardless of how we may feel politically. All that is sought to be done in this instance is to give the head of the Department the right to reduce the personnel by not less than 200, without reference to the civil service.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the Department already have the right to dismiss any surplus employees?

Mr. CAPEHART. It does not, if the employees are under civil service.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is my understanding that if a Department has more employees than it needs, it can dismiss them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not under civil service. In other words, what is sought to be done is to get some efficiency in government, and to reduce personnel and expenses.

I again wish to say that when I offered the amendment, I had no idea that a political football would be made of it, as has been done today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield so much of the remaining time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to take much time to discuss the amendment. It was considered very thoroughly in the committee. I do not remember the exact vote by which the provision was stricken from the bill, but substantially this amendment was eliminated from the bill by a vote of 7 to 4, according to my recollection.

The amendment would not reduce the number of persons employed in the agency. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is quite correct when he points out that the actual administrative cost or overhead cost will be greater under the bill this year than it was last year. According to Governor Stassen's statement to us, there have been reductions in force of about 30 percent during the 2 or 2½ years in which he has been connected with the organization.

The amendment would not reduce the number of employees. It would not cut down or save expense. It would do but one thing, in the opinion of the committee, and that is to shake the confidence of persons in the civil service in the integrity of that service, because certainly the amendment, if adopted, would be a morale shaker, whereas that would not be the case if the integrity of the civil service system were preserved by the rejection of the amendment. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Dworshak	Mundt
Barrett	Flanders	Payne
Beall	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bush	Ives	Smith, Maine
Butler	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Carlson	Kuchel	Welker
Case, N. J.	Langer	Wiley
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	Young
Dirksen	McCarthy	
Duff	Millikin	

NAYS—40

Anderson	Holland	Morse
Barkley	Humphrey	Neely
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Douglas	Kefauver	Russell
Eastland	Kerr	Scott
Ellender	Kilgore	Smathers
Ervin	Lehman	Sparkman
Frear	Long	Stennis
George	Magnuson	Symington
Hayden	Mansfield	Thurmond
Hennings	McNamara	
Hill	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—16

Allott	Fulbright	Murray
Bender	Gore	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Green	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Watkins
Chavez	Malone	
Clements	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 40 and the nays are 40. So, the amendment is rejected.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, it is proposed to strike out lines 13 and 14 and insert the following:

(b) In section 402, after the word "used" in the first sentence, insert "during the fiscal

year 1955, and not less than $300 million shall be used during the fiscal year 1956,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I hope to be very brief. I have been joined in offering the amendment by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment will reiterate the position expressed a year ago by the Senate, when it adopted an amendment providing that not less than $350 million of these funds shall be used for the disposal abroad of surplus agricultural products and products made therefrom.

I wish to commend the FOA for a very good job which has been done this year in that regard. They not only fulfilled the mandate of the Senate and of the Congress, but they have actually spent $374 million, or allocated $374 million, of these funds in that manner; and it is planned to have $381 million of them allocated in this manner by the end of the fiscal year.

I have had a talk with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I believe it is agreeable to him to have adopted this language which calls for $300 million of the funds in the coming fiscal year to be used for the disposal of surplus agricultural products.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment will not increase the total authorizations carried by the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. It will not.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment is to utilize $350 million for the exportation of surplus farm commodities. The amendment is agreeable to the chairman of the committee; and if I have a right to do so, I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I certainly have no desire to make a speech; I desire only to have my amendment adopted. This bill is based on the concept that the United States should help others to help themselves. My amendment carries this concept one step forward by doing something helpful for American agriculture, thus helping ourselves to help others to help themselves. American agriculture needs this added shot in the arm and our friends can use our foods and fabrics abroad quite as well as they can use our money.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT BILLS AND FILE NOTICES OF MOTIONS DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield briefly to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may be authorized to report bills and file notices of motions to suspend the rule during the recess of the Senate, following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, what was the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is requested by the Senator from Texas that the Appropriations Committee may be authorized to report bills and file notices of motions to suspend the rule during the recess of the Senate.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof "subsections."

On page 4, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the quotation mark.

On page 4, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) In providing assistance in the procurement of commodities in the United States, United States dollars shall be made available for marine insurance on such commodities where such insurance is placed on a competitive basis in accordance with normal trade practice prevailing prior to the outbreak of World War II: *Provided*, That in the event a participating country, by statute, decree, rule, or regulation, discriminates against any marine insurance company authorized to do business in any State of the United States, then commodities purchased with funds provided hereunder and destined for such country shall be insured in the United States against marine risk with a company or companies authorized to do a marine insurance business in any State of the United States.

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

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to make a brief announcement. I hope all Senators will remain in the Chamber, for there are only two more minor amendments to be acted upon, and then we shall have the yea-and-nay vote on the question of the final passage of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say that I shall be glad to accept the amendment, insofar as I have a right to do so as chairman of the committee, and to take the amendment to conference, where the matter can be examined. The amendment will not add in any way to the expense or cost of the bill, as I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to state only one sentence in regard to the amendment: It is the hope of those of us who propose the amendment that the Senate will make it permissive to allow the American marine insurance companies to participate and to bid. I hope that in conference the conferees will agree to include this language, which is proposed in order to achieve that goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the amendment may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I am offering an amendment to the Mutual Security bill now before us in hope of providing for our American marine insurance companies the right to compete on equal basis with foreign insurance companies for the business of insuring foreign-aid shipments.

Under the law as it is now interpreted by the officials of our mutual aid organization dollars are not allocated for payment of marine insurance on foreign-aid shipments unless they are requested by the recipient country. American insurance agencies have tried unsuccessfully to get a fair share of this business but because of discrimination against them by the recipient countries in favor of their own companies, they have failed in their efforts.

This has deprived the American marine insurance market from opportunity to compete for some of this business and the Mutual Security organization has refused their request to change the regulations so that dollars will be available to pay the insurance premiums to Americans.

There seems to be no other recourse left except to include in this legislation a provision that dollars shall be made available for marine insurance on commodities shipped where the insurance is placed on a competitive basis in accordance with normal practices prevailing before World War II.

I am, therefore, offering the amendment which also provides that where a participating country by statute, decree, rule or regulation discriminates against any marine insurance company licensed to do business in the United States the commodities purchased with funds advanced under the program shall be insured in the United States against marine risks with a company authorized to do business in the United States.

It seems only fair that our marine insurance companies be given the same right to bid on the insurance on foreign-aid shipments as companies from other parts of the world enjoy.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk an amendment proposed by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, in line 18, it is proposed to strike out "$21,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$38,000,000."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and with other members of the committee. It is my understanding that they have no objection to the amendment. It is designed to change the flow of funds from the contingency fund into a specific development assistance authorization for Bolivia, Guatemala, and Haiti, where today emergency conditions exist. It is essential that a specific authorization for these areas be made, rather than having to rely on the contingency fund which may or may not be available. There is a definite need for a specific additional authorization of $10 million for Guatemala and $4 million for Bolivia, as well as an authorization of $3 million for Haiti to enable those countries to cope with the existing emergency conditions. The amendment merely makes it definite that these funds are to be used for these three countries of Latin America, so that it will not be necessary to rely contingency fund under the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to state that I will accept the amendment. I am sure that out of other funds, funds in slightly increased amounts will be provided for the three countries in question.

But if the amendment is agreed to, it will become certain that no contingency under which they would not get some slight increases will arise.

The increased amount would go to Bolivia, Guatemala, and Haiti, which have suffered very severe storm damage within the past few months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida, on behalf of himself, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "section" and insert "sections."

On page 16, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 549. Statement of congressional policy: It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

(1) the United States, through mutual-security programs, has made substantial contributions to the economic recovery and rehabilitation of the nations of Western Europe;

(2) due in part to those programs, it has been possible for such nations to achieve complete economic recovery and to regain their military strength; and

(3) certain other friendly nations of the world remain in need of assistance in order that they may defend themselves against aggression and contribute to the security of the free world—

those nations that have been assisted in their recovery should, in the future, share with the United States the financial burden of providing aid to those countries which are still in need of assistance of the type provided under this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me——

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say that I am sure the amendment is not objectionable. It merely calls upon the countries which, through our aid programs, have gotten on their feet, to participate with us in our efforts to be of service to Asian countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is the purpose of the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

The amendment I have just offered does not affect the funds in this bill; it pertains only to the bill's philosophy, its approach, if you please. This amendment only states that it is the sense of the Congress that the administration of this program—which concerns the mutual safety of the entire free world—should be a cooperative program, with our allies assisting the United States in extending a helping hand to those less fortunate than ourselves.

We have seen the Marshall plan come to an end; today, Europe is well and prosperous. Now, it is time for our European allies to join forces with the United States in building an even stronger shield against Communist infiltration of underdeveloped countries.

I do not believe this is a selfish attitude for us to take. The title of the bill now before us is "The Mutual Security Act of 1955." The emphasis is not on security alone, but upon mutual security. The programs it authorizes are advanced as being beneficial not only to the United States, but to all nations of the free world. The expenditure of funds for development assistance, defense support, direct forces support, and technical assistance (as well as direct military aid) has been advanced as necessary not only to the security of the United States of America, but to the security of France, Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and other members of the community of free nations. Since this is a mutually advantageous program, the burdens of financing it should be spread among all those nations which it seeks to benefit. Let me add that this includes the direct beneficiaries of our bounty, as well as others.

I cannot urge the Senate too strongly to accept this amendment and embody in this legislation the philosophy I have just outlined. I frankly feel that such action is long overdue, but merely because we have failed to so act in the past is no reason for our failing to act today.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I am glad to see that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved authorizations for development assistance in the Near East, Africa, and Asia. I hope that these authorizations will be approved in this Chamber. There has been a regrettable tendency to disparage and minimize the importance and value of these development assistance programs. But as I pointed out in the Senate in a longer speech on April 1 of this year, the record will show that our economic aid to countries that have needed it has strengthened and stabilized their economies, toughened their resistance to communism and enlarged the area of free world friendship.

There is now an increasing volume of evidence showing the effectiveness of these programs. There is an excellent example in the case of Israel, to which I wish to refer in a little more detail today. The testimony and the evidence furnished to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee show how American aid has helped that little country to make substantial progress toward economic independence. I point to this record with some satisfaction because 4 years ago, I took the initiative in introducing legislation to grant Israel financial assistance. Up until 1951, Israel was not included in our overseas assistance programs, although she was struggling against very great odds to establish her economy and at the same time to receive and resettle more than 600,000 Jewish refugees who poured into the country from all parts of the globe in the first 3 years of its existence.

I was joined in that legislation by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, the distinguished Republican floor leader, and by 34 other Members of this body. Senator Taft and I differed on many issues, but here we were in agreement. Both of us felt that the entire foreign aid program was too large at that time and had to be reduced for the economic safety of our own country. At the same time both of us felt that the Department of State had not responded adequately to Israel's appeal for help. A majority of the Congress agreed on this issue. The facts confirmed our judgment. In that year more than 200,000 immigrants entered Israel. There was a scarcity of everything that was needed to keep these new immigrants alive. They were unable to produce enough for their own needs, they had little left for export, and they lacked the dollars to buy the barest necessities of life. Israel's trade deficit that year was well over $300 million.

The Congress helped Israel in a concrete way in the 1952 MSA appropriation. We gave her $65 million. It was a small part of what she needed, but it literally saved her from utter financial chaos.

Some Members of the Senate were skeptical about our program that year. They had the friendliest attitude toward the people of Israel, but they were afraid that Israel could never be on a sound, self-sustaining basis. The question was put to me in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I replied:

"There are some who think that they could not develop a sufficient agricultural and industrial base. My point is that they have made a very plucky try so far and that they ought to be given a chance and that they have a very good prospect of making a success of this."

The record in succeeding years shows that this optimism was justified. In the following year the State Department took a more realistic view of Israel's tremendous needs, and without any prompting from the legislative branch recommended a $72.8 million authorization, which was granted.

Israel made good use of this money. It has absorbed most of the refugees and many of them are now self-supporting. It has expanded its agricultural and industrial plant and it is producing an increasing share of the food for its table and its every-day needs for clothing and shelter. Imports have been coming down and exports have been rising.

If I may be permitted to cite economic data furnished by the administration—I would like to quote from the President's report on the MSP for the period ending December 31, 1954. He informed Congress:

"The Israeli government's program to stabilize its foreign exchange and debt position produced measurable results by the end of 1954. The upward swing in its external indebtedness was brought to a halt, and much of its short-term debt was successfully refunded. Increased industrial and agricultural production brought a substantial rise in export revenues and assisted the drive to reduce import requirements, particularly for food. As a result, Israel's trade gap was appreciably narrowed in 1954, although it still was estimated at about $210 million.

"United States aid under the Mutual Security Program has been only a part of the worldwide assistance which Israel has received since its establishment, and the striking economic gains in the country have been produced primarily by the driving energies of the Israelis themselves. Nonetheless, our aid measures have formed a significant part of Israel's progress and have contributed importantly toward the maintenance of a going national economy. United States development assistance and technical cooperation have played a major role in the tripling of the land area under irrigation since the state was founded, in the doubling of agricultural and industrial production and power-generating capacity, the reduction in the trade deficit by $75 million in 3 years, and the settling of nearly 700,000 immigrants in permanent or semipermanent quarters."

The FOA has considered it possible to reduce our assistance program to Israel. The $72.8 million figure in 1953 was reduced to $53.5 million in 1954 and to $40 million in the current fiscal year—half of it loan and half of it surplus agricultural commodities.

In the program now pending before the Senate, the administration plans to reduce the amount of assistance for Israel still further.

Israel's progress has been most reassuring to her many friends in this country. We hope that it will be continued. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake if our aid program to Israel were cut too sharply or too rapidly. I call your attention once again to President Eisenhower's report to Congress. He said: "Despite its growing achievements, Israel continues to face a troublesome financial situation. Its trade deficit of over $200 million and external debt of over $400 million make it most difficult for it to pay from its own resources for the essential commodities and capital items needed to sustain an adequate rate of development. * * *"

Drastic cuts at this stage could have an adverse result—they could arrest development and prove expensive in the long run.

I am also glad to see that we have been carrying on a constructive program of economic and technical assistance in some of the Arab countries. In my judgment, this is the one sound way to win the Arab peoples to the cause of the West, and I am particularly encouraged to read in the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the news that some progress may soon be made to bring about the resettlement of a substantial number of the Arab refugees. The committee has informed us, on page 31, that final negotiations are nearing completion for two large-scale resettlement projects. One would provide for 60,000 to 70,000 people in Sinai, while the other will benefit about 150,000 in the proposed Jordan Valley development. If a start can be made on both projects in the next 12 months, this administration will be entitled to congratulations.

On the other hand, I deeply regret that this administration thinks it necessary to grant military assistance to Arab countries prior to an Arab-Israel peace.

The transcript of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on this legislation shows us that military assistance is now being given to Iraq.

We have a military assistance agreement with Iraq and funds are available from unexpended balances not included in this bill. We do not have any positive assurances that military aid will not be extended to other Arab countries in coming months. So far as we know, no military aid is going to Israel—although that country requested help from us 40 months ago, when it officially informed us that it was ready to join in our western plans for the defense of the free world.

The arms program for Iraq is a dangerous gamble and could have disastrous consequences. I note that Mr. Stassen testified on this question before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I call attention to his remarks on page 47, where he asserted that we are not furnishing any arms to Israel or to any country that borders on Israel. Apparently the administration feels that it is safe to send arms to Iraq since that country does not border on Israel.

But the absence of a common frontier does not remove either the physical or the psychological dangers that lurk in this policy. Iraq has the closest ties with Jordan, which does have a common frontier with Israel, and which, incidentally, gets arms from our ally, Britain. The lack of a common frontier didn't prevent Iraq from declaring war against Israel in 1948 and from sending its soldiers to join other Arab armies in their unsuccessful invasion of that country. Iraq was always the ideological leader in the Arab struggle to prevent the establishment of Israel, and this is not surprising, because Iraqi leaders came under Nazi influence in the 1930's. It is a melancholy fact that Iraq was the one state in the Middle East where the Nazis were able to stage a pro-Nazi coup during World War II. I say melancholy because the record does not heighten our confidence in the reliability or responsibility of the state we have singled out as the recipient of our arms in this region. The ideological unreliability of Iraq has been notorious. And equally conspicuous was the weakness of the Iraq Army which was quickly overwhelmed by the British in 1941, and which did not cover itself with glory in the war against Israel in 1948.

Iraq's attitude toward Israel and the Jewish people has been so bitterly hostile that Iraq has never abandoned its war against Israel and to this day it refuses to sign an armistice agreement with that country. The Jewish community of Iraq—a victim of pogroms back in 1941—was forced to leave Iraq in a mass exodus in 1951. I spoke earlier of the fact that we voted economic aid to Israel in that year because of its refugee problem. It was during that same period that 120,000 Jewish refugees came there from Iraq—virtually all the members of one of the oldest Jewish communities in history. In April 1951, in the very month that Senator Taft and I introduced our bill providing financial assistance for Israel, 30,000 Jewish refugees arrived in Israel from Iraq. They poured in at the rate of 1,000 every day.

It is of little consequence that Iraq does not have a common frontier with Israel. The conflict between Israel and the Arab States is not merely a frontier dispute. It is a misconception of the entire situation to regard the Arab-Israel conflict as a mere succession of border raids and reprisals, and it is no solution to the basic problem to isolate these incidents as they occur, and to try to fix responsibility for their authorship—unfortunate and tragic as they undoubtedly are.

The primary and continuing cause of the Arab-Israel conflict is the refusal of the Arab States to recognize the existence of Israel and their open and official war against her. So long as the Arab States persist in their war against Israel, a democratic nation firmly alined with the West, it is, I think, a mistake for us to furnish arms to any one of them.

It may be true that these arms won't be used against Israel tomorrow, or next week, or next month. But nobody can guarantee that they won't. And up to this time, I have seen no indication from the administration that it is ready to enter into a defense agreement with Israel or to insist upon its inclusion in a broader regional pact, however logical and appropriate it would be for our two democracies to be partners in such a broad regional defense treaty.

But the real danger is the psychological effect on the Arabs and the implications for an Arab-Israel peace. So long as we pass out arms to Iraq, without requiring her to accept Israel's existence as a fact, we encourage Iraq to believe that the issue is of no importance to us, and that the Arab war against Israel may go on without incurring our disapproval.

I intend to vote for the mutual-security program because I believe that this is a major element in our overall policy to strengthen the free world against Communist aggression. But I wish to place into the record my reservations and exceptions to any proposals to send arms to the Arab States in advance of an Arab-Israel peace. This is a serious blunder, which may some day boomerang against our own best national interests.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on the mutual security bill a statement which I had prepared on section 9 (e), and some excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and newspapers.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

As the author, during the 83d Congress, of legislation known as the cargo-preference bill (Public Law 664), intended to assure that at least 50 percent of any Government-financed or Government-purchased cargoes be transported in privately owned United States merchant vessels, I should like to make 1 or 2 observations with respect to the pending measure.

Section 9 (e) of the bill now before us for consideration would have the effect of nullifying the 50–50 shipping provision with regard to transportation between foreign nations of goods procured with foreign currency. With emphasis upon the terms "foreign nations" and "foreign currency," I find no fault with this provision for the tonnage coming within such a category and normally available to American shipping would be relatively small at the present time. I am confident that there is no desire on the part of American shipping to stretch the application of the 50–50 or cargo-preference law beyond its original purpose, or to precipitate any tenuous relations with the community of free nations. On the contrary, the major attack of what in the opinion of most Americans is a most reasonable reservation for one of our own industries, has originated in foreign countries.

From time to time, I have brought to the attention of the Senate the extent and nature of these criticisms. I regard this matter as so essential to the preservation of the American merchant marine that I include a number of relevant editorials and comments to be reprinted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

In studying the report accompanying S. 2090, one will note several references to this subject of cargo preference for American shipping, and I am equally confident that these are not to be construed as a prelude to any change in administration policy. The feasibility and prudence of a minimum 50–50 arrangement have been amply demonstrated and the results have been helpful to our shipping. However, that is not to say that conditions in this vital industry have reached a utopian state. Unfortunately, such is not the case. Continuing vigorous efforts to preserve and strengthen the American merchant marine, as a part of our peacetime national economy and as our fourth arm of defense, must have the intense attention and cooperation of the Congress, the administration, and the industry itself. Jointly this vital objective can be achieved.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, OF MARYLAND, UNITED STATES SENATE, FEBRUARY 8, 1955

PUBLIC LAW 664—CARGO PREFERENCE LEGISLATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the closing days of the 83d Congress legislation was enacted to broaden and make permanent certain existing cargo preference guaranties to the American merchant marine.

Public Law 664, signed by President Eisenhower on August 26, 1954, affirms a national policy, which had previously been proclaimed time and again by the Congress, of assuring to privately owned United States-flag merchant vessels of at least 50 percent of all oceanborne cargoes purchased for, or given away by, or financed by, the Federal Government.

The policy thus incorporated into permanent legislation previously had been laid down in the Merchant Marine Acts of 1920, 1928, and 1936, and again in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. The substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce which these acts called for as necessary to maintenance of an adequate, privately owned merchant fleet, was made more specific in various military and foreign economic provisions of the past half century.

As far back as 1904 Congress legislated to require that "vessels of the United States and no others" were to be employed in the transportation by sea of coal, provisions, fodder, or supplies of any description, purchased pursuant to law, for the use of the Army or Navy.

Again, in 1934, Public Resolution 17, 73d Congress, required that all cargoes financed by the Export-Import Bank or any other instrumentality of Government should be carried in American bottoms. This resolution still is effective.

In the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and the ECA amendments of 1949, the principle of "at least 50 percent" was adopted, and this interpretation of the policy of "substantial portion" was continued in the Korean Aid Act—Public Law 447, 81st Congress—and in all emergency aid and assistance acts since that time, as well as in the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

In all these enactments, it was provided that the 50-percent guaranty should apply only to the extent that such vessels were available at market rates. That same safeguard was included in Public Law 664.

Why is such a guaranty necessary? Why, from earliest time, has it been felt necessary to take specific measures to assure continued existence and operation of an adequate, privately owned merchant fleet? The reasons, basically, are quite simple.

As a maritime Nation, America's progress and prosperity have always been possible only to the extent that shipping has been available to carry its products to foreign shores, and bring back the raw materials lacking here.

Furthermore, as a nation open to attack by water on more than half of its borders, and, more recently, because of the urgent shipping needs of our military forces in action, or in constant danger in stations in many parts of the world, certain facts regarding ocean transportation have become inescapable.

First. Peacetime needs require a merchant fleet capable of carrying our foreign commerce. Otherwise, our economy is at the mercy of foreign shipping, as bitter experience has proven.

Second. World Wars I and II, and the Korean hostilities, have given indisputable evidence that America's Military Establishment, or its defensive setup, cannot operate without a vast auxiliary of merchant shipping. We suffered in World War I, and the free nations were in extreme danger in World War II, because there was not adequate shipping available. Actually, it was not until the spring of 1945 that our Military Establishment could plan its strategic moves with entire confidence that sufficient shipping would be available. It is no secret that World War II was prolonged needlessly, with resulting additional losses in men and in national wealth, because our merchant marine was not nearly adequate to war's requirements.

With all this a matter of record, the third fact then becomes equally clear; namely, that United States-flag vessels cannot compete in the world transportation field—it cannot survive—without some aid from Government. Wages, supplies, safety requirements, all stemming from America's higher standard of living, give the low-cost foreign vessels an insurmountable advantage over American ships.

So we come to the nub of the problem—how best to aid American-flag vessels to meet this competition. Some have suggested that we entrust our commerce, and our national security, to the low cost foreign vessels and stop worrying about how to meet their competition. But one does not hear any such suggestions from informed sources—such as military leaders who have to meet logistic requirements throughout the world, and industrial leaders who must depend upon the United States merchant fleet.

The military leaders have the experience of World War II and Korea fresh in their minds. Industry remembers its experience of years gone by. It remembers when ocean freight rates jumped as much as 2,000 percent, and when American cargoes rotted on docks everywhere because the foreign shipping on which reliance had been placed was nonexistent, or was too busy taking care of their own nations' need to bother about American commerce.

When it comes to a question of how to aid American-flag vessels, there can be only one truly sensible answer.

That answer is—cargoes. Shipping lives, and prospers, by the cargoes it carries. Deprived of those cargoes, as much of America's shipping has been lately, in the face of vastly increased foreign competition, shipping cannot survive. It was to fill this breach—which always will exist except in time of emergency—that the cargo preference, or 50–50 policy, was devised. American shipping does not want handouts from the Government. It wants to earn its way, in the one manner that justifies the existence of shipping anywhere; namely, by carrying cargoes. And certainly it is not too much to ask that cargoes for our own needs, those which we give away, and those which we finance in one way or another, be divided equally as between our own shipping and that of other nations.

Opposed to the school of thought which would entrust our commerce to ships of foreign nations on a false economy basis, is another school which maintains that we should demand not 50 percent, but 100 percent of Government-aid or financed cargoes, for our own flag vessels.

The point out that even with this 50–50 division American-flag vessels have been carrying less—sometimes far less—than a third of our foreign commerce. On the other hand, foreign shipping is in better health than at any time since World War II.

As a matter of fact, Public Law 664, as originally conceived, provided for 100 percent carriage of Government-owned or financed cargoes in American-flag vessels. Mainly because of the adverse effect which such action might have on our allies abroad, I refused to support those demands. But, as between the two schools of thought, as between the policy of guaranteeing our own ships no part of those ocean cargoes paid for or financed by Government, or of guaranteeing them 100 percent of such cargoes, I could have no hesitancy in taking a stand. I would be with those who urge 100 percent. But it is fortunate, indeed, that no such choice is necessary. Commonsense will always require that we do not place reliance on foreign shipping, but, rather, that we take such reasonable measure as will protect our merchant fleet from disappearing from the seas.

It has come to my attention that the Department of Agriculture, which stated that it had no immediate interest in this 50–50 bill when it was before the Senate for consideration, now is having trouble finding space on American vessels for transportation of surplus agricultural products.

If that be a fact, certainly there is no reason to attach any blame to the cargo-preference bill. Rather, there should be genuine satisfaction over the improved, but still far from healthy, state of the American merchant marine, which this bill has certainly helped to accomplish. How much better it is to have our shipping generally busy, rather than rotting at the wharves, as was the case a few months ago before this bill became effective.

My information, however, is that competitive bids have been submitted by American ship operators on every occasion when the Department of Agriculture has asked for bids. Moreover—and this is most important—I am told that American-flag tramp-vessel quotations as of the present time are 20 cents per ton less than even our National Shipping Authority rates.

Rates on United States-flag berth liners, of course, are identical with those of competing foreign vessels. I suggest that the Department of Agriculture may resolve these transportation difficulties by seeking a greater number of competitive bids from American shipping.

It should be kept in mind that Public Law 664 foresaw just such a situation as is now reported—and provided for it. The law makes application of the 50–50 provisions dependent upon the condition that American vessels are "available at fair and reasonable rates for United States-flag commercial vessels." If privately owned United States-flag vessels are not so available, there is no requirement in the law that such vessels be used for the transportation of these surplus agricultural commodities.

Another point to be kept in mind, however, is the desirability of maintaining our tramp fleet in an active, prosperous condition. Anyone familiar with ocean shipping history can recall the numerous instances when American exporters have been forced to pay outrageous rates for space on foreign ships because no privately owned American-flag vessels were available.

Public Law 664, with its assurance of 50 percent of Government-purchased or Government-financed cargoes to United States-flag vessels, is a reasonable measure.

Even under it, our shipping will still be far from the goal, as fixed in the basic merchant marine legislation, of carrying what might reasonably be considered a "substantial portion" of our country's waterborne export and import foreign commerce. Even under this "50–50" law, our ships will not be carrying the 50 percent of all our commerce which can rightfully be claimed as their due.

At least, however, Public Law 664 will help the American merchant marine meet to some extent the terrific competition of foreign shipping operating at one-fourth to one-half of the cost of American-flag vessels. On a realistic basis, this looks like as much as we can hope for. But it is as little as we can afford to take, in the interest of American prosperity and national security.

I will oppose to the utmost any efforts to deprive American shipping of the relatively feeble aid it now enjoys as a result of the operation of Public Law 664.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of February 16, 1955]

IT DOESN'T COME FREE

There have been indications from Washington recently that some Congressmen—primarily those from the farm States—want to take another look at the so-called cargo-preference law, under which at least one-half of all cargoes financed by the United States Government—whether inbound or outbound—must move in American-flag ships.

This policy, applied to all relief and rehabilitation shipments since the war, on a temporary basis, became the law of the land last year with the enactment of the Butler Tollefson Act. More recently lingering doubts as to its applicability this side of the Federal courts were cleared up when Attorney General Brownell gave it as his considered opinion that the act applies to surplus farm commodities exported by the Government under Public Law 480.

The reason for renewed congressional interest in the issue is obvious. Some foreign countries are reluctant to negotiate purchases of United States surplus farm stocks if one-half the shipment must be carried in American vessels, and at least one of these nations is understood to have turned down such an agreement entirely. In the eyes of some farm State legislators, therefore, the Cargo Preference Act is beginning to look like an obstacle to the administration's farm-surplus-disposal program.

This newspaper has supported the 50–50 principle from the outset, although with misgivings.

We supported it originally because, while realizing it was an extraordinary measure for a great creditor nation to undertake, the circumstances were also extraordinary. UNRRA, the Marshall plan, NATO, and point 4 were all unprecedented programs.

The United States had just emerged from a war which showed clearly that a strong merchant fleet was essential to its mere survival in a clash of great powers. If this merchant fleet were itself to survive, it would have to find work; and if it were not given a half share in these great programs, where, indeed, would it have found it in view of its high operating costs and the worldwide scarcity of dollars to buy its services? Subsidies, paid to a relatively few shipowners, provided only part of the answer.

The cargo-preference policy could not be judged by normal commercial standards because there was nothing either normal or commercial about the programs under which it was adopted. If it prevented foreign owners from earning some dollars they would otherwise have earned, their loss was nothing compared with the gain these programs brought to their national economies, and the policy literally kept American shipping afloat.

So far as Government aid programs are concerned, stockpiling and the like, we see no reason for modifying this policy.

The misgivings we held at the outset we still retain, however. We retain them because we know that nothing comes free.

The 50–50 rule has established a precedent which is not in all respects pleasant. What one nation can do to protect its shipping, another nation can also do. And if one such act detonates others, the outlook for a reasonably free market in shipping—shaped by the old laws of supply and demand—is poor indeed, and so are the prospects of nations which depend heavily on shipping earnings.

The Onassis agreement with Saudi Arabia was one of these portents, but not by any means the only one. There is a danger inherent in going too far—and we believe the United States went as far as it ever should go when it arranged the recent sale of coal to England for sterling on condition that half the cargoes move in American ships.

The deal was advantageous to the British, for it saved them dollars, but the transaction came close to being of a straight commercial type, and the attachment of the 50–50-cargo-preference principle left a burning question in the air as to whether there would be more of the same. Thus far there has not been.

The farm-surplus export program is not of this variety, however.

It is a Government operation; and while we have had as many misgivings about it as about the 50–50 rule, we accept the assurances of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson that sales will be handled in such a way that they do not disturb ordinary commercial marketings, either of United States citizens or those of friendly foreign countries.

If one accepts those assurances, this program cannot be considered a commercial venture, and there should be no question as to the applicability of the Cargo Preference Act to shipments made under it. The Attorney General is on firm ground in taking this position.

It would be a little ironic, however, if farm interests should take the stand that the Cargo Preference Act should go because it seems to interfere with sales of Government-owned agricultural surpluses. They would be skating on thin ice, indeed.

Let there be no mistake about it. Both the crop-support program and the cargo-preference policy are, in one way or another, forms of subsidy, and there is no occasion whatever for the recipients of either to take a holier-than-thou attitude toward the other.

Both bear the seeds of possible future trouble. It is safe to use them only so long as their potential dangers are kept in mind, and those who administer them do so with restraint.

[From the Northwestern Miller, Minneapolis, Minn., of March 8, 1955]

THE 50–50 LAW

There is a tendency in some quarters to look upon America's abundance of agricultural products as a curse rather than as a blessing. Yet to the world at large these surpluses are a blessing, indeed, for the administration is doing everything within its powers, and within the bounds of prudence, to see that needy people get them.

Part of the plan is that agricultural surpluses may be sold for foreign currency under the provisions of Public Law 480. Because of the inability to procure, or to spend dollars, such countries as Yugoslavia, Pakistan, Turkey, Chile, and Peru are benefiting. Others are listed as possible beneficiaries.

It seems hard to understand, therefore, why one small provision or condition of such deals should arouse bitter criticism abroad. The United States Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, Jr., ruled last December that half of the commodities sold for foreign currency must be moved in American ships under the provisions of the Butler-Tollefson Cargo Preference Act. Known as the 50–50 law, this legislation is aimed at providing business for American ships. American surpluses have made food available to foreigners. What is wrong with moving it in American vessels? The rule has done no harm to overseas maritime nations, for the movement of surplus commodities has resulted in a major increase in freight rates. Because foreign companies' operating costs are much lower than those of American firms, they make that much extra profit.

From the vehement protests uttered abroad one might imagine that the Americans are taking their customers for every penny they have. Admittedly, these customers are paying for the goods, but it is in their own national currencies and the American administration is committed to spending the cash take on projects abroad. Admittedly, again these projects are aimed at strengthening world defense, itself an advantage to the United States. But they are also advantageous to the recipients in spheres apart from mutual defense. Money circulates more freely and the projects themselves are capital gains.

Even when the United States was giving freely and without charge large amounts for the economic rehabilitation of Europe in the early postwar years, there were squeals of protest at even the smallest stipulation imposed by the American administration. The removal of the provision that 25 percent of all wheat shipped under the aid scheme should be in the form of flour was sparked by the protestations of the beneficiaries.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been hearing about the protests. The firm recommendation is that the committee should not allow the administration to recognize them.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of May 20, 1955]

SHIPPING OUTLOOK: THE 50–50 LAW

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

Discrimination is a dangerous word to bandy about at any time unless you happen to be talking about the finer things in life, like art or music, when it assumes a certain majesty.

We find it necessary, however, to discuss discrimination today—flag discrimination particularly—and how it is being applied specifically to the United States ever since the Butler-Tollefson so-called 50–50 law was enacted last year.

The criticism that has been leveled against this measure abroad during recent months has mounted steadily. It reached a new peak this week when Sir Colin Anderson, president of the International Chamber of Shipping, told delegates from 35 nations representing some 17 million tons of shipping, who attended the Baltic and International Maritime Conference at Copenhagen, that "one of our biggest problems today is United States flag discrimination."

Since this use of the word in a depreciatory sense before such an important group can only result in a false and misleading statement coming to be accepted as genuine by many, unless challenged, it is time to state a few facts.

First. This law does not provide that American-flag ships are to get 50 percent of certain types of cargo to which it applies. The American-flag ship "must be available" and at "reasonable rates." Otherwise, the shipment can move on a foreign ship, as many of them have been handled. Last year, for example, 82 percent of this country's tramp-borne commerce moved in foreign ships, because the 50 tramps still under

the United States flag were not able to handle the allowed percentage.

Second. The law applies only to overseas cargo paid for or guaranteed as to payment by the United States Government, including American surplus commodities that are sold for local currency and hence must be covered by dollar appropriations out of the United States Treasury. This local currency is either spent by the United States in that foreign country or allowed to stay there as a grant or long-term loan. Regardless of the final disposition, it is a tab that the American taxpayer must meet.

