employs physically handicapped persons. This firm is the Empire Furniture and Rattan Works of Coral Gables, Fla. In 1942 this firm adopted the policy of employing physically handicapped persons. This policy was established by Edward Axlrod, a young man who was physically handicapped from birth.

The pioneering efforts of this young man, and his father, Leo Axlrod, who now carries on the business, helped spread the movement among businesses to hire physically handicapped persons to every important community in the United States and to foreign countries. The story of Edward Axlrod is, of course, familiar to the readers of Performance; there is no need to repeat it here. But it is of interest to show how our sympathetic approach to the problems of small business resulted in a business expansion loan to this enterprising firm.

It was in February 1954, that the proprietor of this firm came to the Small Business Administration. Mr. Axlrod asked the agency to share in a $20,000 bank-participation loan to help him increase production. The firm was then employing 23 persons, mostly physically handicapped, and wanted to expand, to provide employment for 17 additional handicapped persons.

Mr. Axlrod had already talked over with his banker the need for more funds to expand operations. The banker wanted to make the loan, but it was against the bank's policy to make loans for such a long term, in this case 4 years. However, the bank was willing to take half the loan, if we would take the other half. Our investigation was favorable, and a short while later the funds were disbursed to help this firm remodel and expand, and provide more jobs for physically handicapped persons.

That, very briefly, is the story of one loan we have made to help a firm that has pioneered in giving jobs to physically handicapped persons. There have been others, and I have no doubt that in the future there will be more. For it is becoming increasingly clear to all of us that providing jobs for handicapped persons is more than kindness and consideration. It is also good business. Properly placed, physically handicapped persons are good craftsmen. Consider for a moment this statement made to us in their loan application by the Empire Co.:

"While we are extremely proud of our work with the handicapped, we are most happy too, that we make such products of excellence that have given our firm root in the homefurnishing field of our area and the country. We export some furniture to Latin American countries and are attaching a catalog printed in Spanish and English to give you some idea of our line."

There is the traditional spirit of American enterprise for you: It is a spirit we are happy and eager to foster.

We are proud of the agency's record of providing financial assistance to help enterprising small firms expand and grow. So far, we have approved more than 1,300 business loans totaling about $70 million and two-thirds of these loans have been made in participation with private banks.

In addition, we have approved more than 1,100 disaster loans totaling $7,700,000 to individuals and firms who suffered damage in catastrophies such as floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes. This is a purely humanitarian function.

But the Small Business Administration also has other programs of which it is equally proud, and they are all geared to the central idea of helping small business grow and prosper. All of them are, of course, available to the physically handicapped and to firms employing physically handicapped.

Not so well known, perhaps, as our financial-assistance program, is our program to help small firms obtain a fair share of Government purchase orders. Here is the way it works.

The Small Business Administration has representatives stationed in principal procurement centers of the military departments across the country. Here, all individual proposed procurements valued at $10,000 or more (except those classified as "confidential" or higher) are screened jointly by the Small Business Administration representatives and military procurement officers.

Those found suitable for performance by small business, if jointly agreed to by the Small Business Administration and the military, are earmarked and reserved exclusively for competitive award to small firms. In some cases, portions of proposed procurements are also earmarked for performance by small firms under this program.

Under this one program we have been able to earmark more than $500 million in Government purchases for exclusive competitive award to small firms. This is business that these small firms would probably not have received except for this program.

Of course, the Small Business Administration also assists small firms in other ways. The agency's 40 regional and field offices are constantly making prime contract bid referrals to small firms with suitable facilities to bid on Government contracts.

In addition, through cooperative programs, its representatives are constantly encouraging larger private firms to subcontract more of their orders with smaller firms in their area.

For many small firms, the most serious problem is not one of obtaining financing of Government contracts, but an urgent need for help in overcoming a management or technical problem or in acquiring greater management and technical skill. The Small Business Administration helps here in a number of ways.

In cooperation with the Small Business Administration, collegiate schools of business and other educational institutions offer owners of small firms courses in currently important business administration subjects. These courses, conducted in the evening, are taught by experienced business leaders and college teachers. This year more than 55 such courses were offered.

The Small Business Administration publishes three series of practical, helpful leaflets called Management, Technical and Marketers Aids for Small Business. These leaflets cover a wide range of management and production problems, telling how to recognize and deal with them. They are available free at all of our field offices. In addition to these programs, all of which are available to help physically handicapped persons who have small businesses, as well as others, the Small Business Administration also provides experienced counsel to small business concerns and individuals in locating a marketable product or new line or type of product, or in locating a market for a product.

This products assistance program is designed to assist small firms in finding solutions to research and development problems regarding product improvement and new products. As part of this agency service, field offices maintain lists of Government-owned patented products and processes which are available to small firms free or with only a nominal charge for their use.

Production specialists in the Small Business Administration offices are available to help individual small-business concerns with technical production problems.

All of the services the agency has developed to help small business are available at its field offices. In order to foster better cooperation between firms employing physically handicapped persons and this agency, each field office has been provided with a list of certified sheltered workshops and a list of competitive firms employing handicapped persons. Persons interested in this subject may check their local telephone directories or write the Small Business Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O thou God of the changing years, in this still moment of another week's deliberations may a holy hush within our spirits whisper courage and fortitude and fidelity. We would make our hearts, cleansed by Thy forgiving grace, a temple of Thy presence, knowing that only to the pure dost Thou grant the vision of Thy face. We come asking not that Thou wouldst give heed to the faltering petitions our lips frame, but that Thou wilt bend Thine ear to the crying of our deep need.

We bring to the altar of prayer our inmost selves, cluttered and confused, where good and evil, the petty and the great, the worthy and the unworthy are so entwined. May the eternal immensities shame our little thoughts and ways. May the vision of what we might be convict us of what we are. In this great day of Thy visitation on the earth, may we not miss the things belonging to our peace and to the peace of the whole world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 24, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 67. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines; and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KEFAUVER, and by unanimous consent, the Monopoly and Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet for hearings this afternoon at 2 o'clock, during the session of the Senate.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BIBLE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate having met today following an adjournment, there will be the regular morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches made in connection therewith.

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I may state that it is the plan of the leadership at the conclusion of the morning hour to request that Senators who are in attendance upon committees come to the Chamber. In that connection we plan to have a quorum call and then to have the Senate proceed to consider the calendar.

At the conclusion of the calendar, if Senators are ready, the majority leader proposes to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 586, Senate Joint Resolution 21, to establish a Commission on Government Security, which measure was reported with amendments from the Committee on Government Operations. I wish to have all Senators on notice regarding the procedure.

The transaction of routine business during the morning hour is now in order, so I hope that all Senators who have matters to submit in connection with the morning hour will do so at this time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON THE BUSINESS ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, that Commission's report on the Business Organization of the Department of Defense (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FRANK G. GERLOCK

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DUAL EMPLOYMENT OF CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES IN CERTAIN POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE ROBERT A. TAFT

A letter from the Chairman, the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc., Washington, D. C., transmitting a resolution adopted by the executive committee of that foundation, offering to the Congress a memorial to the late Senator Robert A. Taft (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A communication from the President of the United States, favoring the acceptance of the proposed memorial to the late Senator Robert A. Taft, which was offered by the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 30

"Joint resolution relative to levees on the San Joaquin River and the Stockton Deep Water Channel

"Whereas for the purpose of improving navigation and eliminating a projection of land into the Stockton Deep Water Channel and the San Joaquin River, it has been proposed that there be constructed therein a deep water turning basin opposite Rough and Ready Island; and

"Whereas a portion of the north levee of the Stockton Deep Water Channel has already been weakened by the wave wash of ocean-going vessels; and

"Whereas the ships going and coming to the United States Navy Supply Depot, which is opposite the levee, have contributed greatly to the damage to the levee; and

"Whereas the proposed turning basin will increase the wave washing damage to the same levee; and

"Whereas in the event of a break in the levee, a heavily populated area with homes of families of moderate circumstances, containing approximately 4,000 property owners, would be flooded, with probable great loss of lives and property; and

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers has recognized this danger and has proposed a project for the repair and improvement of the levee, which proposal is included in House of Representatives Document No. 752, 80th Congress, second session; and

"Whereas the levee repair and improvement project has been authorized, but no financial provision therefor has been made by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to provide an appropriation for the purpose of improving and repairing the north levee of the Stockton Deep Water Channel and the San Joaquin River in order to protect the lives and property of the inhabitants of the area; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution relative to construction of a supercarrier at San Francisco

"Whereas the United States is, at the present time, contemplating the construction of additional aircraft carriers of the 60,000-ton *Forrestal* class; and

"Whereas shipbuilding facilities adequate to undertake the construction of such supercarriers are available in the San Francisco area; and

"Whereas sound military logic during this critical period of world affairs clearly dictates the imperative necessity for the diversification of ship construction; and

"Whereas the maintenance of a healthy ship construction industry in the San Francisco area is particularly important in view of the current Asiatic crisis; and

"Whereas the maintenance and availability of such an industry in the San Francisco area depends in a large measure upon work being provided by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby respectfully urge the Federal Government to provide for the construction of one of the contemplated *Forrestal*-class carriers in the San Francisco area; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to prepare and transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, and to the Secretary of the Navy."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 33

"Joint resolution relative to providing Santa Clara, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties with a supply of water from the Central Valley project

"Whereas Santa Clara, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties comprise one of the fastest growing regions of the State of California; and

"Whereas a great increase in population and in industrial development, together with intense agricultural activity, have combined to tax severely the existing water supplies of the region; and

"Whereas at present the watersheds of Santa Clara, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties are virtually the sole source of the water supply for the region; and

"Whereas to meet the desperate water needs of this region, it is necessary that the most feasible plan to obtain an additional supply of water be determined with the least possible delay; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to take such action as may be necessary to conduct and complete with least possible delay the necessary investigations, surveys and studies for the purpose of providing plans and feasibility reports to furnish a supply of water from the Central Valley project to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Alameda, and Contra Costa Counties, all generally in keeping with section 2 of the act of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 852), authorizing the American River Division Central Valley project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the United States Bureau of Reclamation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 34

"Joint resolution relative to the construction of proposed National Forest Highway Route 74

"Whereas one of the proposed national-forest highways in this State is National Forest Highway Route 74 (the North Fork Route), which would be located in Sierra National Forest in Madera and Fresno Counties, linking the Bass Lake region and the Shaver Lake and Huntington Lake regions of said national forest; and

"Whereas this route will also serve as part of a connecting link between Yosemite National Park and General Grant Grove, Kings Canyon National Park, and Sequoia National Park; and

"Whereas many schoolchildren residing in the Bass Lake region attend the Sierra Union High School located in Auberry in Fresno County and at the present time are compelled to spend as much as 5 hours daily traveling to and from this school on existing roads in this area, and approximately 2 hours of this time spent in school buses could be eliminated by the construction of National Forest Highway Route 74 between these areas; and

"Whereas while some Federal-aid funds have been allocated for the construction of a portion of this route, and 4.3 miles of the proposed 26.6 miles of said route have been completed, the existing plans of the United States Forest Service, the United States Bureau of Public Roads, and the California Department of Public Works apparently do not call for the completion of this project in the near future: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and the Federal and State officials charged with the duty of constructing national-forest highways in this State to take whatever steps are necessary to provide for the construction of National Forest Highway Route 74 as soon as practical in the orderly development of the forest highway system; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce, to the Chief of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, and to the director of the California Department of Public Works."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States, the President and his Secretary of Interior, Urging Study of the Red Tide in the Waters of the Gulf of Mexico

"Whereas the commercial and sports fishing industries are of the utmost importance to the economic security of the State of Florida; and

"Whereas from time to time certain noxious marine animal or plant organisms, commonly called the red tide, evolves in the water of the Gulf of Mexico; and

"Whereas when there is an occurrence of this organism known as the red tide, it destroys a tremendous number of fish and other marine creatures; and

"Whereas a substantial part of the natural resources of this great State stand to be destroyed by future attacks of the red tide; and

"Whereas the Department of Interior through its Fish and Wildlife Service has rendered a valuable service to the State of Florida by its study of the red tide, and it is with sincere appreciation that this legislature expresses its thanks and gratitude for such service; and

"Whereas there exists a definite and proven need for further extensive and exhaustive study, with a view toward the prevention or abatement of the red tide: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States, the President, and his Secretary of Interior are hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to facilitate and expedite an extensive and exhaustive study of the red tide, with a view toward the prevention or abatement of the red tide; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State of the State of Florida to the President of the United States and to his Secretary of Interior; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House in the Congress of the United States; the congressional delegations of the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas; the chairman and members of the Senate and House Joint Committee on Appropriations; and to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal of both the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Florida and sufficient copies thereof be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor June 18, 1955.

"Filed in office, secretary of state, June 30, 1955."

Resolutions adopted by the Holy Name Societies of St. Therese of Lisieux Roman Catholic Church, Brooklyn, and St. Leo's Roman Catholic Church, Queens, both of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Joseph P. Brogan, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Delaware State Council, Knights of Columbus, Wilmington, Del., relating to resistance to communistic infiltration and military pressures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, from the delegates to the Polish-American Congress, New York, N. Y., signed by Francis J. Wazeter, president, favoring the ratification of the Genocide Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Clyde Helmick, and sundry other citizens of the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of a constitutional amendment relating to race segregation in schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ABOLITION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Freeborn-Mower Cooperative Light and Power Association at their 18th annual meeting on May 25, 1955, condemning the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Lending Agencies recommending that REA be abolished.

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

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE ACTION OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Hoover Commission Task Force on Lending Agencies has recommended that REA be abolished and whereas the committee further recommends:

1. That the Rural Electrification Administration be incorporated under the Federal Corporation law as the Rural Electrification Corporation.

2. That the Federal Government subscribe $50 million for common stock to this corporation.

3. That the cooperative be required to charge such power and telephone rates as will enable them to pay (a) their own maintenance, (b) provide reserves for expansion, (c) make proportionate purchases of Government stock in the corporation and (d) pay interest and amortization on their loans.

4. That future financing be secured on the open market at considerable higher rate of interest.

5. That no loans be made for construction that private utilities stand ready to build.

Whereas these recommendations, if carried out, would mean the end of our rural electric cooperatives, now be it

Resolved, That the members of the Freeborn-Mower Cooperative Light & Power Association assembled in annual meeting this 25th day of May, 1955, do hereby go on record condemning this report in the strongest possible terms and urge our Congressmen to vote against these recommendations.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT, AS AMENDED—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., reiterating their opposition to the passage of the so-called Harris bill, H. R. 4560, to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, by resolution passed March 11, 1955, and approved March 14, 1955, opposed the passage of the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560); and

Whereas the city council has learned that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, June 8, 1955, by a vote of 16 to 15 recommended said bill for passage; and

Whereas it is still the opinion of the city council that such bill is inimical to the interests of the consumers of gas in the city of Minneapolis; and

Whereas the city council refers to and makes a part hereof its resolution hereinbefore referred to; and

Whereas hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and evidence produced therein have firmly convinced the city council that the Harris bill may well result in increased cost burdens to consumers of gas in the city of Minneapolis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That it reiterates and repeats its opposition to the passage of the so-called Harris bill or any legislation having a similar object; be it further

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Minneapolis requests the Members in Congress from Minnesota to exercise their utmost efforts to defeat this bill; be it further

Resolved, That it requests all the Members in Congress to oppose the passage of this bill; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be requested to submit forthwith a copy of this resolution to each Member in the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 619. A bill to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; without amendment (Rept. No. 637).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1835. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 671).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 756. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 638).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 59. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 672).

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

S. 717. A bill for the relief of Hedi Gertrude Spiecker (Rept. No. 640);

S. 1084. A bill for the relief of Santiago Landa Arrizabalaga (Rept. No. 641);

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Luca Saltarelli (Rept. No. 642);

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas (Rept. No. 643);

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Hal A. Marchant (Rept. No. 673);

S. 1220. A bill for the relief of Josephine Ray (Rept. No. 674);

H. R. 928. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maida (Rept. No. 644);

H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille (Rept. No. 675);

H. R. 990. A bill for the relief of Takako Riu Reich (Rept. No. 645);

H. R. 1111. A bill for the relief of Philip Mack (Rept. No. 646);

H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn (Rept. No. 647);

H. R. 1247. A bill for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst) (Rept. No. 648);

H. R. 1255. A bill for the relief of Ferenc Babothy (Rept. No. 649);

H. R. 1281. A bill for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto (Rept. No. 650);

H. R. 1283. A bill for the relief of Olga Joannou Georguea (Rept. No. 651);

H. R. 1287. A bill for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn, nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger (Rept. No. 652);

H. R. 1357. A bill for the relief of Chin York Gay (Rept. No. 653);

H. R. 1417. A bill for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlica (Rept. No. 654);

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Stijepo Buich (Rept. No. 655);

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca (Rept. No. 656);

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Eleanore Hauser (Rept. No. 657);

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg (Rept. No. 658);

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Wing Chong Chan (Rept. No. 659);

H. R. 1525. A bill for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez (Rept. No. 660);

H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of T. C. Elliott (Rept. No. 676);

H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh (Rept. No. 661);

H. R. 3069. A bill for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina (Rept. No. 662);

H. R. 3070. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang (Rept. No. 663);

H. R. 3075. A bill for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson) (Rept. No. 664);

H. R. 3194. A bill for the relief of E. S. Berney (Rept. No. 677); and

H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of John Lloyd Smelcer (Rept. No. 678).

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

S. 476. A bill for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout (Rept. No. 679);

S. 550. A bill for the relief of John Axel Arvidson (Rept. No. 665);

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil (Rept. No. 666);

H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend (Rept. No. 667);

H. R. 1155. A bill for the relief of Solomon Wiesel (Rept. No. 668);

H. R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward (Rept. No. 680);

H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts (Rept. No. 681);

H. R. 3074. A bill for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell (Rept. No. 669); and

H. R. 3363. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vicente D. Reynante (Rept. No. 682).

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

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Asher Ezrachi (Rept. No. 670); and

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders (Rept. No. 683).

EXTENSION FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS OF CERTAIN HOUSING PROGRAMS, THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953, AND DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably an original joint resolution, to extend for temporary periods certain housing programs, the Small Business Act of 1953, and the Defense Production Act of 1950, and I submit a report (No. 639) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) to extend for temporary periods certain housing programs, the Small Business Act of 1953, and the Defense Production Act of 1950, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM DISASTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1077) to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947, and I submit a report (No. 684) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the report is a favorable one on Senate bill 1037, introduced by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself. The bill provides for the payment of claims growing out of the Texas City disaster in 1947. The bill would compensate the families of 570 persons who lost their lives in the disaster, 3,500 persons who were injured, and many persons who suffered millions of dollars of damage because of the fires and explosions occurring in Texas City Harbor when the Federal Government sent there certain explosive fertilizer, which was intended for use in the foreign-aid program.

I hope the Senate will be able to act promptly on this measure, and thus express its will that compensation shall be given to those who, through no fault of their own, lost their lives or were seriously injured or suffered millions of dollars of damage.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

William J. Hallahan, of Maryland, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. GEORGE), from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive D, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva convention of August 12, 1949, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in Armed Forces in the field; with a reservation and a statement (Ex. Rept. No. 9);

Executive E, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva convention of August 12, 1949, for the amelioration of the condition of wounded, sick shipwrecked members of Armed Forces at sea; with a statement (Ex. Rept. No. 9);

Executive F, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva convention of August 12, 1949, rela-

tive to the treatment of prisoners of war; with a statement (Ex. Rept. No. 9); and

Executive G, 82d Congress, 1st session, the Geneva convention of August 12, 1949, relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war; with a reservation and statement (Ex. Rept. No. 9).

GEN. MATTHEW BUNKER RIDGWAY—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army, retires on June 30.

Under existing law all officers serving in either 3- or 4-star grade are serving in such grades under temporary appointments.

Upon retirement they revert to their permanent 2-star grade unless they are advanced on the retired list pursuant to law.

No increase in pay is involved.

The Senate has in all cases of these 3- and 4-star officers who have retired during the last 8 years advanced them on the retired list to the rank in which they were serving at the time of their retirement.