Third. Cargo preference of the type just mentioned has been applicable in one form or another over several years, or ever since this country engaged on its policy of helping friendly nations at the end of the war. American ships had a priority up to 50 percent of all aid cargo. We do not recall any great furor being raised abroad during this period though the surrounding circumstances, basically, were little different than they are today.

Yet, despite this effort to assist United States shipping, the percentage of our dry cargo trade handled by American bottoms has steadily dropped. In 1946, for example, American ships handled 60.9 percent of our exports and 56.3 percent of our imports. The figures for November 1954, the latest available, show American ships handling 24.4 percent of dry cargo exports and 29.1 percent of imports.

This is rather ironic in view of another observation by Sir Colin at the Copenhagen conference that world trade is 20 percent greater than in 1950 and 50 percent greater than prewar.

United States flag shipping certainly hasn't been doing too well in this expanding market.

So we have a situation in this 50–50 law where United States flag shipping is not guaranteed any percentage of cargo but must meet certain conditions: Where the cargo involved is directly tied to the taxpayer's dollar; where the so-called preference has been in effect for years; and where, despite this misnamed discrimination, the fleets of every leading maritime nation have expanded while that of this country has declined.

Surely this has not resulted in any restraint of trade. Competitive forces have been freely at work around the world outside this country as the statistics covering the handling of our waterborne commerce indicate.

Overlooked in all this hullabaloo is the fact that whatever flag a vessel flies, it is placed at no disadvantage with American ships in normal trading with this country. We do not have any special port dues, consular fees, berthing preferences and other dodges to aid our shipping.

This is discrimination in the proper meaning of the word as we see it, for these gimmicks are aimed to divert all cargo to a particular nation's shipping, not 50 percent of taxpayers financed cargo which, in turn, is a small percentage of all cargo moving in and out of our ports.

Our friends abroad have every right, of course, to criticize this statute, but we believe that in labeling it flag discrimination they are putting on a handle that does not fit. In so doing they are letting loose impressions that are not warranted by the simple truth.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, we have a division of the time on the bill. I have not received very many requests for time, but there have been several requests of that sort.

Let me inquire how many minutes the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would like to have me yield to him?

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to have the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well, Mr. President; I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to state how I interpret this bill as a member of the Appropriations Committee, which will be charged with the responsibility of implementing it.

As I cast my vote here, and as I vote in the Appropriations Committee, I shall keep in mind the words of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. A day or two ago he said—and in my opinion he said correctly—that in this case we are passing a maximum authorization bill. We are not definitely promising to spend any specific amount of money.

I think we should not let the idea exist in our country or exist beyond our shores that tonight we are in any way approving or passing a promissory note that has to be redeemed 100 cents on the dollar in its full amount by the Congress as a whole or by the Appropriations Committees.

Personally, I expect to vote for the bill, on the question of final passage, because substantially half of the authorizations under the bill will go for actual military assistance. Some of the rest will go to help countries such as Formosa, Pakistan, Korea, and countries in other areas of the world which desperately need our help, and which definitely manifest their friendship for the United States of America and their faith in freedom.

Mr. President, I think the bill is a bit waterlogged. I shall do what I can in good faith, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which will deal with this specific fund, to whittle down the areas which I think are inflated, to squeeze some of the water out of the bill, to reduce it from the standpoint of its size in certain areas, and to try to move it in the direction of loans, instead of grants—which, if continued, will endlessly engulf our country in increasing debt and steadily perpetuate an expensive and exhausting practice.

I make this statement primarily as one member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to make it crystal clear on the record that we are not tonight signing a promissory note and guaranteeing to redeem its maximum limitations 100 percent. We have created a maximum in an area in which the Appropriations Committee and the Congress will exercise their good judgment to determine how much of what we authorize here eventually we shall deliver over there.

This bill establishes the ceiling beyond which we cannot go. It now becomes our responsibility to decide how far we shall go with our appropriations in moving toward this very generous maximum ceiling. We make no commitments on those final monetary figures by our votes on policy here tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is further use of time desired?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time, and will do so after making a very brief statement.

I know that I speak for every Member on this side of the aisle, and I hope for the entire membership of the Senate, when I express great admiration for the magnificent job done by the Foreign Relations Committee, and particularly by its distinguished chairman, in handling one of the most important bills the Senate has considered during this session.

We have long known that no Member of this body is possessed of more wisdom, greater eloquence, better powers of persuasion, or a finer sense of devotion to duty than the great senior Senator from the State of Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. To him and to his colleagues on that committee on both sides of the aisle I express my gratitude and appreciation for the fine job they have done.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been used or yielded.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. FREAR (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present and voting I am informed that he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired against the bill with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. The Senator from Nevada is absent on official business of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Sen-

ate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business for the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—59

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Anderson	Hill	Mundt
Barkley	Holland	Neely
Beall	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bennett	Ives	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Payne
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Bush	Kefauver	Purtell
Butler	Kilgore	Robertson
Carlson	Knowland	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Scott
Cotton	Lehman	Smathers
Dirksen	Long	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Mansfield	Stennis
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Symington
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Thurmond
George	McNamara	Thye
Hayden	Millikin	Wiley
Hennings	Monroney	

NAYS—18

Barrett	Ellender	Langer
Byrd	Goldwater	McCarthy
Curtis	Hruska	Russell
Daniel	Jenner	Welker
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Williams
Eastland	Kerr	Young

NOT VOTING—19

Allott	Capehart	Clements
Bender	Case, S. Dak.	Frear
Bridges	Chavez	Fulbright
Gore	McClellan	Sparkman
Green	Murray	Watkins
Kennedy	O'Mahoney	
Malone	Schoeppel	

So the bill (S. 2090) was passed.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall shortly move that the Senate recess until Monday at noon.

For the information of Senators, I should like to say that it is expected that two appropriation bills will be reported by the Committee on Appropriations tomorrow. So far as I know, there is no great controversy on either of the bills. Furthermore, so far as I am informed, there is no plan to have a yea-and-nay vote on either of the appropriation bills, although, of course, Senators may require it. These bills will be considered on Monday.

On Tuesday it is planned to bring up the housing bill and any other bills which may be reported and are on the calendar. However, when the Senate recesses this evening, it will recess until Monday at noon. I assure Senators that I shall be glad to stay here this evening until all Senators have had an opportunity to place matters in the RECORD.

DEATH OF DR. F. MELIUS CHRISTIANSEN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to take a few moments of the Senate's time to pay an appropriate tribute to a very distinguished citizen of the State of Minnesota who passed away yesterday. I refer to Dr. F. Melius Christiansen, director of the St. Olaf choir of St. Olaf College, at Northfield, Minn.

Dr. Christiansen was one of our senior citizens in Minnesota in the fullest sense of that term. For more than 35 years his choir traveled throughout America and in many foreign countries. It brought a message of good will and American life to people in foreign lands, and it brought good cheer and good music to people in our own country.

Dr. Christiansen was knighted by the King of Norway, and he was received by Presidents of the United States. He was known to governors of our States, Members of Congress, leaders of business and professions, and people in all walks of life.

His death is a sad loss to our State and to the great college he so ably represented for more than 35 years.

We in Minnesota have great pride in his many accomplishments. His spirit will live on and his works will live on in the person of his own son, who is the new director of the St. Olaf choir, which I consider to be one of the finest choral organizations in America.

THE HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I understand that tomorrow morning the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in charge of the bill introduced by several Senators, to authorize the Hells Canyon Dam on the reaches of the Snake River in the State of Idaho, will meet to discuss and probably vote on the bill and its referral to the full committee.

I had intended today to make some remarks regarding the Hells Canyon controversy. However, because of the lateness of the hour, and because it is expected that the committee will vote on the bill tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent that my statement regarding it be printed in the RECORD at this point, in the hope that the committee may give some attention to the statement.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION EXAMINER PROVES CASE FOR FEDERAL HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

On May 6 the presiding examiner of the Federal Power Commission made public his long awaited—recommended—finding on the 3-dam license application of the Idaho Power Co. for the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River.

For many years I, together with many of my colleagues, have said time and time again on the floor of the United States Senate that the proposed Federal high dam at Hells Canyon represented the only means by which maximum development of this stretch of Snake River would be attained.

We have said time and time again that its great block of power-at-site and downstream would benefit the region and the Nation. We have said that the 3-dam private plan would sacrifice needlessly most of the potential of the river.

We have pointed out the tremendous economic benefits of such a project in new industries, payrolls and jobs, a broader tax-base.

We have said time and time again that as a key upstream storage project in the Corps of Army Engineers main control plan for the Columbia Basin, the operation of Hells Canyon, integrated with the other Federal projects, would provide not only the greatest feasible production of firm power but also navigation, flood control, recreation, aid to future irrigation, and full development of the great phosphate reserves in eastern Idaho and neighboring States, so important to the Nation's farm economy.

And we have said time and time again that the investment of the American people in the economic stimulation of the Pacific Northwest—by means of development of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River—would be repaid by the region's power users in 50 years with interest.

Not only that, but in the following 50 years Hells Canyon Dam would pay for itself twice.

After more than a year of hearings before the Federal Power Commission, after the various parties had exchanged briefs and counter briefs, the examiner has shifted the record of facts on this most vital matter to the future of river development in America.

This is what the examiner has to say about the Federal high dam at Hells Canyon:

"The facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake" (p. 55).

This is precisely what we have been saying since 1949, in the face of misleading propaganda, in the face of half-truths, in the face of talk about creeping socialism, in the face of the myths of an alternative "special interest" plan for development.

If there is one thing that is made clear by the examiner's finding of fact it is this: There is no alternative private plan for development at Hells Canyon.

No such plan exists. Three small dams were hurriedly proposed in order to establish the appearance of an alternative.

A small amount of storage was proposed at one of the three sites—Brownlee.

In the hope that the people of the Northwest would be incapable of rising to protect their own interests, the Idaho Power Co. went into the hearings before the Federal Power Commission, confident that the proceedings would be over before the true nature of their flimsy, improvised nonplan would be revealed in the record.

The Idaho Power Co. failed. Their claims were given the most rigid scrutiny over the months. Government witnesses testified concerning the soundness of engineering and economic planning for the high dam. The examiner could, in all intellectual honesty, come to no other conclusion to the one which I have just quoted—that high Hells Canyon represents "the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake."

Where are the major disputations arguments against Hells Canyon now? Let us take a number of the more important ones:

You have heard the opponents say: Hells Canyon dam is unfeasible engineeringly and economically, will never repay its costs from the sale of its power.

Here is what the examiner says in reply:

Finding 136: "The high-dam project is feasible from an engineering standpoint"; and in

Finding 155: "The high-dam project apparently would pay out its reimbursable costs with interest within a 50-year period, i. e., amortization of the Federal investment allocated to power, together with costs of operation and maintenance."

Here is another argument of the opponents: The three-dam plan will produce almost as much power as Federal Hells Canyon Dam, and cheaper.

On this the examiner says:

"That the at-site energy produced by the three dams would be 505,000 kilowatts of prime power" (finding 15); and

"That the Federal Hells Canyon project would produce 924,000 prime kilowatts."

This is a difference of 410,000 kilowatts, the equivalent of another Bonneville, in favor of the Federal dam.

Cost of salable firm power from Hells Canyon project, says the examiner, would be $23.80 per kilowatt-year, and would not affect the going Bonneville rate of $17.50 a kilowatt-year when pooled with the Federal system (finding 148). This means that Hells Canyon power would cost delivered at load center 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Cost of salable firm power from the three dams would be 6.69 mills per kilowatt-hour (finding 25). This would make such power cost $58 per kilowatt-year, far and above the general going cost of generation and transmission in the Pacific Northwest outside the area served by the Idaho Power Co., and nearly 250 percent higher than Federal Hells Canyon power.

Could anyone in his right mind call this three-dam proposal an alternative plan to Federal Hells Canyon Dam on those two facts alone:

1. A loss of 45 percent of the power potential;

2. Power available at nearly 250 percent higher cost than the Federal project?

Another loud argument against Federal Hells Canyon—and for the three dams—capitalizes on the impending power shortage in the Pacific Northwest, which is indeed a most serious one.

Opponents of Hells Canyon have stated over and over again that the private plan would provide a needed block of power for the Northwest and would get it on the line in 3 years, if necessary; far more rapidly than high Hells Canyon could ever accomplish the job.

The examiner shows little mercy on these contentions. In several findings, and in the general text, he makes the facts eminently clear from the record:

1. That the energy from the three dams could not be used in the Idaho Power Co.'s own service area until about 1975 (finding 20).

2. That surplus energy to the Idaho Power Co. service area would have to be sold elsewhere in the region at prices equal to the costs of producing and transmitting the power (findings 21 and 22).

3. "The prospects, as reflected in this record, for the sale in the Northwest of the large amounts of excess power that would be available from the three projects at rates which would equal the cost of the power are so feeble as to be worthy of no consideration" (finding 27).

The examiner has previously stated (p. 25) that "The cost of the Idaho Power Co. 3-dam output will always exceed the upper limit of the sales price for wholesale power in the Pacific Northwest * * * this will also be so in 1980 when all the additions to capacity in the Northwest will be steam-electric."

No one except those who are forced to buy Idaho Power's electric energy, or use coal-oil lamps, will accept 6.69-mill power in the Pacific Northwest. This power is of no use to us. It will not answer the region's needs for large blocks of low-cost power available to the entire region to help meet normal load growths and attract needed new industry as well.

But by the time 1975 has rolled around, Federal high Hells Canyon Dam, assuming a start of construction in 1956, will have been on the line producing its full at-site and downstream power for 22 years. Not until 1975 would there be a local market for the power from the other two Idaho Power dams at the prices they would charge.

So much for the allegation of the three dams producing any power for the Columbia Basin as a whole, and so much for having it on the line sooner than Hells Canyon.

One of the most misleading and vicious arguments against Hells Canyon Dam has been that there wouldn't be enough water after expansion of upstream irrigation on Snake River to fill the high-dam reservoir during critical years of low flow. Southern Idaho irrigationists have been made the target of this fallacious propaganda which was calculated to strike them at their most sensitive spot, since their very existence depends upon water for their crops.

The examiner gives short shrift to this straw man. In finding 166 he says:

"With ample allowance for all foreseeable upstream water uses, a dependable water supply can reasonably be expected for the efficient and economic operation of the high-dam project during its payout period."

Opponents of the high dam have contended for years that the Idaho Power Co. had a plan for comprehensive development. This they argued when the company proposed and applied to the Federal Power Commission for only the small Oxbow development. They shifted with the next company shift when it talked about five low-head dams—including Oxbow. Once more they shifted when, after several years, the company came out with the 3-dam proposal—including Oxbow, Little Hells Canyon, and Brownlee—the latter with 1 million acre-feet of storage.

Is this really a comprehensive plan? Listen to what the examiner says in finding 48:

"To call completely separable power development units of a single project in order that a license be issued for all of the projects at once and the construction period of one of such separable projects could actually begin at some time after the 4-year period specified in the statute, would be a violation of section 13 of the Federal Power Act."

Moreover, the examiner shows from the record of the FPC proceedings that the 3 dams were planned, designed, and engineered primarily to meet the power needs of the Idaho Power Co. service area (finding 70). And also the 3-dam proposal's transmission system is not designed for a fully integrated operation with the Federal Columbia River power system, nor does the record show any such intention or planning on the part of the Idaho Power Co. (finding 139).

To add to this 3-day—"no-plan"—the examiner himself recommends operation of the Brownlee Reservoir so that it is filling—when it should be emptied—to provide the optimum release for downstream power firm-up. When it should be filling in the summer, it is being drawn down to meet peak loads in the Idaho power service area (art. 40, p. 79).

This is a comprehensive regional development plan in reverse and can truly be termed a "nonplan."

The examiner finds that for the region as a whole the high dam project would stimulate:

(a) Power-load development.

(b) Greater utilization of power in industry, agriculture, commerce, community, and service activities.

(c) New business and employment opportunities.

(d) Expansion of production and productivity.

(e) Development of minerals and other materials important to the regional and national economy, and to the national security.

(f) Strengthening of the regional and national economy (finding 164).

He also lists the benefits which would be available from Federal high Hells Canyon Dam to the Snake River Subbasin which is in such need of cheap power:

1. Industrialization, diversification, and stabilization of its dominantly agricultural economy.

2. Reduction of seasonal unemployment of new industrialization.

3. Fostering of individual initiative, private business and industrial initiative.

4. Increasing employment and business opportunities, broadening the tax base, raising income levels and standards of living (finding 163).

In other recommended findings, the examiner finds that the Federal high Hells Canyon project—with its 3,880,000 acre-feet of storage—will provide greater flood control, navigation, and recreation benefits; that it will stimulate the development of phosphatic fertilizer for the Nation's farmers to a greater extent than the private 3-dam proposal; that it will provide power revenues for future irrigation projects if they are authorized by the Congress; that it will stimulate greater expansion of electro-process industries than the 3-dam proposal.

The examiner then proceeds to reject license applications for Oxbow and Little Hells Canyon Dam. The overwhelming logic of his findings and conclusions—which I have already itemized—would, one would suppose, inevitably result in turning down the entire private scheme.

This is particularly true in terms of section 7 (b) of the Federal Power Act. This section provides that whenever, in the judgment of the Commission, Federal development of a waterway or waterways should be undertaken—any competing private license application should be rejected—and the Commission should make its recommendation to the Congress with whatever data, engineering reports and other material—it deems of use to that body.

But it is at this point that the examiner drives his car into the ditch. He says that he cannot invoke 7 (b). High Hells Canyon is, as he says, "the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake," but section 7 (b) doesn't apply.

The examiner now proceeds to introduce one of the most outlandish criteria of feasibility that I have ever heard of.

All of us in this body are aware that multipurpose projects must be judged on their merits with the yardsticks of engineering and

economic feasibility. With respect to Hells Canyon, its superiority on both counts is beyond argument.

The examiner breaks away from the Federal Power Act—and the merits of the case—by introducing political feasibility as his novel yardstick in determining whether or not he should invoke section 7 (b) and recommend Federal development.

Here is his peculiar reasoning, stated in his own words on page 56. It is also found in slightly different language in finding 182.

"I conclude," says the examiner, "that on the basis of the facts before me, including the legislative history of the various Hells Canyon bills which have been heretofore presented to the Congress without success, the likelihood of the authorization of and appropriation for an undertaking of the size involved in the high dam project is so remote as to make a recommendation to the Congress under section 7 (b) that such a dam be undertaken by the United States a completely useless action."

He then adds, in justification of his next step, that "nonutilization of power resources could be—in some circumstances—just as shortsighted as less than maximum development."

With political feasibility, his guiding star, the examiner, in high good spirits, then recommends the granting of a license to the Brownlee project—but not before this advance apology to the Congress:

"If the Congress feels that the Commission has not performed its function in the public interest and in accordance with the provisions of this statute, the Commission's power to issue a license may be withdrawn or suspended at any time."

He cites two cases in which this has been done; in 1921 with respect to power sites in national parks and monuments, and in 1928 for some time on the Colorado River and all its tributaries except one.

I wish to point out to the Senate of the United States that the examiner's decision demonstrates that the Federal Power Commission is not the fit repository for policy decisions on the manner in which our rivers should be developed for multiple purposes when private and public plans come into conflict.

The relegation of section 7 (b) to the port of forgotten laws by this examiner's recommended finding for Brownlee project, when every fact points to the superiority of high Hells Canyon, is an illustration of the enormity of the precedent being established here.

This case will be a precedent and a disastrous precedent unless the Congress once more assumes the power of decision over the development of our river systems for low-cost power, flood control, navigation, irrigation, and the other benefits—which are so abundantly derived—when a construction program is carried out in conformity with an overall, basinwide engineering plan.

The examiner has assumed the function of political soothsayer and is attempting to justify his recommended action by gaging the future action of Congress through a crystal ball, on the basis of what Congress has or has not done in the past on Hells Canyon.

This self-assumption of second sight by any creature of Congress, such as the Federal Power Commission, and used to decide whether the act shall be complied with, is taking unconscionable liberties with the law. Moreover, it is taking liberties with the powers delegated by the Congress, itself, to its creature, the Federal Power Commission, powers to be used only as the appropriate provision of the Federal Power Act provides. It is, in effect, defiance of Congress itself.

Fascinated by his uncanny gift of seeing into the future, the FPC examiner is assuming that the representatives of the people of the United States, in Congress, will stand aside while the Idaho Power Co. proceeds with the construction of its Brownlee project, a dam which will produce a mere 221,000 kilowatts of prime power, and provide salable firm power at 7.6 mills per kilowatt-hour. All this in the face of his findings that the Federal Hells Canyon project will produce 924,000 kilowatts of prime power and salable firm power at only 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

If the Congress does not act to remove this matter from the hands of the Federal Power Commission by authorizing Hells Canyon dam, there will be a massive loss to the region and the Nation equivalent to the total output of McNary Dam. The small block of power from Brownlee will be sold only to a restricted area served by the private utility at a unit cost per kilowatt-hour nearly 280 percent higher than the great block of power from the Federal project, a great block of power which would not only serve the Idaho Power area, but the entire region.

If the Congress fails to act, the region will be deprived of 2.88 million acre-feet of valuable upstream storage for power, flood control, navigation—storage which each year is becoming more difficult to obtain, and which when developed in its entirety will account for 65 percent of the total achievement of the Columbia Basin's still unharnessed power potential.

If the Congress fails to act, the region and the Nation will be deprived of power revenues to aid future irrigation development upstream from Hells Canyon. This new land will become more and more valuable as population pressures continue to exert themselves against available food supply.

If the Congress fails to act, farmers from Ohio to California will be deprived of the opportunity which Hells Canyon will provide for cheaper, higher grade phosphatic fertilizer, vitally needed to maintain productivity of their farms and the nutrition of their crops.

If the Congress fails to act there will be withheld from thousands of young persons and others in my region the opportunity for new jobs. This will come about because there would be a total sacrifice of more than 1 million kilowatts of low-cost power—low-cost power necessary to attract new and to expand existing electro-processing and other industries for the region's and America's strength in peace and for defense.

If Congress fails to act, the comprehensive plan for the Columbia Basin will be well on its way to disintegration. Storage will be sacrificed. Integrated operation will be replaced by service area operation. Low-cost power will be sacrificed for high-cost power.

This decision recommended by the examiner, if allowed to stand, simply means that no unauthorized site proposed for Federal development in accordance with a basinwide integrated plan of operation will ever be constructed if a private utility files for a license before Congress can act.

In my State of Washington the people fought for 30 years before Grand Coulee was won.

It has taken years to attain the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development.

It has taken years to realize such great developments as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Hoover and Shasta Dams.

Were they worth waiting for? Ask the people who live in the shadow of these enduring monuments to the fighters for full development.

If the Congresses of the past had been willing to fritter away such sites and such engineering plans simply by applying the gage of political feasibility there would be not a single one in existence today.

The Nation would have sustained a grave loss in its economic strength and in its ability to provide the seed corn for expanded economic activity and expanding free enterprise. The examiner has forgotten this or has chosen not to use history—instead of the misapplied semantics and tortured logic—which characterize his evasion of the real issue implicit in Hells Canyon.

He has forgotten that the Congress can and will act in the public interest at Hells Canyon. For in spite of himself, the examiner on the basis of the record could come to no other conclusion than the one held by myself and those with whom I have fought to save this mighty damsite, namely, that the Federal plan is the only one which can harness the Middle Snake for all of its wide ranging and lasting benefits.

Had there been a Senate vote on the issue of Kettle Falls versus Grand Coulee, I cannot believe there is a single Senator in this great body who would have voted to reject Grand Coulee for the proposed private development at Kettle Falls on the mighty Columbia River.

The analogy between Grand Coulee and Kettle Falls in the 1930's and between Hells Canyon and Brownlee now is perfect.

Hells Canyon is the Grand Coulee of the 1950's. Brownlee is the Kettle Falls of the 1950's.

The facts are marshalled. The issue is plain. The duty and responsibility of the Congress to the people is clear.

The Federal Power Commission examiner has proved the case for high Hells Canyon Dam.

LEIF ERICSSON—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on the day before yesterday I again introduced my annual joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia. I have found unusual support for the resolution on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Apparently among the names of the Senators who have joined in sponsoring the joint resolution the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was inadvertently omitted when the resolution was printed. The Senator from Kansas is very proud of his Scandinavian ancestry, and he has always supported the joint resolution. I wish the RECORD to show that he is also wholeheartedly in support of it and wishes to add his name to it as a sponsor. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Washington recalls that one of the earliest experiences of the junior Senator from Louisiana, 7 years ago, was his service on the Committee on Rules and Administration when the effort to find an appropriate place for Leif Ericsson first came up. I am delighted to know that the Senator from Washington is still looking out for Leif Ericsson, and I regret that Lief is still not in his right place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. Mr. President, although I do not have the formal support of the majority leader and the minority leader, I can tell by the looks on their faces that they will help me in this matter.

CONGRESSIONAL SOFTBALL TEAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have been requested by the Press Club to organize a softball team from the Senate and from the House. I wish to say that we are having a little problem in completing a 9-man team, and I would welcome the wholehearted support of the majority and minority leaders in getting good representation on Sunday at 2 o'clock. It would be a calamity if the Press Club should prevail over the Congress in the field of softball.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to say that two of the most delightful Members of this body are the two Senators from the State of Washington. I have served with both of them in the House and in the Senate. But they are pouring problems on my back so fast, what with Lief Ericsson and a softball team, that, except for the absence from his post of duty of the distinguished Vice President this evening, we might have suffered a defeat. I am appreciative of the fact that the Vice President had duties elsewhere. Had he been in the Senate, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], of course assuming that the Vice President would vote with the minority, would have been adopted. So far as I am concerned, I have no doubt that he would have voted with the minority. They seem to be holding their lines pretty well.

I have not had a chance to consider the suggestion of the senior Senator from Washington or that of the junior Senator from Washington, but they have my support whenever I can possibly give it without fear of disastrous consequences. Since they have gone into these two matters pretty thoroughly, I have every reason to believe that I can support them.

SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS—DECISION OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT (S. DOC. NO. 46)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases involving segregation in the public schools, which was rendered on May 31, 1955, be printed as a Senate document.

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

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 6, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

Ralph L. Pfau
William M. Gibson
Alvin C. Thorson
Joseph C. Partington

To be commissioned lieutenant

Alfred C. Holmes

To be commissioned ensign

John H. Bennett
Robert J. Black
Oscar L. Doster
Albert J. Hamlett, Jr.
Page A. Herbert
Ralph G. Jourden
J. Frank May, Jr.
Lavon L. Posey
James E. Sommerer
William M. Tidwell

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 2 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

POSTMASTER

Mrs. Lulie M. Frick to be postmaster at Atlas in the State of Michigan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, whose kind and beneficent providence fills each new day with blessedness, makes us more appreciative and worthy of Thy continuing love and care.

Help us to sense the sanctity and sacredness of the duties which confront us and may we perform them faithfully and as in Thy sight and for Thy glory.

May we have a clear vision of that blessed time when the nations of the earth shall yield themselves in a glad and willing obedience to Thy divine sovereignty.

Show us how we may strengthen our own faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness and justice when men everywhere shall follow the ways of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5559. An act to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE a member of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy, Mr. BIBLE a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–18.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on School Construction of the House Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate while the House is in session.

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

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. WALTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, because of the very obvious attempt to play politics with a subject which should not get into the realm of politics, and I say that because of an address that was made last evening, I am inserting in the RECORD an analysis by a technician on the immigration laws of the United States. I respectfully urge you to read it in the interest of knowing what the truth really is.

ITALY REMEMBERS JUNE 2, 1946

Mr. BARRETT. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, after the defeat of the Nazis in World War II, Italy was in a state of ferment. A political vacuum had been created by the failure of Mussolini's despotic experiment, but ready to step into this vacuum was a coalition group of anti-Fascist parties which had been suppressed by Mussolini, but had united underground as the Committee of National Liberation.

At first the government had a difficult and uncertain time. Before December of 1945, several cabinets had already formed and fallen. A number of elements contributed to the unhappy political situation, but two of these were crucial. In the first place Italy at the end of the war found herself in a serious plight economically; and in the second place no decision had been reached as to whether Italy was to remain a monarchy or become a republic. In December 1945, however, Alcide de Gasperi, the Christian Democratic leader, became Premier of Italy, and managed to give Italy a relatively stable government.

Then in 1946, on June 2, the Italian people went to the polls for the express purpose of deciding the kind of govern-

ment they wanted. In this public referendum the issue of monarchy or republic was settled by the people in favor of a republic.

This series of events and subsequent developments in Italy have given the free nations of the West confidence in the Italian people and in their ability to produce strong democratic leadership. The road that Italy has had to traverse since the war has been at times very disheartening. The U. S. S. R., fully aware of Italy's strategic importance, made that country one of its chief targets for subversion. The Communist menace, coupled with the economic problems of unemployment and the crucial need for land reform, have at times made Italy's plight seem quite critical.

But today when we look at Italy we see a country that is well on its way to greater economic and political stability, and that in its relationship with its neighbors and allies is enjoying friendly cooperation and understanding. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Coal and Steel Community are some of the larger international projects in which Italy is a participant and a leader. In the Trieste settlement with Yugoslavia, Italy has shown her desire to negotiate troublesome disputes for the sake of agreement and peace. The friendship between Italy and our own country is continually evident. For instance, this spring there was a visit to our country by Premier Mario Scelba; and this summer we plan to participate in the international trade fairs in Milan and Palermo.

On this June 2, Italy is looking back along the way she has come. May we be among the first to congratulate the Italian people on the remarkable accomplishments that their republican government has made since 1946.

RESPECT FOR A FORMER PRESIDENT

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers recently carried a story that former President Harry S. Truman had "declined an invitation" to attend the session at San Francisco later this month celebrating the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. It now appears that the newspaper did not carry the full story.

Former President Truman, it appears, was invited merely to go along in a certain crowd, as a kind of official guest of Secretary of State Dulles, but without the natural invitation to speak at the ceremonies that is indicated by common courtesy and by Mr. Truman's intimate connection with the founding of the U. N.

It is understandable that Secretary Dulles and the U. N. officials could not complete their program until they were sure about the official representation of the present administration. It might have been difficult for them to ask Mr. Truman, a former President, to speak if the highest-ranking official American spokesman was the Cabinet officer, the Secretary of State.

Now President Eisenhower has announced that his schedule will permit him to address the U. N. celebration. The matter of protocol has been taken care of, for naturally our present Chief Executive will make the first American speech as America's highest present spokesman.

I very much hope, and I strongly urge, that Secretary Dulles will now suggest to the U. N. officials that Harry S. Truman, private citizen of Independence, Mo., be invited to speak.

No human being in all the world had more to do with the founding of the United Nations than Mr. Truman.

The first major decision he had to make as President, when he succeeded Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, was a decision that the scheduled San Francisco conference to establish the U. N. would meet exactly as planned, and that the United States would participate exactly as planned.

It would be very curious—it would be a shameful thing—if Mr. Truman, still in the vigor of his years, should not be called upon by his countrymen to take a part in the ceremonies celebrating the organization which his decisiveness and wisdom helped found.

The initiative, no doubt, must rest with President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles to make the proper suggestions to the appropriate U. N. officials. The suggestions should be made, and made promptly. I have no doubt that Mr. Truman, even though a private citizen, will have much wisdom to offer.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file sundry reports.

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

There was no objection.

FOREST FIRES AND OUR NATIONAL FOREST RESERVES

Mr. BAILEY. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute in order to call the attention of my colleagues to a release by the United States Department of Agriculture reporting damage caused by forest fires on our national forest reserves:

Damage on national forests was estimated at $3.7 million for calendar year 1954, the United States Department of Agriculture announced yesterday.

According to reports from Forest Service field offices 7,369 forest fires—3,425 of them man-caused—burned 107,656 acres of national forest land during 1954. The timber damage was $1,062,489.

The destruction of ground cover, such as grass, trees, and shrubs, resulted in damages of $2,227,455 to watersheds which supply a large part of the water used in the West for industry, irrigation farming, and in the home. These damages appear in erosion of topsoil, excessive silt in streams and reservoirs, flash floods, and in a few instances mudflows. Damage to other nontimber resources such as wildlife, recreation, and forage was $447,033.

The 1954 report shows an across-the-board improvement over the 1953 national forest fire record. During that year 8,353 fires burned 231,314 acres of national forest land, leaving in their wake an estimated damage of $14,489,594.

The Department of Forestry is to be congratulated for this fine record which was made possible through adequate appropriations by the Congress.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (S. 2061) increasing the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Post Office Department.

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday H. R. 5376, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

It is understood if there should be any rollcalls that day, they shall go over until Tuesday.

On Tuesday there is the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar, and one suspension, S. 2061, the postal pay-raise bill.

After that House Resolution 210, an investigation of the Federal Open Market Committee from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The first order of business on Tuesday will be the consideration of the postal pay-raise bill under suspension of the rules. After that bill is disposed of the two calendars will be called.

On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, not necessarily in the order in which I shall list them, there is H. R. 5923, inter-American highway.

H. R. 6410, Smithsonian Institution, Museum of History Building.

Mr. MARTIN. That is for the construction of a new building?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

Then H. R. 6227, Bank Holding Company Act of 1955, if a rule is reported.

The usual reservations: Conference reports may be brought up at anytime and any further program will be announced later.

AMENDING THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT WITH RESPECT TO RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 261, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 192) to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River). After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, with the adoption of this resolution, the House will consider H. R. 192. This bill amends existing law, section 10 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946.

It is interesting to note that when the original act left this Chamber it called for a dam 240 feet high. When it reached the Senate, it was reduced to 220 feet. The committee of conference agreed on that.

This act was passed in 1946, and now the Army engineers feel that this is not feasible, and they come back and ask this Congress to consider and pass this resolution, making the dam 240 feet high.

The existing law reads:

Rappahannock River Basin: The project for the Salem Church Reservoir on Rappahannock River, Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 8, 1946, at an estimated cost of $17,755,000: *Provided*, That the power pool shall be maintained at an elevation not to exceed 220 feet.

All this does is to change the 220 feet to 240 feet. The bill is reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule or the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEIL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

DIRECT LOANS UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 246.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 5715, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

It also provides loans for the following purposes:

(A) To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

(B) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

(C) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

(D) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home.

This is a continuation and extension of legislation already on the books on behalf of the veterans.

I know of no opposition to the bill either in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Indiana has explained the legislation as well as the main provisions of the bill.

I know of no opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a further announcement in connection with the program for next week, and ask that my remarks be made a part of my previous reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The first order of business on Tuesday will be consideration of the postal pay-raise bill under a suspension of the rules. After disposition of this bill, the two calendars will be called.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts what the program is for the remainder of this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of these two bills today, we are going over until Monday.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

SURVEY OF HURRICANE DAMAGE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 414) to authorize an examination and survey of the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have occurred from hurricane winds and tides.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Rhode Island about this bill. First, however, let me say that I favor the survey and hope it will open the way for greater protection from the hurricanes. In recent years all New England and the residents of the eastern Atlantic shore have suffered tremendous losses.

These losses for the most part fall upon individuals as there is no insurance coverage for damage done by water.

Scores of individuals were wiped out by the hurricanes of recent years. If we can through survey secure better protection it would be a proper service of the Government to its people.

Lately we expanded our weather warning service and this is in the direction of further avoiding catastrophes. As I understand it, this is a request for a survey only?

Mr. FOGARTY. For a survey of the northeastern section of our country and down the Atlantic coast including South Carolina, where the brunt of these hurricanes has been occurring in the last few years. This bill passed by unanimous consent in the Senate a couple of days ago.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why is it not broadened to take in places like Kansas, Oklahoma, and Nebraska?

Mr. FOGARTY. I would not object to that at all, but in our section of the country in the last 5 or 6 years these hurricanes seem to have been occurring more often than in the past and something has to be done immediately. It is something new that is occurring.

Mr. MARTIN. I think this is only a coastal survey.

Mr. FOGARTY. A survey of the coastal area.

Mr. MARTIN. I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska that they should have their areas surveyed, too, and of course I would be glad to aid them in their efforts for better protection for their constituents.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are they going to do something about the Almighty originating these hurricanes? How far will this Congress go? I think I will object so that it can be held up until it will include the rest of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN. Why does not the gentleman get his own bill introduced?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is easier to hook it up to a bill that is being pushed through.

Mr. MARTIN. I might say to the gentleman that nobody is trying to push this bill through. It has been passed by the Senate and is being considered in the orderly way.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am going to object until I can look it up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the gentleman will not object because the matter has been cleared and screened. So far as legislation with reference to surveys elsewhere is concerned we all are for it and will enthusiastically support that proposition. I hope my friend will not object on this occasion to the present consideration of the bill. I can assure the gentleman that if anyone introduces a resolution for a survey anywhere else in the country it will gladly receive the support of the leadership on my side, and, I know, of the leadership on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. With the majority leader and minority leader insisting, and with their explanation, I withdraw my reservation. I would like to include the rest of the Nation, and I might at a future time introduce a resolution to make inquiries into the balance of the country.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do, Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I make just this observation: I have been disturbed at the names they give these hurricanes. They always give the name of a member of the gentler sex, and I do not think it is appropriate. If there are any more hurricanes, I hope they will use another name except that of a member of the gentler sex.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the names are used according to whether they occur north of the Equator or south of the Equator. If south of the Equator, they use the names of the male of the species; north of the Equator they use the names of the female sex.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in reference to the peculiarity in connection with the names of hurricanes, I particularly object to the one with the name of Carol.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the difference between this particular bill and the one I introduced that the gentleman is definitely acquainted with?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not familiar with the bill the gentleman from Connecticut introduced. I may say to the gentleman from Connecticut that we are accepting the Bush bill that passed the Senate on May 31. Its sponsor is the Senator from the gentleman's State. The bill was amended in the Senate to take in as far as South Carolina.

Mr. PATTERSON. I have introduced a bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Some Congressmen from the New England area have the same bill in.

Mr. PATTERSON. They are not the same. Mine would give the people adequate warning.

Mr. FOGARTY. This is not the same type of bill at all.

Mr. PATTERSON. What does this have to do with?

Mr. FOGARTY. This authorizes a survey to be made by the Army engineers.

Mr. PATTERSON. For what purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. To ascertain the cause of hurricanes and what can be done to protect the coastline.

Mr. PATTERSON. What is going to be done in the meantime for the protection of the people up there; not only up there but elsewhere?

Mr. FOGARTY. The House very graciously added almost $3 million to the appropriation bill a week or 10 days ago to give the Weather Bureau more funds to enable them to give quicker warnings for hurricanes and tornadoes. I understand that a move is being made in the Senate to increase that by $11 million for the Weather Bureau, and if the bill comes back increased by $11 million, I think the House will accept the amendment of the Senate for research and for quicker warning systems for hurricanes and the like.

Mr. PATTERSON. I was only informed this morning that the amount the House passed last week was very inadequate to take care of any warning system.

Mr. FOGARTY. It may be inadequate, but it is a lot more than before we started negotiations, I will say to the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted that this bill is coming up, because only a week or 10 days ago in New England we had what some people designated a hurricane, with very heavy swells and high seas along the beaches. We think this bill is very necessary.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of satisfaction that I join in support of the passage of S. 414, introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. I should like to call to the attention of the House that prior to the introduction of Mr. FOGARTY's bill, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3811, identical to the Senate bill. This bill which we are about to pass has certain amendments to conform with changes made in the Senate.

It would be remiss of me to fail to use every legitimate opportunity to point out to the Members of this body that the Governor of the State of New York is holding up an identical authorization for Long Island's south shore.

This involves one of those Federal-State agreements whereby the Army engineers do the work. However, the money is put up equally between the Federal Government and the State. In actuality, the State funds are provided 50 percent by the State and 50 percent by the county—in this case Suffolk County. So far, everybody has done his job except the State of New York. Why? Is it because the Governor feels that the prevailing political party on Long Island is not to his liking? The most vicious thing that any public official can do is to play politics with people's lives. Our shore erosion surveys are a matter of life and death to us on Long Island. The delay in this survey must and shall be directly charged to Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York. Public officials have continually called to his attention the need for joining with the Federal Government in a cooperative survey. He has consistently ignored our pleas. Erosion control committees have been set up in almost every community. They have urged the Governor to join in a nonpolitical venture to save Long Island's shores. Their pleas, too, have been ignored.

With specific reference to the bill before the House may I say that upon passage of this measure we have completed but half the job. From here we must make a presentation to the Bureau of the Budget requesting funds of the Appropriations Committee to carry out the intent of our bill. I can only hope and pray that the administration will take a sympathetic attitude to our plight.

Locally, we have an alert board of county supervisors who will undoubtedly, on their own initiative, come up with a positive program for saving lives in the event of an emergency. As I have said repeatedly, this is more than a local project. It is areawide, statewide, and regionalwide. The hurricanes may strike anywhere and without a great deal of advance warning.

In closing, let me repeat that the proposition should be for one and all to join on a completely nonpartisan basis for the common interest. By swimming together we will not drown individually.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in view of the severe damage to the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States from the occurrence of hurricanes, particularly the hurricanes of August 31, 1954, and September 11, 1954, in the New England, New York, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, and the hurricane of October 15, 1954,

in the coastal and tidal areas extending south to South Carolina, and in view of the damages caused by other hurricanes in the past, the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and other Federal agencies concerned with hurricanes, is hereby authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of the eastern and southern seaboard of the United States with respect to hurricanes, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have occurred.

SEC. 2. Such survey, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, shall include the securing of data on the behavior and frequency of hurricanes, and the determination of methods of forecasting their paths and improving warning services, and of possible means of preventing loss of human lives and damages to property, with due consideration of the economics of proposed breakwaters, seawalls, dikes, dams, and other structures, warning services, or other measures which might be required.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, almost the entire eastern coast faces the threat of these devastating storms. However, it is in the Northeast that the damage has been greatest.

Hurricanes can strike in any of the summer or fall months. They have been concentrated, however, during the months of August and September. The next hurricane season is only 2 months away. There is no assurance whatsoever that the Northeastern States will not experience in 1955 a repetition of the severe damage suffered in August and September of last year. We cannot afford to lose time in arriving at the best solutions to the critical problems which these recurring storms create. I feel that it is vitally necessary that we in Congress act promptly to give an assurance that no time will be lost in meeting the Federal responsibility for leadership in solving the hurricane problems.

Hurricane protection is clearly a Federal responsibility. In principle, it is no different than the measures already established in Federal practice under flood control and beach erosion. It is merely because of legal technicalities that special authorization must be obtained from the Congress to permit the Army engineers to enter this field. It is true, however, that Congress has recognized in the past the magnitude of this problem and has authorized participation by the Federal Government in hurricane flood control at Galveston, Tex., and Lake Okeechobee in Florida. All of the Senators and Congressmen with whom I have discussed this matter have agreed that it is clearly a Federal responsibility. This problem is urgent. If significant steps are not in progress during the coming hurricane season, there will be little confidence throughout the New England area in the interest of the National Government in the welfare of this significant section of the Nation.

As a nation, we cannot afford to permit the loss, every few years, of almost a half-billion dollars in wealth, when for a fraction of this amount the greater part of the loss can be prevented. Several independent engineering firms have made extensive studies of the upper end of Narragansett Bay, R. I., where one of the 20 largest metropolitan centers in the Nation is located. This area is periodically buffeted by hurricane winds which surge 20 miles up the bay and funnel a 13-foot tidal wave to smash into the downtown area of Providence. Gentlemen, unless you have seen a city under water, you cannot grasp the extent of destruction, the dangers to health, the crippling effect on all normal activity, of the ocean gone mad. The preliminary engineering studies which have been made show that protective works are possible which will provide annual benefits valued at from 2 to 12 times the annual costs involved. By the same methods and standards which are used to judge other Federal public works projects, Narragansett Bay protection makes a great deal of sense.

There have been any number of different schemes proposed to solve the problem, and at present there is confusion, even among engineering circles, as to which will be most effective. The people of the affected States, however, are relying upon the objective analysis and superior experience of the Army engineers to resolve which of the many proposals is the one which will do the job best. At this time, Federal leadership is essential to settle this matter and to settle it promptly. Here is the opportunity for Federal leadership that will help to compensate for the failure of Federal agencies to provide adequate warning last August 31.

I have spoken primarily of the problem in Narragansett Bay and the Providence, R. I., area, because that is where the greatest concentration of losses occurred and is likely to occur again. It is also the location where effective results from protective construction can be obtained most quickly.

It should be made clear, however, that the majority of the problems associated with the hurricanes are shared by many communities and by several States. The problem is not an isolated one. The paths of hurricanes are unpredictable more than a few hours ahead. The broad scale planning needed for meeting this problem is one definitely of Federal interest. Action must be taken and it should be taken now. The bill presently before us will permit some form of action in the near future. For this reason I urge all the members to support this bill which will authorize this all-important study. By so doing we shall point the way toward an end to the repeated loss of life and property.

AMENDING THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT WITH RESPECT TO RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 192) to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946—Rappahannock River.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 192, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1946 to provide for the increase in height of the Salem Dam on the Rappahannock River, which was authorized to be constructed at a height of 220 feet. The House, as requested by the Corps of Engineers in the report on the project submitted to the House in 1946, recommended that the height of the dam be at 240 feet. The House, in its omnibus Flood Control Act of 1946, passed a bill providing that the Salem Church Project should be constructed at 240 feet, pursuant to the request of the Corps of Engineers, based upon a survey that had been made prior to the enactment of the act of 1946. The bill went to the Senate, where it was provided that it should be constructed at a height of 220 feet. The measure went to conference, and the Senate version prevailed, and the conference report was adopted providing for the construction of the dam at 220 feet. The Corps of Engineers, standing by the original report which they submitted to the House and to the Senate, is of the opinion that a height of 240 feet would make a better dam and would carry out the intentions of its construction to a far greater degree than the prior 220-foot authorization.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand that this is an authorization and no money has been appropriated actually for the building of this dam.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, I am coming to that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This is in the same category in which there are many, many other projects that have been authorized but for which no money has been appropriated.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This is a modification of an authorized project that has not received a survey. The authorization originally was for $17 million for the construction of this project. It is not expected that the project will cost any more. Therefore the authorization carries forward the original figures contained in the 1946 act. The project is a multiple-purpose project for flood control, the generation of hy-

droelectric power and for navigation on the lower stem of the river.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How much is represented by the generation of hydroelectric power?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I believe that information is in the report.

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman will yield, it is 90 percent for power and 8 percent for flood control.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The installed capacity will be 54,500 kilowatts. The run of the river power plant at Fredericksburg would be about 21,800.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield further, what is the total cost of the project?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. $17 million.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And that includes the 240-foot dam?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What portion of the $17 million will be repaid to the Federal Government eventually?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, it would be hard to determine the exact repayments since it would be most difficult to determine the stream flow, because there is no other regulating dam. Therefore any figure that I would submit would be a mere speculation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, under our law the amount expended on flood control is not repayable. If only 8 percent goes to flood control and 92 percent to power I would expect that the power, if generated, would pay back to the Federal Treasury the money plus the interest. That is what I would like to have someone tell me, if that is being done in this bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, the gentleman well knows the procedure by which rates are determined by the disposing agency, the Federal Power Commission, upon the estimate of cost that is allocated to each division or each category of the functions of the dam.

I think if we have an authorized project of 220 feet and then we amend that to 240 feet and make that dam of greater economic benefit to the Federal Government, that is the sound action for this House to take, particularly when it does not increase the cost of the project.

The gentleman is bringing up questions that properly should have been brought up when the bill was being considered or the item was being considered in the Flood Control Act of 1946.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have no copies of hearings on the bill. I notice that there are supposed to be transcripts of hearings on file presently.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Which may be obtained from the clerk of the committee. I assume that the hearings would show what portion was allocated to power. Under reclamation law the part of the money advanced for power is returnable at 2½ percent interest.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If the gentleman has notions that we are going to have to revise and go back through the authorizations computing the division of costs, then it will be necessary for me to get the letter of transmittal of the hearings presented in 1946. The questions the gentleman is raising with me at the moment are not questions that seem to me should be raised at this time, in view of the fact that they should have been raised back when the project was authorized. The situation has not changed. It is the same dam, involving the same economic factors now that they had in 1946. So the committee was not prepared to go back and examine all the details and survey all the reports, because we have numbers and numbers and numbers of these projects before the committee, and we have and will have in the future a great number of projects that will require revision because new economic facts are being brought into play to authorize projects that were authorized several years ago.

We hope in the Committee on Public Works to scrutinize those projects and see that their return will be commensurate with the investment at the hands of the Federal Government and see that those projects are investments that reflect wise and prudent management on the part of the committee and of the House. We have hundreds of authorized projects and they, too, will have to be reviewed in the light of new demands that are made on the projects that have been heretofore authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most worthy project, and I hope we do not experience difficulty by having it opposed today.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to oppose raising the height of the dam although I think you are making a rather futile gesture here in raising it from 220 to 240 feet. It is my understanding that $8 or $9 billion has been authorized by Congress for various flood control projects for which no money has yet been appropriated. I presume this falls into the same category.

I do want to say this, that if there is money allocated in here for power, I should like very much to see that the power portion be returned to the Federal Government. Under reclamation projects on which power is produced, the principal plus 2½ percent interest is returned to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. About the return anticipated from the power project, it is estimated that the annual power benefits will be $1,641,310.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is very good. Then I presume much of it will be returned.

I did want to say, too, that we have authorized flood control projects, and I have voted for them. That is nothing more than getting water off the land, protecting property, digging channels deeper so that ships can get up to the industrial areas. But about $11 billion has been appropriated by Congress since it has been in the business of flood control, with no return of interest or principal. We from the 17 arid States come in and ask for money for reclamation projects and in 50 years we have received $2.6 billion for reclamation projects. The best figures we have from economists say that these Federal projects of 17 million acres of land under irrigation now have returned to the Federal Treasury about $4 billion in taxes. They are paying back and they have paid back about $600 million of the money that has been borrowed. Sure, they borrowed the money without interest, but I remind you again that these flood control projects pay no interest at all or pay back not 1 cent of principal so I am just making the plea that when some reclamation projects come before the House committee and the House generally that they will be looked at with a little more feeling of charity. I have before me a map showing the expenditures for the different States prepared by the Library of Congress showing the amount of moneys that have been expended up to June 30, 1952, for flood control projects in the different States, and the money that is returnable which is reclamation money. It makes a very interesting study. I think after we go back into the House, I shall ask permission to place this study in the RECORD so that the Members of Congress can understand that the tremendous amount of money spent for flood control goes over all the 48 States. None of it is returned except that it does protect property, and I think we must do that. But, in comparison, money spent for reclamation projects brings in new wealth, security, new confidence and a healthy and growing dynamic country. So reclamation projects will come before the House from time to time, and I hope will receive the considerate attention of Members of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would like to assure the gentleman he will not find us indifferent to the fine projects he describes which may be reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand that this is one case where the other body had reduced something that the House had passed?

Mr. BECKER. That is correct. They reduced it in 1946, when the bill went through, from 240 feet to 220 feet.

Mr. BOW. In other words, in the case of dams, they think we are too high.

Mr. BECKER. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. I hope they will have the same feeling on appropriations now going over to the other body.

Mr. BECKER. I hope so, too.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the passage of this request for a resurvey of the project for a dam on the Rappahannock River. I listened very carefully to the testimony and interrogated many of the witnesses before our subcommittee. When this amendment was proposed before our committee, the first opening was on the basis of the need for water for the people of the city of Fredericksburg. There was no mention of hydroelectric power and no mention of flood control. As a matter of fact, in the entire testimony there was little or nothing of interest on the matter of flood control. If you will look at the report now before us, you will notice that the estimates that are printed in the report of the previous construction estimates total $17 million, which is encompassed in this amendment. However, on the very latest estimates which were testified to by the Army engineers, this project would cost approximately $50 million. As I stated here a few minutes ago, and I made the statement that the testimony was that if this project was built, it would be built on the basis of 92 percent for hydroelectric power and 8 percent for flood control, and that the record of that area of Virginia over the past 50 years will show that there has been little or no flood damage at all for the entire past 50 years or more. If the people of the city of Fredericksburg need water, I am certainly anxious to see them get that water. But I also made a little investigation and interrogated people, and I find that the city of Fredericksburg has at no time made any effort to secure water on its own. I know many places in this country where people, in order to secure water, have to go and dig their own artesian wells and thus secure the finest water that you can get. I am sure that if the city of Fredericksburg needs water, it can dig its own artesian wells and secure all the water it needs. To build this dam in that particular area, I think we must take into consideration that there is electric power there now provided by the Virginia Electric Power & Light Co., which is supplying all the power that is necessary, and this company is able, if necessary, to build additional powerplants if they are needed and if more power is required.

Personally, I am anxious to see more steam plants built in that area, if necessary, because in that way they would, perhaps, use the coal which our coal miners can produce and thus keep our coal miners working. Many Members of the House here today can testify to the fact that in our coal mining areas we have a great deal of unemployment because of a lack of demand for our coal. So I say if more electric power is needed in that area, more steam plants could be used and the Virginia Power & Light Co. could produce it very well.

I would like to point out that in the course of the testimony in relation to the Cooperative Electric Co. in that area, they say they are producing rates now at 6.81 average to the consumer, whereas the Virginia Power & Light Co. produces at a rate of 7.5, a difference of a few mills or a part of a mill. But they also bring out the fact that the electric power company in that area pays the Federal Government some $19 million income taxes, whereas the cooperatives pay not 1 dime.

These things should be taken into consideration. Last but not least, if we are to authorize a survey to go further with the construction of the proposed dam, we are going to inundate the lands of thousands of farmers in that area in Culpeper County. Those people have beautiful farms. You are going to put them completely out of business. I have taken occasion to drive through that area and have seen those farms. They are beautiful places. They are beautifully cultivated. They have made their homes there for generations. There is no reason under the sun why a dam should be built in that area and put those people out of their homes.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. As I understand the issue in this bill, it is whether the dam is to be raised 20 feet.

Mr. BECKER. That is true, but I would like to kill the whole thing.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. It is authorization for the construction of a 220-foot dam.

Mr. BECKER. That is right, and it has proved nonfeasible on the report of the Army engineers. Now the request has come in to increase it to 240 feet to make a feasible project out of it, and they do not know whether that will do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BECKER. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there is much to be considered here in view of the fact that when the original authorization took place the Army engineers made their survey and their estimates, and they proved that a 220-foot dam was unfeasible. Nine years later we come back, after spending $145,000 on the previous survey, and there has to be more money spent to determine whether or not a 240-foot dam is going to be feasible. They do not know whether that will be feasible either.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wanted to ask about the amount of money that is in this bill. I have been listening for days to estimates set up for projects for a certain amount of money, but when the project was built it turned out to be as much as 10 times the amount. I see this is estimated at $17,755,000. I have figures in my office to show that it will probably run over $50 million.

Mr. BECKER. I have already stated that. The estimate is over $46 million, and now it will be over $50 million.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This amendment does not change the figure as to the estimate. All it does is to increase the height of the dam.

Mr. PHILLIPS. But the bill is brought before the Congress on the basis of a figure which is probably one-third of what the actual cost would be. Does the gentleman feel that the attitude of the Congress will be the same if they know it is going to cost three times what it says here?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, the gentleman is better able to answer that question than I am. He is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is talking about projects authorized 4 or 5 or 6 years ago.

Of course it would be impossible for us to give an authorization figure that would be useful 5, 10, or 15 years from now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The point the gentleman from Alabama has just made is exactly the point the gentleman from New York and California have been making, that authority to the Appropriations Committee should not be passed by the Congress on the assumption it is going to be $17 million, only to find several years from now that it is going to be $50 million. If that is to be the cost, we should be advised of it right now.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Are hearings available? Have they been printed?

Mr. BECKER. Hearings have not been printed. I have in my hand here a mimeographed copy of a report. They have not been available to anyone, and that is the reason I may say in closing why I think there ought to be more time so the Members of the House can read the report and read the testimony of these hundreds of people who came up from Virginia.

This authorization should be killed; the entire project should be killed, for it is absolutely unneeded. For one thing you will be destroying many Virginia farms; for another, there is no need for electric power up there, for they are getting all the power they can use in that area now; and flood control is totally unneeded.

I say the best thing we could do would be to kill the survey and kill the whole proposition.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this morning I appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the committee unanimously ordered reported H. R. 692, my bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace."

An identical bill, as you know, was passed by the House in the 83d Congress on August 18, 1954, but Congress adjourned before action could be taken

in the Senate. I look for no objection to H. R. 692 in the present Congress.

With our country in the position of leadership in the free world, with the heavy responsibility that accompanies such leadership, we are cognizant of the ever increasing attacks upon us by forces of godlessness and atheism. It is well indeed that we be reminded of our dependence upon God and of our faith in His support. A cancellation die on the face of the mail bearing the words "Pray for peace" will send this supplication to the four corners of the earth. And in this action we will imitate the humility of our Founding Fathers who were ever mindful that a Supreme Being watches over the destinies of men and nations. This country has been singularly blessed; it has been noted for its charity to distressed sister nations in times of need. The whole world longs for tranquil times. Let us embrace the eloquent words of Alfred Tennyson, "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of," and place upon the face of our mail the significant words "Pray for peace."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], author of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in the hope I can simplify the issue involved here to some extent. I would like to reiterate the history of this project.

Mr. Chairman, in the general flood-control bill considered by the 79th Congress this project was included at an estimated cost of $17 million. That bill came to the House and was passed and provided for an elevation of 240 feet. It went over to the other body where an amendment was adopted limiting the height of the dam to 220 feet; in other words, lowering it by 20 feet. It then went back to the Army engineers for further consideration as to an appropriation, as all of these things do. The Army engineers thereupon reported that it was not economically feasible at 220 feet but it was economically feasible at 240 feet. So I introduced this bill which does nothing in the world but restore this dam to what the House adopted in the 79th Congress, namely, the 240-foot elevation. All I am asking the Congress to do in this legislation is to reaffirm what it did before under the authorization and under the report and recommendation of the Corps of Engineers.

All the debate that has gone on this morning about this bill, which I thought would be passed in a few minutes, has been over the question of whether we should destroy the whole thing that the Congress authorized in the 79th Congress. But that is not the question. The question is whether you shall reaffirm and stand by the action of the 79th Congress. I do not know about all of this talk whether it will cost more than the $17 million. I only know what in the hearings on this piece of legislation the Army engineers said. Now, it has been 4 or 5 years since this thing has been done; we do not know whether we can build it for that figure or not; we do not know whether we can recommend it now. So what we would like you to do is to give us an opportunity to reexamine the whole proposition in the light of subsequent developments and subsequent costs.

Mr. Chairman, those of you who are familiar with these projects—and most of you are far more familiar than I am—know that the Army engineers must find this to be economically feasible. If they find upon reexamination that the costs are such that it is not economically feasible, it will be like hundreds of these projects that are laying around here; it will be authorized but not built because it is not economically feasible under the formula described by the Army engineers, unless the appropriation is increased.

I hope that the House will not consider going into the question of repudiating what the 79th Congress did after a most elaborate consideration. For instance, I hold in my hand the report upon which this bill was originally passed, a report from the Army engineers, consisting of 69 printed pages. It goes into every detail of the whole original project. But that is not what we are talking about today. What we are talking about today is whether we shall restore this thing to what the Army engineers said and what this House said was the proper level, 240 feet. That is all there is to it.

Later on when the questions come up of determining how much of an appropriation shall be made or whether there shall be no appropriation, I shall be glad to meet the gentleman from New York at that time, and that will be the appropriate time to discuss the questions which he has in mind.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia the testimony before the committee in the hearings had the estimate for a 220-foot dam at $46 million. Now, that did not take into consideration the request for the 240-foot dam which would run a great deal more money.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. On the contrary, it does take into consideration and it is based upon the 240-foot dam. The gentleman is just mistaken. He will find that in the report.

Mr. BECKER. I have the testimony on page 19.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know about the testimony.

Mr. BECKER. It says so right here in the testimony and I would like to read it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield further. I do know that here in the report, a most elaborate report of some 69 pages made by the Army engineers, it was based upon 240 feet. They say so in the report and the estimate was $17 million. If they are wrong I am not here to hold any brief for the Army engineers.

Maybe they make mistakes like the rest of us do sometimes. Maybe they did make a mistake between $17 million and $40 million. I do not think they did. I do not think they are that far wrong. Anyhow, that is what their report says on the legislation we are now considering. And, what somebody may have said the other day at the hearing, I do not know, and I do not recall that figure. But, it is immaterial today, because before anything is done, before a dollar is appropriated, before a spade of dirt is turned, this thing must go back to the Army engineers for a further estimate, and that is all this bill does.

Let me say this in response to the gentleman from New York. He said all this was going to do was to flood Virginia out. I certainly appreciate his solicitude for my constituents, because if it floods anybody, it is going to flood my constituents, and I am not in the habit of getting up here and asking you all to drown my people, because I depend upon them very largely in November every other year, and I do not want them drowned and I am not going to get them drowned. But, I do appreciate the solicitude of my good friend from New York. I can understand and you can understand the natural feelings of people whose property is going to be taken for this dam. It happens with every dam that is built in the United States. If that is a consideration, you could not build any more dams, because you are going to take somebody's land. Although this is a large dam and is raised 20 feet, the engineers' report shows that it will take not over 2,000 acres of tillable land to raise the dam 20 feet more, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of misunderstanding about this. My friend says that there has not been any flood damage on that river. Well, as a matter of fact, in this very lengthy report made by the Army engineers, after due consideration, they give you the floods, the years that they occurred, and the amount of dollar damage that was done in each one of them. It is all here in the book. What I am trying to impress upon my friend is that that is not the question we are discussing today. The only question today is whether we shall put this bill back where the House passed it originally and just say to the Army engineers "Take another look."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The figure of $17 million was based upon the 240-foot elevation. Now, if it is necessary to increase the authorization of which the gentleman from New York complains, he will have an opportunity to examine it again, because it will come before the Committee on Public Works, and he can then interpose the objections that he has now. This is not the time to discuss the proposition of the authorization figures.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. When it comes before the House, as I said before, we will meet here and discuss it then. That is the proper time. Let us not argue this case prematurely, because my friend will run out of material and would not have anything to argue about. So, let us wait and argue it at that time.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Is it the intention of this bill to only increase the capacity of the dam to prevent floods?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The purpose of this bill is to restore it to the 240 feet which the Congress passed, because the 220 feet had been decided by the Army engineers not to be economically feasible within the formula prescribed. At 240 feet it was considered feasible. That is all there is to it. It just goes back to what the House did in the 79th Congress.

Mr. SAYLOR. This will not affect the pool that is to be kept in this reservoir at any time; this is only to add 20 feet of storage capacity to help prevent floods lower down the river?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And produce more power.

Let us be frank about the thing. Those folks who are opposed to any public power are just naturally opposed to this bill. I want to be entirely frank about this thing. Opposition to this comes from some people whose property is going to be flooded and from the power company in Virginia, which is the Virginia Electric Power Co. They are very much opposed to it. I can appreciate their opposition to it. They are opposed to it. That is where the main part of the opposition is coming from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House should know that the figure given in the testimony by the Army engineers just recently for the 220-foot dam is $46 million. I am not opposing this authorization on the basis of whether the cost is $46 million or $70 million.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman refer us to the page of the hearings at which this figure was submitted by the representative of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. BECKER. Page 19 of the testimony.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is the gentleman quoting from his own question propounded to the witness?

Mr. BECKER. The answer given was that a firm estimate for the lower elevation was $46 million. That is to be found at page 19, at the top of the page.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Has the gentleman taken into account what preceded the discussion before the interrogation to which he has referred?

Mr. BECKER. Yes, I have.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, if there is an increase of any amount that is required, that request would come before the committee of which the gentleman is a member. That would be the proper forum in which to discuss the question of increased cost, because these projects have been authorized for a number of years and all of them are going to have to be reexamined in the light of increased cost. Certainly we will have ample opportunity to examine all witnesses with respect to the cost of this project and other similar projects.

Mr. BECKER. Will the genteman show me any testimony in any part of this hearing that indicates any other purpose for this dam than power?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, the report is full of it.

Mr. BECKER. Where?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There are 69 pages of the report.

Mr. BECKER. Is the gentleman talking about the report submitted 6 years ago or the recent hearings, 2 weeks ago, before the committee?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is the same river, the same dam, the same authorization. The only thing the pending bill does is increase the level of the original figure of 240 feet.

Mr. BECKER. I am not going back to the hearings of 8 or 9 years ago. I am referring to the hearings that we had here recently. That was just 2 weeks ago. They have not even been printed yet. The testimony all through those hearings is to the effect that 90 percent of the purpose of building this dam is power and that less than 8 percent is for flood control. If anybody looks through the record, they will see that there has been very little in the way of flood damage in the vicinity of Fredericksburg, in Culpeper County, in the past 50 years. It has amounted almost to nothing, according to the testimony. I can see no need, when there is sufficient power in that area today, for this dam. There is no shortage of power that calls for spending a minimum of $48 million, and it may run up as high as $75 million before new estimates come in.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. In order to accomplish what the gentleman from New York is evidently trying to do here, it would be necessary to introduce a resolution de-authorizing the project.

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman that this would be a means of de-authorizing it, by killing it now.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. You do not de-authorize it and you do not kill it. If the gentleman's views were to prevail it would mean that the Federal Government would have less return from its investment. You would get a poorer type of construction, a poorer type of project, which would mean less income for the Federal Government. So to be economical, the thing to do is to proceed with this bill.

Mr. BECKER. I do not think it would be economical at all. I disagree on the question of economy in this respect because there has been over $145,000, I believe from the record I saw here, spent already on surveys in this area. When we authorize this additional survey now at the 240-foot level there will certainly be an additional expenditure, which will be automatic, and we will spend more money. The object now of trying to defeat this bill is to discontinue spending any more money for any additional surveys, because all the testimony has proved the lack of need for this project in that area for power or flood control or for any other reason. Anyone can read this testimony when it goes into print and see how little need there is for this project. It is truly a power project that is not even needed on the basis of demand for electricity, that can be provided by other power interests in that area that are paying over $19 million in taxes to the Government.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2126 and S. 516 to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, have been passed by the House and the Senate respectively and are now in conference, where the differences in the two bills will be reconciled.

I come before this body today to urge the House conferees to give favorable consideration to the language contained in paragraph 2 of the Senate bill, which states:

> Similarly, the fullest cooperation by and with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Civil Defense Administration in research and in determining the future needs of the Nation with respect to potable water and ways and means to provide same shall be carried out in the interest of achieving the objectives of the program.

I believe that the adoption of this section will stimulate the production of atomic energy for peaceful use, for water is an indispensable element in such production. This section is also in line with a previous statement I made to the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power on May 13, 1955, wherein I asked that consideration be given to the invitation of the Atomic Energy Commission for the purchase and use of the energy developed by the experimental reactor being built in southern California by North American Aviation. I believe that the adoption of this section will stimulate closer cooperation between the Atomic Energy Commission and municipal water and power departments all over the country, particularly in Los Angeles.

I would also like to strongly suggest to the conferees that they give favorable consideration to the language contained on page 2, line 24, of the Senate bill, wherein it is stated that "not less than $2,500,000 shall be expended for research and development in Federal or educational institution—State or private—laboratories."

In line with this section, I would like to inform this body that the legislature of the State of California has appropriated funds for the University of California, for research into the development and utilization of saline waters. The additional funds provided in the Senate bill will stimulate research into this very important field in all areas of our country as well as in California, and will help us to find a practical means of increasing and preserving a natural water resource which is so vital to the future prosperity and development of many parts of our country.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], a member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak in regard to this bill primarily because an incorrect assumption has been given in the debate about the justification for the passage of this bill as presented to our committee.

A large number of constituents of my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], several hundred, appeared in behalf of the legislation. Primarily they testified in behalf of the legislation in order to give flood protection to the city of Fredericksburg and to give an additional water supply to that city.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman says that hundreds of people appeared at the hearing and testified in favor of this?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There appeared to be that many. I did not count them, I did not count noses, but there were so many that they were divided up, and half the people in favor of it could not get in the committee room in the morning.

Mr. BECKER. May I correct the gentleman?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Let us get it straight, now.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman's statement is so incorrect that it stands correction. I leave it to the gentlemen on the other side over there. Only 3 people testified in favor of this and there were 200 people there that were cut down so that only about 7 testified.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman from Virginia, who represents all the people in that area, can best describe who was there, and I leave it to the House.

Mr. BECKER. I think that is an unwarranted challenge, and I resent it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not want to get into the middle of a fuss about it, but as a matter of fact a great many people were present at the hearings. The committee was very courteous and asked them to put up several people on either side to testify, and gave them the opportunity. I would say there were about an equal number on either side, but the great area there of Fredericksburg, Stafford County, and Spotsylvania County, were unanimously in favor of it. In the upper regions of the river, where some people were going to be flooded out, a good many people opposed it.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I do not have authority to settle this, but let the gentleman ask me the question.

Mr. BECKER. I cannot ask you the question because the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is the only one who is able to answer the question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will gladly answer any question I can, but I am sorry I do not have the floor.

Mr. BECKER. I asked the gentleman to yield so that I could ask the gentleman from Virginia a question.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. What I would like to say is simply this—that amongst the people you mentioned, and I respect you to the highest degree, sir, and I want you to know that—the only people who testified in behalf of this project was your good self, the gentleman from the REA, and one member of the Legislature of Virginia. That is all who spoke and nobody else at that hearing of the people from that area testified.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me say to the gentleman that there were a hundred people there, and they selected a member of the Virginia State Legislature, Mr. Gouldman, to speak their piece for them, which was the orderly way to do it, and he spoke for the group.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the fight here is one of those old fights between the people below the dam and the people above the dam. Of course, the people above the dam who think that their land will be taken over are opposed to it, but this idea of nobody being in favor of it is completely incorrect, and the best evidence that it is incorrect is the fact that the gentleman who represents that district in the Congress is supporting this and actively fighting to get this legislation passed. The member of the State Legislature of Virginia, Mr. Francis B. Gouldman, who represents the city of Fredericksburg and the county of Spotsylvania, testified at length about the flood damage that has been visited upon the city of Fredericksburg. Anybody who cares to look at the testimony will find several pages of the testimony with reference to that. Other representatives of the area reported also about the need for an adequate water supply for the city of Fredericksburg, which they could secure by the construction of this dam. There is no question but that very strong evidence was presented in behalf of the dam not only by this gentleman who represented this area in the legislature, but the plant manager of the Sylvania Division of the American Viscose Corp. of Fredericksburg, Va., testified in behalf of the legislation in regard to the need for water and in regard to the need for flood protection for this industry which is vital for the continued employment of the people in Fredericksburg and the surrounding area.