I trust that the Senate will also take this action in the case of General Ridgway, whose nomination, as in executive session, I now report from the Committee on Armed Services, and request that it be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, General Ridgway is one of the great officers of our time. I serve notice on the Senate that at the appropriate time tomorrow I shall call up the Executive Calendar, in order that we may complete action on this nomination before the end of the fiscal year.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 27, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 67. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2326. A bill to require any attorney at law practicing before a Federal court, or appearing before a congressional committee as counsel for a witness testifying before such committee, or appearing as counsel before any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, to file a non-Communist affidavit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 2327. A bill for the relief of Takako Iba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2328. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2329. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps to commemorate the opening of the new Cumberland Gap National Historical Park; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2330. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to deny the use of United States mails and facilities of interstate commerce to persons in foreign countries who sell, or offer for sale, within the United States any securities in violation of such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2331. A bill to provide for improvement in the system of personnel administration through the establishment of a senior civil service in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

S. 2332. A bill relating to the simplification of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2333. A bill relating to the certification of eligibles under the civil-service laws;

S. 2334. A bill providing for a simplified performance rating system for Federal employees;

S. 2335. A bill relating to appeals by veterans under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944;

S. 2336. A bill relating to reduction in personnel procedure and preference of veterans; and

S. 2337. A bill relating to the transfer of Federal employees from the classified civil service to another personnel merit system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2338. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 2339. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2340. A bill for the relief of Umberto Randaccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2341. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Heindel;

S. 2342. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng; and

S. 2343. A bill for the relief of Kuo Hwa Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2344. A bill to make the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia subject to the provisions of the Hatch Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to extend for temporary periods certain housing programs, the Small Business Act of 1953, and the Defense Production Act of 1950; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he reported the above joint resolution, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which appear under a separate heading.)

REQUIREMENT FOR FILING A NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to require any attorney at law practicing before a Federal court, or appearing before a congressional committee as counsel for a witness testifying before such committee, or appearing as counsel before any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, to file a non-Communist affidavit, and ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement in reference to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

The bill (S. 2326) to require any attorney at law practicing before a Federal court, or appearing before a congressional committee as counsel for a witness testifying before such committee, or appearing as counsel before any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, to file a non-Communist affidavit, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Generally speaking, the bill will bar Communist lawyers from practice in Federal courts, before agencies in the executive branch of the Government, and before congressional committees.

Specifically, the bill would require that before any lawyer shall be admitted to practice in any Federal court, or to appear as counsel before any agency in the executive branch of the Government or before any committee of either House of the Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, he shall make and file an affidavit that he is not, and for a period of 3 years immediately preceding the filing of such affidavit has not been, a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America, or any other organization which advocates or teaches the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional means. After such an affidavit had been filed, every reappearance by the attorney filing it would constitute, under my bill, a reaffirmance of the affidavit. The bill also would prohibit the appearance in Federal court, or before any executive agency or congressional committee, by any attorney

who has, before a proper tribunal, refused, on the ground of possible self-incrimination, to answer a question respecting his Communist affiliation.

I hope, Mr. President, that this bill may be reported promptly from committee, and promptly passed by the Senate and concurred in by the other body; and I hope it may set a precedent for legislative action by the several States in their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. President, a member of the bar is an officer of the court. In performing his functions as an attorney, his highest duty is to the court and the system of justice which the court both represents and administers. The fitness of an individual to hold this high status is a matter of great importance to the people who must rely upon that system of justice.

As the American Bar Association has so ably pointed out, in the brief of its special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, membership at the bar is not a right, but is a high privilege, dependent upon continuous compliance with exacting conditions. Meeting and maintaining the high standards for admission to the bar has always been a condition of continued membership in the bar by any attorney.

In his oath of office as a member of the bar, each attorney has sworn to support the Constitution of the United States and of his State. Membership in the Communist Party is inconsistent with that oath. The Congress of the United States has legislatively found the Communist Party to be an arm of a foreign dictatorship, seeking the overthrow of the United States by force and violence. The Subversive Activities Control Board, after a lengthy trial and all due process, has made a similar finding. The courts of this country have repeatedly made judicial findings to the effect that the Communist Party of the United States of America teaches and advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Membership in the Communist Party is not a question of belief, nor a question of political affiliation; it is a question of taking part in a conspiracy against the Government of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is obliged to inform the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes longer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. As the bar association committee has pointed out, loyalty to this Nation, to its Constitution, and to his own oath of office as an attorney is required of every lawyer so long as he is to practice at the bar.

The profession of the law requires a standard of character and reputation, and the maintenance of a code of ethics and conduct, at least as high as those in any other profession. Because the bar is the natural protector of justice, and upholder of the laws of the Nation, it is natural that these high standards should be fixed and required.

But, Mr. President, Communist lawyers do not protect or seek to protect the laws, nor do they serve or seek to serve justice. They serve only the objectives of the Communist Party, and they seek to subvert justice, to tear down or nullify the laws where that will serve the purposes of the Communist Party, to pervert the meaning of court decisions, to misuse constitutional rights, to make fools of our judges, a mockery of our courts, and a shambles of our judicial processes. They do this under Communist domination, under Communist instructions, under Communist discipline, and solely to further the aims and objectives of the Communist Party.

The statute which I have proposed is not an ex post facto law, nor is it a bill of attainder. It does not provide for a forfeiture. It only sets a reasonable standard for attorneys to meet if they wish to practice in the Federal courts or before agencies in the executive branch of the Government, or to appear as counsel before committees or subcommittees of the Congress. The law which I propose would not even say to a lawyer that he may not be a Communist; it would only force him to choose between being a Communist and practicing before Federal bodies. It would not deny him his right to claim the privilege against self-incrimination in order to avoid testifying about his Communist affiliations; it would only require him to elect between that privilege and the privilege of practicing at the Federal bar.

As Mr. Justice Cardozo said in *Matter of Rouss* (221 N. Y. 81, 116 N. E. 783):

> Membership in the bar is a privilege burdened with conditions. A fair private and professional character is one of them. Compliance with that condition is essential at the moment of admission; but it is equally essential afterward (citing cases). Whenever the condition is broken, the privilege is lost. To refuse admission to an unworthy applicant is not to punish him for past offenses. The examination into character, like the examination into learning, is merely a test of fitness. To strike the unworthy lawyer from the role is not to add to the pains and penalties of crime. The examination into character is renewed; and the test of fitness is no longer satisfied.

Mr. President, the privilege against self-incrimination, under the fifth amendment, is a personal privilege. The benefit of it flows to the witness himself, and to no other. Testimony may not be refused because of possible incrimination of any other person. Nor may testimony be refused because of possible or even certain embarrassment to the witness himself. The privilege is a privilege against self-incrimination, not a privilege against embarrassment. To claim the privilege, the witness must honestly believe that a truthful answer would tend to form at least a link in a chain to help convict him of an actual crime, on which the statute of limitations has not run, and with respect to which he has not been granted immunity.

Just as the privilege was not intended to protect the witness against embarrassment, so neither was it intended to insure the continuance of the witness in any office or to protect him in any privileged status.

Let me quote again the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives of the American Bar Association. That committee said, in a brief filed with the Supreme Court of the State of Florida:

> The American Bar Association does not contend that membership in the Communist Party establishes disloyalty of a lawyer unless he (1) joined voluntarily, (2) understood the conspiratorial nature of the party, and (3) intended thereby to support its criminal purposes. But membership alone casts upon an attorney, as an officer of the court, the responsibility to disclose fully any such extenuating facts or circumstances. Duress in joining the Communist Party, lack of knowledge of its conspiratorial nature, and intention not to support its criminal purposes, are all facts peculiarly within the knowledge of the person charged with being a member of the party.

Following up that line of thought, Mr. President, it is obvious that if a person has joined the Communist Party without knowledge of its conspiratorial purposes, without intention to support its criminal purposes, he will leave the party when he learns of these purposes. Further, a man who has left the party upon the discovery of these purposes, because he could not go along with such purposes, will not need to claim the protection of the fifth amendment, the protection against being required to incriminate himself, as a basis for refusing to testify with respect to his Communist affiliations.

The preamble of the canons of professional ethics of the American Bar Association states:

> In America, where the stability of courts and of all departments of Government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system for establishing and dispensing justice be developed to a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration. The future of the Republic, to a great extent, depends upon our maintenance of justice pure and unsullied. It cannot be so maintained unless the conduct and the motives of the members of our profession are such as to merit the approval of all just men.

As the American Bar Association special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives has so cogently declared:

> The American people cannot have absolute confidence in the administration of justice if officers to whom that sacred responsibility is entrusted under law are not faithful to the institutions upon which the administration of justice is predicated. For this reason attorneys must take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and of the State under the laws of which they are admitted to practice.
>
> It is not sufficient to proclaim the lofty concept of the bar, its vital importance to the public and to our form of constitutional government and the ideals upon which the profession's canons of ethics are based. Each of its members must personify them.
>
> Complete trust and confidence in the loyalty to his oath as an attorney are indispenable at all times.

In closing, Mr. President, let me sum up what my bill would do.

By requiring the filing of non-Communist oaths by attorneys, my bill would contribute to public confidence in the

Federal bar; and by banning those attorneys who refuse, on the ground of possible self-incrimination, to give testimony respecting their Communist affiliations, my bill would eliminate from Federal practice certain individuals who have clearly forfeited their right to that public confidence which the American Bar Association properly regards as indispensible to the satisfactory functioning of our judicial system.

A party to a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence—and that is what a Communist lawyer is—should not be allowed to practice before any Federal body. My bill would weed him out and keep him out, in the interests of the United States of America.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, RELATING TO USE OF MAILS FOR SALE OF CERTAIN SECURITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to deny the use of United States mails and facilities of interstate commerce to persons in foreign countries who sell, or offer for sale, within the United States any securities in violation of such act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2330) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, so as to deny the use of United States mails and facilities of interstate commerce to persons in foreign countries who sell, or offer for sale, within the United States any securities in violation of such act, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I have introduced today a bill designed to fill an important gap in our existing securities legislation. One of the most difficult problems to emerge from the Senate Banking and Currency Committee's study of the stock market involves the illegal sale of securities by foreign salesmen to American citizens. Senator WILEY, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has also been greatly concerned with this situation and has provided me with valuable data on the subject.

THE NEED

The inability of the Securities and Exchange Commission or any other branch of the Government to control the sale of securities by foreign brokers and dealers has long been a major deficiency of the Securities Exchange Act. It has been estimated that between $10 million and $50 million worth of securities are sold by foreign confidence men to American investors each year. One such scheme alone extorted $5 million from American investors. Most often it is the person least able to protect himself and who can least afford the loss who suffers.

These illicit operations recognize no State lines, find distance no barrier, and seem to operate in a no-man's land of the law. For instance, very recently I received a letter from a doctor in Arkansas who wrote me telling of the pressure he was receiving by letter and by long-distance telephone call from Montreal, Canada, to invest in a particular security. As a matter of fact, the caller said he was a friend of mine. I investigated and found that the company had little or no assets but the stock was being sold on the basis of the extravagant claims made by the Canadian dealer. Needless to say, I had never before heard of the securities salesman. Fortunately, in this instance, the investor ignored the high-pressure tactics and suffered no loss. Unfortunately, our natural confidence in human nature causes too many of us to succumb to visions of profitable investment even when support for those promises is lacking.

In July 1952 an effort was made by the Government to impose some sanction upon this illegal traffic in securities. A supplementary extradition convention with Canada was ratified by the Senate which was specifically designed to permit the American authorities to extradite violators of its laws from Canada when the violation consisted of securities frauds. We hoped that this convention would, at least to some extent, help bring to trial those who were guilty of fraudulently selling securities across the border between Canada and the United States. In the only case brought under this extradition convention, extradition was denied. It is apparent, therefore, that a new solution must be found.

I recognize that the legislation I have proposed may be imperfect. Clever violators may still be able to carry on their activities. It would be far better if, as the Senate Banking and Currency Committee stated in its report on the stock market study, "the Department of State and the Securities and Exchange Commission should seek the cooperation of the Canadian Government to force the discontinuance of those sales of securities which are in violation of American statutes." But this legislation should provide some measure of protection for American investors until the Department of State, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Canadian Government arrive at a full solution to the problem.

THE PROBLEM

The Securities Act of 1933 imposes upon all securities sold in interstate commerce or through the mail (with certain exceptions) registration and prospectus requirements. This is designed to insure that the purchasers of securities receive sufficient information about the securities to permit them to form an intelligent judgment upon whether they should buy them. In addition, the act prohibits any sales by means of false, fraudulent, or misleading statements. These provisions are enforced by the Securities and Exchange Commission either by civil or by criminal actions against violators. However, when the violator is resident in a foreign country, he is beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission and the United States courts, and he can, with impunity, sell securities which have not been registered by means of any statements he finds persuasive. The only limitations may be the extent of the gullibility of the public and his imagination.

The problem, therefore, is to find a way to subject the violator to the jurisdiction of the commission and the American courts, so that the obligations imposed by the registration and antifraud provisions of the Securities Act as may be applicable to him.

THE BILL

The bill would permit the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue an order which would deny to any violator of the Securities Act of 1933 the right to use the mails or any instrumentality of interstate commerce so long as he refuses to appear and answer charges of violation. A notice that charges have been made against the violator and that he has failed to appear to answer the charges is sent to the Postmaster General, the telephone companies and the telegraph company. Upon receipt of the notices, the Postmaster General, the telephone companies and the telegraph company are required to deny to the violator the use of the mails, the telephone, and the telegraph.

The violator may remove these restrictions upon his right to communicate with others by coming into the United States and subjecting himself to the jurisdiction of the commission and the courts.

The bill provides as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 20 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(d) Whenever it shall appear to the commission, either upon complaint or otherwise, that the provisions of this title, or of any rule or regulation prescribed under authority thereof, have been or are about to be violated in the offer or sale of any security by any person in any foreign country to any person in the United States or any Territory thereof, the commission shall give notice thereof to the person so offering or selling such security and shall give such person a reasonable time within which to submit to the jurisdiction of the commission or of any court in which any action may be brought under the authority of this act. If such person fails within the time specified in such notice to submit to the jurisdiction of the commission or such court, the commission shall give notice of such failure to the Postmaster General and to such agencies or instrumentalities of interstate commerce as the commission shall deem necessary, and thereafter, so long as such failure continues, no matter from or addressed to such person shall be carried in the United States mails and it shall be unlawful for any such agency or instrumentality knowingly to transmit or transport, within the United States, any matter or communication from or addressed to such person.'"

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday of this week, the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will expire. This Commission, through its Chairman, former President Hoover, and the other members of the Commission, has made its final report.

As Governor of the State of Kansas, I had the honor to serve on the Federal-State affairs task force of the original Hoover Commission. This gave me an opportunity to familiarize myself with the work of the Commission.

The work of the Commission during these many years has been of real value to the citizens of our Nation. Great credit is due President Hoover for his unselfish service, his outstanding leadership, his patriotic devotion, and his untiring efforts in this field of Government operations, for which he has special qualifications.

When the first Commission went to work, there were 75 separate bureaus with authority in the field of transportation, 104 in Government lending, 37 in

foreign trade, 64 dealing with business relations, 22 with insurance, and 44 with agriculture.

Following the Commission's report, consolidations have been effected in every one of these agencies. While it is true that many of the recommendations of the present Hoover Commission report have not been acted upon, and many have not been favorably received, great good will come from the study and the report. It is my hope that this Congress will give serious consideration and study to them.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, the proposals and recommendations made by the Commission on changes in our civil-service system.

It seems to me that these recommendations merit study and consideration by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Our committee can determine whether changes should be made in the proposed legislation, and whether it has merit.

I am introducing the following bills:

First. A bill to provide for improvement in the system of personnel administration, through the establishment of a senior civil service in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Second. A bill relating to the simplification of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Third. A bill relating to the certification of eligibles under the civil-service laws.

Fourth. A bill providing for a simplified performance rating system for Federal employees.

Fifth. A bill relating to appeals by veterans under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

Sixth. A bill relating to reduction-in-personnel procedure and preference of veterans.

Seventh. A bill relating to the transfer of Federal employees from the classified civil service to another personnel merit system.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Post Offic and Civil Service, as follows:

S. 2331. A bill to provide for improvement in the system of personnel administration through the establishment of a senior civil service in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

S. 2332. A bill relating to the simplification of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2333. A bill relating to the certification of eligibles under the civil-service laws;

S. 2334. A bill providing for a simplified performance rating system for Federal employees;

S. 2335. A bill relating to appeals by veterans under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944;

S. 2336. A bill relating to reduction-in-personnel procedure and preference of veterans; and

S. 2337. A bill relating to the transfer of Federal employees from the classified civil service to another personnel merit system.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT ST. LOUIS, MO. (S. DOC. NO. 57)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated July 26, 1954, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of April 20, 1948. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

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

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Responses by him to questions asked on the program entitled "Youth Wants To Know," on Sunday, May 15, 1955.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. KENNEDY):

Statement prepared by Senator KENNEDY regarding proposed Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address delivered by Senator SCOTT at a recent breakfast group meeting of Senators.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Interview with Senator MANSFIELD on the international situation as published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 26, 1955.

USE OF THE SALK ANTIPOLIO VACCINE IN CANADA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two articles appearing in the Providence Evening Bulletin of Tuesday, June 21, and Wednesday, June 22, written by Leonard D. Warner, special staff reporter for that paper. The articles relate to the use of the Salk vaccine in Canada, and I believe they will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

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

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of June 21, 1955]

NO FUSS, JUST RESULTS, IN POLIO PLAN

(By Leonard O. Warner)

OTTAWA.—While United States politicians, scientists, and parents have been concerned about the confusion over the antipolio vaccine, Canada has been vaccinating its children without fuss, with complete calmness, and, thus far, with no errors.

Now and then the men and women in Washington who have been forced by events to make the vaccine their business have talked about the orderliness of the Canadian program, but never too loud.

With characteristic detachment, the Canadians here in the capital city are not shouting too loudly, either. They don't have to. The facts are with them.

The day the dramatic announcement of the vaccine's effectiveness was made at Ann Arbor, Mich., the Canadians had on hand and distributed throughout the Nation enough vaccine for all selected early-age school children.

Up to now, there have been no reactors among the nearly 1,000,000 Canadian children inoculated.

Not one instance of live virus has been discovered in any of the vaccine produced in Canada.

Not a single hitch has developed in the program.

The second dosage injection is going ahead on schedule.

"All this has been accomplished by the exercise of great care, and with some luck," said George Carty, administrative assistant to the Canadian minister of health and national welfare, Paul Martin.

Carty gives two chief reasons for the smoothness with which the antipolio program has gone forward.

The first, he said, is careful planning started back last September. The second is a combination of factors resulting in rigid testing of the safety of the vaccine.

In Canada, all of the vaccine injected into children has been produced by the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories of the University of Toronto.

And the Canadian Department of Health and National Welfare has subjected all of the university-produced vaccine to its own tests, using monkeys at the federal laboratory of hygiene here in Ottawa.

In the United States the vaccine was produced by commercial pharmaceutical houses, and the Government itself did not test the vaccine. The commercial houses had been issued Federal licenses showing they meet specifications prescribed by the Government.

"Of course," Carty said, "there have been a few who said the government was interfering with private enterprise, but we most certainly do not feel that way. This was a matter of the greatest national public health interest, and we feel the government must assume the responsibility."

Why, he was asked, did the government laboratories here in Ottawa find it necessary to check vaccine produced in Tororto by an institution partially supported by the federal government, the university's Connaught laboratories?

Carty reiterated his government's feeling about complete safety, and gave this instance in which the double check paid off:

At both the university and at government laboratories in Ottawa, each batch of vaccine is subjected to 36 tests.

Two batches passed 35 tests but the 36th test, while not poor, indicated some doubt about the safety of the vaccine. The two batches were immediately destroyed.

Health Minister Martin put his department's position in these words when the United States furor developed on May 7 and all injections were ordered stopped there:

"There has been no evidence whatever of unfavorable reactions among the several hundred thousand Canadian children who have been inoculated.

"On the basis of this extensive experience in the use of the vaccine and the safeguards provided by the safety checking, it is the unanimous feeling of the provincial health authorities with whom we have been in touch that the vaccine is safe and no changes in the immunization program are contemplated."