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

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River) be amended by striking out the proviso which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That the power pool shall be maintained at an elevation not to exceed 220 feet."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That section 10 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, Public Law 526, 79th Congress, under the title 'Rappahannock River Basin' is hereby amended by striking out '220,' and substituting in lieu thereof '240.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BECKER) there were—ayes 48, noes 11.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 192) to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1956—Rappahannock River, and pursuant to House Resolution 261, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

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.

TO AMEND THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is to be commended for yesterday's action in adopting the following provisions from my bill to amend the Natural Gas Act—H. R. 5034:

In the administration of this act, the Federal Power Commission shall consider among other things—

(1) the maintenance of productive capacity of the several domestic fuel industries sufficient to meet the current and long-range fuel needs of the Nation; and

(2) the sound principles of conservation in order to preserve the available reserves of natural gas for purposes which will afford maximum long-range benefits to the public,

with due regard for the conservation policies and regulations of the producing States.

When the Natural Gas Act was enacted in 1938, the situation in the energy field was so far different than it is at the present time that there was no compelling reason to include conservation provisions in the law. Even as late as 1946, the first year of peace after World War II, the natural gas picture presented no cause for alarm. In 1946 discoveries of natural gas reserves were three times greater than total production. The life index of this fuel was set at 32½ years and it was assumed that we had nothing to worry about.

In 8 short years, however, conditions have changed considerably. In 1954 discoveries barely exceeded production, and the American Gas Association reported that the index had dropped to 22½ years. The situation is serious. We must take stock and find ways of conserving our natural gas resources. The decision of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is one important step toward achieving this objective.

While the Federal Power Commission has made token efforts to conserve natural gas supplies, it could hardly be expected to carry out such a policy on a wide scale because it has never received a congressional mandate to do so. The legislation which I trust will soon come to the floor will remedy this deficiency and enable the Commission to use conservation as a guiding light indetermining the Nation's fuel policy.

Mr. Speaker, there is entirely too much waste of natural gas taking place in various areas of the country. President Truman's Materials Policy Commission warned in 1952 that natural gas should be used as economically as possible because it is a short-life fuel. Here is a question which that Commission asked in its report 3 years ago:

> How can the Nation minimize inferior uses of gas for which more abundant energy resources, notably coal, would serve as well—and, in the long run, at lower real cost to the Nation—in order to maximize special advantage uses in which gas serves its highest economic function in the long run?

The report explained the distinction between special advantage and inferior uses. It stated that special advantage uses are those for which consumers are willing and able to pay a higher price for natural gas than for other fuels, on a contained energy basis, because of its superior convenience or performance in the particular use.

The report pointed out that in certain gas-producing areas of the country there is an economic reason for using gas for industrial purposes, but it condemned use of gas in distant markets where alternate fuels are available. The Federal Power Commission will be on notice to prohibit such shameful waste just as soon as Congress enacts the provisions adopted by the committee yesterday.

The new law will have the dual advantage of giving the coal industry an opportunity to regain some of its traditional markets. The general practice has been for the gas pipelines to vend their product at industrial plants at whatever price is necessary to undersell coal. By eliminating extravagant uses of gas, the FPC will at the same time reopen such industrial markets to coal producers, with the result that many of our idle miners will have an opportunity to get back to work.

I realize that there have been charges of selfishness leveled against the coal industry for its support of legislation to insist upon the economic dispensing of our natural-gas supplies. If it is selfishness for us who represent coal districts to want to give our people an opportunity to earn a living, then there are quite a number of us in this Congress who will willingly admit to being guilty. But I remind you that the conservation of a waning fuel resource is essential to the long-range welfare of the entire Nation, and every single Member of Congress has enough personal interest in tomorrow's America to insist that we take special care of a resource that is fast being exhausted.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DIRECT LOANS UNDER SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, 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 consideration of the bill H. R. 5715, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I desire to compliment my colleague on bringing out this legislation which bears his name, and which means so much to the veterans of this country, and to congratulate him on a job well done.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will extend the direct loan program which has been in operation for the past 6 years for 1 additional year. It makes some $150 million available for the next year. This is the same amount that has been available for the present year.

The bill also advances up to $50 million per quarter, but the annual total may not exceed the sum of $150 million. In addition to extending the direct loan program, H. R. 5715 provides that a direct loan may be made for any of the following purposes: First, to purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home.

Second, to purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home.

Third, to construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home.

Fourth, to repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home.

The overall purpose of this legislation is to place the farm veteran or the veteran who is living in a small town where there is no available private financing on an equal footing with veterans who live in city areas or in areas where they have the guaranteed loan program.

The plain facts of the matter are that in recent years we have seen a steady decline in the volume of farm home building, and certainly there has also been a decline in the volume of farm loans that have been made under the guaranteed loan program. Let me give you a few of the figures that are significant and that I think deserve mention: Since 1947 the VA guaranteed farm loans have declined from 19,800 loans in 1947 to only 1,432 loans in 1954.

From the initiation of the loan program through December 25, 1954, the total farm loans closed was only 66,957 as compared with 3,607,000 home loans.

The very obvious conclusion from these figures is that we have had a farm loan program that has fallen far short of the needs of our veterans in local areas. The fact that we have a waiting list at the present time of around 20,000 veterans seeking direct loans in this country and unable to obtain them because there has not been enough money available clearly indicates that there is a definite need for the continuation of this program at the present time.

To show something of the support this legislation has—and it has been bipartisan support, and it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the same legislation which is before the House today has also been introduced and presented to the Congress by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER],

the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], the ranking minority member of the Housing Subcommittee.

This is a good bill; we think it is a bill that is designed to meet a present need existing throughout the country. There are more than 40 States where this direct loan program is definitely filling a need that exists in farm communities and rural communities.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. I want to commend my colleague for his action in this matter and for the bill that bears his name. I want to associate myself in support of the legislation. I am happy to know that we are going to put the farm veteran on the same basis with the veteran who is fortunate enough to live in city areas.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this House has favorably acted on H. R. 5106, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], which had the effect in the guaranteed loan program of equalizing the benefits available under that program for the rural veteran. This direct loan program with the minor changes that have been made in it has the same objective, and it gives us a balanced program with the same type of benefits in the direct loan program for farm veterans as in the guaranteed loan program for farm veterans.

I hope this bill will be passed unanimously by this body.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I want to heartily endorse the pending bill. I think it is only fair to do for the rural communities what we do for city dwellers. This is an excellent bill and I do not think there will be a vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], an expert on housing and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee that handled this matter.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for yielding me 10 minutes but I am afraid if I took the 10 minutes I would convince the Members of the House that I am not an expert in this field.

Mr. Chairman, a similar bill was brought up in the last session of the Congress. In the present bill we have extended it to give a little more coverage to boys in the farm area who are also in need of a home as well as land.

A direct loan program is going to be necessary so long as private lending institutions do not see fit to go into the rural areas. All the bill does is to give the veterans who live in the rural areas the same opportunity to enjoy the benefits of the GI loan program as do the veterans in the city areas.

I want to concur in the statement the gentlewoman from Massachusetts made that in all probability there will not be a vote against this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD].

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the pending bill, H. R. 5715. It does for our veterans living in the rural areas that which should have been done some years ago.

This bill extends the Veterans' Administration direct loan program for 1 year and provides for $150 million for the fiscal year from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1956. The bill does more than simply extend the direct loan program. It rights a wrong that has long existed. It places the qualified veteran who wants to: first, buy a farm with a farm residence; second, to buy a farm and build a farm residence; or, third, to build a farm residence on a farm he owns or has an equity in, on a parity with the qualified veteran who wants to build a home on a city lot. The direct loan program extends only to areas where the veterans cannot obtain other financing and it is for these veterans I am speaking for today.

I strongly urge the approval of H. R. 5715. It is similar to a bill introduced in the Congress by me, designated as H. R. 5727.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. I want to commend Mr. EDMONDSON and his subcommittee for having brought before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member, and this House, this important bill to place our young veterans who have chosen farming as a career on an equal basis with their city-dwelling comrades.

H. R. 5715 makes a number of important changes in the section of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act which provides for direct loans to veterans, but I am particularly concerned with its enlarged authority for helping in establishing young farmers in areas where private financing is not available.

Under this legislation, if the Veterans' Administrator finds that private capital is not available for financing, it will be possible for veterans to secure direct loans to purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home, or to construct a farm residence on land owned by the veteran, or to repair, alter or improve a farm residence.

The bill will also permit veterans who have not exhausted their entitlement of guaranteed loans to utilize the direct loan procedure in appropriate cases where private capital is not available.

In my own district in California there are a number of rural and farming areas in which banks do not make loans and there is, therefore, no opportunity for veterans to acquire farms and farm homes under the usual guaranteed veterans' loan program. Passage of this bill will be very helpful in these areas. I am sure it will be substantially beneficial also in providing farms and farm homes to veterans in the institutional on-farm training program, in which I am very much interested.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I favor this proposed legislation that amends the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder.

I believe the approval of this legislation will relieve a rather pressing situation. It will provide additional needed homes for deserving veterans, including those who engage in farming and do not have sufficent capital to operate on their own.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, as has been said here today, this bill in effect extends a program which is already in existence. There are some minor changes proposed in this legislation but the effect, as I said, is to extend a program which we have found during the past years to be a good one.

This program will bring relief principally to veterans who live in small towns or in rural areas. It is, of course, the direct-loan program and is not to be confused with the veterans' guaranteed loan program.

It is important to the Members of the House to realize that in the years during which this program has been in operation the rate of loss has been very small. I am informed that it is less than one-half of 1 percent. Therefore the matter comes down to a very simple but important point. We have a program for the relief of those who live in small towns and in rural areas and who are not able to get loans otherwise. If they are able to get conventional loans, then they are not eligible for relief under this legislation. But, if they are not, and they can demonstrate the need, if they can demonstrate a prospective ability to repay, then this program will become available to them and they will be permitted to make loans of not to exceed $10,000 at an interest rate of 4.5 percent a year. I think this is good legislation. I believe the House should support it.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Indiana this question. I believe a part of his district comprises the city of Fort Wayne.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SCHENCK. In the event a veteran is unable to secure a so-called GI loan in the city of Fort Wayne, is he able to secure such a loan under this legislation?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman's question is pertinent, as the provisions of this bill extend only to certain areas. As has been pointed out, they are areas largely of small towns or rural communities. Generally speaking, there are no major cities, the residents of which would be entitled to the benefits of this bill. The communities which may benefit hereby are established by regulations of the Veterans' Administration. I ought to add, however, that virtually the entire State

of West Virginia, including some sizable cities, has been listed as an area whose people are eligible for these loans.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I ask the gentleman further, is there a limitation in this bill as to the size of the community?

Mr. ADAIR. Not in the bill itself. It is established, as I have just said, by regulation of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. SCHENCK. Well, is it the intention of Congress to confine this type of direct loan to very small communities, or is it the intention to serve the veterans that it is supposed to serve?

Mr. ADAIR. I would say in answer to the question of the gentleman from Ohio that it has been the philosophy of this legislation in past years that it was primarily for rural communities and small towns, and there is change in the present bill in that respect.

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

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. In order to help clarify the question raised by my colleague from Ohio, as was pointed out before, the reason for the direct loans is that private financing is not available in most cases in the smaller communities. It is not because they are a small community; it is because private financing is not available there.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I point out to the gentleman and to the committee that oftentimes in large cities loans are not available to veterans, either from banks, building and loan associations, insurance companies, or other lending agencies; therefore, it would seem to me that in order to make the legislation helpful to the veterans it should apply not only to the so-called smaller communities but to the larger communities as well.

Mr. ADAIR. What the gentleman says is true, and since the members of the committee are aware of this need I am sure will accord it a continuing study.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that if a veteran cannot secure a loan in the city from any bank, that then he would be entitled to a direct loan.

Mr. ADAIR. That is, only if the community in which he lives is one which is listed by the Veterans' Administration. As long as he is in a community which has been declared by the Veterans' Administration to be eligible, and if he meets the other requirements, then he may make his application.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the bank will not loan him, then he is entitled to a direct loan. He must try the banks first.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to take this opportunity to commend the committee for its consideration in favorably reporting this laudable legislation. In studying the committee's report I have tried to determine whether or not this legislation tends to make direct loans available to veterans for the improvement of their farm buildings. The report points out that it is for the purpose or construction of the dwelling or to purchase a farm or farmland and to construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence and also to repair, alter, and improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] or any other member of the committee whether this bill will make it possible for a veteran to obtain a loan to improve his farm buildings, to repair a barn, or to make other improvements of importance in farm operations.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question, the bill is designed primarily as a farm home and veteran's home program and in order to preserve the equality that exists in the city and in the rural area, the bill necessarily limits the repair and improvement provisions to buildings occupied as dwellings, either in a small town or in a rural area, or wherever the direct loan might be placed in effect.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Has the committee given any consideration to the direct-loan feature with reference to the aspect to which I have referred?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course, in the case of business types of property there is a guaranteed loan program that prevails both in farm areas and in city areas.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Then the gentleman would regard a loan for the purpose of repairing a barn as a business loan, whereas a loan to improve a home which is part of a farm is not a business loan?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is the distinction that I think the Veterans' Administration recognizes and the committee in its bill also recognizes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, for the convenience of Members and others interested, I am including in the RECORD at this point the so-called blue sheet, which describes the provisions of the pending bill, together with the committee report on the bill:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OLIN E. TEAGUE, *Chairman*.

CONTINUE DIRECT LOANS TO JUNE 30, 1956—H. R. 5715

Title: To amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Introduced and referred April 20, 1955.

Analysis:

1. Extends the direct-loan program for 1 year, to June 30, 1956.

2. Provides for $150 million for the extended year of the program (not to exceed $50 million in any quarter less the amount of sales).

3. Extends the direct-loan benefits to all qualified veterans who have not previously used all their guaranty entitlement.

4. Provides that a direct loan can be made for any of the following purposes:

(a) To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

(b) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

(c) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

(d) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration):

"* * * As indicated, the measures would authorize a direct loan to an eligible veteran who has previously made partial use of his guaranty entitlement but the maximum principal amount of such loan would be reduced on a pro-rata basis from the present $10,000 limitation, depending on the percentage of the full guaranty entitlement of $7,500 for home loans which remains available. It is estimated that those veterans who have heretofore made some use of their guaranty entitlement have, on the average, about $3,500, or less, of their $7,500 entitlement remaining and, therefore, under the formula contained in the proposed legislation there would be available not more than $4,700 for direct loans to such veterans. In view of current real-estate valuations, the practical question arises as to whether this amount would prove to be adequate for the purposes intended.

"It should also be borne in mind that the existing provision, whereby no direct loans can be made unless private financing is unavailable for Veterans' Administration guaranteed loans in the area in question, would be continued in the proposed revision of subsection 512 (a). Under regulations promulgated pursuant to this provision the Veterans' Administration has, in general, excluded heavily populated areas from those eligible for direct loans and, therefore, veterans who live in such areas would continue to be subject to this limitation.

"A technical consideration arises in connection with the proposed section 512 (b) (B) of the act which would charge the guaranty entitlement of a veteran with an amount which bears the same ratio to $7,500 as the amount of the loan bears to $10,000. This proposed amendment would work to the disadvantage of veterans obtaining direct loans as compared to veterans able to obtain guaranteed loans. For example, a veteran obtaining a $10,000 direct loan would have a $7,500 charge against his entitlement, whereas, under the guaranteed home-loan program, a $10,000 loan would involve an entitlement charge of only $6,000. Similar disparities would occur for lesser loan amounts, since the effect of the proposal cited would be to require a charge against entitlement in all instances where direct loans are made.

"With further reference to the proposal in H. R. 5420 and 5472 to authorize direct loans to finance the purchase of a farm with a farmhouse it should be noted that veterans have experienced increasing difficulty in recent years in obtaining farm loans under section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. For example, the volume of farm loans closed has decreased quite steadily from a peak of 19,862 loans with a principal amount of $77.7 million in 1947 to 1,432 loans with a principal amount of $6.5 million in 1954. In connection with the inadequacy of local financing at the maximum rates provided for VA-guaranteed or insured loans, it should be borne in mind that the maximum guaranty on farm-realty loans made pursuant to section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is 50 percent but not to exceed $4,000,

whereas the maximum guaranty on home purchase, construction, or improvement loans under section 501 of the act is 60 percent of the loan but not over $7,500. It is thus apparent that comparatively the guaranty protection to private lenders on farm real estate has been less attractive and the committee may wish to consider proposals designed to increase the investment appeal of farm-realty loans to private lenders as a preferable alternative to the extension of the direct-loan program into this field. * * *

"In connection with section 6 of the proposed legislation, which would extend the direct-loan program for 1 year until June 30, 1956, it should be noted that, notwithstanding any improvement in the supply of funds which may result from the operations of the voluntary home-mortgage credit program established by title VI of the Housing Act of 1954 to facilitate the flow of private credit into remote areas, it is expected that there will be certain areas where VA-guaranteed loans will continue to be unavailable and that VA direct loans will afford veterans in such areas their only opportunity for sharing in the GI-loan benefit. It would appear, therefore, that if the Congress desires to assure the availability of loan-guaranty benefits to veterans in the remote areas, an extension of the direct-loan program should be considered. In the administration of the program the Veterans' Administration would continue its practice of excluding from eligibility those areas where private funds become available for home loans. * * *

"Under the subject bills the rate of fund advance quarterly in the first 3 quarters of the 1956 fiscal year would be accelerated with a $50 million less sales limitation in lieu of the present limit of $37.5 million quarterly less sales. Since the proposed $150 million limit for the entire year is not reduced because of sales proceeds, however, any reduction made from the $50 million quarterly allotments during the first 3 quarters will ordinarily become available during the fourth quarter. However, the amount made available in the fourth quarter, as in any other quarter, could not exceed $50 million less the sales in the preceding quarter. * * *

"As noted, the extension of the direct-loan program proposed by the subject bills, and the funds proposed to be provided, are at variance with the recommendations of the President as contained in his budget message. Also, that recommendation was directed to a continuation of the existing authority which limits direct loans to a veteran 'who has not previously availed himself of his guaranty entitlement,' and restricts the type of direct loans authorized to those to finance 'the purchase or construction of a dwelling' or 'the construction or improvement of a farmhouse.'"

Hearings: April 14, 1955, Subcommittee on Housing.

Reported: April 26; House Report 447.

CONTINUE DIRECT LOANS TO JUNE 30, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The direct loan program as authorized by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, has been extended from year to year, in keeping with the demands for financial assistance to those veterans living in areas where other types of financing were not available. The program was extended for 1 year, ending June 30, 1955, by Public Law 611, 83d Congress, August 21, 1954, which provided a sum not to exceed $150 million for the fiscal year. The original authorization extended from July 19, 1950, to June 30, 1951, and empowered the Administrator to make direct loans up to $150 million (Public Law 475, 81st Cong., approved April 20, 1950). After expiring, at the end of June 30, 1951, the authority was renewed on September 1, 1951, on a revolving fund basis, limited to $150 million outstanding as of any one time, and extended to June 30, 1953 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong.). The revolving fund included the unreserved portion of the original $150 million fund allocation, plus the increment from loan repayments, and the proceeds of sales of direct loans to private investors. The revolving fund was augmented in April 1952 by an additional allocation of up to $125 million, to be made available by the Secretary of the Treasury in quarterly installments of $25 million, less the proceeds of direct-loan sales in the preceding quarter (Public Law 325, 82d Cong.). Under provisions of Public Law 101, 83d Congress, approved July 1, 1953, the program was continued for 1 year, to June 30, 1954, with up to $100 million added to the revolving fund, to be made available in quarterly installments, and the maximum interest rate on direct loans was raised to conform to the rate on guaranteed loans.

Under the present law, direct loans can be made in areas where private financing is not available, but only to an eligible veteran who has not previously used any of his guaranty entitlement, for "the purchase or construction of a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home, or to finance the construction or improvement of a farmhouse."

The bill, with the exception of two technical amendments, is identical to H. R. 5420, upon which public hearings were held on April 14, 1955.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

It extends the direct-loan program until June 30, 1956, and provides approximately the same amount for the program as provided by Public Law 611, 83d Congress; namely, $150 million. The bill also provides that eligible veterans who have not previously used all of their guaranty entitlement, and live in an area where private financing is not available, can obtain a direct loan.

In addition to the foregoing, the bill also provides that a direct loan may be made for any of the following purposes:

(a) To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

(b) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

(c) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

(d) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home; if the Administrator finds that in the area in which the dwelling, farm, or farm residence is located or is to be constructed, private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, the purchase of farms with farm residences, or the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of farm residences or other dwellings, as the case may be, by veterans under this title. In case there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan made under this section for the construction of a dwelling or farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien.

Under existing laws and Veterans' Administration regulations, the Veterans' Administration will guarantee a loan to a qualified veteran for the construction of a dwelling to be occupied as his home on (1) a lot or farm owned by the veteran, or (2) on a lot or farm in which the veteran has an equity, or (3) on a lot or farm selected by the veteran, and to pay off the indebtedness against the lot or farm. This bill provides the same benefits under the direct loan program.

In the hearings on this bill the Veterans' Administration brought out the fact that no provision is contained in the bill requiring a first lien on the property for a direct loan for repairs, alterations, or improvements. There is no mandatory requirements in the law governing guaranteed loans that loans for repairs, alterations, or improvements be secured by first liens but existing Veterans' Administration regulations do require such liens in certain circumstances. Further, in addition to other requirements to be eligible for a direct loan, the veteran must show "to the satisfaction of the Administrator * * * that he is a satisfactory credit risk." It is not the intent and desire of the committee that the Administrator make questionable direct loans. Pursuant to his general authority under the act it is expected that he would not only resolve the question of whether the veteran is a satisfactory credit risk but also would impose such requirements concerning lien security as he determines to be advisable considering the best interests of the Government and he may require such loans to be secured on a first lien basis in certain circumstances.

In the hearings it was also brought out by the Veterans' Administration that it has some 20,000 veterans on the waiting list for a direct loan under the present law. However, most, if not all, of the veterans on the waiting list are not farming veterans or veterans wanting to purchase a farm with a farm residence (or veterans seeking to build or construct a farm residence on land owned by them). This would indicate that in States where there is presently a large waiting list there are few farming veterans or veterans on such list who would want a direct loan to buy a farm. It is not the intent or desire of the committee to change the present administration of the direct-loan program which serves the veterans on a first-come first-served basis. However, this bill will make direct loans available to all veterans who have not exhausted their entitlement, living in an area where private financing is not available, for the purchase of a farm with a farm residence, or construction of a farm residence on land owned by the veteran. Therefore, it is the desire and intent of the committee and of this bill that the farm veterans embraced by the bill be placed on a parity with the veterans now on the waiting list, and that the Administrator issue regulations or take the necessary administrative action to accomplish this on an equitable basis. This could be accomplished by establishing a separate list of such farm veterans from the existing waiting lists and serving the first veterans from each list as their names come to the top. As stated hereinbefore, this would not materially affect the existing waiting lists, as most of those on the waiting list at the present time are for loans for other than farm properties. The committee's desire could also be implemented by earmarking a percentage of the funds to be used in making direct loans for the purchase of a farm with a farm residence or the construction of a farm residence.

These, or other comparable procedures, should be used to avoid the necessity of farm veterans, or veterans wishing to purchase farm properties, from having to come in at the bottom of the present waiting list to obtain the benefits under this bill.

The present law provides that direct loans shall be made only in areas where the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has found that private capital is not available for the financing of the veteran's purchase or construction of a dwelling or construction or improvement of a farmhouse. This bill does not change this provision; the Administrator will continue to designate direct-loan areas.

To summarize, this bill—

1. Extends the direct-loan program for 1 year, to June 30, 1956.

2. Provides for $150 million for the extended year of the program (not to exceed $50 million in any quarter less the amount of sales).

3. Extends the direct-loan benefits to all qualified veterans who have not previously used all their guaranty entitlement.

4. Provides that a direct loan can be made for any of the following purposes:

(a) To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

(b) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

(c) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

(d) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home.

H. R. 5106, passed by the House on April 18, 1955, placed certain guaranteed farm loans on a parity with city loans. This bill places the direct loan for a farm with a farm residence on a parity with a city loan for a lot with a residence.

The status of the direct-loan program (as of February 25, 1955) is as follows:

From the beginning of the direct-loan program in July of 1950 through February 28, 1955, a total of 109,520 formal applications for direct loans had been received, of which 37,584 had been withdrawn or denied, 59,393 had resulted in closed and fully disbursed loans and 12,543 were in process. From the inception of the program, a total of $535,068,300 had become available in the revolving fund for making direct loans. This sum was derived from the following sources:

Original congressional authorization	$150,000,000
Subsequent Treasury advances (12 quarterly advances)	307,587,700
Proceeds of direct-loan sales	35,158,600
Other principal repayments	42,322,000
Total	535,068,300

APPLICATIONS

	Total, all types			
	Number	Percent change, end of previous month	Initial loan amount	Average loan amount
Applications received to date	109,520	3.3	(1)	
Rejected or withdrawn to date	37,584	2.4	(1)	
Funds reserved, net	69,488	1.6	$500,488,486	$7,203
Closed and fully disbursed	59,393	2.3	419,427,663	7,062
In process, end of month	10,095	−2.7	81,060,823	8,030
Cleared, not yet approved	6,167	−5.0	49,213,450	7,980
Approved not yet closed	3,611	.8	29,105,674	8,060
Closed, not fully disbursed	317	7.5	2,741,699	8,649
Awaiting fund reservations	2,448	160.7	(1)	
Veterans waiting to file applications	20,375	−8.4		
Unreserved regional funds			$27,164,637	

LOANS

Loans closed and fully disbursed	59,393	2.3	$419,427,663	$7,062
Loans terminated to date, total	6,669	4.6	46,765,303	7,012
By sale	5,325	3.6	38,192,439	7,172
By repayment in full	1,208	9.7	7,820,182	6,474
By foreclosure	70	4.5	395,278	5,647
By voluntary conveyance	66	1.5	357,404	5,415
Fully disbursed loans outstanding	52,724	2.1	372,662,360	7,068
Loans in default, total	2,659	8.5		
4 or more installments	479	10.6		

[1] Loan amount not reported until funds are reserved.

Location	Fully disbursed loans		Terminated loans				Loans outstanding	Loans in default			Applications in process, funds reserved	Applications awaiting processing and veterans on waiting list [1]
			Sold		Repaid in full	Foreclosed or voluntarily conveyed		Total	4 or more installments			
	Number	Average amount	Number	Percent of fully disbursed loans					Number	Percent of outstanding loans		
Total	59,393	$7,062	5,325	9.0	1,208	136	52,724	2,659	479	0.9	10,095	22,823
Alabama: Montgomery	2,151	7,498	10	.5	40	6	2,095	106	7	.3	328	1,876
Alaska: Juneau	532	8,840	0		17	1	514	0	0		62	0
Arizona: Phoenix	352	7,234	3	.9	2	0	347	17	3	.9	74	191
Arkansas: Little Rock	1,537	6,775	130	8.5	16	0	1,391	74	8	.6	167	292
California:												
Los Angeles	321	8,376	11	3.4	3	0	307	19	2	.7	43	24
San Diego	288	8,543	0		6	2	280	5	0		1	0
San Francisco	850	9,035	0		13	0	837	28	8	1.0	163	68
Colorado: Denver	818	7,243	22	2.7	16	4	776	32	2	.3	119	680
Connecticut: Hartford [2]												
Delaware: Wilmington [2]												
District of Columbia: Washington [2]												
Florida:												
Miami	190	9,005	24	12.6	3	0	163	3	1	.6	67	25
Pass-A-Grille	854	7,873	59	6.9	15	2	778	31	1	.1	179	60
Georgia: Atlanta	2,155	6,897	94	4.4	30	2	2,029	206	18	.9	258	2,646
Hawaii: Honolulu [2]												
Idaho: Boise	573	7,435	154	26.9	9	0	410	18	5	1.2	25	51
Illinois: Chicago	2,108	6,911	376	17.8	30	9	1,693	85	17	1.0	951	415
Indiana: Indianapolis	2,016	6,116	250	12.4	55	9	1,702	83	10	.6	206	790
Iowa: Des Moines	1,532	6,501	376	24.5	37	0	1,119	32	2	.2	103	64
Kansas: Wichita	675	6,937	276	40.9	7	2	390	15	6	1.5	100	184
Kentucky: Louisville	3,375	6,444	15	.4	102	16	3,242	106	14	.4	386	1,883
Louisiana:												
New Orleans	1,060	7,536	20	1.9	23	1	1,016	16	7	.7	210	758
Shreveport	732	7,107	0		19	4	709	34	4	.6	137	254
Maine: Togus	703	5,553	242	34.4	16	5	440	16	2	.5	66	9
Maryland: Baltimore	662	7,692	40	6.0	17	1	604	31	7	1.2	112	28
Massachusetts: Boston [2]												
Michigan: Detroit	1,783	7,206	52	2.9	8	2	1,721	134	9	.5	290	35
Minnesota: St. Paul	1,242	6,874	47	3.8	33	5	1,157	58	5	.4	227	216
Mississippi: Jackson	2,083	7,516	69	3.3	26	3	1,985	120	1	.1	367	1,079
Missouri:												
Kansas City	873	6,843	6	.7	23	1	843	27	2	.2	132	811
St. Louis	1,177	6,744	12	1.0	27	0	1,138	30	3	.3	322	557
Montana: Fort Harrison	1,037	7,216	122	11.8	36	1	878	15	2	.2	69	452
Nebraska: Lincoln	770	6,886	22	2.9	41	0	707	2	0		37	7
Nevada: Reno	324	8,464	0		8	0	316	10	4	1.3	47	27

[1] Applications awaiting fund reservations plus veterans waiting to file applications.
[2] No portion of region eligible for direct loans.

Location	Fully disbursed loans		Terminated loans				Loans outstanding	Loans in default			Applications in process, funds reserved	Applications awaiting processing and veterans on waiting list
	Number	Average amount	Sold		Repaid in full	Foreclosed or voluntarily conveyed		Total	4 or more installments			
			Number	Percent of fully disbursed loans					Number	Percent of outstanding loans		
New Hampshire: Manchester [2]												
New Jersey: Newark [2]												
New Mexico: Albuquerque	632	7,693	20	3.2	5	0	607	11	0		147	286
New York:												
Albany	248	6,749	39	15.7	7	0	202	30	10	5.0	29	0
Buffalo	183	6,150	141	77.0	1	2	39	6	1	2.6	2	3
New York [2]												
Syracuse	130	6,298	100	76.9	0	0	30	6	2	6.7	2	0
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	2,820	7,483	162	5.7	33	4	2,621	145	31	1.2	891	784
North Dakota: Fargo	832	5,960	99	11.9	25	3	705	30	4	.6	71	9
Ohio:												
Cincinnati	1,417	6,622	78	5.5	29	0	1,310	20	0		277	1,552
Cleveland	1,173	7,314	28	2.4	30	1	1,114	73	16	1.4	136	1,503
Oklahoma:												
Muskogee	532	6,364	0		14	0	518	6	0		51	52
Oklahoma City	455	7,011	57	12.5	2	0	396	8	0		125	0
Oregon: Portland	496	$7,377	101	20.4	6	2	387	20	2	.5	85	35
Pennsylvania:												
Philadelphia [2]												
Pittsburgh	1,260	7,173	74	5.9	19	2	1,165	72	15	1.3	363	0
Wilkes-Barre	1,444	6,598	99	6.9	49	3	1,293	82	23	1.8	31	12
Puerto Rico: San Juan	505	8,321	0		5	0	500	62	2	.4	171	710
Rhode Island: Providence [2]												
South Carolina: Columbia	1,272	7,388	76	6.0	11	1	1,184	94	14	1.2	313	154
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	862	6,634	47	5.5	41	0	774	29	8	1.0	109	165
Tennessee: Nashville	1,792	6,669	44	2.5	32	12	1,704	143	33	1.9	381	1,167
Texas:	797								0		89	8
Dallas	611	7,346	42	5.3	5	0	750	2	2	.4	80	2
Houston		7,517	71	11.6	7	6	527	20				
Lubbock	635	7,035	0		17	1	617	10	0		159	193
San Antonio	300	7,631	67	22.3	2	0	231	10	1	.4	18	0
Waco	693	6,776	17	2.5	12	0	664	6	1	.2	121	5
Utah: Salt Lake City	428	7,667	5	1.2	7	0	416	11	2	.5	51	180
Vermont: White River Junction	254	5,417	239	94.1	3	0	12	8	3	25.0	0	3
Virginia: Roanoke	2,609	7,262	40	1.5	62	7	2,500	43	7	.3	422	1,223
Washington: Seattle	469	7,546	19	4.1	11	0	439	50	12	2.7	85	0
West Virginia: Huntington	1,938	6,550	0		39	5	1,894	270	132	7.0	465	1,209
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	1,503	6,894	1,150	76.5	52	11	290	27	8	2.8	130	86
Wyoming: Cheyenne	330	8,177	78	23.6	4	0	248	12	0		43	0

[2] No portion of region eligible for direct loans.

The report of the Veterans' Administration on a substantially identical bill, H. R. 5420, follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE
ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1955.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Further reference is made to your request for a report on H. R. 5420 and H. R. 5472, 84th Congress, identical bills to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

The purpose of these measures is to amend sections 512 and 513 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act so as to extend for 1 year the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make a direct loan to eligible veterans, and to make additional veterans, and types of loans, eligible for direct loan purposes. The proposed legislation would eliminate the existing provision in subsection 512 (a), which limits the eligibility for direct loans to a veteran "who has not previously availed himself of his guaranty entitlement" and provide by amendment to subsection 512 (b) that the maximum amount of any direct loan made by the Veterans' Administration, instead of $10,000 as at present, shall be that amount which bears the same ratio to $10,000 as the amount of guaranty to which the veteran is entitled under section 501 bears to $7,500. No veteran would be entitled to loans aggregating more than $10,000. In addition, the measures would authorize direct loans for the purpose of purchasing or constructing a dwelling, purchasing a farm with a farmhouse, constructing a farmhouse on land owned by the veteran, or repairing, altering, or improving a farmhouse or dwelling owned by the veteran, provided that in each instance the farmhouse or dwelling is to be occupied by the veteran as his home. (Under existing law, direct loans are authorized only for the purpose of purchasing or constructing a dwelling, or constructing or improving a farmhouse.) It is also provided that if there is an indebtedness on land owned by the veteran the proceeds of a direct loan to construct a dwelling or farmhouse thereon may be used also to liquidate the lien securing the indebtedness if such indebtedness does not exceed the reasonable value of the property.

Section 4 of the bills would permit direct farmhouse or home-improvement loans, held by the Administrator on the date of enactment of the act or made after such date, to be repaid in quarterly, semiannual, or annual installments instead of on the monthly basis presently prescribed by law.

The measures would also extend the termination date for the direct-loan program from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1956, and would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to advance additional funds therefor of not over $150 million, provided that the amounts advanced in any one quarter annual period shall not exceed $50 million, less the amounts received in the preceding quarter from the sale of direct loans to private lenders.

Information relating to the legislative history and current status of the Veterans' Administration direct-loan program is contained in a separate statement which is attached hereto and made a part of this report.

As indicated, the measures would authorize a direct loan to an eligible veteran who has previously made partial use of his guaranty entitlement, but the maximum principal amount of such loan would be reduced on a pro rata basis from the present $10,000 limitation, depending on the percentage of the full guaranty entitlement of $7,500 for home loans which remains available. It is estimated that those veterans who have heretofore made some use of their guaranty entitlement have, on the average, about $3,500 or less of their $7,500 entitlement remaining, and, therefore, under the formula contained in the proposed legislation there would be available not more than $4,700 for direct loans to such veterans. In view of current real-estate valuations the practical question arises as to whether this amount would prove to be adequate for the purposes intended.

It should also be borne in mind that the existing provision whereby no direct loans can be made unless private financing is unavailable for Veterans' Administration guaranteed loans in the area in question would be continued in the proposed revision of subsection 512 (a). Under regulations promulgated pursuant to this provision the Veterans' Administration has, in general, excluded heavily populated areas from those eligible for direct loans, and, therefore, veterans who live in such areas would continue to be subject to this limitation.

A technical consideration arises in connection with the proposed section 512 (b) (B) of the act which would charge the guaranty entitlement of a veteran with an amount which bears the same ratio to $7,500 as the amount of the loan bears to $10,000. This proposed amendment would work to the disadvantage of veterans obtaining direct loans as compared to veterans able to obtain guaranteed loans. For example, a veteran obtaining a $10,000 direct loan would have a $7,500 charge against his entitlement, whereas, under the guaranteed home-loan program, a $10,000 loan would involve an entitlement charge of only $6,000. Similar disparities would occur for lesser loan amounts, since

the effect of the proposal cited would be to require a charge against entitlement in all instances where direct loans are made.

With further reference to the proposal in H. R. 5420 and 5472 to authorize direct loans to finance the purchase of a farm with a farmhouse it should be noted that veterans have experienced increasing difficulty in recent years in obtaining farm loans under section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. For example, the volume of farm loans closed has decreased quite steadily from a peak of 19,862 loans with a principal amount of $77.7 million in 1947 to 1,432 loans with a principal amount of $6.5 million in 1954. In connection with the inadequacy of local financing at the maximum rates provided for VA-guaranteed or insured loans, it should be borne in mind that the maximum guaranty on farm realty loans made pursuant to section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is 50 percent but not to exceed $4,000, whereas the maximum guaranty on home purchase, construction or improvement loans under section 501 of the act is 60 percent of the loan but not over $7,500. It is thus apparent that comparatively the guaranty protection to private lenders on farm real estate has been less attractive and the committee may wish to consider proposals designed to increase the investment appeal of farm realty loans to private lenders as a preferable alternative to the extension of the direct loan program into this field.

The provisions of section 512 (b), which would not be modified by this measure would apparently have the effect of making the requirements of section 502 applicable to the proposed direct farmhouse loans. Such requirements would include determinations that "the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations * * * are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful" and that any property purchased "will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations." In this connection it may be noted that an index of the average value of farm real estate per acre prepared by the Department of Agriculture indicates that the cost of farmland in November 1954 was 82 percent above the level of 1944, the year in which the Servicemen's Readjustment Act became law. It would appear, therefore, that the amount of funds necessary in order to establish a farming enterprise of a size that would provide a veteran farmer with a livelihood has also risen substantially. Such amount may vary widely in different sections of the country but it would seem that in many areas the direct loan maximum of $10,000 might not meet the practical necessities of the situation.

The first section of the proposed bill would authorize direct loans for the repair, alteration, or improvement of any dwelling unit. Presently, such loans may be made only in connection with a farmhouse and thus there would be a considerable widening of the authorization as to the type of properties on which direct loans for repairs, alterations, or improvements may be made. Since section 512 (b) provides that direct loans shall be subject to such requirements or limitations as are prescribed for guaranteed loans, and since section 500 (c) of the act excepts guaranteed loans for repairs, alterations, or improvements from the first lien security requirement, a question would appear to exist as to whether it is the intent of the bills that such direct loans be made other than on a first-lien basis. In this connection the committee may wish to consider that in respect to guaranteed loans such loans currently may be secured by a second lien or made on an unsecured basis in certain types of cases. Since it might be anticipated that there would be a considerable influx in the number of requests for such loans, the administrative complexities, particularly from the standpoint of salvage in case of liquidation, would be reduced if a first lien is required in such cases. In addition, there are problems inherent in the servicing of unsecured loans and second mortgage loans which do not exist with respect to loans secured by primary liens. Also, such loans if made on an unsecured or second-lien basis would be virtually unsalable.

Section 4 of the bills would authorize the repayment of direct farmhouse loans on a monthly, quarterly, semiannual or annual basis, in the discretion of the Administrator. This amendment would be consistent in that it would bring the repayment requirements on such loans into line with those currently applicable to guaranteed loans and permit amortization on a basis which would be more consonant with the manner in which the borrower derived his income.

In connection with section 6 of the proposed legislation, which would extend the direct loan program for 1 year until June 30, 1956, it should be noted that, notwithstanding any improvement in the supply of funds which may result from the operations of the voluntary home mortgage credit program established by title VI of the Housing Act of 1954 to facilitate the flow of private credit into remote areas, it is expected that there will be certain areas where VA-guaranteed loans will continue to be unavailable and that VA direct loans will afford veterans in such areas their only opportunity for sharing in the GI loan benefit. It would appear, therefore, that if the Congress desires to assure the availability of loan guaranty benefits to veterans in the remote areas, an extension of the direct loan program should be considered. In the administration of the program, the Veterans' Administration would continue its practice of excluding from eligibility those areas where private funds become available for home loans.

Pertinent to the subject of the extension of the direct loan program is the statement in the budget message of the President that—

"The Veterans' Administration program of direct housing loans expires on June 30, 1955. These loans are made only where guaranteed private mortgages are not available or cannot be secured through the voluntary home mortgage credit program. I recommend legislation continuing this program until expiration of the veterans' loan guaranty program for World War II veterans on July 25, 1957. If permission is granted to use receipts from repayments, as well as from sales, new obligational authority of $100 million should be adequate for the fiscal year 1956."

Under the subject bills the rate of fund advance quarterly in the first 3 quarters of the 1956 fiscal year would be accelerated with a $50 million less sales limitation in lieu of the present limit of $37.5 million quarterly less sales. Since the proposed $150 million limit for the entire year is not reduced because of sales proceeds, however, any reduction made from the $50 million quarterly allotments during the first three quarters will ordinarily become available during the fourth quarter. However, the amount made available in the fourth quarter, as in any other quarter, could not exceed $50 million less the sales in the preceding quarter.

Certain technical aspects of the bills deserve to be noted. In connection with the proposed revision of section 512 (a) (2) it is noted that clause (C) of section 512 (a) (2) would be amended to eliminate the reference of section 502. Such a deletion would be inappropriate unless certain amendments, contemplated by other pending legislation to provide for the guaranty of farmhouse loans under section 501, are enacted. In addition, it would seem that the word "of" in line 1 of clause (C) on page 2 of the bills should be deleted. Moreover, it is observed that reference to "dwellings" was omitted in line 17 on page 2. It is believed that such a reference should be included to prevent uncertainty as to the fact that a direct home repair, alteration, or improvement loan may only be made where a guaranteed loan for such purpose is unavailable.

As noted, the extension of the direct-loan program proposed by the subject bills, and the funds proposed to be provided, are at variance with the recommendations of the President as contained in his budget message. Also, that recommendation was directed to a continuation of the existing authority which limits direct loans to a veteran "who has not previously availed himself of his guaranty entitlement," and restricts the type of direct loans authorized to those to finance "the purchase or construction of a dwelling" or "the construction or improvement of a farmhouse."

No figures are available on which to base an estimate of the cost of the proposed legislation. It is believed, however, that the cost of servicing direct farm loans and the cost of resulting losses in connection with defaults would be likely to exceed such costs in connection with direct home loans, since in the case of farm loans lending would be on the basis of the likelihood of success in a business venture as well as on the security of real estate.

In view of the foregoing, I am unable to recommend that the committee give favorable consideration to these measures.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. HIGLEY,
Administrator.

"STATUS OF VA DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM, FEBRUARY 28, 1955

"The Veterans' Administration is authorized to make direct loans to eligible veterans for the purchase or construction of homes or for the construction or improvement of farmhouses in areas where guaranteed or insured home loans are not available from private lending sources. Designated direct loan areas consist primarily of the less populous counties or portions of counties.

"The original authorization extended from July 19, 1950, to June 30, 1951, and empowered the Administrator to make direct loans up to $150 million (Public Law 475, 81st Cong., approved Apr. 20, 1950). After expiring, at the end of June 30, 1951, the authority was renewed on September 1, 1951, on a revolving fund basis, limited to $150 million outstanding as of any one time, and extended to June 30, 1953 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong.). The revolving fund included the unreserved portion of the original $150 million fund allocation, plus the increment from loan repayments, and the proceeds of sales of direct loans to private investors. The revolving fund was augmented in April 1952, by an additional allocation of up to $125 million, to be made available by the Secretary of the Treasury in quarterly installments of $25 million, less the proceeds of direct loan sales in the preceding quarter (Public Law 325, 82d Cong.). Under the provisions of Public Law 101, 83d Congress, approved July 1, 1953, the program was continued for 1 year, to June 30, 1954, with up to $100 million added to the revolving fund, to be made available in quarterly installments, and the maximum interest rate on direct loans was raised to conform to the rate on guaranteed loans. By joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, Public Law 438, approved June 29, 1954, the program was extended through July 31, 1954. Under provisions of Public Law 611, 83d Congress, approved August 21, 1954, the program was continued through June 30, 1955, with up to $150 million added to the revolving fund, to be made available in quarterly installments of $37½ million.

"From the beginning of the direct loan program in July of 1950 through February 28, 1955, a total of 109,520 formal applications for direct loans had been received, of which 37,584 had been withdrawn or denied, 59,393 had resulted in closed and fully disbursed loans, and 12,543 were in process. From the inception of the program, a total of $535,068,-300 had become available in the revolving fund for making direct loans. This sum was derived from the following sources:

Original congressional authorization	$150,000,000
Subsequent Treasury advances (12 quarterly advances)	307,587,700
Proceeds of direct loan sales	35,158,600
Other principal repayments	42,322,000
Total	535,068,300

"By the end of February 1955, the initial amount of direct loans disbursed was $421,-506,500. An additional $79,135,000 had been committed for loans in process, leaving $34,-426,800 in uncommitted funds available for making additional direct loans.

"As of February 28, 1955, there were 22,823 veterans with loan applications or requests on file for which funds had not been reserved in the 56 VA regional offices which have areas designated as eligible for direct loans as compared with 34,480 at the end of February a year ago.

"As of the end of February 1955, a total of 6,669 direct loans had been terminated, 1,208 by repayment in full, 5,325 by sale, 70 by foreclosure, and 66 by voluntary conveyance of title to the property. As of the end of February 1955, there were 2,659 direct loans in default, of which 479 were 4 or more installments in default, or a little less than 1 percent of the 52,724 direct loans outstanding on that date.

"(Veterans' Administration, Department of Veterans' Benefits, Office of Loan Guaranty, April 7, 1955.)"

RAMSEYER RULE

In accordance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the changes made in existing law by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no changes are proposed is shown in roman):

"PUBLIC LAW 346, 78TH CONGRESS, AS AMENDED

"Supplemental direct loans to veterans

"SEC. 512 (*38 U. S. C. 649l*). (a) (*1*) Upon application by a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title [who has not previously availed himself of his guaranty entitlement], the Administrator is authorized and directed to make, or enter into a commitment to make, the veteran a loan [to finance the purchase or construction of a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home, or to finance the construction or improvement of a farmhouse, if (1) the Administrator has found, after the effective date of this section, that in the area in which the dwelling or farmhouse is located or is to be constructed, private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, or the construction or improvement of farmhouses, as the case may be, by veterans under this title, and (2) the] *for any of the following purposes:*

"(*A*) *To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;*

"(*B*) *To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;*

"(*C*) *To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or*

"(*D*) *To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home;*

if the Administrator finds that in the area in which the dwelling, farm, or farm residence is located or is to be constructed, private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, the purchase of farms with farm residences, or the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of farm residences or other dwellings, as the case may be, by veterans under this title. In case there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan made under this section for the construction of a dwelling or farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien.

"(*2*) *No loan shall be made under this section to a* veteran *unless he* shows to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

"(A) that he is a satisfactory credit risk,

"(B) that the monthly payments to be required under the proposed loan bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses,

"(C) that he is unable to obtain from private lending sources in such area at an interest rate not in excess of the rate authorized for guaranteed home loans a loan for such purpose for which he is qualified under section 501 [or section 502] of this title, and

"(D) that he is unable to obtain a loan for such purpose from the Secretary of Agriculture under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or the Housing Act of 1949.

"(b) Loans made under this section shall bear interest at the rate to be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, not to exceed the rate authorized for guaranteed home loans, and in no event to exceed 4½ per centumn per annum and shall be subject to such requirements or limitations prescribed for loans guaranteed under this title as may be applicable: *Provided* That—

"(A) the original principal amount of any such loan shall not exceed [$10,000] *an amount which bears the same ratio to $10-000 as the amount of guaranty to which the veteran is entitled under section 501 at the time the loan is made bears to $7,500;*

"(B) the guaranty entitlement of the veteran shall be charged with [the same amount that would be deducted if the loan had been guaranteed to the maxima permitted under section 500 (a) of this title] *an amount which bears the same ratio to $7,500 as the amount of the loan bears to $10,000;*

("C) the authority to make loans under this section shall expire [June 30, 1955] *June 30, 1956, except that if a commitment to make such a loan was issued by the Administrator prior to that date the loan may be completed subsequent to such date.*

"(c) In connection with any loan under this section, the Administrator is authorized to make advances in cash to pay the taxes and assessments on the real estate, to provide for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, and improvements, and to meet the incidental expenses of the transaction, and shall credit to the principal of the loan an amount equal to that which would have been payable under section 500 (c) of this title had the loan been made by a private institution.

"(d) The Administrator is authorized to sell, and shall offer for sale, to any person or entity approved for such purpose by the Administrator, any loan made under this section at a price not less than par; that is, the unpaid balance plus accrued interest, and may guarantee any loan thus sold subject to the same conditions, terms, and limitations which would be applicable were the loan guaranteed under section 501 [(b)] of this title.

"(e) [This section shall take effect ninety days after the date of enactment of the Housing Act of 1950.] *Loans made under this section shall be repaid in monthly installments; except that in the case of loans made for any of the purposes described in clauses (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the Administrator may provide that such loans shall be repaid in quarterly, semiannual, or annual installments.*

"(*f*) *No veteran may obtain loans under this section aggregating more than $10,000.*

"SEC. 513. (*38 U. S. C. 694m*). (a) For the purposes of section 512 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums not in excess of $150,000,000 (plus the amount of any funds which may have been deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts under subsections (a) and (c) hereof), as the Administrator shall request from time to time except that no sums may be made available after [June 30, 1955] *June 30, 1956.* After the last day on which the Administrator may make loans under that section, he shall cause to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, that part of all sums in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (c) of this section, and all moneys received thereafter, representing unexpended advances or the repayment or recovery of the principal of loans made pursuant to section 512 of this title. Interest collected by the Administrator on loans made under section 512 in excess of the amount payable by him to the Treasurer of the United States under subsection (b) of this section, together with any miscellaneous income or credits, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said obligations. The Administrator shall have power to invest such reserves, or any unexpended part thereof, from time to time in obligations of the Government of the United States.

"(b) On advances by the Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (a) of this section, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsections (a) and (c) hereof the Administrator shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the advance.

"(c) In order to make available the sums payable under subsection (a) of this section and to effectuate the purposes and functions authorized in section 512 of this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as herafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, are hereby extended to include such purposes. Such sums, together with all receipts hereunder, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, in a special deposit account, and shall be available respectively, for disbursement for the purposes of section 512 of this title. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in said account as in his judgment are not needed for the purposes for which they were provided, including the proceeds of the sale of any loans, and not later than [June 30, 1956] *June 30, 1957,* he shall cause to be so deposited all sums in said account and all moneys received thereafter in repayment of outstanding obligations, or otherwise, except so much thereof as he may determine to be necessary for purposes of liquidation. Without regard to any other provisions of this title, said Administrator shall have authority to take or cause to be taken such action as in his judgment may be necessary or appropriate for or

in connection with the custody, management, protection, and realization or sale of such investments, to determine his necessary expenses and expenditures, and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed and paid, to make such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the carrying out of the functions hereby or hereunder authorized and, except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of his functions hereunder to such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as he may designate.

"(d) For the purposes of further augmenting the revolving fund established in subsection (a) hereof the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed between the effective date of this subsection and July 1, 1952, to make available to the Administrator such additional sums not in excess of $25,000,000 as the Administrator may request, and is authorized and directed to advance from time to time thereafter until [June 30, 1955] *June 30, 1956,* such additional sums (*not in excess of $150,000,000 in any one fiscal year*) as the Administrator may request, [provided] *except* that the aggregate so advanced in any one quarter annual period shall not exceed the sum of [$37,500,000] *$50,000,000* less that amount which had been returned to the revolving fund during the preceding quarter annual period from the sale of loans pursuant to section 512 (d) of this title. Except for the limitation on the sums authorized in subsection (a) hereof, this subsection shall be subject to the other provisions of this section and of this title."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, the veterans direct loan program, in my opinion, has operated successfully since its inception and warrants continuation. For that reason I introduced H. R. 5726 which, among other things, will extend the direct loan program for an additional year. That measure is identical to the bill now under consideration, H. R. 5715.

From the beginning of the direct loan program in July of 1950 through March 31 of this year, 61,014 applications have resulted in closed and fully disbursed loans by the Veterans' Administration. As of the end of March 1955, a total of 7,147 direct loans had been terminated, 1,308 by repayment in full, 5,692 by sale, 76 by foreclosure, and 71 by voluntary conveyance of title to the property. On March 31, 1955, there were only 2,659 direct loans in default, of which only 480 were four or more installments in default or about nine-tenths of 1 percent of the 53,867 direct loans outstanding on that date. The extremely low default rate throughout the entire United States certainly indicates the soundness of this program.

In my own State of Alabama the direct loan program has proved equally successful. Since the beginning of this program in July of 1950 and through March 31, 1955, a total of 4,217 formal applications for direct loans had been received from Alabama veterans, of which 1,514 had been withdrawn or denied, 2,192 had resulted in closed and fully disbursed loans by the Veterans' Administration, and 511 were in process by the Veterans' Administration.

By the end of March 1955, the initial amount of direct loans disbursed in Alabama was $16,488,550. An additional $2,536,250 had been committed for loans in process. As of March 31, 1955, there were 1,534 veterans with loan applications or requests on file for which funds had not been reserved in the Alabama areas designated as eligible for direct loans, as compared with 1,460 on the same date a year earlier.

At the end of March of this year a total of 57 Alabama direct loans has been terminated, 41 by repayment in full, 10 by sale, and 6 by foreclosure or by voluntary conveyance of title to the property. There were only 109 direct loans in default, of which only 8 were four or more installments in default or about four-tenths of 1 percent of the 2,135 direct loans outstanding on that date. Certainly these statistics speak well for the veterans of Alabama.

The bill now under consideration extends the direct-loan program until June 30, 1956; authorizes the appropriation of $150 million for the extended year of the program; and liberalizes the farm-loan provisions of the program.

Under the present law, veterans can obtain farm loans only for building a house or improving an existing structure on land they already own. This legislation extends to the veterans the privilege of obtaining direct loans for the purchase of a farm with an existing residence or the purchase of farmland and the construction of a farmhouse to be occupied by the veteran.

At the present time the Veterans' Administration has approximately 20,000 veterans on the waiting list for direct loans under the existing law. However, where there is presently a large waiting list, there are only a few veterans on that list who are applying for a direct farm loan. As a matter of fact, only a total of 112 direct farm loans have been made. The State of Alabama has made only 13 direct farm loans since the inception of the program.

There is every reason to believe that the liberalization of the farm-loan provisions of the direct-loan program, provided for in this legislation, may encourage more veterans to return to the farms.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for the lead he has taken in placing this legislation before the House. I think the measure now under consideration is both sound and reasonable, and I am confident the House will adopt it by an overwhelming vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to state that I think the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], as well as the ranking minority member and members of the entire subcommittee, have done a very fine job in reporting out this bill.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to add my wholehearted support to this proposed legislation. I trust every Member of this House will likewise give it his enthusiastic approval.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H. R. 5715 and congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on bringing this legislation to the House.

Speaking as a Congressman from a predominantly rural area, I want to thank the House for passing legislation similar to this during the past several years, legislation which has enabled our people who are far removed from the money-lending centers of the Nation to participate in this wonderful home-building program. As many of you realize, I know, in the rural areas of this country it is very difficult no matter how very good your credit is to borrow money, because there just is not enough money available to take care of all the needs of local business and at the same time to enable participation in such a program as suggested by the bill we are considering here in the Committee today.

I cannot conceive of any opposition to this bill because it certainly will not cost any money. As has been stated, this program has been eminently successful. The veterans have paid back their loans. I certainly hope this legislation is unanimously passed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman on the excellent bill he has brought out. This bill will aid tremendously the small farmers who need aid at this time. This has been a splendid program. The funds that have been involved have been paid back. It has allowed our small farmers, especially, to live in a much better way than they would have otherwise. It is a fine bill for veterans, and it is entirely proper for us to employ this means to assist them in civilian life.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill wholeheartedly. I am proud to have been one of the authors of the first direct loan acts for veterans with which to build homes which was enacted into law by the Congress, and I have supported similar legislation each year, here in the House of Representatives.

This bill extends the direct loan program for 1 year from June 30, and provides $150 million for the program next year. My only objection to this bill is that the amount authorized is not sufficient to meet the needs of all the veterans.

This bill puts farm veterans on a parity with other veterans on the waiting list. It also is a definite aid to farm veterans in buying a farm. This should, and I feel sure will have the unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us, H. R. 5715, having the sub-

stantial purpose of extending the authority of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to make direct loans to qualified veterans needs no prolonged advocacy and I do not intend to unnecessarily trespass upon the time of this House. In summary the measure is designed to provide for direct loans to eligible veterans for the following purposes, first, to purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by the veteran as a home; second, to purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home; third, to construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or, fourth, to alter, repair or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home. The safeguarding restrictions and eligibility qualifications have been fully and ably explained by the committee chairman and representative members. The experience of the past demonstrates the program has been continuously productive of most wholesome results in providing assistance to veterans and their families that could not have been otherwise obtained. A decent home is the foundation of Christian life. Lending this financial encouragement to veterans desiring to own their own homes is a comparatively small return for the great part of their personal lives sacrificed in the service of their country. Let us enact this justifiable measure without further delay.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to again support the extension of direct loans for veterans. I am particularly happy to support the Edmondson bill which provides that direct loans may be had by the rural veteran with which to buy a farm or a home. I have argued for this principle for years.

I had the privilege of sponsoring this direct-loan legislation in the House in 1951.

This loan program has provided homes for our veterans in areas where private financing is not available. It should be continued. The bill before us provides a 1-year extension. Next year, we should extend it again. Every rural veteran should have an opportunity to share in its benefits, if private financing is not available to him.

On February 28, 1955, 2,151 loans had been made to Alabama veterans under this program. Three hundred and twenty-eight loans were in process of being closed. One thousand eight hundred and seventy-six applications were awaiting processing. This bill will enable this great program to go forward.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, we are considering today a bill long overdue as far as the veterans are concerned who live on farms or prefer farming as a livelihood.

For some unexplained reason, farming veterans were discriminated against in the passage of the original housing legislation for World War II veterans under which loans are guaranteed by the Government, and this same discrimination was continued for Korean veterans. They were also left out in the cold when the Congress authorized direct loans for veterans residing in rural areas where banks and lending agencies do not operate. The direct loans were authorized for residences only in rural areas, but did not extend to the purchase of a farm, the repair and alteration of a farmhouse, or the construction of a house on farmland already owned by the veteran. The bill under consideration today which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and of which I have the honor to be a member, will rectify this unfair situation which has prevailed for many years toward farm veterans. If it is enacted into law, along with H. R. 5106, another bill will have to be reported to equalize guaranteed loans for farm veterans on a parity with city veterans, the entire housing situation for these boys will be finally evened up.

I commend my colleague from Oklahoma, the Honorable ED EDMONDSON, for his long hours of work and study in order to gain these benefits for rural veterans, and I commend the chairman of our committee, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, for his many efforts along the same line. We are at long last getting somewhere. I supported the bill under consideration today, H. R. 5715, when it was before our committee, as well as H. R. 5106 which I also hope to see enacted at an early date.

The measure we are now considering has a double purpose: First, that of extending the direct loan authority of the Veterans' Administration for a 1-year period by authorizing $150 million for that purpose in the coming fiscal year; and, second, extending the program of direct loans for the purchase of a farm on which there is a farm residence, or the altering, repair, or improvement of a farm residence or other dwelling located on a farm; or to construct a residence on farmland already owned by the veteran.

The great majority of the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana which I represent is classified as rural and therefore will qualify for these direct loans. My only misgiving as far as this bill is concerned is that it does not go far enough. I fear that the amount of money authorized is inadequate for the vast number of farm veterans who want to use their entitlement to fix up the home they already have, or to purchase a farm and residence. But we shall take another look after the program has been in operation for a year and if more money is needed, I will be one of the first to advocate increasing the authorization and the appropriation.

If I had been in Congress when those bills were first passed to discriminate against the rural or farm veteran, you would have heard my voice screaming in protest. We are late in our apology to these boys, but fortunately it is not too late for most of them to take advantage of farm purchase or construction and alteration of their farm residences.

To support this proposal is a privilege, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will do likewise.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5715 extends the direct loan program, which has been in operation for the past 6 years, for 1 additional year. It also makes available $150 million for this coming year.

The direct loan program was inaugurated in order to assist veterans living in small towns and in rural areas to obtain loans to purchase homes, since there was a scarcity of private financing in these areas. The Veterans' Administration experience with the direct loan program to date is very commendable. Out of a total of 61,014 loans made to date, only nine-tenths of 1 percent are in default and the loss on these defaulted loans will be more than recovered from the interest being paid to the Veterans' Administration under the direct loan program.

This bill places the farm veteran on a parity with the city veteran under the direct loan program. This is in keeping with H. R. 5106, already passed by the House, which places the farm veteran on a parity with the city veteran so far as a guaranteed or insured loan by the Veterans' Administration is concerned.

In addition to extending the direct loan program for 1 year, H. R. 5715 makes it possible for a veteran to buy a piece of farmland and build a dwelling that he intends to occupy as his home; it makes it possible for a veteran to buy a farm with an existing dwelling which he intends to occupy as his home; and it also makes it possible for the veteran to repair or improve the farm dwelling which he now owns. Under previous laws authorizing a direct loan program, in order for a veteran to qualify for a loan to buy a farm, he had to show that the major portion of his yearly income would be derived from the farming operation. This restriction prevented many veterans from buying a farm while working on a salary and putting their earnings into the farm until such time as the farm would be self-supporting. This bill changes this requirement. Now all the veteran has to do is to qualify for the loan, and express his intentions of living in the dwelling on the farm to be purchased.

Both of the bills, that is H. R. 5106 and this bill, H. R. 5715, should encourage the return to the farm of veterans who wish to make their livelihood from farming. There has been a mass exodus from the farms in recent years, and in this connection your attention is invited to the fact that the volume of farm loans closed has decreased quite steadily from a peak of 19,862 in 1947 to 1,432 loans in 1954.

The 83d Congress authorized the establishment of the voluntary home mortgage credit program, which assists veterans in obtaining conventional financing in areas where such financing is limited or scarce. This program is progressing rapidly; however, it will not eliminate the necessity for the direct loan program, because even this group cannot induce private financing to accept veterans' loans in many remote areas of the country.

The direct loan program is similar to the guaranteed loan program in that the veteran must qualify and receive a certificate of eligibility for a loan under either program. I would like to emphasize the fact that many of the veterans in this country have sold their entitlements, receiving all the way from a drink

to $400 for their entitlement, and allowing some other ineligible persons to receive the benefits under their loans. The sale of the entitlement is an illegal and fraudulent act, punishable by law. The veteran who sells his entitlement also loses all of the benefits which have been provided for him by the various acts of Congress. Along this same line, many veterans have obtained direct loans or guaranteed loans and have sold their equity in the property, permitting buyers to assume their GI loans. Later, these buyers have defaulted and thousands of veterans now find themselves liable for a deficiency at the foreclosure.

I wish it were possible for every veteran to be made to realize that once he obtains a GI loan he is liable for that loan until it is fully paid. If he chooses to sell his home, he should require the buyer to refinance the loan and pay off his GI loan so that he will not be liable for a default by the person to whom he sells his home.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of H. R. 5715, providing for continuation of the direct-loan program to veterans in areas where such financing is not readily available.

This program has worked out well since its inception and there is no reason to believe that it will not continue to be a wise and productive one. In looking at the figures submitted by the area office at Portland, Oreg., it is of particular interest to me to note that the number of defaults there have been exceedingly low. Almost 500 of these direct loans have been consummated there and of that total only 2 are in substantial default. This fine record alone is proof that this is one program where the Government is not going to be hurt in any way but instead is going to do a great deal of good.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I take this time just to urge the committee to give very careful consideration to the plight of veterans who live in the larger metropolitan areas. There are times when money for veterans' loans is not available. Most finance organizations try to keep a balanced portfolio of the various types of mortgage loans in their organizations. Therefore, there are times when money is not available in the banks, the building and loan associations, and the loan correspondents of some of the larger cities. I would earnestly urge the committee to take very careful cognizance of that fact, to see if something cannot be worked out so that direct loans can be made to veterans in the event it is impossible to secure a loan from a local source, regardless of the size of the community.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to thank the gentleman from Ohio for the excellent suggestion he has made and to make the comment that there are many cities in the United States where the unavailability of private financing has made this direct-loan program applicable. Any Member who has a community where there is a dearth of GI financing under the guaranteed loan program should bring that to the attention of the Veterans Administration, as I am sure many Members have done, in order to get application of the direct-loan program in those areas.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that the city of New York got about 8 percent of all veterans' money last year. Does the gentleman know whether or not that figure is correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That may be so under the guaranteed loan program, but not under the direct loan program because I do not believe the city of New York has ever been under the direct loan program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to the members of the staff of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the fine work they did in connection with the technical features of this legislation. They have done a fine job in improving some of the technical phases of it, and I take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the entire Committee to the staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Veterans' Affairs Committee for the expeditious handling of this legislation.

I particularly commend the committee for extending borrowing authority to those war veterans who desire to make farming their permanent occupation and must have financial assistance to do so.

I regret that financial assistance has not been available through private lending agencies in some areas of the district which I have the honor to represent, thus enabling war veterans to establish either urban or rural homes. I trust this measure will alleviate that situation, at least in part.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring out one point and that is that the veterans have paid back the loans. I think one-half of 1 percent of the loans are delinquent, which is a remarkable record and the record is even better on the direct loans than it is on the guaranteed loans.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and I also want to congratulate the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the author of this bill, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for the wonderful job they have done in bringing this legislation to the House. I think there is a great need for it in the area of Wisconsin which I represent in Congress since it is two-thirds rural with many small farms. The veterans can use loans like these to improve their homes on the farms.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 6941) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 512. (a) (1) Upon application by a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, the Administrator is authorized and directed to make, or enter into a commitment to make, the veteran a loan for any of the following purposes:

"(A) To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

"(B) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

"(C) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

"(D) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home;

if the Administrator finds that in the area in which the dwelling, farm, or farm residence is located or is to be constructed, private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, the purchase of farms with farm residences, or the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of farm residences or other dwellings, as the case may be, by veterans under this title. In case there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan made under this section for the construction of a dwelling or farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien.

"(2) No loan shall be made under this section to a veteran unless he shows to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

"(A) that he is a satisfactory credit risk;

"(B) that the payments to be required under the proposed loan bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses;

"(C) that he is unable to obtain from private lending sources in such area at an interest rate not in excess of the rate authorized for guaranteed home loans a loan for such purpose for which he is qualified under section 501 of this title; and

"(D) that he is unable to obtain a loan for such purpose from the Secretary of Agriculture under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or under the Housing Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of such section is hereby amended by striking out clauses (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) the original principal amount of any such loan shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to $10,000 as the amount of guaranty to which the veteran is entitled under section 501 at the time the loan is made bears to $7,500;

"(B) the guaranty entitlement of the veteran shall be charged with an amount which bears the same ratio to $7,500 as the amount of the loan bears to $10,000;". (b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to loans or commitments made under such section 512 prior to the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of such section is hereby amended by striking out "section 501 (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 501".

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (e) of such section is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Loans made under this section shall be repaid in monthly installments; except that in the case of loans made for any of the purposes described in clause (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a),

the Administrator may provide that such loans shall be repaid in quarterly, semiannual, or annual installments."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to direct loans held by the Administrator on the date of enactment of this act and direct loans made by the Administrator on or after such date.

SEC. 5. Such section is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) No veteran may obtain loans under this section aggregating more than $10,000."

SEC. 6. (a) Clause (C) of subsection (b) of such section is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 513 of such act is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section 513 is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

(d) The first sentence of subsection (d) of such section 513 is hereby amended by striking out all beginning with "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956, such additional sums (not in excess of $150 million in any 1 fiscal year) as the Administrator may request, except that the aggregate so advanced in any 1 quarter annual period shall not exceed the sum of $50 million less that amount which had been returned to the revolving fund during the preceding quarter annual period from the sale of loans pursuant to section 512 (d) of this title."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of June 30, 1955.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER] having assumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, 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. 5715) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 246, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 654) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes, a substantially similar bill to the bill, H. R. 5715, just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 512 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 6941) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 512. (a) (1) Upon application by a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, who has not previously availed himself of his guaranty entitlement, the Administrator is authorized and directed to make, or enter into a commitment to make, the veteran a loan for any of the following purposes:

"(A) To purchase or construct a dwelling to be owned and occupied by him as a home;

"(B) To purchase a farm on which there is a farm residence to be occupied by the veteran as his home;

"(C) To construct on land owned by the veteran a farm residence to be occupied by him as his home; or

"(D) To repair, alter, or improve a farm residence or other dwelling owned by the veteran and occupied by him as his home;

if the Administrator finds that in the area in which the dwelling, farm, or farm residence is located or is to be constructed, private capital is not available for the financing of the purchase or construction of dwellings, the purchase of farms with farm residences, or the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of farm residences, or other dwellings, as the case may be, by veterans under this title. In case there is an indebtedness which is secured by a lien against land owned by the veteran, the proceeds of a loan made under this section for the construction of a dwelling or farm residence on such land may be expended also to liquidate such lien, but only if the reasonable value of the land is equal to or in excess of the amount of the lien.

"(2) No loan shall be made under this section to a veteran unless he shows to the satisfaction of the Administrator—

"(A) that he is a satisfactory credit risk;

"(B) that the payments to be required under the proposed loan bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses;

"(C) that he is unable to obtain from private lending sources in such area, at an interest rate not in excess of the rate authorized for guaranteed home loans, a loan for such purpose for which he is qualified under section 501 of this title; and

"(D) that he is unable to obtain a loan for such purpose from the Secretary of Agriculture under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or under the Housing Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. Section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection (f) as follows:

"(f) Loans made under this section shall be repaid in monthly installments; except that in the case of loans made for any of the purposes described in clauses (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the Administrator may provide that such loans shall be repaid in quarterly, semiannual, or annual installments.