Martin's words reassured most Canadians who had been worried about the United State news. But in Montreal a few mothers failed to bring in their children next Monday for inoculation.

Two days later, however, the Montreal mothers appeared with their children and

since that time there have been no instances of parents refusing to have their children inoculated, at least, none that Carty knew of.

When Carty spoke of luck in the Canadian program, he included in that category the fact that on April 12—the day of the Ann Arbor announcement—the Canadian Government licensed two United States pharmaceutical houses to ship vaccine to this country. Two other companies applied but were refused. Carty does not identify those failing to get import licenses.

One company had shipped 13,000 triple vaccine doses to Canada for sale to physicians. That company's vaccine never has been involved in any of the United States incidents.

But, when the live virus furor broke on May 7, Carty said, "We asked the company if it would not just as soon take all it had left in Canada back home."

Then he said emphasizing that he did not want to place Canada in the position of gloating, "We could just as well have licensed a company whose vaccine did give trouble. That's what I mean by luck."

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of June 22, 1955]

CANADIANS ANTICIPATE SUCCESS OF SALK VACCINE

(By Leonard D. Warner)

OTTAWA.—The Canadians now acknowledge, with a smile, that they cribbed a little on the use of the antipolio vaccine.

They were so sure the vaccine was safe that a few days before April 12—the date of the Ann Arbor effectiveness report—a few provinces already had started inoculating some of the selected lower age children.

In disclosing what then was a premature activity, George Carty, administrative assistant to Paul Martin, Minister of Health and National Welfare, said the early inoculations point up the complete readiness of the Canadian program.

"We did not know until the Ann Arbor report was made whether the vaccine was effective," Carty said. "On the basis of our double testing, we did know the vaccine was safe. And so a few places started ahead of time."

That's how ready the Canadians were when the Ann Arbor report was made.

In September of last year the advisory council to Paul Martin, Minister of Health, had decided to authorize the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories of the University of Toronto to start producing the vaccine.

"It was the view of members of the council that, since all experimental evidence pointed to the probability of a successful outcome of last year's trial of the vaccine," Martin said, "it would be prudent to initiate production of the vaccine in Canada so that immunizing material would be available immediately on release of the report."

If the report had said "No" or "Maybe," Carty added, the expense of production of the vaccine probably would have been justified because further experiments would be indicated.

Probably a factor in the authorization given to the nonprofit Connaught laboratories was that Dr. R. D. Defries, head of the laboratories, is chairman of the advisory council. In addition, Dr. G. D. W. Cameron, Deputy Minister of Health, was a staff member at Connaught for several years, and knew of the excellence of its work.

There was still another important factor.

Several years ago, three Connaught scientists had developed a method of keeping tissue alive in a solution called Medium 199. They developed it for use in cancer research, but found that it would not work in the way they wanted. And so it was put on the shelf.

When the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis was experimenting with the development of production techniques for the vaccine, Connaught came forward with its Medium 199 and said it might be used to grow the virus. It was used, a contribution of which the Canadians are understandably proud.

But Martin is quick to praise the scientists of the United States for the research leading to the development of the vaccine.

By April 12 the Canadians had 630,000 triple doses of vaccine ready. Much of it already was in the hands of authorities in the nation's 10 Provinces. The Federal Government and the Provinces were sharing the cost on a 50–50 basis.

When the effectiveness report showed that the third dose should be administered 2 months after the first, the Canadians realined their supplies and used the third dose portion for their first injections. That boosted the total available for the first and second doses to 900,000.

Meanwhile, Connaught was hard at work producing more, and the Institute of Microbiology at the University of Montreal also was preparing to get into production.

Another element of planning went into the Canadian program.

The department of health foresaw that discovery of polio in any inoculated child immediately would set off a chain reaction of disfavor.

With that in mind, it organized teams of well known medical men so that if a child were stricken, a team immediately would go to the patient and obtain all the facts. All this was done because some forms of polio are difficult to diagnose, and mistakes could be made, Carty said.

One child did develop polio after receiving the vaccine.

Within hours, the team of experts was at the child's side.

Result: The child had been infected 3 or 4 days before the injection and never should have been inoculated, the medical team said.

There was no national screaming, as there surely would have been had not the experts been ready and able to get all the facts.

In the United States, meanwhile, outbreaks among inoculated children could not be definitely diagnosed always and the confusion arose as a result.

Plans here call for the inoculations to continue until about July 1. If an epidemic occurs before then, the injections will stop.

The Government is committed to a national program only until next July. Before that time, the Government will resurvey the situation.

Despite the success of the program, Martin is emphasizing caution in the thinking of parents.

"We should regard the vaccine as a blessing, not a miracle," he said.

"The vaccine is not a total and complete preventive of paralysis from polio. Indeed, we must face up to the fact that some children may even develop polio after vaccination, since no two children have the same degree of immunity, either natural or acquired. But scientific evidence indicates that such attacks would likely be of a milder form."

Martin himself had polio when he was a young man. His right arm still is slightly affected. And his only son has had a mild form of the disease.

Some Canadians like to point to a set of circumstances that proved fortuitous for the Nation's antipolio program: the Minister of Health had intimate knowledge of the effects of the disease; the Deputy Minister of Health had experience in the ways of the University of Toronto's Connaught laboratories, and the head of the laboratories was also chairman of the national advisory council on health.

That's what the Canadians call "great care and some luck."

IMPORTANCE OF THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, an extremely interesting and important editorial appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of last Saturday, June 25. The editorial discusses the present Communist "redefection" campaign, designed to persuade many of the persons who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain to return to Communist-dominated countries. As the editorial points out, the program has serious implications in the propaganda struggle which is being waged in the cold war. This campaign points to the urgent necessity of making the refugee relief program a vital and dramatic success. This can be done only if Congress acts during the present session on the amendments which have been proposed by those of us, including the President of the United States, who believe that the full quota of refugees and escapees authorized by the Refugee Relief Act must be brought into the United States before the expiration of the act.

I ask unanimous consent that this well reasoned and convincing editorial, entitled " 'Redefection' Racket," be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

THE "REDEFECTION" RACKET

Many of our readers no doubt noticed the advertisement inserted in Wednesday's edition of this newspaper by the Czechoslovakian Embassy here in Washington. The same advertisement appeared also in the New York Times and in various other papers throughout the country. It reminded Czechoslovakian refugees of the proclamation of amnesty—dated May 9, the anniversary of the entry of the Red Army into Prague—for all "criminal deserters" who fled the country "under the influence of hostile propaganda" and now desire to return, and instructed them to apply to the Embassy for the necessary documents.

These advertisements were immediately recognized by emigre organizations and by American experts on East European affairs as part of the vast "redefection" campaign upon which the Soviet Government and its satellites have been expending enormous amounts of money and energy. In some way the Communists have managed to obtain the addresses of a very large number of anti-Communists, even emigrants of nearly 40 years ago, who have made homes in the West, so that these persons are now said to be receiving frequent and pitiful appeals from relatives still behind the Iron Curtain, telling in many cases of members of the family who have been arrested as hostages by the political police.

One purpose of the "redefection" campaign, undoubtedly, is to counteract the efficacy of the emigre propaganda transmitted beyond the Iron Curtain by such agencies as Radio Free Europe. Another purpose is to close off the trickle of escapes, which, despite the strictest frontier vigilance, steadily continues. Still another purpose is to create distrust and suspicion between the leaders of emigre organizations, whose prestige and acquaintanceships have usually smoothed their way to relatively comfortable asylum, and the humbler refugees doomed to wait and wait in German or Austrian internment camps.

There are said to be now in the United States about 15,000 persons of Czechoslovakian nativity who can be classified as

refugees from either nazism or communism. There is scant likelihood that more than a very few of these will swallow the bait now offered them by the embassy; for the adjustment and assimilation of these persons has been greatly aided by the numerous Bohemian-American or Slovak-American religious and social groups. But with the other thousands who are still languishing in the refugee camps abroad it may be quite another story. These unfortunates have certainly not realized that hope of freedom which impelled them to risk their lives in the effort to escape. The Germans, sorely bedeviled by the millions of their own refugees from the east, are naturally far less concerned about the personal fates of refugees of other nationalities. The continuing unwillingness of the western countries, including those of North and South America, to admit more than a relative handful of these refugees from communism contributes to the general atmosphere of despair.

Those refugees who succumb to Communist blandishments and consent to repatriation will of course find themselves effusively welcomed at home and will for a time be kept busy describing their disenchantment in propaganda broadcasts and newsreel conferences. But when their propaganda value has been exhausted they will be more likely than not to find themselves in some Communist prison or slave camp. For it should be carefully noted that the amnesty proclamation of May 9 covers only the crime of desertion, and makes no promises whatever of retroactive immunity for other offenses, such as espionage or sabotage against the Communist state.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II AND THE BIG FOUR MEETING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the July issue of Nation's Business, appears an article entitled "Trouble Shooter at the Big Four Meeting." The article refers to the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, Counselor of the State Department. Although the article is complimentary, I think it should be even more complimentary. However, I suppose my reaction is based upon prejudice, for I have such a high regard for this gentleman and the work he has done through the years.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, Mr. President.

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

TROUBLE SHOOTER AT THE BIG FOUR MEETING

When President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles sit down to talk peace with the leaders of Russia, Britain, and France at the Big Four meeting, the news photographs of the historic occasion may reveal a lean, smartly dressed career diplomat hovering not far from Mr. Dulles' elbow. Few will recognize his face but his name is a household word from Penobscot Bay to Panmunjon.

The man who will be passing notes to Mr. Dulles when the talks get down to negotiating a cold war truce is Douglas MacArthur II, 46-year-old nephew and namesake of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

It is Mr. MacArthur's peculiar fate that he is usually introduced as the general's nephew, rather than by his own title, Counselor of the State Department. Although he is the State Department's trouble-shooter-at-large and one of Mr. Dulles' closest advisers, he has learned, like his colleague, Undersectary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., that it is exceedingly difficult to make a name for yourself when the name you bear is already known to history.

This hard truth was brought home to Mr. MacArthur, for perhaps the thousandth time, on a recent trip to Europe. He had wired ahead for hotel reservations, taking pains as he always does to include the numerals after his signature. He arrived to find the royal suite awaiting him—and the manager bitterly disappointed that his guest was not le général célèbre.

He experienced a similar "Oh, it's only you" reaction when he came to Washington in early 1953 to assume his present post. An excited real estate man passed the word that Douglas MacArthur was buying a house in Georgetown, and several gossip columnists leaped to the conclusion that the general was going to be Mr. Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense.

A surprising number of people who do notice the "II" after his name take him to be General MacArthur's son. This puzzles Mr. MacArthur, since considerable publicity has been given to the fact that the general's only son, Arthur, is just 17 years old. Mr. MacArthur is often tempted to shout that he has a daughter 1 year older than Arthur.

Mr. MacArthur's problem is compounded by the fact that he has not one but two illustrious relatives. His father-in-law is former Vice President (now Senator) ALBEN W. BARKLEY. But the cynics are wrong if they credit the general or the Veep with Mr. MacArthur's present job. It was another general who plucked him from comparative obscurity and installed him in the top echelon of State Department policy makers.

When General Eisenhower was preparing to become supreme commander of the newly formed North Atlantic Treaty Organization he instructed his chief of staff, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, to recruit someone from the State Department to serve as diplomatic adviser on the SHAPE headquarters staff. General Gruenther chose Mr. MacArthur, who, as Deputy Director of the State Department's Office of European Affairs, had been working closely with Pentagon officials on NATO preparations.

General Eisenhower had expected General Gruenther to come up with a prominent ambassador. But he remembered that Mr. MacArthur had served as an assistant political adviser on his SHAEF staff during the liberation of France and that he had formed a good impression of him then.

"Okay, go ahead and hire him," he said.

General Gruenther telephoned Mr. MacArthur at his home that evening.

"Ike wants you to serve on his staff at SHAPE," he announced. "Can you leave for Paris in 48 hours?"

Mr. MacArthur stammered something about having a job to close out and a house to sell.

"All right," said General Gruenther magnanimously. "Take a whole week."

Mr. MacArthur served at SHAPE for 2 years, helping to steer the NATO command through the difficulties and complications that beset a defense force in which 14 sovereign nations have a stake. Salving the sore spots of Allied relations is highly confidential work and his efforts attracted little public attention. But his boss admired and appreciated his work.

"Mr. MacArthur made a tremendous contribution to the success of NATO," General Gruenther said recently. "General Eisenhower grew to trust him implicitly and to rely heavily on his judgment."

Shortly after General Eisenhower was elected President Mr. MacArthur was called home from Europe to be Counselor of the State Department. There is no doubt that he was the President's personal choice for the post; at the time of his appointment he had met Mr. Dulles only once.

The Counselor is not, as some people think, the State Department's chief legal officer. He is precisely what the title implies—a man who gives top-level advice and counsel to the Secretary of State. On the Department's organizational chart, the office ranks below the 2 deputy undersecretaries of state and above the 8 assistant secretaries. Actually, the Counselor's influence on foreign policy may be much greater than that of the deputy undersecretaries. These officials are heavily burdened with administrative duties, whereas he is deliberately freed from routine responsibilities to devote his full attention to major current projects and policy decisions. Mr. MacArthur's predecessor in the post was Charles E. Bohlen, now Ambassador to Russia. Mr. Bohlen's predecessor was George F. Kennan.

Both Mr. Bohlen and Mr. Kennan operated primarily as heavy-duty thinkers and as experts on Russia. Mr. MacArthur has taken on, in addition to the Counselor's traditional advisory role, many of the operational functions of ambassador-at-large, a post formerly held by Philip C. Jessup and now vacant.

It was in this latter capacity, for example, that he took charge last year of preparations for the Manila Conference at which the Southeast Asia collective defense pact was signed. The fact that this conference went off without a serious hitch and produced a treaty which is now regarded as a keystone of the free world's defenses against Red China's imperialism is testimony to his skill in the unromantic but important work that diplomats call "coordinating."

Coordinating is gobble-dy-gook for 2 of the essential tasks of diplomacy; 1, ironing out as many differences as possible before the formal negotiations begin; and 2, making sure that our foreign policy doesn't go off half-cocked out of ignorance of how the other fellow feels.

In these intramural negotiations Mr. MacArthur is careful never to gloss over any differences that crop up. He feels that it is his job not to bury conflicting viewpoints but to pinpoint the exact areas of disagreement. This gives the Secretary of State, and if necessary the President, an accurate picture of the choices and consequences involved in executive decisions. It also insures that any official or agency whose position is overruled will recognize the fact and fall in line with the decided course of the Government.

Once United States policy for the Manila Conference had been threshed out and a proposed draft of the treaty prepared, Mr. MacArthur began meeting informally and individually with Washington representatives of the other pact nations. This shirt-sleeves diplomacy began in July, nearly two months before the conference convened. In late August, Mr. MacArthur flew to Manila where an 8-nation working group proceeded to hammer out the actual terms of the treaty. By the time the foreign ministers arrived, virtually everything had been settled except the wording of the key clause committing the signatories to come to each other's aid in case of attack.

Here there were basic differences—some of the Asian nations wanted a more sweeping pledge than the United States was prepared to give. With lesser problems out of the way, the foreign ministers were able to agree on this clause in a couple of days, and the treaty was signed in an impressive display of speed and harmony.

Although the Manila Pact was perhaps his greatest personal triumph, Mr. MacArthur played a similar advance man role in other major international conferences, including the December 1953, Big Three meeting at Bermuda and the January 1954, Big Four foreign ministers meeting in Berlin. He has been deeply involved in the preparations for the coming meeting at the summit since the first diplomatic feelers were put out early this spring. If Mr. Molotov throws a curve, Mr. MacArthur should be in a position to give Mr. Dulles a quick, whispered briefing

on any previous consideration which United States, British, and French experts have given that matter.

Mr. MacArthur has found advising Mr. Dulles a highly nomadic occupation. The Secretary has a habit of ordering up his airplane and flying to wherever he thinks personal diplomacy may help settle a crisis. Usually Mr. MacArthur has to pack his bags in a hurry (his wife says they are never really unpacked) and roar away with his boss. Since he became Counselor in early 1953, Mr. MacArthur has logged approximately 168,000 miles of air travel, some of it on his own missions, but most often in the company of Mr. Dulles. He has made 10 visits to Paris, 4 to London, 3 to Bonn, 2 each to Taipei and Manila, and 1 each to Rome. The Hague, Brussels, Luxembourg, Cairo, Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Amman, Damascus, Beirut, Bagdad, Riyadh, Dhahran, New Delhi, Karachi, Istanbul, Ankara, Athens, Tripoli, Bermuda, Berlin, Geneva, Milan, Tokyo, Bangkok, Rangoon, Saigon, Phnom Penh, Vientiane, Ottawa, and Vienna.

He winces, however, when someone suggests that he has seen a lot of the world at the taxpayers' expense. What he usually sees is the road between the airport and the United States Embassy, and the four walls of a conference room. From these vantage points, he has discovered, the landscapes of Paris and Phnom Penh are remarkably similar.

When he does get home to Washington, Mr. MacArthur earns his $15,000 a year by putting in a 12-hour day, 6-day week at the State Department with about half of his evenings requisitioned for official social occasions, and a good many Sunday afternoons devoted to conferences at Mr. Dulles' home.

His day begins at 6:45 a. m., when he goes to the study of his Federal period house in Georgetown to read the New York Times and the Washington Post and Times Herald while eating an unvarying breakfast of orange juice, melba toast, and coffee. He usually gets to his office by 8 a. m. There he spends another hour reading the secret messages and diplomatic reports that have arrived overnight.

By 9:15, Mr. MacArthur is ready for the Secretary's daily staff conference. It often lasts from 45 minutes to an hour, and is attended by Mr. MacArthur, Mr. Hoover, Deputy Under Secretaries Loy Henderson and Robert D. Murphy, and the assistant secretaries. It is a key part of the formal machinery for making State Department policy on all current problems.

Mr. Dulles spent much of his adult life preparing for his present job, and he brought to it definite ideas about United States foreign policy. This fact, coupled with his far-ranging travels and his determination to conduct personally as many important negotiations as possible, has exposed him to the charge that he tries to run the State Department as a one-man show.

Mr. MacArthur, who has a high regard for Mr. Dulles, contends that the Secretary's daily staff meeting and other policy meetings on specific problems refute this allegation. He says Mr. Dulles demands candid advice from his subordinates and if one of his own pet ideas is vulnerable, "he wants it shot down in flames."

"In fact," Mr. MacArthur says, "I have never known a man who so thoroughly exposes his thoughts and ideas to his advisers for honest opinions. He doesn't like yes men."

When the staff meeting adjourns, Mr. MacArthur returns to his office, but he is usually interrupted several times by telephone calls summoning him back to Mr. Dulles' office. If the call is urgent—and during periods of great international stress it often is—he barrels out of his office with the fleet-footed grace of a natural athlete who won his letter in football at Yale. But the time that he saves by good broken-field running down the corridor is usually lost when he arrives at the do-it-yourself private elevator that runs to the executive sanctum. In his impatience, he frequently stalls the mechanism entirely by jamming 3 or 4 buttons at once.

This streak of impatience appears to be a factor in what his associates identify as both his outstanding virtue and his chief handicap. On the good side, it is reflected in a hard-driving passion to get ahead with a project, and an almost ruthless dedication of time and energy to the problem at hand. On the debit side, it shows up in occasional outbursts of temper—which he himself deplores—and an inability at times to hide the fact that he does not suffer fools gladly.

It may also help to explain why, with Mr. MacArthur, as with his famous uncle, people tend to divide into two camps: those who admire him tremendously, and those who cannot abide him.

Candid appraisals that were solicited through numerous State Department offices included such diverse comments as:

From a veteran ambassador: "He is one of the best men we have in the Foreign Service. He is forceful, persuasive, a skillful negotiator, and has highly developed powers of analysis."

A second-echelon career official: "He can be nice or nasty, depending on his mood. Frankly, he irks the hell out of me."

A subordinate: "He is a driver, but he drives himself harder than anyone else. The one thing in his mind is to get the job done."

An equal on the policy level: "I rate his intelligence and ability highly. He is extremely direct and has a faculty for cutting through the underbrush and getting to the real problem. I have found him most cooperative, but he has a few personal qualities that irritate some people. I think there is also a dab of jealousy here and there about his rapid rise."