"The amendment made by this subsection shall apply only with respect to direct loans held by the Administrator on the date of enactment of this subsection and direct loans made by the Administrator on or after the date of enactment of this subsection."

SEC. 3. (a) Clause (C) of subsection (b) of section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 513 of such atc is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section 513 is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958."

(d) The first sentence of subsection (d) of such section 513 is hereby amended by striking out all beginning with "June 30, 1955," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957, such additional sums as the Administrator may request: *Provided*, That the aggregate so advanced in any one quarter annual period shall not exceed the sum of $50 million less that amount which had been returned to the revolving fund during the preceding quarter annual period from the sale of loans pursuant to section 512 (d) of this title."

(e) The amendments made by this act shall take effect as of June 30, 1955.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMONDSON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 5715 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 5715 was passed be vacated and that that bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the so-called description of the bill just passed be inserted as a part of the RECORD during the consideration of the direct-loan bill, and also the report of that bill be inserted in the RECORD at that point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A FEDERAL LOTTERY TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of the public, to twist a phrase, is essential to our national well-being and survival today. It is, I think, no exaggeration to say that most of what is important in the future of our country will depend upon the welfare of the people. And to promote these broad goals, the Federal Government has followed an ever-expanding philosophy of responsibility.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, and as every Member in this House knows, each

session of Congress brings its own variety of requests for increased expenditures. Lately, even our brightest young economists and our wisest elder statesmen are having trouble finding new tax revenue sources.

Defense costs still consume the major portion of our expenditures, or about 83 percent of the 1956 budget. At the same time, there is a growing demand for more old-age pensions, more unemployment benefits, more hospital funds, more aid to the needy, and more services to the blind. The $64 question making the rounds of Congress these days is: "Where's the money to come from?"

I believe I have found a satisfactory answer to this question—namely, a national lottery, sponsored and administered by the Federal Government.

I am, therefore, introducing again, in this session of Congress, a Federal lottery bill similar to one I introduced in the 83d Congress.

Many of us assume that because lotteries are forbidden by State statutes and because the transmission of lottery tickets through the mails is prohibited by the Congress, that this has always been the case. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In the first days of the Republic lotteries were among the most common and favorite methods of raising public funds—especially for schools, bridges, and roads. All of us, presumably, know that the first regular Congress of the United States held its sessions in the city of New York. But how many of us know that lottery money provided the roof under which that Congress met? Even earlier than this, lottery money fed and clothed the Continental Army, which won our independence. George Washington purchased the first ticket for the relief of his suffering soldiers.

Between 1782 and 1820, 148 different lotteries were authorized in Pennsylvania and Virginia. Indeed, one of the leading citizens of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson, has written one of the most eloquent defenses of lotteries. In an undated paper, written near the close of his life he had this to say:

> If we consider games of chance immoral, then every pursuit of human industry is immoral, for there is not a single one that is not subject to a chance, not one wherein you do not risk a loss for the chance of some gain * * * There are some other games of chance, useful on certain occasions, and injurious only when carried beyond their useful bounds. Such are insurances, lotteries, raffles, etc.

By the end of the past century, however, public sentiment had reversed itself. The last lotteries in actual operation were those in Mississippi under an act of 1867, and Louisiana under an act of 1868. Just 24 years later, in 1892, Louisiana banned lotteries altogether, making a solid network of State statutes prohibiting lotteries. At the same time Congress prohibited the transmission of lottery tickets through the mail. This is the situation today. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our practices and laws with regard to lotteries and gambling are due a thoroughgoing reappraisal.

Not only is our own history replete with examples of Government-sponsored lotteries, but most other civilized countries of the world have relied even more heavily on such measures for revenue. Central and South America, Spain, Italy, France, Ireland, Australia, Turkey, and Sweden are but a few of the countries which today defray much of the cost of running the government through national lotteries. Each may differ in price, conduct, and awards, but essentially they all consist of the selection by chance of numbers or tickets which entitle certain ticketholders to cash or bond prizes.

The bill I am proposing today would provide for a commission of five men to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. They would be men of high integrity who would prescribe rules and regulations and decide on the frequency of drawing. The tickets would be engraved and printed by the United States Treasury and sold by the post offices all over the Nation. The proceeds of the ticket sales would be deposited in the Treasury and held in a lottery fund.

No ticket would be sold in any State, or in a political subdivision of any State, where such sale is illegal. Nor would any ticket be sold to anyone under the age of 21.

Balances remaining in the lottery fund after payment of prizes and expenses and repayment of the initial appropriation may be paid, at the direction of the Commission, to Federal hospitals, the blind, recipients of old-age assistance, and disabled veterans.

These services now cost the taxpayer, including the honorable Members of this House, an estimated $4.5 billion a year. I am not saying the creation of a national lottery would eliminate these expenditures. I do say, however, that a Government-sponsored lottery would relieve the budget and the taxpayer of much of these expenditures.

Ultimately, of course, it is the taxpayer who pays, but his purchase of a lottery ticket is considerably different from compulsory payment of taxes. In the one instance, his action is purely voluntary and he receives certain intangible benefits from the payment of the so-called voluntary tax itself as well as the indirect benefits from the expenditure of those funds for the public good.

The economics of national lotteries is, however, only one of the justifications for my bill. Another principle, which I am sometimes inclined to regard even more highly, is the sociological principle which some people call the gaming instinct. However, one views the widespread human tendency to gamble—legally or illegally—the astonishing fact is that it has contributed to what is now a $30-billion-a-year industry. More, by far, than we spend on education, religion, medicine, or automobiles. Since most of these dollars are wagered illegally, they end up largely in the hands of professional gamblers and racketeers, who not only make the payoff as small as possible, but see to it that very little is returned to the Federal Treasury in income taxes.

In the preparation of my original bill in the 83d Congress, I spent some time studying the pros and cons of Government lotteries. I learned some astonishing things. For instance, 57 percent of the adults in this country gamble regularly on horse races, card games, athletic events, local lotteries, church and club raffles, office pools, slot machines, and just plain betting. Whether it is legal or not, our people continue to gamble, just as they continued to drink during prohibition.

The intriguing thing, of course, is to look for what is good in gambling and what it is that is bad. I will not take time now to develop this distinction fully. I call your attention, however, to Thomas Jefferson's words and suggest that they have particular relevance to us today.

For, after all, our Nation and our entire economic system rests on the foundation built by men who were willing to take a chance—buccaneers of industry who risked their fortunes in the market place and pioneers who risked their lives in the wilderness. To attempt to outlaw this gaming instinct is to deny human nature.

One of the most shocking things I discovered in the preparation of my bill is that Americans spend between four and six billions every year on foreign lotteries. In fact, as I have pointed out on another occasion, almost every government in the world can conduct a lottery on our soil except our own, and can use the earnings of American citizens to lighten taxes abroad.

Even more shocking, however, is the fact that racketeers often tamper with these foreign lotteries. Most people would be astonished, as I was, to learn that fully half of the Irish sweepstakes tickets sold in this country are complete fakes.

On this evidence alone, Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree that we need our own legitimate, Government-backed sweepstakes. Then there would be less incentive for people to buy foreign lottery tickets; the proceeds from the sale of lottery tickets would be spent for the welfare of our own people; and Government administration of the program would eliminate much of the racketeering and underground activities.

If you will indulge me 1 second more, Mr. Speaker, there is yet another reason for my bill. I hesitate to mention it because, while I think it is important, I realize it is immeasurable. That is the pleasure derived from dreams and hopes of winning and the vicarious enjoyment received when others win. I mentioned earlier the importance of entrepreneurs and innovators in our history—men who were willing to take a chance. In our modern industrial life, however, the opportunities of taking a chance are limited. Routine characterizes most of our lives. In this sense buying a lottery ticket provides an avenue of escape from routine and boredom.

There are some people who might raise the moral question—those who view gambling as immoral. It goes without saying that if gambling is immoral then it should be outlawed. However, that is the very issue that should first be proved.

A new magazine, the Catholic Lawyer, recently carried an article on bingo. The authors, Father W. Dominic Hughes and Prof. Frederick J. Ludwig, both well qualified to discuss the moral aspects of the question, wrote that the playing of games is not itself immoral.

The Very Reverend Francis J. Connell, dean of the School of Sacred Theology at the Catholic University of America, has stated "that gambling is not sinful."

It is an indisputable fact that nowhere in the Scriptures does the law of God forbid gambling as such. We are taught that gambling becomes sinful only when operated dishonestly, fraudulently, or when abuses become part and parcel of the gambling. Under my bill, a Federal lottery will be Government operated, controlled and supervised with a maximum of safeguards against possible abuses.

To sum up, I am relatively sure that, if enacted, my bill would cut down taxes, increase revenue for health and welfare services, decrease racketeering, channel people's gambling instincts and provide a healthy outlet for daydreams.

No one can say in advance, of course, just how much tax money such a lottery would raise. A conservative estimate, however, based on sums raised in other countries is $10 billion a year. This sum, if averaged out among the 41 million tax-paying persons would amount to a reduction of about $250 a year per person in taxes. This is more than the average family spends for all personal health services.

I have suggested, very briefly, some of the reasons which I think justify the creation of a national Government sponsored lottery. I have not taken time to develop any of these ideas fully. Yet, I think it is clear that there are many reputable people who feel that in attempting to outlaw lotteries, we are not only trying to stop a flood by putting a finger in the dike, but we are also overlooking an excellent and much-needed source of tax revenue.

ATOMS FOR PEACE EXHIBIT

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that arrangements have been made to extend the "atoms for peace" exhibit on the ground floor of the Library of Congress. The exhibit will now be open daily from 9 a. m. to 10 p. m., through Friday, June 10.

I hope the Members of the House will take the time to visit this very interesting exhibit which the President opened on Friday, May 27. This is the first time that an exhibit emphasizing the many peaceful uses of atomic energy has been shown in Washington. Following this showing in Washington it will be exhibited at the U. N. meeting in San Francisco later this month.

The exhibit includes models of nuclear-powered reactors which will be built in the next 3 years to generate power for domestic and industrial uses.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), on official business.

HON. JOHN MURPHY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and my pleasure to be in the city of Scranton United States district court just 2 days ago. I think you would like to know that there our former colleague from Pennsylvania, United States District Judge John Murphy became the president judge of the United States district court for the great middle district of Pennsylvania.

It is a classic American story: "Johnny Murphy," as we knew him then and as you all remember him well, you will recall he served upon the Pearl Harbor Commission and he served upon many important committees in this House and then went to the Federal bench. He worked in the mines as a boy, and on the railroads. It is the great American story of which you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, are so proud. I am sure you join me in wishing many many years of continued success upon the Federal bench for Judge John Murphy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a statement he made today before the House Committee on Education and Labor on the minimum-wage legislation.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

Mr. YATES.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, June 6, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

860. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report on the administration and enforcement of the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act, as amended, pursuant to section 9 (c) of the act for the period from June 1, 1954, through May 31, 1955, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

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. KILGORE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4585. A bill to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2061. An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; with amendment (Rept. No. 728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca; with amendment (Rept. No. 707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1538. A bill for the relief of Jean Isabel Hay Watts; with amendment (Rept. No. 708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1552. A bill for the relief of Dalisay Lourdes Cruz; with amendment (Rept. No. 709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1661. A bill for the relief of Kim Dong Su; with amendment (Rept. No. 710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Barbara Knape; with amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2911. A bill for the relief of Max Steinsapir; with amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Lazara Camargo Bernoudy; without amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1549. A bill for the relief of Salvacion Carbon; with amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1551. A bill for the relief of Gualberto Estralla Alabastro, Pura Zarco Alabastro, and Arlene Alabastro; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Elena Gigliotti; without amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Margarete Gartner; without amendment (Rept. No. 718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2274. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Florentino Munoz; without amendment (Rept. No. 719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin; without amendment (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Ofelia Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rodriguez Perez, also known as Carmelo Rodriguez Fenald; with amendment (Rept. No. 722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3048. A bill for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo; with amendment (Rept. No. 723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3270. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Arsena; without amendment (Rept. No. 724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Eveline Wenk Neal; without amendment (Rept. No. 725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Luise Isabella Chu, also known as Luise Schneider; without amendment (Rept. No. 726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3635. A bill for the relief of Birgit Camara, also known as Birgit Heinemann; without amendment (Rept. No. 727). 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. BROYHILL:

H. R. 6619. A bill to provide for the creation of a civil defense agency having jurisdiction of civil defense for the Metropolitan Washington area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 6620. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho and Wyoming, the Narrows Federal reclamation project and a reregulating reservoir below the Palisades Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6621. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the Vice President-elect and to authorize Secret Service protection for the Vice President-elect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6622. A bill for the relief of certain rural carriers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6623. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1952, so as to obtain the consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to mutual military aid in an emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 6624. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 6625. A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 6626. A bill to provide for a Federal lottery to raise funds for Federal hospitals, the blind, recipients of old-age assistance, and disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 6627. A bill to provide for the apportionment of education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6628. A bill for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6629. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 6630. A bill to amend chapters 4, 5, 6, and 8 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 6631. A bill to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6632. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 6633. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, so as to provide additional preference in retention, reemployment, reinstatement, or transfer for veterans having a disability of 10 percent or more; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. R. 6634. A bill to provide for the conveyance of 1.8 acres of land more or less within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage-disposal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. J. Res. 332. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution designating the second full week of October in each year as National Week for Nursing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 334. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm Act 199 of the session laws of Hawaii 1955, authorizing the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of $6 million for the completion of the construction of the Kalini tunnel and its approach roads and for the construction of a second bore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 6635. A bill for the relief of Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 6636. A bill for the relief of Rosa Willand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6637. A bill for the relief of Azmi Shawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6638. A bill for the relief of Tami Ann Olson (Tami Ann Kato); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 6639. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Darwin L. Selley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 6640. A bill for the relief of Ellen Yuin-Shang Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

302. By Mr. CRETELLA: Petition of the Town Council of East Hartford, Conn., recommend and urge that the minimum wage be increased to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

303. Also, petition of the Court of Common Council of the city of Hartford, Conn., requesting the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary to secure congressional approval, appropriations, and early completion of 12 flood-control reservoirs; to the Committee on Public Works.

304. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of Rev. Michael M. Rachko and some 60 members of Saint Annunciation Macedonian-Bulgarian Orthodox Church, of Steelton, Pa., urging favorable action on pending legislation which would allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious belief on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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 for the first calendar quarter of 1955.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1955:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is produced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

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" as 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 of 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"—Section 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 "C 4" and fill out Items "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 "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
    Please answer "yes" or "no": _____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term '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. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life insurance business.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 Natinal Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting strategic minerals.
E. (7) $30; (8) $2.25; (9) $32.25.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft manufacturing interests.
D. (6) $4,703.47.
E. (2) $3,750; (4) $35.43; (7) $918.04; (9) $4,703.47.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 5913 Georgia Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which will or may affect members of the union.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $125.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $479.62.
E. (7) $14.85; (9) $14.85.

A. Joseph Amann, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $750; (4) $249.53; (6) $7.47; (9) $1,007.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages,[3] 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $4,999.98; (7) $1,808.46; (9) $6,808.44.

A. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation involving the practice of medicine and all national health-insurance legislation.
D. (6) $71,381.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $5,264.71.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

E. (2) $3, 613.56; (4) $181.49; (5) $215.81; 6) $110.53; (7) $1,143.32; (9) $5,264.71; (15).[1]

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill, and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Legislation affecting agriculture. (3) Nation's Agriculture and News Letter.
D. (6) $63,224.
E. (2) $18,545; (4) $4,217; (5) $3,153; (6) $484; (7) $343; (9) $26,742; (15).[1]

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $6,538.76; (2) $21,174.41; (4) $3,795.36; (5) $648.90; (9) $32,157.43; (15).[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to benefit handicapped.
D. (6) $1,483.
E. (4) $80.15; (6) $45; (9) $125.15.

A. American Hotel Association,[3], 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $142,503.40.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) and (3).[1]
D. (6) $61,096.56.
E. (2) $12,574.73; (4) $4,049.77; (5) $1,960.84; (6) $259.39; (7) $2,476.05; (9) $21,320.78.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.
D. (6) $1,318.75.
E. (2) $1,318.75; (9) $1,318.75.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $10,250.
E. (2) $929.41; (4) $403.10; (5) $1,933.35; (6) $98.66; (7) $852.41; (8) $450.83; (9) $10,205.89; (15).[1]

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to maintenance of the American Merchant Marine.
E. (2) $7,864.25; (9) $7,864.25.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Reciprocal trade, standby controls, brucellosis program, and other matters pertaining to cattle industry. (3) American Cattle Producers.
D. (6) $34,470.93.
E. (2) $7,097.50; (6) $27.22; (7) $276.83; (8) $26.50; (9) $7,428.05.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bills with provisions for health programs.
D. (6) $454,987.95.
E. (2) $1,313.04; (5) $276.24; (6) $89.06; (7) $265.10; (8) $166.34; (9) $2,109.78.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund (Legislative), c/o Dr. Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
C. (2) Legislation effecting optometry.
D. (6) $902.
E. (2) $2,475; (6) $3.68; (7) $10.50; (8) $1.20; (9) $3,492.10.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $513.12.
E. (2) $375; (4) $59.37; (5) $69; (6) $9.75; (9) $513.12.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Affecting legislation.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,472.25.
E. (2) $326.30; (4) $435.33; (5) $194.73; (6) $58.93; (8) $501.15; (9) $1,516.44.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $33,543.
E. (2) $6,280; (5) $3,800; (6) $249; (8) $1,209; (9) $11,538; (15) [1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Affecting legislation.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $66,772.43.
E. (2) $8,375; (4) $51.48; (5) $773.33; (6) $511.77; (7) $276.38; (9) $9,987.96.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,760.53.
E. (2) $737.50; (4) $263.16; (5) $204.15; (6) $103.10; (7) $452.62; (9) $1,760.53; (15).[1]

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) In favor of extension and amendment of Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.
D. (6) $25.
E. (4) $28.68; (6) $17.99; (9) $46.67.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $232.39.
E. (4) $50; (9) $50.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.
D. (6) $8,000.
E. (1) $10,125; (2) $2,062.50; (4) $69.76; (5) $168.26; (6) $592.42; (7) $503.21; (8) $797.57; (9) $14,318.72; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights and liberties, and veterans benefits.
D. (6) $9,047.
E. (2) $1,311.96; (4) $30; (5) $245; (6) $30; (7) $62.49; (9) $1,679.45.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect veterinary medicine and the veterinary profession.
E. (2) $750; (5) $195.37; (6) $63.13; (9) $1,008.50.

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. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favors economic and technical assistance to Israel and other States in the Near East.
D. (6) $4,687.27.
E. (1) $562.42; (2) $1,449.58; (4) $702.17; (5) $395.05; (6) $201.77; (7) $827.02; (8) $252; (9) $4,390.01.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 400 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1.
D. (6) $2,860.
E. (2) $2,910; (8) $590.20; (9) $3,500.20; (11) $3,500.20.

A. John R. Arent, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $46.20; (9) $46.20.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax, highway, foreign trade, and school legislation.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (9) $666.67.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Arkansas railroads.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $649.15; (9) $649.15.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.
C. (2) Seek compensation for land taken.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicolas Reisini, 11 West 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1195.
E. (9) $1.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $600; (7) $215.43; (9) $815.43.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.
D. (6) $22,649.08.
E. (2) $4,325; (4) $1,269.75; (5) $226; (6) $130.07; (7) $996.49; (8) $34.72; (9) $6,982.03.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $13,175.58.
E. (2) $11,016.85; (5) $1,231.72; (6) $158.47; (7) $662.99; (8) $105.55; (9) $13,175.58.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $1,865.31.
E. (2) $1,345.11; (4) $97.01; (5) $138.70; (6) $33.77; (7) $83.14; (8) $167.58; (9) $1,865.31.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.
D. (6) $250.
E. (9) $250.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Co's., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 126, Vienna, Va.
B. Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Control of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism.
D. (6) $147.
E. (5) $13.50; (6) $1.27; (7) $23.77; (9) $38.54.

A. George P. Baker, 808 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (7) $324.30; (9) $324.30.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,922.43.
E. (6) $125.90; (7) $121.14; (8) $489.70; (9) $736.74.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B.[1]
C.[1]
E. (6) $1.65; (9) $1.65.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) To protect the interests of reciprocal inter-insurers. In opposition to H. R. 43.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Arthur H. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $761.25.
E. (6) $1.78; (7) $112.34; (8) $15.90; (9) $130.02.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 412 Railway Labor Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
E. (6) $2,625.

A. R. H. Barry, 121 15th Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
B. American Seed Trade Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect members of the American Seed Trade Association.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (6) $350; (7) $2,185.50; (9) $2,535.50.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America (CIO), 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act). (3) Correspondence and educational pamphlets.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act). (3) Correspondence and educational pamphlets.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.
E. (2) $1,511.20; (4) $127.68; (7) $27.50; (8) $108.34; (9) $1,774.72.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Louella Miller Berg, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $750.

A. Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. G. B. Macke Corp., 212 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Automatic Canteen Co. of America, Merchandising Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; National Automatic Merchandising Association, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Seeking amendments to District of Columbia Sales and Use Tax Acts.
E. (4) $34.55; (7) $17.35; (9) $51.90.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America (CIO), 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $2,499.68.
E. (2) $1,924.92; (6) $0.80; (7) $538.16; (8) $35.80; (9) $2,499.68.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,795.
E. (6) $31.20; (7) $287.30; (8) $63.50; (9) $382.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation.
E. (5) $58; (6) $5; (7) $30; (9) $93.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Only insofar as legislation affects my employer.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 3026 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills introduced in the House or the Senate having to do with Cuban sugar quotas.
D. (6) $2,550.
E. (4) $3; (9) $3.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America (CIO), 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership.
D. (6) $2,339.73.
E. (2) $1,999.98; (7) $339.75; (9) $2,339.73.

A. Warren B. Bledsoe, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation under consideration in the Congress which will affect postal employees. (3) The National Rural Letter Carrier.
D. (6) $480.63.
E. (7) $15. (9) $15.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General interest in legislation for payroll deductions for Federal employees, war damage, economic controls, taxation of fringe benefits, health programs for Federal employees, and hospital and health matters.
E. (2) $1,500; (8) $340.59.

A. The Borax Cartel Story, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.
D. (6) $100.
E. (2) $100; (9) $100.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Labor relations, wage and hour matters, controls over wages and salaries and social security.
D. (6) $375.
E. (5) $130; (6) $5; (7) $175.75; (9) $310.75.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Assn., 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) In favor of H. R. 1831. (3) Regular weekly trade information letter.
D. (6) $36.65.
E. (7) $1.85; (9) $1.85.

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.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security.

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.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc.
E. (6) $36.34; (7) $429.42; (8) $465.76.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.
D. (6) $450.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to transportation problems of the aircraft manufacturing industry.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. David F. Brinegar, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $203.07; (9) $203.07.

A. Clark L. Brody, 221 North Cedar Street, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau.
D. (6) $484.62.
E. (7) $36.29; (9) $36.29.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Board of Trade, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Guarantees against the risk of nonpayment of foreign debtors due to currency inconvertibility, exchange transfer block, and other noncommercial hazards.
D. (6) $933.80.
E. (5) $163.50; (6) $45.98; (7) $80.61; (8) $15.40; (9) $305.49.

A. William F. Brooks, 604 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor. (3) Locomotive Engineers Journal.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the banking industry.
D. (6) $437.50.
E. (6) $11.85; (7) $96.33; (9) $108.18.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $5,949.99.
E. (2) $5,477.49; (5) $262.50; (8) $36.23; (9) $5,776.22.

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D. (6) $267.35.
E. (7) $154.81; (9) $154.81.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation, local, State, Federal or international, which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John M. Brumm, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding National Health Insurance. (3).[1]
D. (6) $2,374.98.
E. (8) $90.23; (9) $90.23.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (6) $11.83; (8) $20.79; (9) $32.62.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all matters pertaining to the business or policyholders of accident and health insurance.
E. (2) $52.68; (5) $8.72; (8) $3; (9) $64.40.

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 of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Interested in Rubber Tire bill, basing point legislation, antitrust law legislation, quantity discount rule, spare tire monopoly and all legislation affecting independent small business.
D. (6) $3,219.06.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $38.73; (8) $5.70; (9) $44.43.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,495.
E. (7) $962; (9) $962.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,415.60.
E. (2) $3,742.95; (5) $363.21; (6) $144.10; (7) $398.07; (8) $1,010.17; (9) $5,658.50.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 151, S. 171, S. 961, S. 1032, S. 1052, H. R. 158, H. R. 462, H. R. 660, H. R. 2182, H. R. 2552, H. R. 2589, H. R. 4110, H. R. 4629.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $150; (9) $150.

A. Robert M. Burr, 270 Park Avenue (Room 1203-L), New York, N. Y.
B. National Bureau for Economic Realism, Inc., 270 Park Avenue (Room 1203-L), New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation that may be of interest to the bureau.
D. (6) $317.90.
E. (1) $1,844.33; (4) $4,640.92; (5) $107.92; (6) $10; (7) $155.10; (9) $6,758.27.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as annual and sick leave, pay legislation, repeal of Whitten rider, Federal retirement, unemployment insurance, severance pay, and other liberal benefits for the workers.
D. (6) $2,875.03.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $760.20.
E. (6) $3; (7) $20; (8) $10; (9) $33.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
D. (6) $2,692.27.
E. (9) $269.22.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $20; (7) $50; (9) $70.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Matters pertaining to Central Valley project (California) which affect the interest of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.
D. (6) $715.77.
E. (7) $117.86; (8) $283.29; (9) $401.15.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $9.76; (7) $342.35; (8) $84; (9) $436.11.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting client's interests.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $720; (6) $23.90; (7) $246.70; (8) $35.70; (9) $1,024.90.

A. Clarence B. Carter, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of 30-year, half-pay railroad retirement legislation; (3) Pension News Bulletin.
E. (7) $38.30; (9) $38.30.

A. Ralph H. Case, 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak., and Lower Brule Reservation, S. Dak., and Crow Creek Reservation, S. Dak.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clarence N. Sayen, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Aviation legislation and Railway Labor Act.
D. (6) $2,503.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which affects the magazine publishing industry.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $111.84; (9) $111.84.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.
D. (6) $15,283.
E. (1) $141; (2) $5,101.50; (4) $135.88; (5) $1,163.16; (6) $110.82; (7) $921.78; (8) $248.21; (9) $7,822.35.

A. Central Labor Union, Metal Trades Council, AFL, of the Panama Canal Zone, P. O. Box No. 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
C. (2) Legislation before Congress that affects the welfare of citizens employed by United States Government agencies on the Isthmus of Panama and the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $4,677.
E. (2) $1,800; (7) $2,750; (9) $4,550.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Congressional activity in the development of the strategic stockpiling program of the United States.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Promoting a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $5,628.53.
E. (2) $1,755; (4) $2,226.33; (5) $134.04; (6) $23.18; (7) $290.80; (8) $51.21; (9) $4,480.56.

A. CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To support legislation in the interest of seamen.
D. (6) $6,756.
E. (2) $3,677.46; (4) $29; (5) $709.27; (6) $238.54; (7) $739.01; (8) $3,800; (9) $9,193.28.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $486.54.
E. (7) $26.85; (9) $26.85.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
D. (6) $2,769.24.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.
D. (6) $5,025.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $37.25; (9) $37.25.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $2,535.21.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $150.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation jeopardizing California water rights on the Colorado River.
E. (2) $3,000; (4) $470.59; (5) $436.60; (6) $438.93; (7) $2,464.30; (9) $6,810.42.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of commercial banks.
D. (6) $19,100.
E. (2) $8,800; (7) $121.96; (8) $853.69; (9) $9,775.65; (15)[1].

A. Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposed to any amendment to the Constitution which would change the traditional treatymaking power of the President.
D. (6) $65.
E. (2) $7.50; (6) $19.78; (9) $27.28.

A. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Japanese evacuation claims bills and appropriations thereto.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting stock fire insurance companies.
D. (6) $479.
E. (2) $6,000; (4) $250; (7) $300; (9) $6,550.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance.
D. (6) $5,542.81.
E. (2) $5,822.38; (4) $1,456.60; (5) $1,444.63; (6) $182.96; (7) $258.72; (8) $40.16; (9) $9,205.45.

A. Committee for Pipeline Companies, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4560.
E. (2) $6,558.58; (5) $1,481.45; (6) $114.28; (7) $819.53; (8) $2,156.17; (9) $11,130.01.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 44 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $95,243.58.
E. (2) $8,963.15; (4) $1,867.93; (5) $114.77; (6) $169.14; (7) $115.77; (9) $11,230.76; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News.
D. (6) $1,199,256.54.
E. (2) $3,924.90; (6) $0.80; (7) $877.91; (8) $35.80; (9) $4,839.41.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Amendment of section 303 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act.
D. (6) $17,163.27.
E. (4) $50.38; (6) $25.90; (7) $926.43; (9) $1,002.71.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Richard J. Congleton, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (7) $710.78; (9) $710.78.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives. (3) Report on Congress.
D. (6) $37,174.23.
E. (1) $837.16; (2) $17,522.36; (4) $5,302.30; (5) $1,764.14; (6) $959.79; (7) $9,413.28; (8) $1,375.20; (9) $37,174.23; (15).[1]

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $49.69; (7) $28.20; (9) $77.89.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the coal industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 512 South Market Street, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Excise tax on utility trailers.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.
C. Legislation affecting the tobacco industry.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2)[1] Washington newsletter.
D. (6) $159.72.
E. (6) $8.53; (7) $146.05; (8) $253; (9) $407.58.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Against legislation authorizing lower tariffs.
D. (6) $150.
E. (4) $46.25; (6) $41.37; (9) $87.62.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, 122 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which may help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland.
D. (6) $750.
E. (6) $2.09; (7) $32.85; (9) $34.94.

A. Cotton, Brenner & Wrigley, 225 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Martin Aloysius Madden, 27 West 96th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden.
E. (4) $5.15; (6) $13.64; (7) $312.27; (8) $1.12; (9) $332.18.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to technical engineers, especially those engineers employed by the United States Government.
D. (6) $195.
E. (7) $20; (9) $20.

A. A. M. Crawford, 718 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $51,012.
E. (2) $533.33; (8) $4.70; (9) $538.03.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life insurance business.
D. (6) $193.75.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting communications.
D. (6) $3,437.50.

A. Leo J. Crowley,[3] Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee.

A. John C. Cuneo, P. O. Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) The Townsend bills in Congress, H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472.
D. (6) $2,464.77.
E. (5) $712.82; (6) $125.38; (7) $105.80; (8) $104.26; (9) $1,048.26.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss,[3] 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,150.
E. (7) $41.26; (9) $41.26.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 519 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $4,050.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Price support, foreign trade, labor management, wage and hour legislation, rural electrification, farm product standards, Government organization, farm labor, social security, health programs and facilities.
D. (6) $256.02.

A. Joan David, 601 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Parcel post size and weight limitations.
D. (6) $975.
E. (7) $108.21; (9) $108.21.

A. Joan David, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal matters.
D. (6) $975.
E. (7) $98.76; (9) $98.76.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (3).[1]
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.
D. (6) $250.
E. (6) $32.72; (7) $50.13; (9) $82.85.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to taxation of gains and losses upon sale of real property by dealers.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $10.02; (7) $50.12; (9) $60.14.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Copley Press, Inc., 428 Downer Place, Aurora, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of 1954 Revenue Code relating to corporate distributions and adjustments, including corporate liquidations.
D. (6) $350.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.
D. (6) $500.
E. (6) $10.27; (7) $66.84; (9) $77.11.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. John Stuart, 345 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code relating to corporate distributions and adjustments, including corporate liquidations.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba. (3).[1]

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
C. (2) My legislative interest as employee of the above-named employer will be exclusively those of my employer as stated in its preliminary report.

A. Tony Dechant.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $262.75; (9) $262.75.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4587 and legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 312 Court House, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation in aid of the Sacramento River Deep Water Channel project.
D. (6) $2,514.79.
E. (7) $31.04; (8) $83.75; (9) $114.79.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2).[1]
E. (2) $4,846.20; (7) $219.44; (9) $5,065.64.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,750; (9) $2,750.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Act.
D. (6) $1,328.90.
E. (7) $71.80; (9) $71.80.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Thomas J. Green and Edward Simone, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In favor of proposed repeal of tax on preferred stock of banks which have made loans or issued preferred stock to Reconstruction Finance Coporation.
E. (6) $1.30; (7) $1; (9) $2.30.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Building Granite Quarries Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Specific legislation is for percentage depletion relating to granite and other minerals.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Legislation involving percentage depletion on thenardite.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $396.01.
E. (2) $300; (7) $96.01; (9) $396.01.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $14,841.93.
E. (2) $6,412.16; (4) $369; (5) $1,724.32; (6) $346.58; (7) $2.264.28; (8) $2,819.86; (9) $13,936.20.

A. Doerner, Rinehart, Stuart & Clammer,[2] 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.
C. (2) Seeking compensation for land taken.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $1,500.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review and miscellaneous bulletins.
E. (7) $319.55; (9) $319.55.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 236 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise tax on alcoholic beverages.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1.271.94.
E. (7) $44.25; (9) $44.25.

A. John E. Dougherty, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) National water policy.
D. (6) $1,095.
E. (7) $409.37; (9) $409.37.

A. Adin M. Downer, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security; immigration and naturalization; the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration. (3) VFW magazine (Foreign Service) and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $95.02; (9) $95.02.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, State Office Building, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) P R Notes.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225.

A. Robert A. Drum, Omaha, Nebr.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise tax on beer.
D. (6) $13,000.
E. (2) $450; (4) $400; (5) $525; (7) $3,275; (8) $650; (9) $5,200.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Banking legislation.
D. (6) $2,869.50.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting savings and mortgage business.
D. (6) $437.50.
E. (6) $35; (7) $170; (9) $205.

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $435.
E. (7) $10.48; (9) $10.48.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America (CIO), 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $37.75; (9) $37.75.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $3,276.
E. (7) $566.77; (9) $566.77.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meatpackers.
D. (6) $4.52.
E. (2) $25.35; (4) $0.58; (5) $0.20; (6) $0.40; (7) $4.80; (9) $31.33.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any American.
D. (6) $140.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills relating to the education and training of veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.

D. (6) $1,200.
E. (6) $33.24; (8) $51; (9) $84.24.

A. Oscar Elder, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Seek enactment of H. R. 4471.
D. (6) $910.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.
D. (6) $5,024.91.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers and marketers.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Newell W. Ellison, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Housing and labor legislation and other measures affecting retail lumber industry.
D. (6) $3,050.
E. (7) $223; (9) $223.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the water and power rights of the city and legislation affecting public power.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Public works appropriations bill, fiscal year 1956; S. 1515 and H. R. 4359, to authorize conveyance of certain property to city of Richmond, which are favored; and legislation generally of interest to water utilities.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (6) $10.01; (7) $10.25; (8) $14.35; (9) $35.11.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River system, and legislation generally affecting reclamation and power.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (6) $19.75; (8) $20.52; (9) $40.27.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six agency committees and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interests in the Colorado River System and miscellaneous legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policy.
D. (6) $11,296.25.
E. (6) $40.92; (7) $15.84; (8) $32.77; (9) $89.53.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Public-works appropriations bill and legislation affecting Central Valley project and Federal reclamation and power policies generally.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) General appropriations for flood-control works and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.