The pattern of these comments suggest that, in Mr. MacArthur's case, familiarity breeds respect. The people who know him best and who have worked most closely with him have the highest regard for him.

It is easy to misjudge Mr. MacArthur on the basis of casual acquaintance. The first time I saw him, he was addressing a luncheon of the Overseas Writers Club in Washington. His manner was reserved, even aloof. He spoke precisely, choosing each word with obvious care, in an accent born of an Ivy League education and many years abroad. I commented to a luncheon companion that "he looks like a pretty stuffy type." Later, in private conversation under more relaxed circumstances, I found him a friendly, gregarious extrovert with a great deal of personal charm.

The public's legitimate concern, of course, is not with the MacArthur personality but with his ability. How much wisdom, experience and skill does he contribute to the delicate task of keeping the peace?

In seeking an answer to this question, we run up against the fact that a confidential adviser, by the nature of his job, cannot be judged by the same yardstick as an executive. It is the executive, in this case Mr. Dulles, who inevitably gets credit or blame, and Mr. MacArthur is too loyal to his boss either to claim or disavow the authorship of any particular aspect of United States policy.

The consensus of his closest colleagues' opinions is that he is a superior diplomatic technician, and a shrewd analyst of tactical problems, but not a profound thinker of Mr. Kennan's caliber. To put it differently, he is more concerned with making current United States foreign policy work than with brooding over different and possibly better solutions to the ultimate questions of atomic-age diplomacy. Someone once described him as a carpenter rather than an architect of our basic cold-war strategy, and he accepts this as a fair description.

One of Mr. MacArthur's most appealing traits is his unabashed enthusiasm for his job and his organization. He loves diplomacy, even the tedious aspects of it, and his attitude toward the Foreign Service is like that of an old Leatherneck toward the United States Marine Corps.

His never regretted decision in favor of a diplomatic career was made when he was 14, an age when by all logic he should have had his heart set on going to West Point or Annapolis. All his family antecedents pointed him toward a military career. His grandfather, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, had been a famous soldier; his Uncle Douglas was making a brilliant record in the Army; and his father, Arthur MacArthur, Jr., was a captain in the Navy.

In 1923, Captain MacArthur's ship took the Secretary of the Navy on a good will tour of Japan. With a view toward introducing his son early to shipboard life, Captain MacArthur asked and received permission for young Douglas to go along. They sailed from Hampton Roads in May, visited the West Indies, Panama, Hawaii, Japan, China, and the Philippines.

At each port of call, Douglas was placed in the custody of the local United States consul, or embassy staff, while his father was involved in ceremonial duties. He took a great liking to the Foreign Service people who cared for him and for the kind of life they led in faraway, exotic places. When the cruise ended in September, Douglas had firmly made up his mind that he would join the Foreign Service when he grew up.

His father, who died a few years later, assented. Douglas was sent to Milton Academy, a fashionable prep school near Boston, and then to Yale, where he majored in history and broke his nose three times running interference for Albie Booth.

He graduated from Yale in 1932 and passed the examinations for admission to the Foreign Service. But a long waiting list was ahead of him, and it was 1935 before his appointment came through. He spent the intervening 3 years plying the family trade as a lieutenant in the Army. He was stationed at various Civilian Conservation Corps camps in Virginia, an humble duty ameliorated somewhat by the fact that he often spent his weekends in Washington as the house guest of the Army Chief of Staff, his Uncle Douglas.

When he was finally appointed as a Foreign Service officer, he spent routine tours of duty as vice consul in Vancouver and Naples. Then, in 1938, he was sent to the Paris Embassy. He left Paris shortly before the Nazis overran it in 1940, and followed the French Government to Vichy. His wartime work in Vichy had the cloak-and-dagger overtones that are always associated with a diplomatic career in the movies but only rarely in real life. One of his jobs was to help arrange escape routes for Allied fliers shot down over Europe, and he worked closely with the French underground.

Many of the leaders of the French resistance movement whom he met clandestinely in those furtive days are now leaders of the French Government, and Mr. MacArthur's warborn friendship with them has helped to smooth over many a postwar French-United States diplomatic misunderstanding.

The Germans moved into Vichy in 1942, and Mr. MacArthur was sent to an internment camp where he stayed until March 1944, when he was repatiated in an exchange of diplomatic personnel.

In June of that year, General Eisenhower's forces invaded Europe and within a month Mr. MacArthur was on his way back to France to serve as an assistant political adviser on the Eisenhower staff, a job in which he made good use of his contacts with the French underground. Paris was liberated in August, and Mr. MacArthur returned to the Embassy he had fled 4 years before. He stayed there,

as first secretary, until 1948. In 1949, he was brought back to Washington to be chief of the State Department's Western European Division and subsequently Deputy Director of the Office of European Affairs, the post in which General Gruenther discovered him.

That part of Mr. MacArthur's life which is not devoted to his country's service is built around the two women who have shared his nomadic existence for 21 and 18 years respectively. Mrs. MacArthur, the former Laura Louise Barkley, is a gracious and charming Kentuckian who inherited her father's sense of humor and a good deal of his skill as a raconteur. Their daughter, christened Laura but always called Mimi, is a senior at the fashionable Holton Arms School in Washington.

Mr. MacArthur's only real complaint about his job is that the long hours, the frequent trips abroad, and the interminable social obligations leave him too little time for family life.

At least three, sometimes four, evenings a week, Mr. and Mrs. MacArthur have to dress up and go out to a party given by or for someone of diplomatic importance. Mrs. MacArthur tries to minimize the impact of the social circuit on her husband's health (and her own) by arranging their calendar so that they alternate an evening out with an evening at home.

The off-night-at-home is Mr. MacArthur's main joy in life, and he plans carefully in advance how he will spend these few rationed hours with his family. Dinner is a pleasant ritual that recalls their long residence in France. Mr. MacArthur has what his wife calls "gourmet taste and a spartan conscience"—he likes good food and vintage wines, but has an ex-athlete's fear of gaining weight. After dinner, Mr. MacArthur likes to watch the fights or a baseball game on television. He is a die-hard fan of the Washington Senators.

Aside from Mrs. MacArthur and Mimi, the person closest to Mr. MacArthur is his widowed mother, who lives in Washington, and with whom he visits frequently. He also sees a lot of the Veep, who once counseled his daughter not to "marry that young fellow MacArthur and traipse all around the world," but who now regards his son-in-law as the paragon of all filial virtues. He calls on General MacArthur whenever he goes to New York, but their relationship, while warm and cordial, is no closer than could be expected of an uncle and nephew who spent most of their adult lives on opposite sides of the earth.

From the public utterances of the general and Mr. MacArthur, there would seem to be divergencies in their views on foreign policy. The general on numerous occasions has attacked the collective security concept which was expressed in the NATO and SEATO pacts, and which has become the foundation stone of United States cold war policy. Mr. MacArthur believes that collective security—a network of alliances against Communist aggression in which each nation is a full, free and willing partner—offers the best hope of maintaining peace and freedom.

SILLIMAN EVANS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is with sadness that I arise to inform my colleagues of the passing of Silliman Evans, president-publisher of the Nashville Tennessean. Mr. Evans passed away Sunday morning shortly after having attended the funeral of his old friend and associate, the Honorable Amon Carter, of Fort Worth, Tex. His funeral services will be conducted Wednesday morning at 11 o'clock in Nashville.

Over a period of 40 years Mr. Evans played an important part in the newspaper and political and economic life of our Nation. He counted his friends throughout the Nation by the thousands. He enjoyed the confidence of such distinguished leaders as former Vice President John Nance Garner, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, and our own Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

At an early age Silliman Evans became an outstandingly successful newspaper reporter. He was editor of a number of Texas newspapers. He became interested in commercial airline developments in Texas. He handled the publicity for the campaign of John Nance Garner for the Presidency and handled the strategy which led to his selection as Vice Presidential nominee in 1932. Thereafter he became the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General where his modernization of the Department was eminently efficient. Later he took over the presidency of the Maryland Casualty Co. and in 1937 became the publisher of the Nashville Tennessean.

Mr. Evans had the distinction from 1932 of attending every Democratic National Convention as delegate from Texas, Maryland, or Tennessee. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, in introducing him recently to a breakfast given for the national committeewomen in Washington, stated that Tennessee gave a great hero, Davy Crockett, to Texas, but Texas had evened the score by giving Tennessee Silliman Evans.

It has been my pleasure to have been closely associated with Mr. Evans during the past 20 years. He was one of my closest friends and advisors. I had an opportunity of knowing his great capacity for friendship, his remarkable ability, and the warmness of his heart and his progressive liberal attitude. In all of these Mr. Evans excelled to a remarkable degree.

Silliman Evans, through his personal influence and through the progressive Nashville Tennessean, was one of the strongest influences for progress and development in the South. He waged vigorous battles for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the development of the Cumberland, the removal of the poll tax, and better treatment for farmers. He represented liberalism in its finest sense. Mr. Evans never gave up a cause after having embarked upon it. He fought vigorously and uncompromisingly for issues and candidates, even though he may have known the cause was hopeless. Frequently he and his newspaper espoused the candidacy of people who had little chance of winning. However, that did not detract from the vigor of Mr. Evans' support.

Silliman Evans' many friends will miss him greatly. His advice and counsel were always sincere and generously given. When friendship was once established, he never sold a friend short. He stuck by them through thick and thin. I wish to extend to his wife and sons my deepest sympathy and to say to his successors and staff of the Nashville Tennessean that they have an added responsibility of carrying on that great newspaper in the tradition of Silliman Evans.

ALUMINUM PRODUCTION IN CANADA AND IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, through the decisions of this Republican national administration, additional aluminum production has been discouraged in our American Pacific Northwest.

To begin with, Secretary of the Interior McKay has deliberately stopped the great Federal power program which made possible, between 1940 and 1952, the establishing in the Northwest of 44 percent of all the aluminum capacity in the United States. Prior to that time, not an ounce of aluminum had been smeltered in our region.

But Mr. McKay not only curtailed all new Federal hydroelectric development; he also prevented the budgeting of funds for transmission lines and substations that would enable the Bonneville Power Administration to furnish energy for carrying out a Government contract with the Harvey Machine Co., which hoped to erect a great aluminum smelter at The Dalles, Oreg. Failure to have this plant constructed has caused much chagrin and disappointment in Wasco County, particularly, and in Oregon generally. After all, this employment could be essential in providing new jobs and payrolls after the building jobs on the Dalles Dam taper off and decline.

However, Mr. President, while this administration has let aluminum production go by the boards in our own Northwest, the Canadians across the international border have been efficiently busy. The vast Kitimat aluminum plant in British Columbia, now turning out ingots at the rate of 88,500 tons a year, is soon to be expanded to a capacity of 181,500 tons. Furthermore, the Aluminum Company of Canada has announced this week that Kitimat will have an output of 331,500 tons by 1959. Eventually, Kitimat will produce 550,000 tons, which will make it the largest producer of primary aluminum anywhere in the world.

With full development, there is ample hydroelectricity in the Pacific Northwest both for aluminum production and ordinary needs. While aluminum smelting does not employ large numbers of people, the inevitable secondary fabrication—as the Northwest becomes the aluminum center of the continent—will result in the hiring of thousands of skilled men and women at high year-around wages. This is a crucial economic necessity for the region where I was born and raised.

Let me quote a significant paragraph from a New York Times article of Sunday, June 26, 1955; an article from Kitimat, British Columbia, by Jack R. Ryan, correspondent of the Times:

> Virtually all of this metal (aluminum) is going to users in the United States who are eager for more just as soon as they can get it.

What does this mean, Mr. President? It means that our own Nation, which is hungry for aluminum, must depend upon Canadian production for this vital metal of the 20th century. Kitimat is a record-breaking source of vast quantities of aluminum because of the low-cost waterpower generated on the seacoast by dropping so-called hanging

lakes through a 10-mile tunnel into Kemano Fiord.

In our own Northwest we have magnificent sites for power, perhaps not as good as that at Kemano and Kitimat, but wonderful sites nonetheless—sites like Hells Canyon and John Day and many others, for example. Yet this administration proposes to give Hells Canyon to the Idaho Power Co. for piecemeal, partial, and less than full development. In addition, the Interior Department has shown no willingness to recommend the transmission lines and transformers which are necessary to energize the proposed aluminum plant at The Dalles, Oreg.

So that Members of the Senate can understand the irony of further production in Canada to serve the United States, while we let our own aluminum opportunities go to waste here, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the story from the New York Times of June 26, 1955, entitled "Alcan Expanding Aluminum Output."

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

ALCAN EXPANDING ALUMINUM OUTPUT—LONELY INDIAN FISHING VILLAGE ON WILD FIORD IS NOW SCENE OF TOP FREE WORLD PROJECT—MORE POTLINES ON WAY—88,500-TON ANNUAL CAPACITY EXPECTED TO BE RAISED BY 1959 TO 331,500 TONS

(By Jack R. Ryan)

KITIMAT, BRITISH COLUMBIA, June 25.—This thriving new town on a wilderness fiord 100 miles below the Alaskan border is the scene of the largest aluminum expansion project underway in the free world.

Four years ago there was only a lonely Indian fishing village here. The deep forests were populated mostly by black bears, grizzlies, and wolves.

Today Kitimat is home to 5,000 men, women, and children. And its aluminum smelter, fed on processed ore brought by ship from faraway Jamaica, British West Indies, is turning out ingots at the rate of nearly 88,500 tons a year.

Virtually all of this metal is going to users in the United States who are eager for more just as soon as they can get it.

The urgent peacetime demand for aluminum caused the Aluminum Co. of Canada to accelerate its Kitimat expansion program, and twice since the smelter poured its first metal last August large new additions to capacity have been authorized.

BUILDING MORE POTLINES

Construction crews are erecting the blocks long buildings that will house two new potlines or series of production units. The first should be producing next March, the second a year from now. And a new site to the northeast is being prepared for 2 more, for a total of 6.

Last January an avalanche in mile-high Kildala Pass temporarily disrupted the smelter's electrical power supply, and some potlines were damaged. For this reason Kitimat has not yet operated at its present capacity rate of 91,500 tons.

However, the new construction is right on schedule, and by the end of next year the installed capacity will be 181,500 tons. In 1959, barring the unforeseen, it will have reached the present goal of 331,500 tons. Eventually, the capacity is expected to be raised to 550,000 tons, which would make Kitimat the world's largest primary producer.

R. E. Powell, Alcan president, estimates that $300 million has been spent so far on the Kitimat project and its spectacular hydroelectric development. By the end of the presently authorized construction program, this will have climbed to at least $510 million, including some necessary expansion of alumina processing facilities in Jamacia.

HUGE POWER POTENTIAL

Alcan chose this region, 400 miles north of Vancouver and roughly 80 miles up the deep tidewater channels from the sea, because of the abundance of hydroelectric power in a series of nearby lakes high in British Columbia's coastal range.

The carefully planned townsite of Kitimat has nearly 500 homes now. At least 450 more are to be built this summer, along with a high school, 2 large commercial store buildings, and a railway station for the new railroad to Terrace, British Columbia, 43 miles up the valley. By the end of 1959, when the present expansion is completed, the town's population is expected to be around 20,000.

Already a dairy products plant, a welding gas manufacturer, cement-block plant and more than 100 small private businesses are being established in Kitimat.

The townsfolk confidently predict that other major industries will be attracted here by the power, pulpwood and other resources. Studies are being made in the area for the Kitimat Pulp & Paper Co., envisaged as a joint venture of Alcan's parent company, Aluminium, Ltd., and the Power River Co., large newsprint producer.

"We'll make all the electrical power available here that any new industry wants," says McNelly DuBose, vice president in charge of the British Columbia project. "All we need is a little advance notice so we can tap some more of our enormous hydroelectric potential."

He believes Kitimat would be ideal for a large chlorine plant to serve the Northwest's flourishing paper industry.

Kitimat's electricity is generated at Kemano, a settlement of about 700 persons, 50 miles to the south in a narrow fiord overshadowed by precipitous snowy peaks. The gleaming modern powerhouse is inside a chamber blasted from solid rock deep within a mountain and safe from landslides and aerial attack.

The huge cavern, big enough to contain the liner *Queen Mary*, has 3 turbine generators installed now, with a capacity of 450,000 horsepower. Workmen are preparing foundations for two more to keep pace with the smelter expansion. There is room for 8 altogether, to raise capacity to 1,120,000 horsepower.

Water to drive the turbines drops 16 times the height of Niagara Falls, through a penstock bored into the mountain and connecting with a huge 10-mile-long tunnel from Tahtsa Lake to the east. This lake is only 1 of a dozen making up a 140-mile long reservoir created by plugging the eastern outlet of a vast natural drainage area with a dam on the Nechako River.

The water has been rising against this dam since it was completed late in 1952—and not until 1957 will the reservoir be full.

SWEDES' DAY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, two celebrations, related but separated by more than 5,000 miles of land and water, took place within the past few days. One was in Sweden, the other in Minnesota. On Friday, June 24, the people of Sweden put aside for awhile their daily cares to observe the holiday known as Midsummer Eve.

It is only appropriate that the following Sunday, June 26, is Svenskarnas Dag, or Swedes' Day, in Minnesota.

I am sorry that I could not be in Minneapolis for the celebration of Svenskarnas Dag this year. I have been present many times over the years, and each occasion has been a source of inspiration, a powerful reminder of important past events and a cause for renewed faith in the future of our country.

The roots of these celebrations go back for a thousand years or more. The thriving, modern civilizations of Minnesota and of Sweden have been wrought out of adversity by diligence and faith. For centuries the people of Sweden coped with difficult conditions, the poor soil of parts of the country, the harsh climate of long dark winters and brief bright summers, long distances and isolation, the years of war and the years of famine. But even in these bygone days, under the worst of circumstances, the people of Sweden never accepted the yoke of the oppressor, from within or without. For more than 500 years, without a break, the ordinary people have had a real voice in their government.

Now, as in years past, as the people of Sweden celebrated Midsummer Eve they rejoiced in much more than the warmth and brightness of the summer. Again this year they celebrated as well their freedom, their enlightened democratic way of life, their resolute preparedness to defend that way of life in a troubled age, and their 150-year-old record of peace. And as they gathered in the bright, sunny evening of Midsummer Eve under the blue and yellow flag, many of them were thinking of brothers and sisters, children and grandchildren, cousins and uncles and aunts who look up to the Stars and Stripes.

The contribution of more than a million Swedish immigrants to the United States over the last 100 years, particularly in Minnesota, the Midwest generally, and the West, is a well known and inspiring chapter of American history. It is only 7 years since we commemorated the centennial of the arrival of the first Swedes in Minnesota. Today, more than a quarter of the people there trace their origins to Sweden. Doctors, lawyers, farmers, businessmen, builders, legislators, governors, educators, authors, musicians—they have succeeded in all walks of life. Together with the stream of settlers from all corners of the globe they helped transform Minnesota from a wilderness to a populous, vigorous, prosperous State in less than a hundred years.

The early contributions of the Swedish people to the building of America, going back as they do for more than 300 years, are perhaps of equal importance. Although the great wave of immigration did not begin until about 1850, the first handful of colonists from Sweden had landed in Delaware in 1638, more than 200 years earlier. I believe it is notable that the very first book prepared for this struggling little colony was a religious volume, a translation of Luther's Catechism from Swedish into the language of the Algonquin Indians. This same deep Christian spirit characterized the latecomers as well as the early comers, and

it is a vital part of the daily lives of the people of Minnesota today.

During the Revolutionary War the ideals of freedom and justice proclaimed by the American colonists set off a kindred spark among the Swedes. Many of them volunteered for service in the American cause, and participated as part of the forces of our French allies. The historical records clearly show that at least 70 Swedish officers distinguished themselves in behalf of the United States in the Revolutionary War, and that at least one of them was decorated by George Washington himself.

Two descendents of Swedish colonists also distinguished themselves in this early struggle for freedom. One was John Hanson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and for a time President of the Confederation. The other was John Morton, a member of the Pennsylvania delegation which approved the Declaration.

It is also worth remembering that Sweden was the first country not engaged in the Revolutionary War to recognize the struggling young United States of America as a free, equal, and independent Nation. This was done in a Treaty of Amity and Commerce signed in Paris in April of 1783.