A. Robert B. Ely 3d, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Petitioner is interested in having the present Congress pass an act providing for a full judicial review of certain claims arising from French spoliations occurring prior to 1800.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation under consideration in the Congress which will affect postal employees.
D. (6) $476.88.
E. (7) $12; (9) $12.

A. Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support measures beneficial to conservation and oppose measures detrimental to conservation; opposed to construction of Echo Park Dam.
D. (6) $22.25.
E. (2) $22.50; (3) $100; (5) $158.70; (6) $21.92; (9) $303.12.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business. (3) Pulling Together.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (7) $301.35; (9) $301.35.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. Charles J. Fain, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification magazine.
D. (6) $2,630.72.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All Federal legislation, bills, resolutions, appropriations, and other proceedings affecting American agriculture and farmers.
D. (6) $66,732.68.
E. (2) $13,438.72; (3) $169; (4) $319.70; (5) $2,614.12; (6) $968.75; (7) $1,669.19; (8) $149.14; (9) $19,328.62.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 204-A, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1] (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

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.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. Jerry K. Fields, 5124 45th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Improvement of the Social Security Act.
D. (6) $700.
E. (5) $35.30; (7) $312.18; (9) $347.48.

A. Adrian S. Fisher, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association under the act of May 21, 1932.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $472.50.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bulova Watch Co., Bulova Park, Flushing, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,385.93.
E. (1) $166.49; (4) $1,518.51; (6) $17.82; (7) $113.58; (8) $169.58; (9) $1,985.98.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Oreole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $904.08; (6) $61.63; (7) $234.53; (8) $38.13; (9) $1,238.37.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King, & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of commercial banks.
D. (6) $10,500.
E. (6) $15; (7) $200; (9) $215.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $22.85; (9) $22.85.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $224.85; (5) $263.75; (6) $86.55; (7) $500; (9) $2,075.15.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (legislative fund), Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
C. (2) For legislation granting tax relief for sale of fruit on trees.
E. (2) $2,499.99; (5) $40; (6) $1.11; (8) $1.08; (9) $2,542.18.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation.
E. (2) $1,350; (8) $32.62; (9) $1,382.62; (15).[1]

A. Florida Railroad Association, 4040 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $6,500.
E. (2) $1,875; (7) $111.63; (9) $1,986.63.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John J. Flynn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation affecting the welfare and security of working men and women and their families.
D. (6) $1,425.
E. (7) $95; (9) $95.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472. (3) The Townsend National Weekly.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) 1956 Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (6) $2; (7) $86.62; (9) $88.62.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,672.92.
E. (7) $6.60; (9) $6.60.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semi-Monthly.
D. (6) $2,076.96.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Conecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting communications.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 951 and legislation related to extension of regulation to bulk carriers on inland waterways.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (4) $27.90; (6) $11.83; (7) $16.06; (9) $55.79.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) N. A. R. D. Journal.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $40; (9) $1,114.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Mills Corp., 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting rug and carpet-backing industry.
E. (6) $44.16; (8) $5.50; (9) $49.66.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $32,593.69.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $10,755; (3) $445.20; (4) $5,657.61; (5) $4,130.02; (6) $785.67; (7) $2,577.16; (8) $1,481.11; (9) $25,811.77; (15).[1]
A. George M. Fuller, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,479.15.
E. (7) $228.15; (9) $228.15.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation relating to investment banking or securities business.
D. (6) $625.

A. John F. Gale, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy. (3) National Fertilizer Review.
D. (6) $30.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Suite No. 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.[1]
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.[1]
D. (6) $500.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry.
E. (7) $67.20; (9) $67.20.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Foreign trade, aid, and investment; price support and related legislation.
D. (6) $1,354.17.
E. (7) $33.15; (9) $33.15.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops, and The Alert.
D. (6) $29.95.
E. (9) $4.95.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.
D. (6) $5,274.84.
E. (2) $1,500; (4) $27.75; (6) $12.07; (7) $32.11; (8) $15.25; (9) $1,587.18; (15).[1]

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union),

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,002.
E. (7) $115; (9) $115.

A. General Gas Committee, 1612 Continental Life Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) For amending Natural Gas Act.
D. (6) $49,320.
E. (2) $8,215.73; (4) $7,141.55; (5) $8,345.72; (6) $1,434.41; (7) $1,351.01; (8) $777.05; (9) $27,265.47; (15).[1]

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Gerhard A. Gesell, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transamerica Corp., 4 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Banking legislation.
D. (6) $750.
E. (4) $380.07; (6) $116.21; (7) $29.65; (8) $664.19; (9) $1,190.12; (15).[1]

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation and Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $1,404.75.
E. (7) $128.37; (9) $128.37.

A. William F. Giesen, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Maritime Association of the Port of New York, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,250.
E. (9) $99.42.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C., and 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. George Goldstein, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and the general welfare.
D. (6) $1,170.
E. (7) $260; (9) $260.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49.
E. (7) $60.50; (9) $60.50.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, Post Office Box 2212, Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees.
D. (6) $5,650.98.
E. (2) $3,580.28; (4) $299.07; (5) $711.60; (6) $204.77; (8) $492.84; (9) $5,288.56; (15).[1]

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.
E. (2) $217.70; (4) $2.78; (6) $3.02; (8) $4; (9) $227.50.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $1,545.
E. (2) $4,140.24; (5) $879.96; (6) $222.11; (7) $1,914.14; (8) $21.20; (9) $7,177.65; (15).[1]

A. Charles A. Grant, 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1] (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.
C. (2) Legislation to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

A. Francis T. Greene, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interest in support of legislation favorable to maintenance of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $287.84; (9) $287.84.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,425.

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (6) $0.30; (7) $46.93; (9) $47.23.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture, the processing, transportation, import and export of the products thereof.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (7) $165.97; (9) $165.97.

A. Carroll A. Gunderson, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the banking industry.
D. (6) $466.
E. (4) $10; (6) $23; (7) $10; (8) $15; (9) $58.

A. John H. Gunn, Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support legislation in the interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.
D. (6) $312.
E. (7) $60.62; (9) $60.62.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the maritime industry.
D. (6) $825.
E. (7) $456.22; (9) $456.22.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Price support, production and related legislation, agricultural research and education, agricultural services, pest control, farm credit, rural electrification, taxation, appropriations, social security.
D. (6) $1,016.63.
E. (7) $22.34; (9) $22.34.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,697.50.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federal News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $3,354.12.
E. (7) $561.31; (9) $561.31.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,807.66.
E. (6) $30.40; (7) $652.26; (9) $682.66.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (6) $600.
E. (2) $97.50; (5) $150; (6) $42.94; (7) $98.72; (9) $389.16.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters.

A. T. Wade Harrison, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (7) $3; (9) $3.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $82.46; (9) $82.46.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters.
D. (6) $1,942.96.

A. Bernard C. Harter, 5402 Albemarle Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. A. B. Baker, University Hospital, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Seek increased appropriations for research in neurology.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Institute, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting business.
D. (6) $600.
E. (4) $50; (7) $24; (9) $74.

A. Robert N. Hawes and John A. Gosnell, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Patents.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Woven Wood Fabric Industry—Columbia Mills, Inc.; Consolidated General Products, Inc.; Hough Shade Corp.; Warren Shade Co.; Williams Manufacturing Co.
C. (2) Tariff matters.
D. (6) $300.
E. (4) $75; (7) $25; (9) $100.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $29.50; (9) $29.50.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, 808 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (7) $33.15; (8) $1.25; (9) $34.40.

A. Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all matters pertaining to the business or policyholders of accident and health insurance.
E. (2) $52.68; (5) $8.72; (8) $3; (9) $64.40.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. News for Dairy Co-ops; the Alert.
D. (6) $150.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the food-canning industry and opposition to any change in seasonal exemptions in the wage and hour law.
D. (6) $833.33.
E. (7) $158.41; (9) $158.41.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations. (3) National Letters; Report of Recommendations of Federal Legislative Committee to membership.
D. (6) $400.

A. William B. Henderson, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C., Trade Association Executive.
B. Parcel Post Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 73, H. R. 293, and S. 61 of 84th Congress.
D. (6) $4,814.63.
E. (1) $1,163.38; (3) $100; (5) $1,324.91; (8) $225.67; (9) $2,813.96.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects directly or indirectly local property insurance agents. (3) The American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $318.
E. (7) $318; (9) $318.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the wool trade industry.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $37.65; (9) $37.65.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, P. O. Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.
C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the hot house vegetable industry.
D. (6) $500.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (6) $123.30; (9) $123.30.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice cream industry.

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) $187.50.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,519.95.
E. (6) $7.38; (7) $262.57; (9) $269.95.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy,

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $3,200; (9) $3,200.

A. Charles M. Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $216.60.
E. (7) $9; (9) $9.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., Americas Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4200 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union, 1141 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,286.10.
E. (7) $556.10; (9) $556.10.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge and Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Provisions of the internal revenue laws relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.
D. (6) $250.
E. (6) $32.72; (7) $50.13; (9) $82.85.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased (Thomas C. Dennehy, Jr., et al., trustees under the last will and testament of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased) 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting taxation of decedents' estates.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Provisions of the internal revenue laws relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.
D. (6) $500.
E. (6) $10.27; (7) $66.84; (9) $77.11.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association (Merchandise Division).

A. Jesse V. Horton, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) News Letters and the Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $2,562.50.
E. (7) $184.59; (9) $184.59.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) National Housing Act. (3) Raestaff News Letter No. 7.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,248.36.
E. (1) $10; (2) $840; (4) $110.56; (5) $100; (6) $10; (7) $27.80; (8) $150; (9) $1,248.36.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.
D. (6) $4,040.

A. William T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the operaiton of a certificated air carrier.
D. (6) $2,856.
E. (6) $0.80; (7) $286.40; (9) $287.20.

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. (2) $250.

A. John M. Hurley,[2] 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $3,185.
E. (6) $24.95; (7) $293; (8) $60.05; (9) $378.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $825; (9) $825.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Center, Minn.
C. (2) Banking legislation. (3) Reprints of Rayburn speech—Congressional Record.
D. (6) $53,064.21.
E. (2) $6,349.31; (4) $1,603.15; (5) $1,767.77; (6) $567.27; (9) $10,275.50.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $44,970.54.
E. (2) $7,200; (5) $375; (8) $145.44; (9) $7,720.44.

A. Independent Refiners Association of America, 201 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are such as may preserve the existence of independent refiners.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to Amercan-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades, and in other legislative matters affecting American-flag shipping.
E. (6) $54.03; (7) $169.32; (9) $223.35.

A. Kenneth Ingwalson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $247.50.
E. (9) $3.03.

A. International Trade Section, New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fostering the passage of legislation concerning guaranties against risk of nonpayment by foreign debtors due to currency inconvertibility, exchange transfer block, and other noncommercial hazards. (3).[1]
D. (6) $3,418.59.
E. (2) $963.10; (4) $286.59; (5) $4.85; (6) $161.31; (7) $96.92; (9) $1,512.77; (15).[1]

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation affecting the welfare and security of working men and women and their families.
E. (2) $1,425; (7) $95; (9) $1,520.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (9) $10.55.

A. Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Petitioner is interested in having the present Congress pass an act providing for a full judicial review of certain claims arising from French spoliations occurring prior to 1800.
E. (7) $110.43; (9) $110.43.

A. Ivins, Phillips & Parker, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Remington Rand, Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,575.
E. (7) $278.91; (9) $278.91.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $375.
E. (9) $300.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrielles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr 19, Basle, Switzerland.
C. (2) Any legislation effecting the client.
E. (1) $76.58; (4) $6; (7) $71.29; (9) $154.87.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax, highway, foreign trade, and school legislation.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $666.67; (9) $1,916.67.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr., 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,236.25.
E. (7) $47.50; (9) $47.50.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. (Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) All legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Opposed extension of Trade Agreement Act and amendment of Tariff Act of 1930.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (6) $173.21; (7) $1,172.15; (8) $446.94; (9) $1,792.30.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting the pottery industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $245.05; (6) $174.94; (7) $21.70; (8) $261.01; (9) $702.70.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $235.88; (9) $235.88.

A. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists and Proprietors International Union of America,[2] 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C.[1]
E. (2) $2,286.10; (9) $2,286.10.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $546.54; (9) $546.54.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $96.01; (9) $96.01.

A. Kimon T. Karabatsos, 3707 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Niobrara River Basin Development Association, 3707 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Irrigation.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $11.20; (7) $73.40; (9) $84.60.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. Joseph Duff Kelly, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 44 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 23 West Irving, Chevy Chase, Md.
C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the Antarctic Continent, such as that regarding geopolitical decisions, inventions, transportation, communications, equipment, long-range planning, exploitation of natural resources, etc., in the interest of all United States taxpayers and world peace and prosperity; H. J. Res. 25, fer.
E. (4) $5; (6) $10; (9) $15.

A. I. L. Kenen, 302 Beechwood Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favors economic and technical assistance to Israel and other states in the Near East.
D. (6) $583.33.
E. (6) $26.51; (7) $1,521.59; (8) $4.26; (9) $1,552.36.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (7) $37; (9) $237.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] Legislative Bulletin and American Legion magazine.
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (6) $13.80; (7) $55.50; (8) $69.45; (9) $138.75.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2)[1]; (3) VFW magazine (Foreign Service), and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $256.85; (9) $256.85.

A. Jeff Kibre, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting trade unions and their members.
D. (6) $619.02.
E. (2) $300; (5) $179.76; (6) $84.68; (8) $53.35; (9) $617.79.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $875.01.
E. (7) $262.23; (9) $262.23.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $127.50.
E. (7) $57.50; (9) $57.50.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Enactment of H. R. 4392, to tax real-estate investment trusts like security investment trusts.
E. (6) $13.03; (7) $34.89; (8) $1.25; (9) $49.17.

A. Joseph William Kinghorne, 1365 Iris Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lynnes Publishing Co., 1230 Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interest in any legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers.
D. (6) $300.

A. Bill Kirchner, Saulk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
C. (2) Banking legislation.
D. (6) $2,124.96.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $360.
E. (7) $31; (9) $31.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1800 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting retail new automobile and truck dealers.
D. (6) $4,038.
E. (6) $125.25; (7) $220.40; (9) $345.65.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 2623 North Van Dorn Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Taxation, antitrust laws, etc.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (3) $10; (4) $4.50; (6) $6.50; (7) $260; (8) $11; (9) $300.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (7) $36; (9) $36.

A. John T. Koehler,[2] 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Eastern Corporation, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For Mutual Security Act of 1954.

A. Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seek enactment of a law creating a regulatory commission.

A. Edith C. Krogh, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the gas and electric industry.
D. (6) $3,503.21.
E. (7) $4,100.12; (8) $1,002.39; (9) $5,102.51.

A. Catherine C. Kuhne, 1701 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Equal rights amendment and Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. (3) Independent Woman.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the maritime industry.
D. (6) $6,304.97.
E. (2) $4,076.56; (4) $16.80; (5) $491.48; (6) $58.74; (7) $1,738.44; (8) $481.25; (9) $6,863.27.

A. Lake Carriers' Association,[3] 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. A. M. Lampley, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Urging passage of legislation favorable to the interests of railroad labor, and opposing inimical legislation.
D. (6) $2,750.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2).[1]

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc. 1308 Commercial Standard Bldg., Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 1, H. R. 2850, H. R. 4896.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $3,176.04; (7) $93.29; (8) $10.81; (9) $3,280.14.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1, H. R. 2850, H. R. 4896.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $3,176.04; (6) $27.79; (7) $254.90; (8) $40.79; (9) $3,499.52.

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) $7,500.
E. (9) $9.40.

A. John G. Laylin and Wallace G. Dempsey, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Settlement of the unsatisfied claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States Government in 1941.
E. (2) $13.71; (4) $64.15; (6) $19.69; (7) $954.56; (8) $25.50; (9) $1,077.61.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the United States merchant marine. (3).[1]
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (2) $1,910.71; (4) $2,249.44; (6) $139.03; (7) $487.78; (8) $2,171.24; (9) $6,958.20.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba and trade between the United States and Cuba.
D. (6) $1,527.05.
E. (6) $3.70; (8) $23.35; (9) $27.05.

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns water-heater manufacturers, particularly the excise tax.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $27.75; (5) $285; (6) $12.07; (7) $32.11; (8) $15.25; (9) $372.18.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before Congress relating to public education. (3) Washington Outlook on Education and Flash.
E. (2) $2,353.60; (4) $1,704.67; (5) $362.35; (6) $649.52; (7) $2,947.03; (9) $8,017.17; (15).[1]

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy.
D. (6) $4,529.
E. (2) $1,212.50; (4) $529.37; (5) $28.55; (8) $24.25; (9) $1,794.67.

A. G. E. Leighty, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I.
C. (2).[1] (3) National Parent-Teachers.

A. Dr. William N. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $1,335.

A. Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair bidding procedures.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $6,717.23.
E. (2) $4,566.41; (5) $1,943.88; (6) $171.40; (7) $35.54; (9) $6,717.23.

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. E. F. Forbes, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2).[1] (3).[1]
D. (6) $2,875.02.
E. (4) $42.93; (7) $10.05; (9) $52.98.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to investment banking or securities business. (3).[1]
D. (6) $375.

A. Miss Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Transportation legislation.
D. (6) $800.
E. (6) $25; (7) $175; (9) $200.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $750.
E. (6) $7.38; (7) $126.17; (8) $30.05; (9) $163.60.

A. Norman M. Littell and Charles J. Alexander, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado; address of Superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the Navahos.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (4) $17.91; (8) $10; (9) $27.91.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products; also technical changes covering method of payment for excise taxes on tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the pipeline industry.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 522 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For Career Incentive Pay Act.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General interest in legislation for payroll deductions for Federal employees, war damage, economic controls, taxation of fringe benefits, health programs for Federal employees, and hospital and health matters.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $103.26; (7) $569.63; (8) $8.84; (9) $681.73.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,749.99.
E. (7) $15.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. S. A. Healy Co., 61 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1762.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
D. (6) $375.
E. (7) $375.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in aiding the company in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation affecting the finance industry.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cook Electric Co., 2700 Southport Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation affecting company's interests.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Asso., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation affecting mobile homes.
D. (6) $1.000.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Revere Copper & Brass Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in enactment of legislation providing for continuation of suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act.

A. Frederick Lukens, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Education Association of the District of Columbia and Columbian Educational Association, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In favor of S. 1093, revision of public school salaries; against S. 1505; District of Columbia public school personnel salary increase.
D. (6) $150.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,593.76.
E. (7) $55.97.

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives Association, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor—especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $750.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., Aircraft Industries Association.
C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry and other industries.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $500.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
D. (7) $1,803.83.
E. (7) $38.40.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.[1]
D. and E.[1]

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $550.
E. (7) $197.26.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.
E. (6) $14.79; (7) $2,050; (8) $4.60; (9) $2,069.39.

A. Angus McDonald, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,555.55.
E. (7) $277.75.

A. McDonnell & Slattery, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Montana Power Co.
D. (6) $681.25.
E. (6) $37.80; (7) $959.91; (9) $997.71.

A. A. J. McFarland,[2] 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $810.
E. (9) $300.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Charles T. McGavin, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 219 E. 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation in connection with parcel post.
D. (6) $5,333.
E. (7) $512.82.

A. W. H McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.[1]
D. (6) $268.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Hoyt S. Purvis, 212 East Washington Avenue, Jonesboro, Ark.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (6) $6.90; (8) $4.75; (9) $11.65.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4549, a bill for the relief of John J. Braund.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Brothers, 521 5th Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation amending the internal revenue law.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Confectioners' Association, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislative proposals affecting the confectionery industry.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (8) $518.20.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $987.55.
E. (7) $573.22.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $64.60; (7) $136.50; (9) $201.10.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, post office box 1170, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.
D. (6) $375.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the chemical industry.[1]
D. (6) $2,375.
E. (1) $500; (8) $1,875; (9) $2,375.

A. Mrs. 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) $1,625.78.
E. (9) $85.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.[1]
D. (6) $3,290.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $2,350.
E. (5) $870; (6) $181; (9) $1,051.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting and of interest to the B. F. Goodrich Co.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Morton Co., Worcester, Mass.
C. (2) Tariff status of silicon carbide.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (6) $6.44; (7) $4.06; (9) $10.50.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Japanese evacuation claims bills and appropriations thereto.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $15; (9) $15.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of our country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,795.
E. (6) $33.10; (7) $251; (8) $69.90; (9) $354.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,485.33.
E. (7) $383.24; (9) $383.24.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to or affecting the waste-materials industry.
D. (6) $150.
E. (4) $46.35; (6) $3.21; (7) $4.12; (9) $53.68.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare. (3) Informational bulletins.
D. (6) $650.
E. (7) $26.35; (9) $26.35.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action.
E. (2) $1,800; (4) $225; (9) $2,025.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including the extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation.
E. (6) $35; (7) $45; (9) $80.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of the Post Office and General Services Administration. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $700.
E. (7) $179.21; (8) $115.84; (9) $295.05.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & W. Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) General legislation.
E. (7) $240.01; (9) $240.01.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW, Washington, D. C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Sierra Talc & Clay Co., Post Office Box 390, South Pasadena, Calif.
C. (2) Provisions of H. R. 8300 covering percentage depletion of talc.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $14.79; (9) $14.79.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $25; (5) $42.46; (6) $63.40; (7) $670.78; (8) $98.36; (9) $900.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (6) $36.31; (7) $53.64; (9) $89.95.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislation affecting sulfur industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (5) $877.37; (6) $83.52; (7) $700.70; (8) $13.50; (9) $1,675.09.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, Boston, Mass., and Abitibi Power & Paper Co., Ltd., Toronto, Canada.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to cotton textile industry.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (8) $707.13; (9) $707.13.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John H. Davis, Harriett O. Davis, Harry Handley Cloutier, Elinor S. Cloutier, estate of Henri H. Cloutier, deceased, Harry M. Cloutier, executor, Margaret S. Cloutier, Seattle, Wash.
C. (2) Tax legislation.
D. (6) $5,500.
E. (6) $48.19; (8) $5.10; (9) $53.29.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Revision of Internal Revenue Code of 1954.
E. (8) $0.18; (9) $0.18.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $8.05; (9) $8.05.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Matters pertaining to cattle industry.
D. (6) $4,400.
E. (6) $27.22; (7) $276.83; (8) $26.50; (9) $330.55.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (7) $343.45; (9) $343.45.

A. George W. Morgan, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Shipowners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation with respect to maritime matters and transportation.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Robert A. Drum, Omaha, Nebr.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the excise tax on beer.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $15.25; (8) $2.50; (9) $17.75.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D .C.
B. Pickett Development Committee, Blackstone, Va.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the disposition of Camp Pickett, Va.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $2.64; (9) $2.64.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting employer.
E. (2) $400; (4) $7.65; (5) $0.80; (6) $1.20; (7) $6; (9) $415.65.

A. The Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.
E. (4) $7,148.20; (7) $377.69; (8) $504.25; (9) $8.030.14.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D. (6) $4,375.03.
E. (5) $43.39; (6) $4.68; (7) $15.44; (9) $63.51.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $918.04; (9) $918.04.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Allen P. Mullinnix, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Howard E. Munro, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union & Metal Trade Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. Union members employed on the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (3) $249.05; (5) $93.54; (6) $120.81; (7) $947.84; (9) $1,411.24.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) In the interest of favorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Co., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, P. O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) 1956 Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations bill. (3) The Forest Farmer .
E. (6) $2; (7) $86.62; (9) $88.62.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
D. (6) $1,874.86.
E. (2) $1,500; (4) $200.41; (5) $138.45; (7) $36; (9) $1,874.86.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington 5, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all kinds particularly bills relative to GI education for Korean Veterans.
D. (6) $8,205.77.
E. (2) $1,200; (6) $33.24; (8) $51; (9) $1,284.24.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $13,793.75.
E. (4) $79.76; (9) $79.76.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $98,417.22.
E. (1) $2,532.91; (2) $22,456.79; (4) $648.91; (5) $1,602.78; (6) $406.42; (7) $1,153.34; (8) $809.14; (9) $29,610.29.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer news.
D. (6) $30.61.
E. (4) $30.61; (9) $30.61.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents.
D. (6) $3,070.25.
E. (2) $3,489.24; (5) $601.75; (6) $275.37; (7) $318; (8) $119.60; (9) $4,803.96.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $330,710.59.
E. (1) $600; (2) $3,600; (4) $336.40; (6) $974.19; (9) $5,510.59.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which mutual savings banks have an interest in supporting or opposing.
D. (6) $128.77.
E. (2) $86; (4) $39.77; (8) $3; (9) $128.77.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting postal employees and General Services employees. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.
D. (6) $14,122.42.
E. (2) $893.73; (4) $183.33; (5) $155; (6) $47.89; (7) $179.21; (8) $115.84; (9) $1,575.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) News Letters and The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $10,951.96.
E. (2) $2,562.50; (4) $4,246.96; (5) $300; (6) $400; (7) $184.59; (9) $7,694.05.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 1111 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation appertaining to the United States postmasters.
D. (6) $57,756.45.
E. (2) $1,200; (5) $6; (9) $1,206.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,478.37.
E. (4) $193.33; (7) $300; (9) $493.33.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 1218 Locust Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect United States Storekeeper-Gaugers.
D. (6) $444.70.
E. (2) $1,000; (9) $1,000.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of the travel industry.
D. (6) $9,356.49.
E. (1) $180; (2) $375; (4) $22.50; (5) $90; (6) $15; (9) $682.50.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation directly affecting the food canning industry and opposition to any change in seasonal exemptions in the wage and hour law.
D. (6) $203,853.57.
E. (2) $1,583.33; (4) $285.80; (7) $1,177.73; (8) $8.45; (9) $3,055.31.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation as to the taxation of the income of fire and casualty insurance companies. (3) A Proposal for Federal Income Taxation of Fire and Casualty Insurance Companies and Your Part in Fair Share Taxation of Fire and Casualty Insurance Companies.
D. (6) $8,730.
E. (2) $6,593.48; (8) $139.04; (9) $6,732.52.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Parcel post size and weight limitations.
D. (6) $900.
E. (2) $975; (4) $244.44; (5) $4.34; (6) $4.06; (7) $108.21; (8) $53.80; (9) $1,389.85.

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act.
D. (6) $150.
E. (6) $1.63; (9) $1.63.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Legislation which will repeal the existing excise taxes on the transportation of persons and property.
D. (6) $720.26.
E. (2) $27; (9) $27.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the raw cotton industry.
D. (6) $2,899.35.
E. (2) $2,045.14; (5) $199.80; (6) $14.34; (7) $640.07; (9) $2,899.35.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the postal service.
D. (6) $1,440.87.
E. (1) $975; (4) $10.71; (6) $4.39; (7) $376.85; (8) $73.92; (9) $1,440.87; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence.
D. (6) $2,319.72.
E. (2) $500; (4) $1,423.30; (5) $100; (6) $25; (7) $82.46; (8) $25; (9) $2,155.76.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) Newsletter and Qualified Contractor.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation with respect to imports of electrical products into the United States and safety devices for household refrigerators and freezers.
D. (6) $529.30.
E. (2) $84.30; (4) $378.17; (7) $66.83; (9) $529.30.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1] (3) Independent Woman.
D. (6) $188.94.
E. (2) $833.32; (4) $77.25; (5) $250; (6) $84; (8) $79.40; (9) $1,323.97.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk and Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $167,320.50.
E. (1) $600; (2) $7,506.60; (4) $9,120.99; (5) $380; (6) $1,663.40; (8) $3,326.44; (9) $22,597.45; (15).[1]

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,339.50.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $309.50; (5) $30; (9) $1,339.50; (15).[1]

A. National Housing Conference, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Housing legislation.
D. (6) $16,606.38.
E. (2) $7,108.07; (3) $43; (4) $1,648.98; (5) $1,238.59; (6) $411.04; (7) $665.65; (8) $3,505.16; (9) $14,620.49; (15).[1]

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $1,259.12.
E. (2) $528.09; (3) $15; (4) $114.01; (5) $95.35; (6) $37.51; (7) $127.07; (8) $81.39; (9) $998.42; (15).[1]

A. National Institute of Diaper Services, Inc., 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interest to secure deductions for income-tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper services.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Taxation applicable to livestock operators.
D. (6) $1,942.96.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $580.99.
E. (9) $579.51.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and the Alert.
D. (6) $3,067.02.
E. (2) $2,475; (4) $18; (6) $41.37; (7) $469.25; (8) $63.40; (9) $3,067.02.

A. National Multiple Schlerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $600; (7) $217.22; (9) $817.02.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation applicable to postal transportation clerks.
D. (6) $44,787.05.
E. (2) $3,000; (4) $985.48; (6) $154.94; (9) $4,140.42.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.
D. (6) $8,025.55.
E. (2) $5,981.53; (4) $2,264.04; (5) $1,553.22; (6) $281.16; (7) $859.46; (8) $538.73; (9) $11,478.14; (15).[1]

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Welfare of the handicapped. (3) Journal of Rehabilitation.
D. (6) $1,594.80.
E. (2) $420; (5) $100; (6) $50; (7) $262; (9) $832.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) and (3).[1]
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (2) $3,375; (4) $284.36; (5) $917.60; (7) $33.15; (8) $2.50; (9) $4,212.61; (15).[1]

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $13,534.99.
E. (1) $150; (2) $2,108.40; (3) $20; (4) $428.65; (5) $269.03; (6) $36.17; (7) $1,301.60; (8) $1,616.88; (9) $5,930.93; (15).[1]

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural-electrification program provided for under the REA act of 1936, as amended. (3) Rural Electrification magazine.
D. (6) $67,073.64.
E. (9) $67,073.64.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation under consideration in the Congress affecting postal employees. (3) The National Rural Letter Carrier.
D. (6) $6,109.75.
E. (1) $200; (2) $2,155.10; (4) $4,261.47; (5) $329.79; (6) $243.51; (9) $6,989.87; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing.
D. (6) $231,691.20.
E. (2) $850; (4) $531.40; (9) $1,381.40; (15).[1]

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (2) $4,597.92; (5) $1,309.67; (6) $181.91; (9) $6,089.50.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $146,466.
E. (2) $1,183; (4) $403.48; (9) $1,586.48.

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, L. S. Franklin, director, 2309 Pinecroft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
C. (2) Tax limitation.
D. (6) $1,270.
E. (2) $375; (5) $250; (7) $450; (9) $1,075.

A. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization and conservation of natural resources.
D. (6) $30.
E. (5) $490.24; (8) $2; (9) $492.24.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
D. (6) $2,724.02.
E. (2) $1,175; (4) $21; (5) $396.86; (6) $37.62; (7) $190.53; (9) $1,821.01.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Extension of Trade Agreement Act and amendment to Tariff Act of 1930, opposed. (3) Magazine for sheepmen.
D. (6) $11,266.
E. (2) $3,125; (6) $173.21; (7) $1,172.15; (8) $446.94; (9) $4,917.30; (15).[1]

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1. (3).[1]
D. (6) $10,200.
E. (2) $8,692.51; (4) $1,448; (5) $562.03; (6) $591.56; (7) $343.72; (8) $1,297.85; (9) $12,935.67; (15).[1]

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all matters pertaining to the business of policyholders of accident and health insurance.[1]
D. (6) $105.37.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Otis H. Ellis, general counsel, National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Interested in general legislative matters which might affect business interests of independent oil jobbers.
D. (6) $225.
E. (9) $75.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.
D. (6) $6,081.68.
E. (2) $39.90; (5) $1,509.95; (6) $352.25; (7) $469.48; (9) $2,331.68.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting the ship repair industry directly or indirectly.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (2) $2,500; (5) $357.97; (6) $11.51; (7) $235.52; (8) $55.93; (9) $3,138.93; (15).[1]

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax and other legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.
E. (2) $3,075; (7) $774.32; (9) $3,849.32.

A. Niobrara River Basin Development Association, 3707 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Irrigation.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (2) $1,000; (6) $11.20; (7) $73.40; (9) $84.60.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51 Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,170.
E. (9) $260.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks enactment of a law establishing qualities and standards.
E. (7) $7.25; (8) $3.35; (9) $10.60.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,545.
E. (7) $15.28; (8) $1.50; (9) $16.78.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the ice-cream industry.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Taxation, forestry, and labor management relations.
D. (6) $100.
E. (7) $148.15; (9) $148.15.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and the Alert.
D. (6) $335.55.
E. (7) $131.55; (8) $4; (9) $135.55.

A. Frank Norton, Mercantile Securities Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. John Lord O'Brian, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association under the act of May 21, 1932.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America.
C. (2) and (3).[1]
D. (6) $29,944.62.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interest in support of legislation favorable to maintenance of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (5) $675; (6) $94.50; (7) $382.45; (8) $99.75; (9) $1,251.70.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Of. 504, Lima, Peru.
C. (2) Amendment to Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, to increase quota.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (6) $38.86; (8) $10; (9) $48.86.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. A. E. Oliver, 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

[1] Not printed. Filed with the Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $48.10.
E. (9) $4.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (5) $1,624.98.
E. (7) $1,628.24; (9) $1,628.24.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (3) American Legion magazine.
D. (6) $2,370.
E. (7) $22.51; (9) $22.51.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. and B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,425; (5) $1,322.75; (6) $63.07; (9) $3,810.82.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (5) $1,560.
E. (7) $458.40; (9) $458.40.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting maternal and child health and welfare.
E. (9) $50.17.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine.
D. (6) $200.
E. (9) $1,625.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Corp., College Park, Md.; W. A. Shaeffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the pen and pencil industry, the plate-glass industry, the phonograph-record industry, and legislation dealing with excess-profits tax relief in hardship cases.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Parker, Milliken & Kohlmeier, 650 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, as trustee of the Mary Paula Ball Trust, Fourth and Main Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) To establish the value at the date of death of Mary Paula Ball, deceased, as the income tax basis for certain property included in the estate of said decedent for Federal estate tax.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. P. T. Patterson, 5205 Sangamore Road, Glen Mar Park, Md.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote any bill of benefit to the association or individuals thereof. Against any bill not of benefit to the association or individuals thereof. (3) Star Carrier.

A. James G. Patton.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $657.49; (9) $657.49.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty & Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
C. (2) To obtain amendment to Internal Revenue Code dealing with corporate distributions.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (6) $31.02; (7) $49.78; (9) $80.78.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation as to the taxation of the income of fire and casualty insurance companies.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $83.83; (7) $273.73; (8) $50.62; (9) $408.18.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Edward F. Pipe.
C. (2) To amend section 812 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.
E. (7) $58.26; (9) $58.26.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $2,650.
E. (6) $5.20; (7) $133.91; (8) $50.25; (9) $189.36.

A. Catherine A. Pearce, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh Peterson, Ailey, Ga.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (8) $645; (9) $645.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that affects the citrus industry.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (5) $40; (6) $1.11; (8) $1.08; (9) $42.19.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Gene Salentine, Brooksville, Fla.
C. (2) A bill for the relief of Irene Guay Salentine, or similar legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $100.
E. (5) $6.50; (8) $1.98; (9) $8.48.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., Sebring, Fla.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the intercoastal west coast waterway.
D. (6) $600.
E. (5) $10; (6) $3.30; (8) $0.60; (9) $13.90.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $60.