I am proud of the Swedes of Minnesota and I know, from conversations with the people of Sweden, that they take great pride in the achievements of their countrymen in the United States. From generation to generation, they have carried a spirit of freedom and independence that has never wavered. In Sweden today, this spirit keeps a small nation a bright outpost of liberty, progress, and independence almost in the shadow of the Iron Curtain. In Minnesota, on Swedes' Day, we salute this spirit and we recognize again the magnificent contribution of the people of Swedish descent to the making of the United States of America.

SUPPORT PRICE FOR CERTAIN SEGMENTS OF THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a bill now on the Senate Calendar, Calendar No. 363—S. 922—to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals. In my opinion this bill represents one of the boldest raids on the Federal Treasury that has been proposed in recent years.

This bill proposes to furnish a very profitable support price for certain segments of the mining industry at a tremendous cost to the American taxpayers of approximately three-fourths billion dollars.

Furthermore, Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, speaking as the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, flatly states that there is no justification in the name of national defense for the enactment of S. 922.

This bill, if enacted into law, will commit the United States Government for the next 12 years to purchase the entire production of several mentioned minerals at a specified price, which price is far above the prevailing domestic or world market.

To make the proposal even worse, the bill carries an escalator clause suggesting that these prices in the future can be raised but under no circumstances can they be lowered.

The bill was reported by the committee without any public hearings and without the benefit of the opinion of any Government agency involved, yet at the same time it is recommended to the Senate as being needed as a national-defense measure.

I requested Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, that he express the opinion of his agency as to whether or not the measure is needed to carry out our stockpiling program. At the same time I asked him for an estimate of the cost to the Federal Treasury.

In Mr. Flemming's reply dated June 23, 1955, he stated:

> There would be no justification in the name of national defense for either extending or enlarging these programs in the manner proposed by S. 922.

Continuing, Mr. Flemming said:

> Should it be found necessary for national defense purposes to undertake further measures to bring about increased production of any or all of these materials, the authority already provided by the Congress through the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is wholly adequate for the purpose.

His letter concluded with the flat statement that they did not recommend the enactment of S. 922. He accompanied that adverse report with an estimate which had been compiled by the General Services Administration showing the long-range cost to the American taxpayers, should S. 922 be enacted, as being approximately three-fourths billion dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that this adverse report signed by Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point, followed by the estimate of the cost as compiled by the General Services Administration.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1955.

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

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This replies to your request of June 20, 1955 for our comments on S. 922. There is attached hereto a schedule prepared by the General Services Administration which shows the cost of extending the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act as proposed by S. 922. Referring to the columns under the heading "12 years," the first column shows the gross transactions—the total estimated prices which the Government will pay for each of the minerals covered by the proposed legislation. The second column shows the estimated loss on each program based on the prices paid as contrasted with current market prices.

The purpose of S. 922 is to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953. The latter extended the period within which the Government would purchase at substantial premium prices the amounts of various domestically produced metals and minerals called for by certain expansion programs originally initiated under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The Government authorized these programs shortly after the start of the Korean war as a hedge against the possibility that all-out war might come sometime in 1951 or 1952. In these circumstances these domestic materials would have been used to meet defense and industrial needs of the Nation. Some, such as manganese, would have required extensive and costly beneficiation.

The proposed legislation would not only again extend delivery period of such programs up to 12 years but would also remove all limitations on the amounts of such materials which the Government would be required to purchase.

In general, the United States supply position for these metals and minerals has so improved that there would be no justification in the name of national defense for either extending or enlarging these programs in the manner proposed by S. 922.

Should it be found necessary for national defense purposes to undertake further measures to bring about increased production of any or all of these materials, the authority already provided by the Congress through the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is wholly adequate for the purpose.

In view of the foregoing, we do not recommend enactment of S. 922.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

General Services Administration—Estimated cost of domestic purchase regulations—Increased cost for 12-year extension of purchase regulation

[In thousands of dollars]

Commodity	1 year		12 years	
	Gross cost	Estimated loss	Gross cost	Estimated loss
Asbestos	706	214	8,472	2,563
Beryl	280	67	3,360	806
Columbium-tantalum	69	69	828	828
Manganese:				
Butte-Phillipsburg	3,780	2,870	45,360	34,440
Deming	5,940	4,510	71,280	54,120
Wenden	13,500	10,250	162,000	123,000
Domestic small producers	5,280	3,850	63,360	46,200
Mica	3,720	2,520	44,640	30,240
Tungsten	75,600	39,600	907,200	475,200
Total DPA	108,875	63,950	1,306,500	767,397
Chrome	[1] 2,885		[1] 34,615	
Grand total	111,760	63,950	1,341,115	767,397

[1] Expenditures under Public Law 520.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am sending a copy of Mr. Flemming's adverse report, along with the estimate of cost to which I have referred to each Member of the Senate.

This bill, which was not accompanied by the usual reports of the agencies affected and which obviously represents a three-quarter-billion-dollar raid on the Federal Treasury, should be stricken from the Senate Calendar and referred back to the committee. Should it not be voluntarily withdrawn, at the appropriate time I shall move to recommit the bill.

THE EXCHANGE-OF-PERSONS PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have taken occasion before to call to the attention of the Senate the progress which we are making in the direction of a peaceful world through the exchange-of-persons program.

The reports of good will which has been generated around the world because people from other countries have come to our shores, and our people have, in return, been sent abroad, are encouraging and astounding. It appears that there is no substitute for eyewitness reports when we want to dispel rumors, erase faulty images, and disclose lies which enemy propagandists plant in the minds of citizens in other countries in an effort to minimize the importance of the United States.

A number of Senators have been active in promoting the idea of a stronger exchange-of-persons program. Our able Vice President, RICHARD NIXON, has repeatedly urged that the program be accelerated. Our Ambassadors endorse it most heartily. Newsmen have reported that exchange programs are our best weapons against Communist propaganda.

When a program is this successful, it naturally happens that other agencies of government, in an effort to strengthen their own position, look with covetous eyes at it, hoping to annex some of the functions of the program. This has happened and is happening with the exchange-of-persons program. I think that is a tribute to the effective use to which the Department of State has put the program in bettering our position in world affairs.

I pay tribute to our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, for his awareness of the importance of this program, and for keeping it an active arm of his Department.

The exchange-of-persons program, which brings foreign leaders, newsmen, students, teachers, technicians, and many others to our shores, is a program whose benefits will last over the years. It develops a friendly tie on a person-to-person level that cannot be severed by distortion or lies. One visitor told me that before he came to America he felt that all of us here were, in his words, "either millionaires or crooks, or both," and he said that after traveling around the country this idea was dispelled totally. He is an important molder of opinion in his own country, and we were wise to have had him here to see for himself what kind of people make up America.

We must ever increase the prestige of this activity. We must not let it be identified as a propaganda machine so that exchanges are made here, as in the Soviet, with the idea that we should propagandize, spy, engage in subversive activities, or promote political ideologies. We must take care that no changes are made which will remotely give our exchange program that character either in the minds of our own people or in the minds of the people of foreign countries.

We must view this as a forward-looking, longtime operation, and take care that it does not become identified with short-term programs which may change the purpose or uproot the ideas behind these exchanges. I have resisted, and I shall continue to resist, any efforts, anywhere, which will curb or basically change the initial plan for carrying out the purposes of the laws passed in Congress to implement this program.

At this point, Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for June 13, 1955, entitled "Grassroots Peacemaking," which sets out clearly the benefits of the exchange-of-persons program.

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

GRASSROOTS PEACEMAKING

Americans as individuals are strong on neighborliness. They are quick to make friends with people from other countries, happy to welcome them into their homes, eager to introduced visitors to the best features of American life. Increasingly, too, they have become a nation of travelers, keen to learn how other peoples live and work, no less keen to have America's aims and ideals understood abroad. But these attitures are not always reflected fully in Washington.

Usually neighborliness makes for mutual appreciation. But hasty travel—especially under some conditions—can also create a sense of strangeness which is often akin to distaste. The more solid foundation of understanding—on which diplomats can build peace—often requires fuller acquaintance. This is especially fostered by the longer visits or continuing correspondence of students, business and professional men, soldiers, and artists who find common interests that bridge national borders.

So especially useful are exchanges of students and educators that several public and private plans have been set up to foster them. The Fulbright Act and the Mundt-Smith Act provide particularly valuable machinery for this program. Since 1948 about 15,000 Fulbright scholars have gone abroad to study or come from 30 countries to the United States. Part of the expense has been met by sale of surplus property left overseas at the end of the war, certain colleges have granted scholarships, and some students have received aid under the Mundt-Smith Act.

Last year under all the programs reported on by the State Department there were more than 7,000 exchanges, roughly two-thirds being students coming to the United States from 76 countries.

Measuring the results is difficult, for they are so largely found in the broadening of mental horizons and the development of understanding. But tangible fruitage also is beginning to appear. In the Philippines is a school modeled after Berea College—founded by a Filipino girl who "discovered Kentucky." Top-flight American nuclear experts are going out to atom-hungry nations to explain peaceful uses. Many other examples of concrete gains are now coming to light.

This year President Eisenhower asked Congress for $22 million to provide for the international educational program. The House of Representatives cut it in half. Happily, the Senate Appropriations Committee has restored the cuts. But the appropriation still has to pass the Senate and then survive compromises in a conference committee. Improvements may be needed in the handling of the program. We cannot assume that merely bringing students to the United States is going to work wonders—sometimes they have serious adjustments to make during their stay and again in finding a suitable place in their own country's life. But chopping the program down will not improve it.

Certainly a Congress which is concerned about the spread of communism should not cripple a most effective weapon against communism. By comparison with Moscow's efforts the American program is small. The Soviet is sparing neither time nor money in drawing students from abroad; one non-Communist Asian country alone is sending thousands. There are many countries whose future leaders will study either in Russia or the United States. In the basic world struggle of ideas it can easily happen that less money than would build a bomber can win a strategic nation's friendship.

The essential neighborliness of the American people should be expressed in more active support of a program which cultivates much more needed grassroots friendships. These are not only a defense against communism but essential foundations for peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ACQUIREMENT OF CERTAIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND TIMBER ACCESS ROADS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber access roads, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior may acquire rights-of-way and existing connecting roads adjacent to public lands whenever he determines that such acquisition is needed to provide a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to public lands under his jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the term "public lands" includes the Revested Oregon and California Railroad and the Reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road Grant Lands in Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LONG,

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. DWORSHAK conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe the unanimous-consent agreement for the call of the calendar provided for the consideration of bills unobjected to; therefore, is my understanding correct that the Senate will proceed beginning with Calendar No. 589?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Pursuant to the order entered last Friday, the Senate will now proceed with the call of the calendar of bills and resolutions to which there is no objection. The clerk will state the first measure in order on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-5981713, Dickel, Jr., Wlater.
E-078565, Fontes, Sebastiano De.
A-2553452, Garcia, Nicolas.
E-47368, Gasca-Sardina, Juan.
E-069249, Lozano, Jose Pascual.
A-5845821, Maniscalco, Giuseppe.
E-16323, Mercadante, Rocco.
E-069259, Sweedler, Hilda.
A-2266360, Triana-Aguilar, Lucas.
A-1116968, Watchinsky, Samuel.
A-1552531, Lopez-Chavez, Juan.
E-057379, Manouskos, James George.
E-89257, Ciaccia, Catello Charles.
E-069558, Lucio-Leon, Felipe.
A-5988306, Rudy, George.
E-078638, Capozzi, Francesco.
E-069474, Castaneda, Juana Ponce-Rosales de.
A-1894829, Slojkowski, John Anthony.
E-057816, Solano, Ramon.
E-077119, Garcia, Antonio Menendez.
A-4595749, Jakubiak, Frank Anthony.
A-2236659, Jarger, Jr., George.
A-4608159, Maniscalco, Samuel.
E-054983, Mayo, Walter John.
E-058681, Ortiz-Gonzalez, Faustino.
A-4747607, Schmidt, Karl.
A-5149973, Schmitt, Joseph Otto.
A-4793952, Wagner, Sam.
A-3167418, Dippner, Hermann.
A-2744439, Kuprashewithz, Wladimir.
A-1168565, Silverio, Caroline Lucca Di Pietro.
A-4100237, Woislaw, Stanislaw.
A-3939724, Woislaw, Felikcia Anna.
A-5624707, Yen, Lok.
A-2590255, Bakovich, Nick.
E-053681, Barlow, Enid.
1200-43511, Chadwick, Ann Betancourt.
A-1339656, Doolittle, Immacolatina.
A-1437231, Mark, Zef.
E-076774, Porcello, Vincenzo.
A-4777524, Ramirez-Medel, Anastacio.
E-47358, Salazar-Aguilar, Jesse Robert.
E-89260, Shaw, Norman Howard.
A-1109526, Stephens, George Saunders.
A-5932871, Torowis, Jurko.
A-1644860, Wengorowski, Ignatz.
A-5914114, Wolck, Vladimir.
A-5844626, Firetto, Paolo.
A-4948601, Schmidt, Frederick .
A-1153640, Woishnis, Frances Victoria.
A-5339974, Bostrom, Iver August.
E-075816, Castro, Stephen.
A-3322617, Cromie, Thomas Wilfred.
E-076879, Dujuambi, Monte Alfonso Carmett.
A-4167829, Garbus, Abraham.
T-2682534, Mercier, Lucien Treffle.
A-5969128, Michelson, Robert.
A-3231388, Morgan, Charlotte.
A-3900018, Vicklund, Knut Oskar.
A-5753722, Lupino, Louis.
A-5849321, Rostowsky, Frances Catherine (nee Vaiciunas).
A-1595525, Sevagian, Avedis.
A-1604070, Bosky, Paul Adam.
A-2452366, Bungard, Leonard Joseph.
E-47592, Martinez-Luna Hipolito.
A-1631944, Psaros, Speros.
A-3972039, Walker, Gerardo Verdugo.
A-2146407, Wineman, Sam.
E-131755, Wolfson, Abe Bernard.
A-2176896, Wood, James Achibald.
A-4348492, Badalmenti, Dominick.
A-3814987, Caldera-Roldan, Joaquin.
A-2303530, Fryza, George.
A-3554030, Gaytan-Ybarra, Angel.
A-4945116, Grossman, Carmelina.
A-3043634, Duchin, Abraham.
A-2544643, Lande, Ove John.
A-1745616, Litwak, Jake.
A-3042362, Luteron, Illes.
A-5024257, Odder, Toufic.
A-5541581, Russell, Rose Agnes.
A-3774200, Weinstein, Catherine.
A-3433019, Weissman, Hyman.
A-4038929, Culotta, Vincent.
A-4091431, Franicevich, Frank Marija.
A-3243585, Wasserman, Aron Harry.
A-4961731, Wiersch, Rose.
A-8280922, Bartnik, Andrew.
A-4402553, Calish, Ben.
A-8447000, Camiolo, Cristoforo.
A-4749433, Cooper, Benjamin.
A-2608947, Davitto, Barnardo Vercoglio.
A-7361922, Dobrovich, John.
E-080681, Galdikas, Anthony Constance.
A-4819163, Goldberg, Joseph Benjamin.
A-545825, Goldenberg, Scoocher.
A-1738912T, Greenfield, Philip.
A-1165031, Harishuk, James Frederick.
A-1953490, Jacob, Leo Carl.
A-1224861, Kubis, John Joseph.
A-5571019, Maciejewski, Floryian.
A-4088212, Maloff, Carl.
A-1038887, Mordos, Aniela.
A-3773694, Nockowitz, Charles.
E-078680, Paukstys, Vincent.
1415-3776, Paz-Lucio, Isaac De La.
A-2256143, Rojas-Guzman, Pedro.
A-3607468, Schwarz, John.
0402/8161, Smith, Walter.
A-3130901, Telles-Mejia, Tomas.
A-1011263, Valdez, Patricio.
A-5634530, Vito, Liborio.
A-5160088, Zech, John.
A-2390285, Zielinski, Frank.
T-303059, Bartolini, Alberto.
8511-A-1274, Caramanlau, Gheorghe.
E-053084, Cepeda-Teran, Aurelio.
A-3042474, Chaykowski, Michael.
A-1427387, Chervinski, Charles.
E-89265, Chillemi, Giovanni.
A-5934786, Cimino, Jean.
0800-106472, Cobos, Tomas.
A-1459543, Cowart, Harry Fuller.
E-069328, Dem, Louise.
A-2888771, Drewnowski, Czeslaw.
A-1847251, Elber, Isadore.
A-5524604, Feldman, Pal.
A-4724104, Ferro, Pete.
A-2174885, Figiolia, Louis Jack.
A-3740609, Grado, Luigi Di.
A-4705290, Gutstein, Albert.
A-5343594, Holody, Martin.
A-2194350, Honkamaa, Charles.
A-3155214, Irla, Anthony Stanley.
A-3237162, Kalinovik, Alexander Paul.
A-1028748, Kaplan, Abraham.
A-2518778, Kashigian, Artin.
A-5918920, Kauth, Kurt Max.
A-3132325, Knowles, Ann Eirwen.
A-7858221, Kryczka, John.
A-5402770, Lamars, Pete.
A-3623367, Latarski, Sigmund.
A-4963675, Lukac, John.
A-2941249, Maneniskis, Joseph.
A-5151675, Matheson, Wilfred Laurier (William Matheson).
A-3017074, Medoway, Sam.
E-070997, Novak, Bela.
A-5720885, Nowak, John.
A-3818026, Ostrashelski, Constantine.
E-083290, Pong, Soon.
A-8116357, Reed, John David.
A-4755643, Richter, Walter.
A-5753580, Rocco, Louis.
A-2671145, Rucienski, Aleksander.
2770-P-142631, Sandler, Josel David.
A-1853190, Sandor, Victor.
E-086512, Schwar, Klara.
0800-84629, Simon, Aurif.
A-586231, Slater, Frank.
E-47365, Sosa-Paz, Luz.
A-1840646, Torres, Jose Buenaventura.
A-1815668, Tuchet, Frank.
A-4967148, Walonce, Stanley Francis.
A-2935138, Wilkas, Julius.
A-1704536, Ziegenhirt, Joseph Francisco.
A-3122325, Forsbacka, Johannes Alfred.
A-5967839, Hovanec, John.
A-1985254, Jurlin, Daniel D.
A-7485159, Keefe, Everett Vernon.
E-057815, Moreno-Aguilar, Conrado.
A-4727339, Proch, John Alexander.

HAVA SHPAK, A. A. SHPAK, AND SYMPCHA SHPAK— BILL RECOMMITTED

The bill (S. 332) for the relief of Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, and Sympcha Shpak was announced as next in order.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as a result of action taken by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 590, Senate bill 332, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill is recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

KI YOUNG KWAN

The bill (S. 501) for the relief of Ki Young Kwan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ki Young Kwan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EDMUND LOWE AND RICHARD LOWE

The bill (S. 578) for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe shall be held and considered to be the minor children of their mother, Mrs. Sam Lee Jue, a citizen of the United States.

DOMINIC GAETANO MORIN

The bill (S. 871) for the relief of Dominic Gaetano Morin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dominic Gaetano Morin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMON BOUNDARY OF STATES OF MARYLAND AND DELAWARE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 987) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to establish their common boundary, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over to the next call of the calendar.

PAUL Y. LOONG

The bill (H. R. 880) for the relief of Paul Y. Loong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARION JOSEPHINE MONNELL

The bill (H. R. 935) for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUZIE BIONDO (LUZIE M. SCHMIDT)

The bill (H. R. 943) for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAX KOZLOWSKI

The bill (H. R. 968) for the relief of Max Kozlowski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELIZABETH DOWDS

The bill (H. R. 973) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELLEN HILLIER

The bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSANNE FELLNER

The bill (H. R. 988) for the relief of Susanne Fellner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRIEDA QUIRING AND TINA QUIRING

The bill (H. R. 995) for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRMGARD EMILIE KREPPS

The bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEIKO SHIKIBU

The bill (H. R. 998) for the relief of Meiko Shikibu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MELINA BONTON

The bill (H. R. 1028) for the relief of Melina Bonton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMENOUHI ASSADOUR ARTINIAN

The bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT SHEN-YEN HOU-MING LIEU

The bill (H. R. 1083) for the relief of Robert Shen-Yen Hou-ming Lieu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MILAD S. ISAAC

The bill (H. R. 1157) for the relief of Milad S. Isaac was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMANUEL FRANGESKOS

The bill (H. R. 1158) for the helief of Emanuel Frangeskos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYNTHIA JACOB

The bill (H. R. 1205) for the relief of Cynthia Jacob was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS TOSHIKO HOZAKA AND HER CHILD, ROGER

The bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUTHER ROSE

The bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Luther Rose was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VICTORINE MAY DONALDSON

The bill (H. R. 1337) for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. BRAUND

The bill (H. R. 4549) for the relief of John J. Braund, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in connection with Calendar No. 616, H. R. 4549, it is suggested that the discrepancy between "$1,500," which appears on the calendar and the "$15,000" which appears in the bill should be noted and corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD with the amount as contained in the bill rather than with the amount as shown on the calendar.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. Braund, Washington, D. C., the sum of $15,000, representing the amount reported by the Court of Claims to the Congress in response to House Resolution 700, 82d Congress (Congressional No. 9-52, order entered February 8, 1955), to be the amount agreed to by the United States and the said John J. Braund as constituting a full settlement of all past and future claims of the said John J. Braund against the United States with respect to patent No. 2,493,439, issued January 3, 1950, as well as to any inventions disclosed thereunder, and all other claims within the scope of H. R. 4507, 82d Congress: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF MEADOW SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 29, UPHAM, N. DAK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 288) to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within the school district by the Department of the Interior, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., the sum

of $5,197.56 in full satisfaction of such school district's claim against the United States for reimbursement of loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition by the United States Department of the Interior of approximately 30 percent of the lands within such school district for a wildlife refuge, such amount representing the equitable share of such school district's bonded indebtedness remaining due against such lands acquired by the Department of the Interior at the time of such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILMA ANN SCHILLING AND HER DAUGHTER, INGERTRAUD ROSALITA SCHILLING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1159) for the relief of Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilma Ann Schilling, the fiancée of Everett B. Felton, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Wilma Ann Schilling is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Everett B. Felton, and that she is found otherwise admissible under all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, other than section 212 (a) (9) of the said act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shal' apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIESELOTTE BRODZINSKI GETTMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1522) for the relief of Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAYMOND GEORGE PALMER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3359) for the relief of Raymond George Palmer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "except", to strike out "medical expenses shall" and insert "hospital and medical expense actually incurred shall."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1644) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 609) to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States of special nuclear material and atomic weapons, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 636) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

This completes the call of the calendar.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 586, Senate Joint Resolution 21, to establish a Commission on Government Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to establish a Commission on Government Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] wishes to make a brief statement which does not apply to the joint resolution under consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Did the Senator from Minnesota intend to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do so after the Senator from Montana has made a brief statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the junior Senator from Montana for the purpose of permitting him to make a brief statement, without losing my right to the floor, before the Senate proceeds with the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 21.

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

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Kingdom of Laos can hardly hope to compete for world attention with Big Four conferences and other major international developments. Nevertheless, what happens to the kingdom, 1 of the 3 successor states in Indochina, ought not to be overlooked. To its million and a half inhabitants and to the nations of southeast Asia which borders on Laos, developments in that country are of the utmost importance. I take this occasion, therefore, to point out the serious situation which now exists in that remote land, which borders on Communist China and on Communist Vietnam. In the extreme northern part of that wedge are two provinces of great significance at this time in the history of the Far East.

Before the Geneva agreement last year, Laos was invaded several times by the Viet Minh Communists from northern Vietnam. In addition, a small band of Communist-inspired dissidents numbering not more than several hundred men, called the Pathet Lao, was attempting to overthrow the Government.

Under the terms of the Geneva agreement, the Viet Minh Communists agreed to withdraw entirely from Laos, and the Pathet Lao were to regroup and concentrate in the two northern Provinces of Phong Saly and Sam Neua.

In a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations after my return from Laos las year, I noted that:

The Laotian dissidents in the northern provinces are interpreting the Geneva accord to mean that they may exercise full powers in Phong Saly and Sam Neua. Compulsory political indoctrination is being enforced in the villages which they control. Young men

from all over Laos are being brought to the provinces for training and some are being sent to north Vietnam for the same purposes.

As a result, the Pathet Lao have increased in number from several hundred to several thousand, and they have refused to permit the Government to restore its authority over the two northern provinces. They have attacked Government army contingents which have attempted to penetrate Phong Saly and Sam Neua.

All reports from Laos suggest that the Communists are acting in utter disregard of the Geneva armistice.

Mr. President, in recent days a startling development, with little or no publicity, has taken place in north Vietnam. Radio Hanoi, the voice of Ho Chi Minh, has been broadcasting information about the formation of an autonomous Thai-Meo zone in the northwestern sector of the Viet Minh territory. That, Mr. President, is the area in which these two provinces are located. In December 1954, Ho Chi Minh's council of ministers adopted a resolution to establish an autonomous state of Thai and Meo peoples. The fourth session of the National North Vietnamese Assembly held in March of this year, rubberstamped this an extremely important resolution. The Communists' decision was, of course, unanimous.

At the time of the Bandung Conference, Ho Chi Minh issued decree 230–SL, which formally set up the new autonomous area. At the time this decree was issued, it was also stated in an annex to it that the Thai zone would have the authority to organize its own militia, including guerrillas, and also the right to use the Thai language and script in its administrative territory. At approximately the same time Gen. Vo Ngyuen Giap, commander in chief of the Communist forces in North Vietnam, advised the people in a separate message "to push forward in the Thai-Meo zone with the building of a local army, guerrilla forces, and militia in order to protect the autonomous area, protect its frontiers, smash all enemy sabotaging maneuvers, and contribute a worthy part to the struggle for peace, unity, independence, and the democracy of all our people."

Following that statement, that exhortation by Gen. Vo Ngyuen Giap, the state-controlled press in North Vietnam got into the act and began an editorial campaign of warm welcome to the autonomous region.

The Communists agreed at Geneva to recognize the territorial integrity of the kingdom of Laos. The refusal of the Pathet Lao dissidents to permit the government authorities to reoccupy the northern provinces, however, has the effect of dividing the country into two states.

In the second place, the Viet Minh agreed to withdraw from Laos in 120 days. A year later, however, Viet Minh cadres are stationed with Pathet Lao units, and Viet Minh contingents are reported operating in the northern provinces of the kingdom.

Finally the Geneva agreement provides for a cessation of hostilities. Pathet Lao forces, in flagrant violation of this provision, however, have attacked government troops at Houei Thao, Muong Peun, and Nong Khang, and Pakha in Sam Neua Province.

There is an International Control Commission supervising the carrying out of the Geneva armistice in Indochina. It consists of representatives of India, Canada, and Poland. By unanimous vote, the Commission has recognized that the Geneva agreement affirms the territorial integrity of the kingdom of Laos and the government's right to administer the two northern provinces.

Yet this ruling continues to be ignored by the Viet Minh and the Laotian dissidents. When these violations of the Geneva armistice in Laos are added to those in Vietnam, where thousands of people have been prevented from quitting the Communist-held areas, serious doubt is cast upon the sincerity of Communist professions of peace in the Far East.

If we are going to have a worldwide relaxation in tensions, then even remote Laos must share in it. The Soviet Union is a guarantor of the Geneva accord. The Russians have the influence with the Communists in Indochina. They can remove one more cause of tensions by using that influence to end the defiance of the Geneva agreement in Laos.

I wish to thank sincerely the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished Senator from Montana has done a distinct service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. Last week I discussed the same subject with the State Department because I was concerned, as is the Senator from Montana, about this obvious disregard of the Geneva agreement. In view of the fact that the International Control Commission has apparently looked into the matter, and has taken the position that the attitude of the Laotian Government is correct, it seems to me there is a situation in the northernmost provinces not in keeping with either the letter or the spirit of the Geneva agreement. It would seem to me that if that situation is allowed to go unchallenged, pretty soon there will be a fait accompli, and as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, there will be two Laotian governments. While in fact there will not be quite the same kind of division which exists in Korea or in Vietnam, nevertheless practically the result will be an amputation of the two northernmost provinces.

If the Soviet Union is not prepared to honor its commitment under the Geneva agreement, then it seems to me we should know that now. We should know it prior to the Geneva meeting of the chiefs of state.

I think the situation is at least so fraught with danger to the peace of that area of the world that unless there is a very prompt compliance with the terms of the Geneva agreement, the whole matter ought to be called forthwith to the attention of the Geneva conference and the General Assembly of the United Nations, and it should be made plain what is taking place in the northern provinces of Laos is disturbing the condition of peace in the world; that there is an obvious disregard of the Geneva agreement; that the machinery of the Geneva agreement is apparently not working; and that if the situation is allowed to go unchallenged, the whole letter and spirit of that agreement may be vitiated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the distinguished minority leader has said is certainly entitled to the most serious consideration. I know he speaks from first-hand knowledge of the situation, because he visited Laos, and discussed conditions there with the highest officials and with people in that country. It is true that there is a similarity, and that there might occur in Vietnam itself such a division as happened in Korea, in Germany, and elsewhere. The difference is in degree, but the intent and the procedure are very plain for all to see. In the case of Laos, a country which probably is the most remote—and, by the way, it is a beautiful country, peopled by a very kindly, courageous, and lovely race—the situation should be brought to the attention of the great powers. Certainly the Soviet Union and the North Vietnamese, both of which are signatories to the Geneva Convention, should be required to live up to the articles of agreement they signed a year ago at Geneva. It should also, as the distinguished minority leader recommends, be brought before the United Nations for prompt and effective action.

It is my hope—and in this respect, I join the distinguished minority leader—that the Government of the United States will continue to exert every effort in behalf of the Laotian people. Our Government has been consistently doing its best in past months to lend every bit of assistance it can to help the Government of Laos and preserve its freedom and independence of action.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this situation, which indicates an attempt by Ho Chi-Minh and his cohorts to take over other parts of Laos, through an autonomous Thai-Laos state, should be watched very carefully, and the rights of these people should be upheld by every means possible.

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 following bills of the Senate:

S. 391. An act to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 666. An act to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6239) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes: agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRESTON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. BOW, Mr. HORAN, Mr. MILLER of Maryland, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6992) to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; 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 BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6992) to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to establish a Commission on Government Security.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 21 calls for the establishment of a Commission on Government Security.

The passage of the joint resolution represents an indispensable first step in the direction of establishing a well-reasoned, effective, orderly, uniform, and consistent security program which reconciles the needs of security with the protection and preservation of basic American traditions, rights, and privileges. I am pleased and gratified that, to date, the legislative history of this joint resolution is one of unanimity and nonpartisanship.

Senate Joint Resolution 21 was introduced on January 18, 1955, by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself, after a great deal of careful study, consideration, and discussion with our colleagues. The joint resolution was intended to provide a basis for a comprehensive reexamination and reevaluation of the entire security mechanism of the United States Government. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and in turn was referred to the Subcommittee on Reorganization of that committee. In view of the illness of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who was chairman of the subcommittee, I served as acting subcommittee chairman, and arranged for a series of hearings which lasted about 2 weeks. The Senate is indeed fortunate in the composition of the subcommittee. In addition to those mentioned, the members were: The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. These Members gave many hours of their time to the task assigned by the Senate to them. The hearings were well attended by the members of the subcommittee. The questioning was, I believe, intelligent and perceptive; and the meetings we held following those hearings demonstrated the highest degree of patriotism and public service that it has been my privilege to experience. We looked upon our task, not as one of finding fault with the past, but as one of intelligently and constructively attempting to establish a path to the future, one which would contribute to the national security and national prestige of our country.

The need for internal security is a relatively new phenomenon for us. We became fully aware of the necessity for a stringent security program only when our Nation became aware of the imminent perils of Soviet imperialism and Soviet subversion. We were almost totally unprepared as a nation to deal with this dangerous enemy, which utilized fiendishly unique techniques of subversion and espionage to accomplish its purposes. Without experience and without the time to undertake an exhaustive study and definition of the perils we faced, we were forced to adopt stopgap security measures. The Congress enacted statutes and the President issued Executive orders and regulations in a series. The result was an uncoordinated conglomeration of laws, orders, regulations, and practices which do not add up to an effective, efficient, and sound security system. Our hearings demonstrated beyond any doubt an unfortunate state of confusion, overlapping, duplication, and loopholes in the overall security mechanism, as well as an unfortunate lack of confidence, expressed by an important segment of the public, in the security program and its administration. In my opinion, the present security mechanism is not affording our Nation as effective and efficient security protection as can be achieved.

It is important to an understanding of the anatomy of the security program that there be an appreciation of the extent to which the security mechanism permeates our society today. It is a well-known fact that some 2 million employees of the Federal Government are subject to a program for security investigation and clearance, and that similar programs exists for investigation and clearance of Americans employed by the United Nations. It is not as well known that at least an equal number of employees of Government contractors are subject to similar, or even identical, programs; and that under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, many thousands of employees of private industries entering the atomic-energy industry as licensees, with no connection with national-defense programs, will also be subject to security investigation and clearance. In addition, several hundred thousand merchant seamen and waterfront workers are subject to security investigation and clearance, under the port-security program. Moreover, considering the problems of turnover in Government and industrial employment, it is apparent that additional millions of our citizens have been or will be subject to security risk standards. In addition, there has been an increasing tendency on the part of private employers to refrain from employing, even in positions without any relation to Government security requirements, individuals concerning whom a security question has been or may be raised.

It is important also for all of us to appreciate the dollar costs of our security programs. Complete statistics are not readily available, but the fragmentary data available reveal the magnitude of the costs. Since 1946 the Atomic Energy Commission alone had over half a million full background investigations conducted for it by the Civil Service Commission and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At the present time,

the costs of such investigations are $210 for each FBI investigation and $265 for each Civil Service Commission investigation. This means, taking the FBI figure alone, that over $100 million has been expended for personnel security investigations in the atomic-energy program alone, in the past 9 years. The Department of Defense has furnished information indicating that its costs for security investigations in 1954 for military, civilian, and contractor personnel amounted to almost $29 million. These costs do not reflect the other costs of security, such as salaries of personnel who administer the security programs, expenses of handling the substantial paperwork necessary in the program, and expenses of other trappings of the security mechanism, such as fences, guards, weapons, and so forth. It is apparent that all told the costs of security reach astronomical proportions.

It is imperative that a security mechanism of these dimensions and far-reaching implications, with life-or-death importance to our national defense, be operated as a matter of conscious, well-considered national policy, and not as a matter of haphazard or stopgap expedients.

Again, Mr. President, I desire to point out that our subcommittee found, from its investigation, that the development of the security program had been on a more or less touch-and-go basis, from one project to another, one rule to another, one act to another, without any overall coordination or study of the interrelationship of the many particular projects and programs of a security nature which had been launched.

The subcommittee's study of the overall security mechanism has brought to light a number of important problems or difficulties in the present system, which in themselves warrant and demand immediate and intensive study of the security structure by a high level, nonpartisan body which will command public confidence and respect. These problems and difficulties are, however, only illustrative examples, and do not represent a complete catalog of the aspects of the present mechanism which afford cause for concern:

First. There is under the present security mechanism a decided and unwisely uneven treatment to areas of like security importance. The degree of statutory protection does not depend necessarily on the actual security importance of the particular area to be protected, but more on the type of national secret and the particular department or agency involved. Thus the Atomic Energy Act protects atomic energy secrets with far more elaborate protection and restrictions than, let us say, apply to the protection of Defense Department national secrets which are just as sensitive. At the same time our hearings uncovered that in some cases atomic energy secrets have less than full statutory protection afforded other secrets. This multiplicity of statutory security standards does not seem justified, and I believe it is difficult to defend.

Second. There are today three separate and distinct espionage laws which duplicate and overlap one another and provide varying penalties for what is in essence the identical offense. Testimony before our subcommittee indicates that this duplication and overlapping may involve serious loopholes and difficulties in our overall national defenses against espionage. No witness before the subcommittee was able to justify the existence of three separate espionage laws or to explain why a uniform espionage law of universal applicability to all national secrets would not be preferable.

Third. There are multiple standards for security investigation and clearance of Government employees. Executive Order 10450 applies to all Government employees and to all agencies and departments. Nevertheless, a number of agencies and departments are subject to special statutory requirements for investigation and clearance which are at variance with those of the Executive order. Practically speaking, this frequently means duplicate investigations and security determinations under varying standards. These duplications are meaningless from the standpoint of effective security, and are in fact a waste of taxpayer funds.

Fourth. Considerable evidence was presented to our subcommittee demonstrating that security requirements have impeded the flow and interchange of information necessary for effective and efficient conduct of Government operations and for the maintenance of the national security. Up until the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, it is clear that the unnecessarily cumbersome special security clearance requirements delayed the stockpiling of atomic weapons. Even with the passage of the 1954 act, however, there remains what has been characterized by the Department of Defense as a "dual system of security," which imposes "a formidable administrative burden." Furthermore, the 1954 act did not deal with identical problems involving other agencies and departments which are concerned with the implications of atomic energy. Evidence before our subcommittee indicated that our Nation's civil defense efforts have been hampered as a result of unnecessary duplication requirements and bad liaison developing out of those special requirements.

Fifth. It is clear that our present Government employees' security program needs a fresh look with specific reference to affording Government employees the maximum procedural opportunities and procedural rights consistent with the effective operation of a sound security program. This need is underlined by the recent Supreme Court decision in the Peters case. To answer that no person has a right to a Government job is not a realistic or satisfactory solution to the problem of establishing a standard of procedural rights for Government employees. An individual discharged as a security risk has thereby a substantial stigma attached to himself and to his family, and such a discharge affects his future employment opportunities. As a practical matter, an employee found to be a security risk in any position becomes disqualified for any Government position in any Government agency. He also finds many private firms refusing to employ him in nonsensitive positions. Indeed, there is reason to believe that some private employers are reluctant to employ individuals who have encountered long delays in obtaining clearance, even when there is no distinct indication that a question of security eligibility is involved. Furthermore, derogatory information developed in the course of an investigation will follow that individual wherever he seeks employment within the Government, and in large areas of the private economy regardless of whether the information is true or false, new, raw or refined, evaluated or unevaluated.

Sixth. Even in Government agencies and in departments whose security programs are based entirely upon Executive Order 10450, there are substantial variations in the administration of those programs. Evidence before our subcommittee and statistical data that was made available to us clearly demonstrated a lack of any pattern or correlation or uniformity or consistency of application of the security standards. Furthermore the subcommittee was unable, despite diligent effort, to obtain clear information as to who was responsible for coordinating the security program and how such coordination is really effected. It appears likely that there is in fact very little effective coordination.

Seventh. There is not only a lack of uniformity in the standards applied by the various agencies and departments under the security program; there is also a lack of uniformity with regard to procedural rights affecting applicants for employment, and probationary employees. The Atomic Energy Commission affords applicants and probationary employees precisely the same procedures for resolution of security questions as are available to its regular employees. The Department of the Air Force extends its procedures to all probationary employees, and occasionally to applicants. Our subcommittee was unable to find a satisfactory answer to the question of why other agencies and departments do not adopt similar procedures for handling the cases of applicants and probationary employees, especially in view of the impact of the security programs upon such persons. It may be that there are sound reasons for this lack of uniformity, but the problem does warrant an objective impartial analysis and appraisal in the light of security realities.

Eighth. Our subcommittee was aware of the fact that the problem of confrontation in personnel security is a difficult one, in view of the unquestionable necessity for protecting the FBI's methods and devices for infiltrating the Communist conspiracy. Yet the difficulties in a program which uniformly does not allow for confrontation of witnesses is not quite as apparent to all. We, therefore, need a fresh objective study to delineate the precise limits within which confrontation is possible without adversely affecting the security information. The Department of the Army's regulations on confrontation seemed adequate to many who studied the problem, and yet other Government agencies have different standards and different requirements.