A. Milton M. Plumb, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations.
C. (2) Legislative interests of the CIO.
D. (6) $1,899.96.
E. (6) $9.60; (7) $153.95; (8) $62.22; (9) $225.77.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee Representing American Fluorspar Producers, care of J. Blecheisen, Rosiclare, Ill.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, and foreign-trade legislation.
E. (2) $24; (6) $11.78; (7) $35.75; (8) $7.29; (9) $78.82.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pin, Clip & Fasterner Association, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, and foreign-trade legislation generally.
E. (4) $8.16; (6) $5.56; (7) $12.70; (8) $1.20; (9) $27.62.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Portland, Oreg., and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Agricultural and farmer cooperative matters, tariff, customs, and foreign-trade legislation generally.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (4) $1.02; (6) $2.09; (7) $80.49; (8) $3.60; (9) $87.20.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Stanley I. Posner and Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Diaper Services, Inc., 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Deductions for income-tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper services.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining.
D. (6) $1,125.
E. (7) $18.60; (9) $18.60.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To amend the Home Owners Loan Act and control bank holding companies.
D. (6) $86.
E. (7) $3; (9) $3.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry. (3) Legislative bulletins.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25.

A. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $6,500; (6) $3.79; (7) $948.66; (9) $7,452,45.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (6) $3.86; (8) $29.97; (9) $33.83.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation in connection with the promotion and advancement of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $843.75.
E. (7) $241.94; (9) $241.94.

A. Charles E. Purdy, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to benefit handicapped.
D. (6) $1,483.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to architectural profession. (3) Federal aid for school construction.
D. (6) $200.
E. (4) $35; (6) $15; (7) $50; (9) $100.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.; United Cerebral Palsy Association, 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.; and National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Public health.
D. (6) $8,199.97.
E. (2) $921; (5) $1,404.70; (6) $284.87; (7) $2,848.39; (9) $5,458.96.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electrical Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $102.50.
E. (7) $91.52; (9) $91.52.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative interests are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of 30-year retirement regardless of age at half-pay based on 5 years of highest earnings, maximum $200 a month. (3) Pension News Bulletins.
D. (6) $337.79.
E. (1) $7; (4) $75.44; (5) $181.48; (7) $38.30; (8) $7.36; (9) $309.58.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad labor.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Joint Committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy products manufacturing firms.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (1) $345.31; (2) $375; (4) $229.63; (5) $498.84; (6) $172.29; (7) $578.16; (8) $611.34; (9) $2,810.56.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. (3) Common Carrier Washington News Letter and Common Carrier Bulletin.
D. (6) $1,863.24.
E. (2) $1,075; (4) $738.24; (5) $50; (9) $1,863.24.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect Potomac Electric Power Co.
E. (6) $10; (7) $134.50; (8) $25; (9) $169.50.

A. Nicolas Reisini, 11 West 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1195.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officers and ROA Washington Newsletter.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $35,311.68.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $8,339.82.
E. (2) $3,210.95; (4) $634; (5) $386.89; (6) $34.77; (7) $116.05; (8) $1,603.06; (9) $5,985.72.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 683 Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Grower's Association of California, 2261 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
C. (2) Securing equitable cotton acreage allotment for California.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $533.33.
E. (8) $4.70; (9) $4.70.

A. Andrew E. Rice, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights and liberties, and veterans benefits.
D. (6) $830.76.
E. (6) $31.24; (7) $31.24; (9) $62.48; (11) $62.48.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers.
D. (6) $525.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Blackfeet Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Hualapai Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Oglala Sioux Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Pueblo of Laguna in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the San Carlos Tribe in particular.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, Winnebago, Nebr.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Winnebago Tribe in particular.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,795.
E. (6) $23; (7) $310.25; (8) $52.75; (9) $386.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization and conservation of natural resources.
E. (2) $231; (4) $63.66; (5) $118; (6) $18.94; (7) $55; (9) $486.60.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of the American farmer to grow and market sugarbeets.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $37.85; (4) $95.71; (5) $77.03; (6) $24.19; (7) $276.10; (9) $510.88.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $250.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural-electrification program provided for under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 as amended. (3) Rural Electrification.
D. (6) $1,835.38.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (4) $40.25; (7) $330.13; (9) $370.38.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) News Letter and Qualified Contractor.

A. Delbert L. Rucker, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $25.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (9) $256.53.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or affiliated companies.
E. (9) $167.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (9) $105.59.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (9) $334.45.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (9) $60.

A. Gene Salentine, Brooksville, Fla.
C. (2) A bill for the relief of Irene Guay Salentine.
E. (9) $100.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,250.01.
E. (4) $27.34; (6) $36.86; (7) $62.87; (9) $127.07.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (9) $535.20.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $180.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fulton Land and Timber Co., 711 Orchard Road, Hagerstown, Md.
C. (2) Depletion provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $250.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lessees of B. V. Hedrick Gravel & Sand Co., Lilesville, N. C.
C. (2) Depletion provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $1,357.50.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., et al.[1]
C. (2).[1]
E. (9) $1.65.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $182.25.
E. (9) $7.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $2,300.
E. (9) $43.74.

A. James J. Saxon, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the banking industry.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4744 and S. 1589.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 378 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (4) $69.80; (6) $24; (7) $158; (8) $61; (9) $313.80.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.
C. (2) All proposed legislation which would affect the intercity motor bus industry.

A. Mildred Scott, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to benefit handicapped.
D. (6) $1,483.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
E. (7) $37.25; (9) $37.25; (15).[1]

A Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to railroad labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.
E. (9) $28.05.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D. (6) $3,793.99.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $375.
E. (9) $258.50.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $125.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948 and related legislation.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

A. Charles B. Shuman, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Sierra Talc & Clay Co., Post Office Box 390, South Pasadena, Calif.
C. (2) H. R. 8300, covering percentage depletion of talc.
E. (2) $3,750; (6) $14.79; (9) $3,764.79.

A. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks enactment of a law establishing qualities and standards.
E. (7) $153.12; (8) $4.60; (9) $157.72.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policy.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (2) $8,427.50; (8) $89.53; (9) $8,517.03; (15).[1]

A. Stephen Slipher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting savings and loan, housing, home financing, thrift and financial institutions.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (9) $19.05.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $4,533.50.
E. (2) $2,049.51; (4) $234.15; (6) $41.02; (7) $105.90; (8) $2; (9) $2,432.58.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, narcotics, international relations, women, and children.[1]
D. (6) $606.12.
E. (5) $109.89; (6) $50.46; (8) $4.93; (9) $165.28.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (9) $265.77.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.; and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and the Great Northern Railway Co.
D. (6) $3,675.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (9) $261.60.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $825.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 612 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rowe-Doherty Associates, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic jeweled watch industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (4) $100; (5) $70; (7) $100; (9) $170.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $48,051.
E. (2) $16,237.50; (4) $6,063.63; (5) $1,768.14; (6) $127.69; (7) $300.21; (8) $762.18; (9) $25,259.35.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting maternal and child health and welfare.
D. (6) $1,208.20.
E. (1) $75; (4) $66.39; (5) $161.76; (6) $9.79; (7) $54.50; (9) $367.44; (15).[1]

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National RR Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relative to improving and increasing benefits under the RR Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,500; (4) $1,438; (6) $52.20; (7) $477.42; (9) $3,682.12.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Co., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $150.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 9307 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.
B. Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba; and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $3,063.66; (7) $1,144.21; (8) $84.47; (9) $4,292.34.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, P. O. Box 6234, Northwest station, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Health, education and welfare.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to technical engineers, especially those engineers employed by the United States Government.
D. (6) $240.
E. (9) $20.

A. William T. Stephens, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 519 South Broadway, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) General legislation affecting the utility trailer industry.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $4,255.92.
E. (7) $479.67; (8) $26.25; (9) $505.92.

A. Erskine Stewart, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $375.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,739.59.
E. (7) $44.64; (8) $44.95; (9) $89.59.

A. Mrs. Joseph Mills Stoll, 4001 61st Street, Brookmont, Washington, D. C.
B. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting maternal and child health and welfare.
E. (4) $8.07; (5) $9.90; (6) $19.54; (7) $36.28; (9) $73.79.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to benefit handicapped.
D. (6) $1,483.
E. (4) $80.15; (6) $45; (9) $125.15.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 400 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 400 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,692.32.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 400 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.
E. (3) $15.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,875.

A. William C. Stronach, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,215.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the retail industry.[1]
D. (6) $625.
E. (9) $6.50.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. (3) Texas water.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (2) $59.30; (5) $20.95; (7) $178.25; (8) $387.33; (9) $645.83.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting general public health, tuberculosis in particular.
D. (6) $506.25.
E. (4) $40.50; (7) $50.02; (9) $90.52.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy. (3) Educational pamphlets.
D. (6) $775.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $175.10; (9) $175.10.

A. Barrett Godwin Tawresey, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Having the present Congress pass an act providing for a full judicial review of certain claims arising from French spoliations occurring prior to 1800.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, I. R. C.
D. (6) $477.50.
E. (2) $146.25; (4) $18.50; (5) $135; (8) $2.94; (9) $302.69.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting civil aviation.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (7) $400; (9) $400.

A. Jay Taylor, 712 First National Bank Building, Amarillo, Tex.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Maude M. Taylor, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Tyre Taylor, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $8.67; (5) $357.75; (6) $48.32; (9) $414.74.

A. Ruth H. Tegtmeyer,[3] 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $4,730.
E. (1) $94.80; (2) $2,224.20; (4) $827.90; (5) $875.60; (6) $232.99; (7) $228.25; (8) $1,327.77; (9) $5,811.44.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
C. (2) Interests of Nevada railroads.
D. (6) $675.

A. W. M. Thomas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to postal transportation clerks.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

D. (6) $6,500.
E. (7) $204.95; (9) $204.95.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,313.04.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $2,087.50.
E. (7) $35.54; (9) $35.54.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Clothespin Manufacturers of America, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Safeguards to domestic industries in proposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act.
D. (6) $1,663.90.
E. (7) $328.32; (9) $328.32.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $67.40; (9) $67.40.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interests.
D. (6) $1,299.51.
E. (7) $42; (9) $42.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
C. (2) Anything affecting Solano County.
D. (6) $295.
E. (3) $19.18; (5) $116.13; (6) $28.95; (7) $144.67; (9) $308.93.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and The Alert.
D. (6) $2,292.15.
E. (7) $137.70; (8) $54.45; (9) $192.15.

A. Tomoka Land Co., Sebring, Fla.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.
D. (6) $600.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Price support, production adjustments, and related legislation; selective service and military training; development, use, and ownership of natural resources; transportation; farm labor; social security.
D. (6) $2,008.
E. (7) $87.01; (9) $87.01.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.

A. Harold J. Turner, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. Noel T. Tweet, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control Association, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to flood control and soil conservation.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (2) $2,100; (9) $2,100.

A. William S. Tyson, 736 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 493, Balboa, C. Z.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting Panama Canal pilots.
D. (6) $4,133.96.
E. (5) $9.80; (6) $77.51; (8) $15; (9) $102.31.

A. Unemployed Service Association,[3] 622 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) No specific bill but various proposals for unemployed people.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Any legislation which has been or may be introduced, the purpose of which is to amend the Natural Gas Act.
E. (2) $450; (6) $60; (7) $478.80; (9) $988.80.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $1,999.99; (7) $361.70; (9) $2,361.69.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba. (3).[1]
D. (6) $9,132.25.
E. (1) $6,849.02; (2) $1,387.18; (4) $4,074.17; (5) $416.12; (6) $72; (7) $291.81; (9) $13,090.30.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C.[1]
D.[1]
E. (2) $7,183.58; (4) $6,090.70; (5) $2,287.03; (6) $295.23; (7) $7,866.17; (8) $145; (9) $23,867.71.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Richard G. Van Buskirk, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Advance the science and art of medicine.
D. (6) $1,062.51.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 528 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting vegetable growers.
E. (4) $25; (5) $25; (7) $13; (9) $63.

A. Weston Vernon, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of New York Stock Exchange and its members.
D. (6) $75.

A. R. K. Vinson,[3] 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Depreciation allowances on machine tools.

A. Stanley Vogt.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,311.
E. (7) $374.52; (9) $374.52.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $63.25.

A. Claude R. Wallace, 203 Eighth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. POSSE, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Social security and old age benefits.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,493.75.
E. (6) $1.98; (7) $41.07; (8) $3.25; (9) $46.30.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees' Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $4.50; (9) $4.50.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 National Bank Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Company of America.
D. (6) $6,500.
E. (6) $3.79; (7) $237.88; (9) $241.67.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2413.
D. (6) $4,549.
E. (2) $845; (4) $537.15; (5) $239.15; (6) $83.86; (8) $1,054.43; (9) $2,759.59.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the District of Columbia.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 951. (3) S. 951—A Bill—What Does It Mean to You?
D. (6) $1,525.
E. (2) $4,456.01; (4) $2,174.30; (5) $92.44; (6) $11.98; (9) $6,734.73.

A. J. R. Watson, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the ship repair industry directly or indirectly.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 H Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation/reclamation, soil, and water conservation and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,456.80.
E. (3) $1; (4) $65; (5) $7.05; (7) $623.82; (8) $368.50; (9) $1,065.37.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar,[2] 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (4) $1.82; (8) $2.68; (9) $4.50.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,499.96.
E. (6) $26.14; (7) $418.65; (8) $54.55; (9) $499.34.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW, Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (7) $122; (9) $122.

A. Elaine O. Wells, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard H. Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting in any way the bowling industry.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (a) Reclamation Act, 1902, and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures. (3) Bulletin.
D. (6) $3,249.99.
E. (8) $214.22; (9) $214.22.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark deBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests relate to a possible revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 895).
E. (8) $11.25; (9) $11.25.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the Intercoastal West Coast Waterway.
E. (2) $600; (6) $3.30; (8) $0.60; (9) $603.90.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 2301 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
C. (2) Securing equitable cotton acreage allotment for California.
E. (2) $3,000; (6) $507.82; (7) $5,667.82; (8) $338.95; (9) $9,514.59.

A. George Y. Wheeler, 2d, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Radio Corporation of America and/or its subsidiaries and affiliated companies.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting cotton and foreign trade.
D. (6) $500.
E. (4) $33.23; (6) $93.03; (7) $110.22; (8) $32.80; (9) $268.28.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

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.
C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph F. Wildebush, 7 Church Street, Paterson, N. J.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks enactment of a law establishing qualities and standards.
E. (9) $94.39.

A. A. E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anaconda Copper Mining Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
C. (2) In favor of legislation to suspend excise import tax on imported copper.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $38.50; (7) $155.17; (8) $66; (9) $259.67.

A. W. E. Wilkinson, Glenn Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
C. (2) For H. R. 1343, with reservations.
D. (6) $4.25.
E. (4) $14.22; (6) $0.85; (9) $14.22.

A. C. J. S. Williamson, 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation and specific bills or regulations of interest to California economy.
D. and E.[1]

A. Hugh S. Williamson, 1621 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation with respect to maritime matters and transportation.

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $4,800.
E. (6) $6.80; (7) $680.55; (8) $65.20; (9) $752.55.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (3) Washington Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (6) $19.71; (7) $315.49; (9) $325.20.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $950.
E. (9) $142.26.

A. J. B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyo.
B. Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo.
C. (2) All legislation in any way affecting domestic wool growing industry. (3) Wyoming Wool Grower.
D. (7) $2,000.
E. (6) $68.40; (7) $915.37; (8) $32.20; (9) $1,015.97.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Any legislation which has been or may be introduced, the purpose of which is to amend the Natural Gas Act.
D. (6) $450.
E. (6) $60; (7) $478.80; (9) $538.80.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement. The American Merchant Marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (9) $258.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of commercial banks.
D. (6) $10,500.
E. (2) $10,500; (6) $17.39; (9) $10,517.39; (15).[1]

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of commercial banks.
D. (6) $10,500.
E. (2) $10,500; (6) $17.39; (9) $10,517.39; (15).[1]

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) Legislation effecting Texas railroads.
D. (6) $6,650.19.
E. (6) $6093; (7) $1,466.18; (9) $1,527.11; (15).[1]

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Generally legislation relating to the oil and gas business.
D. (6) $1,370.83.
E. (6) $90.91; (7) $1,494.83; (9) $1,585.74; (15).[1]

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1]
D. (6) $2,375.22.
E. (9) $101.60.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
(2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.

A. Donald A. Young,[2] 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $540.
E. (9) $86.53.

A. Harry E. Zwinggi, Clark Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1955:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

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*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to those objectives.

A. American Social Hygiene Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation bearing on health, education, and welfare.

A. Frederic A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif.
B. The Federated Indians of California.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly and Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Ralph K. Ball.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly and Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the machine tool industry.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly and Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurer's Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) In opposition to H. R. 43. (4) $1,000 per month.

A. Frank C. Bateman, Hotel Bancroft, Springfield, Ohio.
B. American Association of Nursing Homes, Hotel Bancroft, Springfield, Ohio.
C. (2) All bills relating to nursing and convalescent homes. (4) Estimated $600 a year.

A. Lester O. Begick, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.

A. Tell Berna, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the machine tool industry. (4) Annual salary is $25,000.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 3026 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to sugar and trade with Cuba. (4) Monthly compensation $850, plus out-of-pocket professional expenses.

A. John J. Boland, 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y.
B. Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Beane, 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting securities dealers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) This registrant will be interested in any and all legislative matters which will or may affect the class I railroads operating in the 24 Western States. (4) $697 salary and $650 per month expenses.

A. Clark L. Brody, 221 North Cedar Street, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 221 North Cedar Street, Lansing, Mich.
C. (2).[1]

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the banking industry. (3) Washington Bulletin. (4) $1,750 annual salary.

A. Robert M. Burr, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Bureau for Economic Realism, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation that may be of interest to the bureau from time to time. (4) $684 salary.

A. Charles B. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Development, use, and ownership of natural resources.

A. Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc., 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For construction of Cal-Sag project.

A. Stuart Cameron, 1430 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Michigan Railroads Association, 301 Michigan Terminal Building, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the Michigan railroads. (4) $500 monthly.

A. Chapman & Wolfsohn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S. A. de C. V., Balderas 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F.
C. (2) Increase in the Mexican sugar quota under the United States Sugar Act. (4) $5,000 per quarter.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the maritime industry. (4) $200 expenses per quarter; annual compensation, $16,500.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Cuban Sugar Mills Owners Association, Havana, Cuba, and the Cuban Sugar Cane Growers Association, Havana, Cuba.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of commercial banks. (4) Anticipated expenses, $75,000.

A. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Japanese evacuation claims bills and appropriations thereto.

A. Bernard J. Conway,[2] 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1] (3).[1] (4) $13,000 annually.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the tobacco industry. (4) $10,000 annual retainer.

A. R. Ammi Cutter, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. R. Ammi Cutter, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposing legislation imposing increased duties or quotas on importation of petroleum or petroleum products.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2).[1] (4) $7,500 salary and expenses.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (4) Annual salary $6,000.

A. Tony Dechant, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (4) Annual salary $3,000; expenses $1,000.

A. Florence de Haas Dembitz, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Benj. Graham, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Furthering the participation of the United States in the development and operation of an International Commodity Reserve Plan.

A. Richard A. Dell, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification magazine.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

A. Casimir de Rham, Jr., 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Casimir de Rham, Jr., 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposing legislation imposing increased duties or quotas on importation of petroleum or petroleum products.

A. Robert A. Drum, chairman of the board, Metz Brewing Co., Omaha, Nebr.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise tax on beer.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting savings and mortgage business. (4) $1,750 annually.

A. Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of measures beneficial to conservation and opposition to measure detrimental to conservation.

A. Edward Falck and Ruth M. Falck, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation in regard to amendments to the Natural Gas Act that may be of interest to Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc. (4) $6,250 per quarter, plus certain expenses.

A. B. T. Fitzpatrick, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King and Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of national banks. (4) $22,500 annually.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 951 and legislation related to extension of regulation to bulk carriers on inland waterways. (4) $3.500 retainer, plus expenses.

A. Mark W. Frawley, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Mills Corp., 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All legislation affecting rug and carpet-backing industry.

A. Gerhard A. Gesell, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transamerica Corporation, 4 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Banking legislation generally and particularly bills to regulate bank holding companies. (4) $500 per month, plus certain expenses.

A. S. H. Grauten, 1722 Harrison Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) Recognition of services of civilians employed on construction of Panama Canal and who had 2 years of such service.

A. Carroll A. Gunderson, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the banking industry. (3) Washington Bulletin. (4) $1,866 annually and expenses.

A. Morton I. Hamburg, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jack A. Haner, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Hardboard Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tariff reclassification of hardboard as recommended in Tariff Commission Report on Hardboard of March 1955. (4) Expenses estimated at $2,000.

A. T. Wade Harrison, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting savings and loan, housing, home financing, thrift, and financial institutions. (4) $6,600 annually.

A. C. E. Hobbs, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the chemical industry. (4) $5,000 annually.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. International Trade Section, New York Board of Trade, Inc., 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fostering the passage of legislation concerning guaranties against risk of nonpayment by foreign debtors due to currency inconvertibility, exchange transfer block and other noncommercial hazards. (4) Expenses of $2,500 anticipated for quarter.

A. Ivins, Phillips & Barker, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Remington Rand, Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Kimon T. Karabatsos, 3707 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Niobrara River Basin Development Association.
C. (2) Authorization and appropriations for the Ainsworth (Nebr.) irritation unit of the Niobrara River Basin. (4) $200 expenses.

A. Joseph Duff Kelly, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 44 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Possible proposed amendments to banking laws. (4) Monthly retainer of $1,000.

A. Edmund H. Kerr, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Hamilton, 52 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Possible legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. (4) Annual salary $13,000 and expenses.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 2623 North Van Dorn Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the business of fire insurance.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposition to H. R. 4560 in its present form and other related bills to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938. (4) Office and traveling expenses.

A. Marvin E. Lewis, 703 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. City and county of San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) All matters whether legislative or administrative having to do with the welfare of San Francisco. (4) Anticipated expenses approximately $15,000 a year maximum and compensation is $12,000 a year.

A. Donald Linville, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Hardboard Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tariff reclassification of hardboard. (4) Traveling and living expenses estimated at $2,000.

A. Leon Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Valeriu C. Georgescu, Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 1310, and for other purposes.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cook Electric Co., 2700 Southport Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation affecting company's interests.

A. Frederick Lukens, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Education Association of the District of Columbia and Columbian Educational Association, 1129 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) District of Columbia public schools salary schedule revision. (4) Monthly compensation $150.

A. John J. Lyons, 3133 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Scully Signal Co., Melrose, Mass., and G. & W. H. Corson, Inc., Plymouth Meeting, Pa.
C. (2) Enactment of H. R. 2128 or a similar bill. (4) $500.

A. McDonnell & Slattery, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (4).[1]

A. Edwin McElwain, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the machine tool industry.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which the railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy. (4) Reimbursed for actual expenses.

A. Robert H. McNeill, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Beaufort Fisheries, Inc., Beaufort, N. C.
C. (2) Appropriation by Congress of funds to deepen ship channel in what is known as Taylor's Creek, Carteret County, N. C. (4) $750 retainer.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation as to the taxation of the income of fire and casualty insurance companies.

A. Julia L. Maletta, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Furtherance of labor and social legislation. (4) $300 per month, plus actual expenses incurred.

A. John M. Martin, Jr., 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to American motorists, and travel generally. (4) Anticipated expenses: negligible; annual salary: $8,500.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Japanese evacuation claims bills and appropriations thereto. (4) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1209 Rippon Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Social and labor legislation. (4) Compensation at monthly rate of $866.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Alfred I. duPont, Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
C. (2) H. R. 2674 and all similar legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, Robert K. Eifler, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Revision of Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Vocational Association.
C. (2).[1] (4).[1]

A. Douglas G. Mode, 705 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.
C. (2) Legislation providing for continuation of the suspension of certain import taxes on copper. (4) Total annual compensation and expenses, $3,000.

A. Douglas G. Mode, 705 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Downtown Merchants, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In furtherance of H. R. 4841. (4) Retainer for this purpose $1,000; additional compensation contingent.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Robert A. Drum, Omaha, Nebr.
(C) (2) Legislation affecting the excise tax on beer.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pickett Development Committee, Blackstone, Va.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the disposition of Camp Pickett, Va.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting employer.

A. Howard E. Munro, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, P. O. Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. union members employed on the Canal Zone. (4) $600 per month salary plus $20 per day expenses.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation as to the taxation of the income of fire and casualty insurance companies.

A. National Congress of American Indians, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting Indians, Indian tribes, bands, or groups in the United States and Alaska.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to postal transportation clerks. (4) $3,000 per annum for salary.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to American motorists and travel generally. (4) Anticipated expenses, negligible; annual salary, $11,000.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Blake T. Newton, Jr., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting communications. (4) Reimbursed for expense; compensation, $1,958.33 per month.

A. Niobrara River Basin Development Association, 3707 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Public Law 612. (4) Anticipated expenses, $200.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the ice-cream industry. (4) Annual salary, $18,400.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Of. 504, Lima, Peru.
C. (2) Amendment to Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, to increase quota. (4) $15,000 annually plus disbursements.

A. Samuel Omasta, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

A. Donald L. O'Toole, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to sugar and trade with Cuba. (4) Monthly compensation, $1,000 plus expenses.

A. P. T. Patterson, 5205 Sangamore Road, Glen Mar Park, Md.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To promote any bill of benefit to the association or individuals thereof.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty & Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
C. (2) To obtain amendment to Internal Revenue Code dealing with corporate distributions.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation as to the taxation of the income of fire and casualty insurance companies.

A. Helen L. Peterson, 823 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 823 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting Indians, Indian tribes, bands, or groups in the United States and Alaska. (4) $600 per month and transportation expense.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Gene Salentine, Brooksville, Fla.
C. (2) A bill for the relief of Irene Guay Salentine, or similar legislation. (4) Fee of $400.

A. Walter C. Ploeser, 50 South Bemiston Avenue, Clayton, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislative matters relating to regulation of domestic transportation, the American merchant marine, flood control and rivers and harbors maintenance, and related matters.

A. Poole, Shroyer & Denbo, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee representing American Fluorspar Producers, Rosiclaire, Ill.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, and foreign-trade legislation. (4) Compensation $150 per day and expenses.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Repeal or reduction of the excise tax now levied on phonograph records. (4) Retainer, $5,000.

A. Riegelman, Strasser & Spiegelberg, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.
C. (2) All legislation of concern to Indians as such and the Nez Perce Tribe in particular.

A. Gene Salentine, Brooksville, Fla.
C. (2) A bill for the relief of Irene Guay Salentine, or similar legislation. (4) Fee of $400.

A. Benjamin H. Saunders and Howard T. Mather, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grier Cotton Co., Statesville, N. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest concerns jurisdictional bill on refund of income taxes.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors. (4) Monthly compensation, $400.

A. James J. Saxon, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the banking industry. (4) Estimated annual salary $1,375 and expenses.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 378 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Appropriations, armed services, education, foreign affairs, Government operations, interior affairs, civil service, rules, un-American activities, veterans' affairs.

A. Paul R. Scott and George F. Gilleland, 627 Ingraham Building, Miami, Fla.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. John H. Sharon, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2).[1] (4) Compensation $5,500 per year, estimated expenses $100 per quarter.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 612 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rowe-Doherty, 612 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1, with certain amendments to protect defense skills and all legislation affecting the domestic jeweled watch industry.

A. Leo V. Sullivan, 106 Chestnut Street, West Haven, Conn.
B. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries. $50 per day and expenses.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana-Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
C. (2) Amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2).[1] (4) Annual salary $5,000, expenses $500.

A. W. M. Thomas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation applicable to postal transportation clerks.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2500 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting Solano County. (4) Fee, $1,180; estimated expense, $720.

A. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
C. (3).[1] (4).[1]

A. Upper Colorado River, Grass Roots Committee, Inc., care of Chamber of Commerce, Grand Junction, Colo.
C. (2) Supporting legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. (4) Approximately $15,000 expenses per quarter.

A. Richard G. Van Buskirk, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislative interest is to advance the art and science of medicine. (4) $4,500 annual salary and $1,500 expenses.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Stanley Vogt, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (4) $3,000 salary annually and $1,000 expenses.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lion Manufacturing Co., 2640 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Manufacturing Co., 3401 North California Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation of benefit to railroad labor.

A. George Y. Wheeler, 2d, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Radio Corporation of America and/or its subsidiaries and affiliated companies.

A. Kenneth W. White, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

A. Herbert P. Wilkins, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Possible legislation to amend or extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

A. Herbert P. Wilkins, 53 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Opposing legislation imposing increased duties or quotas on importation of petroleum or petroleum products.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Any legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act. (4) $150 per month.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 3423 Joseph Street, New Orleans, La.
B. California Commercial Co., 635 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the oil and gas industry. (4) $1,500 annual salary and expenses of approximately $150 per month.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of commercial banks. (4) Anticipated expenses approximately $60,000.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of commercial banks. (4) Anticipated expenses approximately $30,000.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Minimum Wage Legislation This Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege of appearing before the House Committee on Education and Labor to speak in behalf of a fair minimum wage bill.

I believe the House Labor Committee is making a diligent effort to bring out minimum wage legislation so that all the Members of Congress can debate and vote on a new fair minimum wage before this session of Congress adjourns:

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION THIS SESSION

Mr. Chairman, I am indeed happy that the House Committee on Education and Labor has decided to hold hearings on increasing the minimum wage standards of the Nation. I firmly believe that it is highly essential to the economical interests of our Nation that minimum wage legislation be acted upon favorably and signed into law before this session of Congress adjourns. It is indeed unfortunate that President Eisenhower has seen fit to recommend only an increase from the present 75-cent minimum up to 90 cents per hour. This falls far short of the economic needs for low income workers, especially considering the inflationary high cost of living which all families are subjected to at the present time. An increase to 90 cents an hour does not sufficiently cover the rise in the cost of living since the present 75-cent minimum became law in 1949. A number of bills have been introduced, including H. R. 1818 which was filed by me several months ago, calling for an increase to $1.25 per hour. If the President's recommendation of 90 cents an hour is enacted into law, the full-time worker would merely receive an annual wage of less than $2,000 a year. It is apparent, considering the present high cost of living, that a man and wife with children cannot afford the bare necessities of life to his family on that meager income. It is estimated that the annual wage at $1.25 for 8 hours a day and 5 days a week, would bring in an income of $2,500. This income would afford the average family in the lower brackets a great improvement in their status of living and give them an opportunity to enjoy at least a few privileges and necessities of life which they are compelled to forego under their present low income. It is estimated that the lowest income for a family living in high cost areas of the average metropolitan city should be at least $3,600 to $4,000 per year in order to meet the necessary living expenses for a family of five.

Unfortunately, the wage scale in a number of our States is far below other States, particularly those located in the southern areas of our country. The economic situation in a great many of our Northern States today has deteriorated by reason of literally thousands of industries and factories moving into States which have a low wage scale. The Northeast Atlantic States have probably suffered more than any area in the country by reason of "runaway" industry closing their shops and factories and moving into certain Southern States in order to take advantage of substandard wages. This situation has been becoming worse during the last 5 or 6 years until today, we have cities in the North that are suffering through critical unemployment brought about by "runaway" industry desirous of taking advantage of substandard wages. Only recently, I received a letter from a metal worker located at Indianapolis and stating that the top three floors of the factory where he is employed has been closed and the machinery moved to Alabama. He also stated in the letter that over 250 employees have lost their jobs already and that it would be but a short time until the factory would be completely closed and moved to the low-wage area. He also stated that the situation as it exists in the metal factory was no different than in several other industries in the Indianapolis area. Unless the Congress takes some steps to improve this unjust and unfair distribution of wages throughout the country, our economy will suffer far more in the future than it has in the past by reason of low-wage standards in certain areas.

The greatest selling market for products manufactured in low-wage areas is in the States which have a high wage and large purchasing power. If unemployment is rampant in the high-wage States, the factories will eventually close in the low-wage States.

We should not forget that one of the principal reasons for the great depression in the early 1930's was the fact that our factories and industries turned out products and discovered that the purchasing power of the country was so low that there was no market for our production. This brought about unemployment and the most devastating shattering of our economy in the history of the Nation.

Purchasing volume among wage earners is as essential for prosperity as purchasing power among the millions of farmers in America. After 1933, when our Government took steps to improve the economy of the wage earner and the farmer, our economy started to improve until we went into the greatest period of prosperity in our history.

The great industrial areas of the 1920 period learned a costly lesson when they discovered that low wages and low consumer income throughout America did not provide a market for steel and other manufactured products.

The increase in the minimum-wage bracket was promised to the American people by both political parties in the recent election. In fact, Secretary of Labor Mitchell told the CIO convention in 1953 that he was shocked to learn that two-thirds of America's 60 million workers were outside the wage-hour law. He further stated that the position of these exempt workers was dangerously insecure, but also imperiled those covered by the 75-cent minimum-wage law. It is estimated that there are over 7,500,000 retail workers and 5 million service-trade workers who are not covered by the present low minimum-wage base. The industries that are covered are often those industries in which unions are strong enough to enforce a wage rate for higher than the legal minimum. The industries exempted are precisely those where a long tradition of low pay, plus other factors, make it difficult for the workers to organize and present their case effectively. Some folks have the false idea that if the minimum-wage rate is increased, there must be a broader exemption. That in effect, means that we must not have a minimum-wage base in any industry where the law would have a useful effect. Both the A. F. of L. and the CIO have proposed a $1.25 level and if this minimum-wage base is enacted, or something reasonably close thereto, it would have the effect of pumping an enormous buying power into the hands of consumers, aid prosperity, and prove to be an effective barrier against the reoccurrence of another depression.

The Department of Labor survey in October 1951, showed that the annual income need for an average family was $3,812 a year in New Orleans. In the city of Washington, D. C. on account of the increased cost of living, the essential family income would be $4,454. Yet, this family budget would be far more than the head of a family would make at $1.25 an hour. A full year's work of 2,000 hours at $1.25 minimum would yield only $2,500 compared to the $3,800 required for adequate family living in a city like New Orleans.

The raising of minimum wage to a just level would indirectly bring about a great reduction in disease, crime, and slums. Heads of families who are compelled to bring up children with inadequate necessities of life, when children are compelled to go to work at an early age, when the family producers must work such long hours that he has no time for his home, his wife and his children, develops into a dangerous challenge to the state of mind of millions of Americans who live under substandard conditions. It fails to recognize our Nation's interest and welfare in human needs and the protection of the family is completely lost through poverty and lack of opportunity.

I do hope the committee will, without delay, report out a substantial increase in the base minimum wage structure and in doing so, carry out the promises that both political parties made to the American people in the last election.

It is my earnest hope that your committee act favorably so the bill can reach the House floor in the next 2 weeks. If the 435 Members of Congress are given an opportunity to debate, amend, and vote on a minimum wage bill, I am convinced they will reach a wage figure that will be fair and equitable to both employer and employee.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday, May 27, it was my privilege to address a Memorial Day gathering in West Allis, Wis. I stressed the significance of Memorial Day in our time, particularly with respect to aviation defense.

In my judgment, our country must look to its air age laurels if we are to have necessary protection for our national survival.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE MEANING OF MEMORIAL DAY IN OUR TIME—THE NEED FOR SPEEDING UNITED STATES AVIATION DEVELOPMENT

I am proud to be present with you at this outstanding patriotic assembly.

No one could be present today without a variety of deep feelings in his heart.