Ninth. The security program extends beyond the realm of Government employees. The industrial security program affects millions of privately employed American citizens in all of our 48 States. Many of these individuals through no initiative of their own, without seeking positions of public trust, and in most instances without seeking positions involving access to classified information, now find themselves propelled into the security pattern. They, and their friends, and relatives are investigated. All of us in the Congress would agree that there is a necessity for an industrial security program, but a program of this magnitude which operates upon the employment, livelihood, and reputation of millions of our private citizens must be carefully designed, controlled, and administered. If our Government is to act in a responsible manner toward its citizenry, such a program must be established as a matter of considered national policy, and not as a matter of haphazard growth. Yet, our subcommittee was surprised to learn, from testimony by the Assistant Attorney General, that there has apparently been no attempt whatever to coordinate this industrial security program on a Government-wide basis. In fact, the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice which has the basic responsibility for all security matters believes that it does not have the authority to deal with industrial security matters, and that it does not have jurisdiction to review or consider these industrial security programs. In view of the importance of this program, in view of its profound effect upon labor and management, and in view of its apparently wide implications to every city, town, and hamlet in our country, the program needs a careful, objective coordinated study by a bipartisan commission along the lines suggested by Senate Joint Resolution 21.

There can be no doubt that the security mechanisms viewed as a whole—including the espionage laws and other criminal statutes relating to security protection, the laws and regulations relating to classification, control, and protection of national-defense secrets, and the programs for security investigation and clearances of personnel generally—are less effective and efficient than they can and should be; cost far more than they should for actual security achieved; and afford far less protection for individual rights than is possible without jeopardy to security.

The time has come to take stock, to face the problem of security, not with histrionics, but with the maturity with which our democratic Government and our people have faced grave issues of national policy in the past. Let us assess the peril which faces us and decide upon a coordinated, cohesive, rational security system which will protect our national secrets and our way of life.

Security is not a partisan issue. The present deficiencies have not been caused or nurtured exclusively by either party, by either this or past administrations, or by either Congress or the executive branch. Rather, they have been thrust upon us by the threat of Soviet imperialism and subversion at a time when we were, as a Nation, not fully prepared to meet the threat with complete wisdom and reason.

There is much work to be done before the security problem can be brought under rational control. It requires extensive and objective study and analysis. A commission form of inquiry, patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government is the ideal means for coming to grips with the problem, since it would enable representation by the executive branch, the Congress, and eminent public citizens. It would also enable the calm, dispassionate consideration and recommendation, removed from the area of political controversy, which would command public respect and confidence, and provide needed reassurance to the American public in this era of security obsession.

It is most reassuring to the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 21 and to our subcommittee which unanimously reported the joint resolution favorably that the full committee, which likewise unanimously reported the joint resolution favorably, were all pleased that the Task Force on Personnel and Civil Service of the Hoover Commission recently called for an official inquiry and appraisal of the personnel security problem by a panel of distinguished citizens whose judgment cannot be questioned. Senate Joint Resolution 21 meets the demands of that Hoover Commission task force.

We are also pleased that in the other body a companion measure to Senate Joint Resolution 21 seems to be meeting with favorable and unanimous approval. A companion measure, House Joint Resolution 157, introduced by the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has within the last few days been unanimously reported favorably by the House Judiciary Committee.

All of this portends a growing consensus in support of a broad approach to the study of all phases of the security mechanism and to the submission of appropriate recommendations.

Senate Joint Resolution 21 would establish a 12-member nonpartisan commission, patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The President would appoint 4 members to the Commission, 2 from the executive branch and 2 from private life; the President of the Senate would appoint 4 members, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and the Speaker of the House of Representatives would appoint 4 members, 2 from the House and 2 from private life. No more than two appointees of each could be from the same political party.

The Commission would, on the basis of the study made by it, submit reports and recommendations on desirable changes, on the adequacies or deficiencies in the present situation from the standpoints of internal consistency of the overall program, and on effective measures for the protection and maintenance of the national security, and the protection and preservation of basic American rights.

The joint resolution provides that the final report of the Commission shall be submitted by December 31, 1956.

Mr. President, I have attempted in these brief minutes to summarize for the Senate the motivations of the sponsors of this resolution and the evidence and conclusions which guided the committee charged with the responsibility of studying the resolution to support it unanimously. For a more detailed analysis of the hearings we held, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusions of these remarks a statement I have prepared.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in conclusion, I want to thank the members of the subcommittee for their diligence and conscientiousness, and for their perceptive comments and suggestions.

I can say that the subcommittee truly worked as a group, not as individual members, in hearing the testimony, in the preparation of the final form of the resolution, and in the consideration of the report and its submission to the Senate.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is a cosponsor with me of the joint resolution, also wishes to make a statement.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I present a statement in support of Senate Joint Resolution 21, a bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and myself, and unanimously supported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

THE SECURITY PROBLEM

Senate Joint Resolution 21 is intended to provide a basis for a comprehensive reexamination and reevaluation of the entire security mechanism of the United States Government. The necessity for such a reexamination and reevaluation appears to be well established in the light of the present state of confusion, overlapping, duplication, and loopholes in the overall security mechanism, as well as in the widespread concern and lack of confidence expressed by important segments of the public in the manner in which our Government security programs are being administered.

It is important that there be a clear understanding as to the manner in which the present security mechanism has evolved. It can be demonstrated that the present mechanism is replete with anomalies, loopholes, inconsistencies, anachronisms, and lack of coordination without pointing a finger of criticism or blame at any political party, at any national administration, or at any person or group of persons.

Our present security mechanism, which to so large an extent dominates our political life in 1955, is almost entirely a phenomenon of the past decade. It does not strain the facts to point out that through the close of World War II we had no security mechanism in any way comparable to what we have today. It is true that there was some awareness of the need for security in the Government, and that a few departments of the Government had established security programs which, measured by current standards, must be regarded as rather primitive.

There was, however, no effort to construct any kind of comprehensive program for protecting the national security and national defense against acts of subversion, indiscretion, or carelessness.

We became fully aware of the necessity for a stringent security program only when we became aware of the imminent perils of Soviet imperialism and Soviet subversion. We were almost totally unprepared, as a Nation, to deal with this dangerous enemy who utilized fiendishly unique techniques of subversion and espionage to accomplish its purposes. Our first and most urgent concern was to erect adequate security defenses. We did not then have the time to undertake exhaustive study and definition of the perils we faced or to formulate a comprehensive, sound program for meeting these perils. We were forced to adopt stopgap security measures. This resulted in a series of uncoordinated congressional enactments and Executive orders and regulations which have accumulated into our present security mechanism. Although each one of the individual enactments, orders, and regulations may have been reasonable and effective in meeting the immediate problems faced when it was adopted, the resulting conglomeration of security laws, orders, regulations, and practices does not add up to an effective, efficient, and sound security system. Nor does it add up to a security mechanism which reflects careful effort to reconcile the needs of security with protection and preservation of basic American traditions, rights, and privileges.

The security problem is not only one of assuring that our citizens are fairly and justly treated in their dealings with their Government in the area of security considerations. Another, and at least equally important aspect of the present security problem, is to assure that we have a security mechanism which will effectively protect the national security. There can be little doubt that the present security mechanism, with all its deficiencies—some of which I shall discuss—is not affording our Nation as effective and efficient security protection as can be achieved. There can also be little doubt that a security mechanism which fails to command the full respect and confidence of Government employees and large, responsible segments of the public cannot succeed in providing maximum security for a freedom-loving nation.

Our major task in the security field today must be to bring well-reasoned and effective order, uniformity, and consistency out of the existing jerry-built security structure. Senate Joint Resolution 21 represents the indispensable first step in this direction.

SUMMARY OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

Senate Joint Resolution 21 would establish a 12-member nonpartisan commission, patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, to study all phases of the Government's security programs and procedures, and to submit appropriate recommendations. The President would appoint 4 members to the Commission, 2 from the executive branch and 2 from private life; the President of the Senate would appoint 4 members, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and the Speaker of the House of Representatives would appoint 4 members, 2 from the House and 2 from private life. No more than 2 appointees of each could be from the same political party. The Commission would elect its chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

The Commission's function would be to study the entire Government security program, including the various statutes, Presidential orders, regulations, and directives under which the Government seeks to protect the national security, national defense secrets, and public and private defense facilities against loss or injury from espionage, disloyalty, subversive activity, sabotage, or unauthorized disclosures, together with the actual manner in which these statutes, orders, regulations, and directives are being administered, to determine whether the overall security program is in accord with the policy of the Congress, stated in section 1, that there shall exist a sound Government program—

(a) Establishing procedures for security investigations and clearance for Government employees and persons privately employed or occupied on work requiring access to national secrets or affording significant opportunity for injury to the national security;

(b) For vigorous enforcement of effective and realistic security laws and regulations; and

(c) For a careful, consistent, and efficient administration of this policy in a manner which will protect the national security and preserve basic American rights.

The Commission would, on the basis of this study, submit reports and recommendations on desirable changes, and on adequacies or deficiencies in the present situation from the standpoints of internal consistency of the overall program, effective protection and maintenance of the national security, and protection and preservation of basic American rights.

The Commission would be empowered to hold hearings, to administer oaths, and to subpena attendance, testimony, and production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents, as it deems advisable. All agencies and departments would be authorized and directed to cooperate fully with the Commission and to furnish such information as the Commission may request, except for such information as the President may determine might jeopardize or interfere with pending or prospective criminal prosecutions, with the carrying out of investigative or intelligence responsibilities, or with the interests of national security.

THE COMMITTEE'S METHOD OF PROCEDURE

The Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, to whom Senate Joint Resolution 21 was referred for consideration, held extensive hearings over a two-week period in the effort to obtain a clear view and understanding of the anatomy of the Government's overall security mechanism, and to delineate any problems which might be found to exist in the overall security mechanism which would indicate the necessity for further study by a commission, such as is contemplated in Senate Joint Resolution 21, or by some other body. The Department of Justice specifically endorsed the subcommittee's broad approach to the security question. The subcommittee did not seek, however, to explore in detail each and every phase of the security mechanism, since this did not appear feasible from the standpoint of its resources and the practical considerations of time. Such an effort would, moreover, duplicate the work of the commission which would be established if Senate Joint Resolution 21 is approved. Consequently, attention was focused on a few areas of the overall security mechanism which appeared on the surface to present substantial problems.

The subcommittee requested testimony of those governmental agencies which appeared to have the principal responsibilities or greatest experience in the security field, or in connection with whose activities significant security problems seemed to exist. The agencies requested to appear were the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of State, the Civil Service Commission, the United States Coast Guard, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the District of Columbia Office of Civil Defense.

In addition, in recognition of the fact that the Government security mechanism has substantial implications beyond the area of purely governmental activities, the subcommittee requested testimony from representative private organizations with special experience or interest in security matters. To represent the experience and point of view of American industry, the subcommittee requested the testimony of Douglas Aircraft Co. and General Electric Co. A representative of the former testified.

To represent the experience and point of view of American universities, the University of Chicago and Harvard University were requested to, and did, testify. To represent the experience and point of view of organized labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor were requested to testify. The former appeared, and the latter submitted a written statement. To represent the experience and point of view of scientific and engineering groups, the subcommittee invited the testimony of the Federation of American Scientists. The Fund for the Republic and the American Civil Liberties Union were also invited, in view of their special interest in phases of the security program. To represent the experience and point of view of American information mediums, the subcommittee requested the testimony of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In addition, a number of other organizations requested an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to present their views.

Written statements have also been submitted by a number of other organizations.

THE ANATOMY OF THE SECURITY MECHANISM

The hearings before the subcommittee, and consideration of the pertinent statutes, executive orders, regulations, and procedures, reveal a pattern of confusion permeating all phases of the security mechanism. The American people have felt, especially within the past decade, an increasing need for security against the very real dangers of subversion, and the Congress and the executive branch responded to this need with a series of separate and often unrelated statutes and orders. This resulted, perhaps necessarily, in a mass of uncoordinated, random, haphazard legislation and administrative action. There is no evidence whatever that the present security mechanism has evolved with rational control or direction. There is little question that the present situation involves considerable waste of money and valuable time, that it is not as effective or efficient as it might be in protecting our national security, and that substantial improvements can be made to assure better protection of individual rights without any diminution of security.

It is important to an understanding of the anatomy of security that there be an appreciation of the extent to which the security mechanism permeates our society today. It is a well-known fact that some 2 million employees of the Federal Government are subject to a program for security investigation and clearance, and that similar programs exist for investigation and clearance of Americans employed by the United Nations. It is not as well known that at least an equal number of employees of Government contractors are subject to similar, or even identical programs, and that under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 many thousands of employees of private industries entering the atomic energy industry as licensees, with no connection with national-defense programs, will also be subject to security investigation and clearance. In addition, several hundred thousand merchant seamen and waterfront workers are subject to security investigation and clearance under the port-security program. Moreover, considering problems of turnover in Government and industrial employment, it is apparent that additional millions of our citizens have been or will be subject to security-risk standards. In addition, there has been an increasing tendency on the part of private employers to refrain from employing, even in positions

without any relation to Government security requirements, individuals concerning whom there has been or may be a security question raised.

It is important also to appreciate the dollar costs of our security programs. Complete statistics are not readily available, but the fragmentary data available reveal the magnitude of the costs. The Atomic Energy Commission alone since 1946 had over half a million full background investigations conducted for it by the Civil Service Commission and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At the present time, the costs of such investigations are $210 for each FBI investigation and $265 for each Civil Service Commission investigation. This means, taking the FBI figure alone, that over $100 million has been expended for personnel security investigations in the atomic energy program alone in the past 9 years. The Department of Defense has furnished information indicating that its costs for security investigations in 1954 for military, civilian, and contractor personnel amounted to almost $29 million. These costs do not reflect the other costs of security such as salaries of personnel who administer the security programs, expenses of handling the substantial paperwork necessary in the program, and expenses of other trappings of the security mechanism such as fences, guards, weapons, etc. It is apparent that the costs of security, all told, reach astronomical proportions.

It is imperative that a security mechanism of these dimensions and far-reaching implications, with life or death importance to our national defense, be operated as a matter of conscious, well-considered national policy, and not as a matter of haphazard or stopgap expedients.

THE MAJOR PROBLEMS

A number of obvious specific difficulties and possible deficiencies in the present security mechanism came to light in the course of the subcommittee's hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 21, and are discussed in this report. These difficulties alone demonstrate the existing state of confusion and lack of rational planning and coordination in the security field, and would fully justify adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 21 as the first step in a careful reexamination of the present security mechanism looking toward possible overhaul or corrective measures. It must be pointed out, however, that these are merely illustrative examples, and do not represent a complete catalog of those aspects of the present mechanism which affords grounds for concern. Many other difficulties came to light in the specific areas of the security program on which the subcommittee concentrated its attention, and there is little reason to doubt that similar difficulties are to be found in other areas which the subcommittee explored only superficially.

THE UNEVEN TREATMENT OF AREAS OF LIKE SECURITY IMPORT

One of the most troubling aspects of the overall security mechanism is the variation in degree of security protection presently afforded by statute to the various areas of security import in our national defense effort. This is most dramatically demonstrated in the present dichotomy between atomic energy matters on the one hand, and all other defense areas on the other, insofar as concerns the protection and control of national-defense secrets.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 contained, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 reenacted, provisions establishing a self-contained and autonomous system of information control. The cornerstone of this system is the concept of restricted data, broadly defined in the act to embrace all national-defense secrets in the atomic energy field. No affirmative act by AEC is required to bring information within the scope of the restricted data concept and, therefore, within the protected sphere; rather, all information falling within the restricted data definition is automatically subject to the act's provisions for protection and control. National-defense information of other kinds becomes "classified defense information" only by the affirmative act of the department or agency in classifying the information pursuant to Executive Order 10501. Similarly, unlike the situation prevailing with respect to "classified defense information," which is subject to declassification by purely administrative discretion, the Atomic Energy Act prescribes specific statutory standards and criteria for declassification.

Restricted data is automatically subject to a complex of statutory provisions for protection and control:

1. Restricted data is subject to the special espionage provisions of the Atomic Energy Act which closely parallel the provisions of the Espionage Act of 1917, as amended. These special provisions are generally regarded as more stringent than those of the Espionage Act, although in actual fact they are less stringent in some important respects.

One provision of the Atomic Energy Act, section 227, is wholly unique in that it provides a penalty for communication of restricted data information to any unauthorized person, regardless of the communicator's intent and regardless of whether he has reason to believe that the information will or could be used to injure the United States or benefit another nation, if the communicator knows or has reason to believe the information is restricted data and that the communicant is not authorized to receive it. This is in sharp contrast to the analogous provisions of the espionage act which provide for penalties only if the communicator has at least reason to believe the information could be used to the injury of the United States or to the benefit of another nation, and if the communication is willful.

2. The Atomic Energy Act specifically establishes standards for determining those individuals who will be authorized to have access to restricted data. Only individuals appropriately "cleared" by AEC, generally on the basis of a specified investigation by the FBI or the Civil Service Commission, may have access to restricted data. In the other areas of Government security, heads of departments and agencies have complete discretion to make their own determinations as to who will be permitted to have access to classified information, and the conditions under which such access will be afforded.

3. The Atomic Energy Act contains express and specific limitations upon the communication of restricted data to other nations. There are no comparable restrictions or limitations with respect to any other kind of classified defense information.

4. The Atomic Energy Act expressly authorizes AEC to control the dissemination of restricted data in such a manner as to assure the common defense and security. AEC is expressly authorized, also, to promulgate regulations or orders to protect restricted data received by any person in connection with activities authorized under the act. Violation of such regulations constitutes a criminal offense carrying heavy penalties. AEC has, moreover, authority to enjoin violations of the act and violations of its regulations.

The scope of this authority to control information warrants careful note. The AEC general counsel expressed the view, in testimony before the subcommittee, that AEC may impose its security controls upon activities, wholly outside the sphere of Government programs, in the course of which a scientist might independently, and on his own, develop information falling within the restricted data definition. An individual who develops an idea of this sort could, according to the general counsel's testimony, be cautioned that he must safeguard the information and not pass it on to unauthorized persons. He would, presumably, require AEC security clearance to work further on his idea. Major complications would arise if he refused to be cleared, or if he were found ineligible for clearance. The AEC's injunctive authority, as well as the possibilities of criminal prosecution, exist to enforce AEC's control machinery. The implications of this authority are extremely broad and far-reaching, particularly in view of the recent opening of the atomic energy field to American industry. Existence of such broad authority raises basic questions of national policy warranting careful consideration and rational determination.

The information control machinery of the Atomic Energy Act has no parallel elsewhere in the overall security mechanism. Other agencies vitally concerned with protection of other types of national secrets operate without express statutory authority to control the dissemination of classified information, without authority to issue security regulations with effective teeth, and without authority to enjoin security violations. Indeed, such authority as they may attempt to exercise in controlling the dissemination of national-defense secrets is almost wholly administrative in nature, with virtually no clear statutory foundation. The practical effect is that the Government has two separate systems of information control. One is based upon requirements established by the President for classification and safeguarding of national defense information in Executive Order 10501; the other is based upon Atomic Energy Commission's regulations for control of restricted data pursuant to the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act.

These unique statutory provisions applicable to atomic energy restricted data represent the first attempt to establish a comprehensive system for protection of national secrets, although the system operates within only a small area of the Government's total security interest. Its existence raises the fundamental question why, if these elements of the atomic energy security system have worked well in their limited sphere, they are not extended to other, or all, areas of security interest. If this were done on a Government-wide basis, we could then have a single security program and security standard of universal applicability. There has been no indication that this step has been seriously considered. Rather, it appears to be the general assumption that atomic energy secrets are a breed of secrets separate and apart from, and more sensitive than, other national defense secrets, thereby warranting special statutory protection.

This assumption of ultra-sensitivity in the atomic energy field cannot be sustained. Executive Order 10501 provides for the classification of national-defense secrets as "Top Secret," "Secret," and "Confidential," and establishes exclusive definitions for each of these categories. Atomic energy restricted data is also classified as "Top Secret," "Secret," and "Confidential," and AEC had adopted definitions for these categories equivalent to those specified in Executive Order 10501. Thus, "Confidential" restricted data is, by definition, equivalent sensitivity to "Confidential" defense information; "Secret" restricted data is, by definition, of equivalent sensitivity to "Secret" defense information, and "Top Secret" restricted data is, by definition, of equivalent sensitivity to "Top Secret" defense information. But under the Atomic Energy Act, all restricted data is subject to all of the special security provisions, regardless of whether it is "Confidential," "Secret," or "Top Secret." Thus, "Confidential" restricted data is entitled, under our laws, to far more elaborate statutory protection than is afforded our most vital "Top Secret" defense information in areas other than atomic energy. This is not only incongruous, it is also wasteful of time, money, and energy.

But even though atomic energy secrets are given more elaborate statutory protection than other national defense secrets in the respects covered in the Atomic Energy Act, it is an astonishing fact that in some important respects they get much less protection. For example, atomic energy areas of security concern have no statutory protection against trespass, or unauthorized photography or sketching, such as is available with respect to areas within the cognizance of the Department of Defense under sections 795, 796, and 797 of title 18 of the United States Code, sections 781, 782, and 783 of title 50, appendix, of the United States Code, and section 797 of title 50 of the United States Code. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act does not include some penalty provisions of the type found in the Espionage Act relating to willful communication of defense information to unauthorized persons and to loss of defense information through gross negligence, such as are found in sections 793 (d), (e), and (f) of title 18 of the United States Code.

There appears to be no justification whatever for this uneven treatment of matters of like security import on the basis of the type of information involved and the particular agency concerned. It would appear desirable and essential, in the interests of national security, that all national defense secrets and all areas of security concern of like importance be protected uniformly under laws determined to be adequate.

THE ESPIONAGE LAWS

Another problem is presented by the present state of our espionage laws. The basic statute establishing criminal penalties for improper acquisition, handling, or communication of national-defense secrets is the Espionage Act of 1917, as amended, sections 793 and 794 of title 18 of the United States Code. These provisions clearly embrace all national-defense secrets of whatever kind or character. Nevertheless, when Congress created the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 it saw fit to adopt separate, parallel criminal penalties with respect to atomic energy restricted data. And then, in 1951, another separate statute was enacted establishing parallel criminal penalties with respect to cryptographic data. The coexistence of these three statutes of varying scope and with varying penalty provisions for like offenses gives rise to substantial questions as to whether the United States at the present time has a wholly effective structure for criminal enforcement of its programs for protection of national-defense secrets.

These questions can be most effectively demonstrated by reference to the relationships between the Espionage Act provisions and the analogous provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

Sections 224 and 225 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (secs. 10 (b) (2) and 10 (b) (3) of the 1946 act) establish criminal penalties for wrongful acquisition or communication of restricted data. There appears to be no conduct defined as an offense under these provisions which would not also be subject to prosecution under sections 793 or 794 of title 18, in the absence of the special atomic energy provisions. On the other hand, there are some offenses defined under 793, which are not offenses under the Atomic Energy Act. For example, the Atomic Energy Act does not contain a "gross negligence" provision such as is found in section 793 (f) of title 18. Similarly, it does not contain provisions comparable to sections 793 (d) and (e) making it an offense, punishable by imprisonment for up to 10 years and/or a fine of up to $10,000 for "willfully," regardless of intent or reason to believe, transmitting national-defense secrets in tangible or documentary form to unauthorized persons, or "willfully" transmitting information to unauthorized persons with reasons to believe the information could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of another nation. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, did, however, incorporate a new provision, making it an offense, carrying a maximum penalty of $2,500, with no provision for imprisonment, for any person who has been associated with the atomic energy project, knowingly to communicate restricted data to unauthorized persons. This would, presumably, embrace all conduct of the type proscribed in sections 793 (d) and (e) except that section 793 (e) would apply as well to individuals who have not been associated with Government activities. The penalty under the Atomic Energy Act for such offenses, however, is only nominal as compared with that specified under sections 793 (d) and (e).

There are, moreover, significant differences in the degree of penalty provided under the two laws for conduct which constitutes substantially the same offense under both. In some instances the penalties under the Atomic Energy Act would be more severe; in other instances they would be less severe.

This situation gives rise to two principal questions. Do the provisions of the Espionage Act remain applicable to offenses involving restricted data where the conduct in question is also an offense under the Atomic Energy Act, so as to permit prosecution under the Espionage Act where this act provides for heavier penalties than apply under the Atomic Energy Act? Do the provisions of the Espionage Act which have no parallel in the Atomic Energy Act remain applicable so as to enable prosecution under the Espionage Act for conduct which does not constitute an offense under the Atomic Energy Act?

It seems clear that the special espionage provisions of the Atomic Energy Act had their origin in the desire of the Congress to remove atomic scientists from the coverage of the Espionage Act. This point of view was succinctly stated by James R. Newman, who was counsel to the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy which drafted the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

"In the earliest stages of drafting legislation for the development and control of atomic energy, it was realized that the provisions of the Espionage Act were unsuited in several respects for dealing with the secret data of theoretical and applied nuclear physics. The control of information provisions of the Atomic Energy Act were not merely designed to plug certain gaps in the Espionage Act; they were designed with the object of satisfying as far as possible the desires of scientists to escape the stultifying restrictions on the exchange of information to which they had been subjected by the Manhattan District. Although in certain respects more comprehensive and more stringent than the Espionage Act, the Atomic Energy Act provided a framework within which the scientists felt they had some chance of operating effectively, however hazardous their personal lives might become. On the other hand they were convinced that an extension of the information practices of the Manhattan District, based on the Espionage Act, would in the long run smother all creative activity in the field of nuclear research." [1]

At the same time, however, the Congress included in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 a provision, section 10 (b) (6), reading:

"This section shall not exclude the applicable provisions of any other laws."

This provision appears unmistakably to be intended to preserve the operation of the Espionage Act in the atomic energy field, and was so interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Rosenberg case. Moreover, when this provision was reenacted as section 229 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy expressly referred to this provision as continuing the applicability of the espionage law.

This situation demonstrates the present confusion in the field of security. In enacting the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, we apparently removed atomic energy from the ambit of the Espionage Act with one hand, while with the other hand we brought atomic energy back within its ambit, at least to some extent. As Mr. Newman pointed out, if the Espionage Act remains applicable to atomic energy matters, "the scientists have, indeed, sustained a crushing defeat and the more moderate and enlightened information provisions of the Atomic Energy Act are little more than pietisms." [2] Moreover, even if the Espionage Act remains applicable to conduct involving atomic energy matters which are not offenses under the Atomic Energy Act, there are still serious difficulties in reconciling the provisions of the two statutes in cases involving conduct which are offenses under both. These difficulties are discussed in Mr. Newman's article published in 1947,[3] and also in a Legal Analysis of the Adequacy of the United States Laws With Respect to Offenses Against National Security, prepared by the Library of Congress in 1953 and published as a committee print by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,[4] under the direction of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

This is, of course, another example of the uneven and illogical treatment of matters of like security import which pervades our security mechanism. There appears to be no reason why this state of uncertainty and difficulty, with possibilities of loopholes in our espionage laws, should persist. No Government witness before the subcommittee was able to justify the existence of the three separate espionage laws, or to explain why a uniform espionage law of universal applicability to all national-defense secrets would not be preferable. Indeed, there is reason to believe that this situation has not even been, at least until recently, a matter of concern to the executive branch. Assistant Attorney General Tompkins, who testified before the subcommittee, expressed the view that the fact that improper disclosure of restricted data is punishable under the Atomic Energy Act does not preclude the Government from prosecuting the same activity under the espionage laws "when appropriate." When questioned as to the justification for three separate espionage laws applicable to what is essentially the same offense, and as to the desirability of consolidating these statutes into a single statute of uniform applicability, he replied that the matter is now being studied, but that a "thorough research job would have to be done" before he could speak with accuracy. It would seem that such study is long overdue, particularly in the light of the testimony of the general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission that there was doubt as to the applicability of the Espionage Act to offenses involving restricted data until enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

MULTIPLE STANDARDS FOR SECURITY INVESTIGATION AND CLEARANCE

Although it is customary to speak of the Government apparatus for security investigation and clearance of personnel as though it were a single, unified program, the fact of the matter is that there is considerable diversity in even the basic standards for investigation and clearance.

Consider, first of all, the standards for determination of eligibility for clearance. The basic requirement is that of Executive

[1] Newman, Control of Information Relating to Atomic Energy, 56 Yale Law Journal 769 at 790 (1947).

[2] Ibid., at 790.

[3] Ibid., 791–801.

[4] 83d Cong., 1st sess.

Order 10450 which requires a determination that employment of the individual is "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security." But there are additional statutory standards for clearance applicable with respect to certain groups of personnel. For example:

1. The Atomic Energy Act requires a determination that permitting the individual to have access to restricted data will not endanger the common defense and security, and this standard must be employed even if the AEC employee will not in fact have access to restricted data in his particular position.

2. The National Science Foundation Act requires a determination, before any employee may be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which security restrictions have been established, that permitting such access will not endanger the common defense and security.

3. The Federal Civil Defense Act provides that no employee may have access to information or property with respect to which security restrictions have been established until it has been determined that there is no information in the files of investigative agencies indicating that the employee is of "questionable loyalty or reliability for security purposes," and, if such information does appear, until further investigation has been conducted and a report thereon is evaluated in writing by the Administrator.

4. No employee may be assigned to duties under the Mutual Security Act or the Act for International Development until a certification has been made by—

(a) the Foreign Operations Administrator or the Secretary of State, if the individual was investigated by the Civil Service Commission, that based upon consideration of the report of investigation he believes the individual "is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of government, and is not now and has never been a member of any organization advocating contrary views"; or

(b) the Secretary of Defense, if the individual was investigated by a military intelligence agency, that the individual is "loyal to the United States."

In view of section 10 of Executive Order 10450, which provides that nothing in the order "shall be construed as eliminating or modifying in any way the requirement for any investigation or any determination as to security which may be required by law," it is not clear what the relationship is between the various statutory standards applicable to particular agencies and the standard provided under Executive Order 10450. It is noteworthy that the Atomic Energy Commission, in the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, proceeded under both standards simultaneously.

Similar multiplicity exists with respect to responsibility for investigations. There is a statutory requirement in the case of many agencies that security investigations be conducted in the first instance by the Civil Service Commission, with referral to the investigation to the FBI if derogatory information with loyalty implications is developed. But some of these agencies are subject to a further statutory requirement that they designate those positions within their agency which are "of a high degree of importance or sensitivity," and the FBI, rather than the Civil Service Commission, has primary responsibility for conducting the security investigations in the cases of employees occupying such positions. Other departments and agencies are free, under Executive Order 10450, to use their own investigative staffs or to make arrangements for Civil Service Commission investigations. Numerous agencies, such as the State Department, the Agriculture Department, the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, the military departments, and the CIA, utilize their own investigative forces for personnel security investigations.

Agencies which are required by law to base their clearance determinations upon investigation by a specific investigative agency such as the Civil Service Commission or the FBI are apparently precluded from basing their clearance determination upon any other form of investigation. Thus, an individual who has been subject to a full background investigation by, for example, investigative staffs of the State Department or Treasury Department, may not be cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, or other agencies with a statutory requirement for Civil Service Commission or FBI investigations, without having an additional background investigation conducted by such investigative agency. Presumably, if all investigative agencies are of equal competence, as has been asserted, such additional investigations are meaningless and a waste of money from the standpoint of effective security. It would be interesting to know what percentage of the hundreds of millions of dollars spent for personnel security investigations, are attributable to such duplicate investigations.

IMPEDIMENTS TO FLOW OF INFORMATION

One of the most important problems brought to light in consideration of the operation of the security mechanism is that of impediments to adequate dissemination of information. It must be accepted as axiomatic that stringent controls be exercised over the dissemination of our national secrets to avoid their transmission or leakage to our enemies. At the same time, it appears to be equally axiomatic that limitations on the dissemination of such information, and compartmentalization of such information, deprive the Nation of cross-fertilization of ideas and restrict the degree of scientific and technological achievement. There are undoubtedly many competent individuals who do not have security clearance and who have not been engaged in defense activities who could make important contributions to our national defense effort if they had ready access to data now classified. Excessive concern with secrecy could well retard our own achievement in building an effective national defense complex, and scientific groups have consistently advanced the view that the balance presently prevailing between secrecy and accomplishment is unduly weighted in favor of the former.

There is no indication that our Government has ever systematically and comprehensively come to grips with the question of the price being paid for security in terms of the loss to achievement. It is true that there are mandates in the Atomic Energy Act and in Executive Order 10501 that information should be declassified as promptly as possible, but there is considerable question whether these mandates suffice. This appears to be an area which requires objective consideration in the national interest.

A much more serious and immediate difficulty is apparent, however. There is considerable reason to believe that the compartmentalization of security within the Government is adversely affecting the operations of the Government itself, particularly in our national defense effort. Much of this difficulty seems to flow from the statutory security autonomy of the Atomic Energy Commission, and from the special security requirements of the Atomic Energy Act.

Commissioner Thomas E. Murray of the Atomic Energy Commission expressed concern in an address delivered in December 1953 that top officials of the United States Government were inadequately versed in atomic energy matters, and he advocated a policy of "candor" with our Government officials. One of the impediments to understanding of atomic energy within the Government has undoubtedly been the special requirements for security clearance. The Atomic Energy Act specifically requires special clearance by AEC, based upon investigation by the Civil Service Commission or the FBI, before any person may be permitted to have access to restricted data. The only exception to this requirement, found in section 145 (b) of the 1954 act, is that the Commission itself or the General Manager may waive this requirement upon a determination that such action is clearly consistent with the national interest. This exception has been characterized by AEC as clarifying its authority to "permit Cabinet officers, for example, to receive restricted data" without the necessity for regular Q-clearance based upon investigation.

The practical effect of the special requirement for clearance is that individuals employed in other Government agencies with appropriate security clearances granted by such agencies must have an additional clearance, perhaps based upon an additional full background investigation, before they will be permitted to have access to restricted data essential in the performance of their work in such other agencies. An additional consequence would appear to be that such agencies must also take appropriate physical security measures to assure that other individuals employed in the agency who do not have Q-clearance, will not be able to come into contact with restricted data. The illogical nature of this requirement is demonstrated by the fact that an employee of another agency with top secret clearance who has daily access to the most critical top secret matters affecting his agency, must have special AEC clearance for even momentary access to restricted data of only marginal security significance bearing the lowest security classification.

It is apparent that this situation prior to the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, created substantial difficulties with respect to programs of the Department of Defense. Representatives of the Department of Defense, in testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in 1952, in support of legislation (such as was eventually adopted in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) modifying the security clearance requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, stated:

"We are prepared to cite specific instances where the present law, because of its inflexibility, has slowed down important atomic projects of the Army, Navy, and Air Force," and that if the amendments were adopted:

"Much valuable time will be saved in design, procurement, and development work in the weapons program with the result that weapons will enter stockpile at an earlier date."

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 apparently rectified this situation by permitting AEC to authorize personnel engaged in programs of the Department of Defense to have access to restricted data on the basis of their regular Department of Defense clearances, without necessity for special AEC clearance. It is noteworthy, however, that representatives of the Department of Defense testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during consideration of the 1954 act that even with these amendments, the "dual system of security" imposes "a formidable administrative burden."

But even though the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 resolves the problem of interchangeability of AEC and Department of Defense clearance, which, concededly, was a particularly serious problem because of the number of individuals involved and the necessity for close working arrangements between AEC and the Department of Defense it leaves unresolved the similar problem with respect to other Government agencies performing vital national-defense work such as the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Coast Guard, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the

National Bureau of Standards, which remain subject to the special clearance requirement for access to restricted data.

A case in point is that of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The Federal Civil Defense Administrator in testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee referred to the fact that AEC security requirements made it "extremely difficult" for his agency to take effective steps to prepare to meet the "fallout" problem. He pointed out that because of the classification of the information, it could not be discussed, presumably from the standpoint of evacuation, with the Bureau of Public Roads, and that even within his own agency, the scarcity of Q-cleared personnel made it difficult to handle the situation. Subsequently, a representative of the Federal Civil Defense Administration appeared before the subcommittee considering Senate Joint Resolution 21, and testified that the shortage of Q-cleared personnel was attributable to loss of personnel in the administration's move to Battle Creek rather than to any lack of cooperation by AEC. He conceded, however, that the requirement for Q-clearance was a fairly substantial burden in terms of delay and inconvenience.

The Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in subsequent testimony on this matter before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 24, 1955, reiterated that the difficulty in question had been caused primarily by the move to Battle Creek. He pointed out, however, that under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, primary responsibility for civil defense rests with the States and localities, and that the AEC security requirements are an impediment to getting vital information into the hands of governors and mayors. He also pointed out that the Administration was precluded, because of security restrictions, from discussing important matters with other Federal agencies playing a vital role in civil defense, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The overall pattern of this testimony indicates clearly that security restrictions have encumbered and delayed our civil defense effort. It is not unlikely that similar encumbrances and delays are to be found in other areas of our national defense effort. At the very least, it is apparent that the special security requirements in the atomic energy field are quite cumbersome administratively, and quite costly to the taxpayers. As the Federal Civil Defense Administrator pointed out in his testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"If the regular security system were also applicable to access to 'restricted data' this would expedite our work."

The Atomic Energy Commission stated in 1952, in connection with the proposed amendments to the Atomic Energy Act which would permit it to honor Department of Defense clearances:

"We see no reason why the AEC should have to determine whether military personnel who are already cleared by their own agency, are good security risks to get restricted data for use in connection with work assigned them by the military. And, in our opinion, it is wrong from the point of view of the overall defense and security of the United States to raise unrealistic barriers to vital cooperation by all the members of our team in the field of atomic weapons."

There is no readily apparent reason why the same should not be true with respect to all other components of the Government. It is strange, indeed, that the Federal Civil Defense Administration, with a total employment roll of about 600, all of whom are cleared for access to "secret" defense information, has only 109 employees eligible for access to "secret" restricted data, necessary to accomplish the vital mission of that agency. It may be that the requirement for special AEC clearance is justifiable despite the costs, burdens, delays, and impediments to national security, but no such justification has been advanced. The time has come to consider this matter rationally and objectively, and to reach some definite conclusions of national policy concerning this situation.

Another problem in the civil defense field was raised by Dr. George V. LeRoy of the University of Chicago who had had extensive experience in connection with the effects of atomic weapons upon living organisms. Dr. LeRoy testified that there is a considerable amount of classified information relating to treatment of the effects of atomic weapons which is not available to American physicians, and that American physicians are not, for this reason, as adequately equipped as they might be to treat the casualties of an atomic attack. He related that a Japanese doctor who recently visited the United States was able to discuss with him information (about the cases of the Japanese fishermen injured by fallout as a result of last year's Pacific tests) which is presently regarded as classified by our Government. Dr. LeRoy pointed out also that the medical chief of the Illinois civil defense group, who is responsible for planning the medical care and warning system for the State, was unable to obtain from him, because of security restrictions, adequate information about the fallout problem.

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, however, has characterized Dr. LeRoy's testimony in this respect as "irresponsible" and the Director of AEC's Division of Biology and Medicine has stated that no medical information relating to this problem is presently classified. This conflict between responsible and knowledgeable individuals emphasizes the difficulties presently faced in attempting to evaluate and reach sound conclusions about the operation and impact of the security mechanism. It is another indication of the need for a high-level, systematic, objective study of the security mechanism to assure that it is operating soundly and effectively, and to reinforce public confidence.

SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Much of the subcommittee's attention was devoted to consideration of the security requirements for Government employment, and the manner in which the program has been and is being administered. It is this aspect of the Government's security mechanism which has aroused most public interest and discussion, and it has also evoked considerable comment on the part of the public, the press, and responsible Government officials.

Although a number of agencies had previously developed programs of their own for security investigation and clearance of their employees, particularly for access to classified information, and Congress had established security requirements for employment in a few agencies on a fairly random basis, the present security program as applied throughout the Government and to all Federal employees is based primarily upon Executive Order 10450 promulgated by President Eisenhower on April 27, 1953. The purpose and philosophy of the security program was succinctly stated by the Assistant Attorney General in his testimony before the subcommittee, as follows:

"Thus the basic objective of the present employee security program is to make sure that there is no employee on the Federal payroll, nor any applicant appointed, who can, because of his position endanger the national security. President Eisenhower insists that all Federal employees be persons of integrity, high moral character, and unswerving loyalty to the United States. At the same time, the President has cautioned all heads of the executive establishments that in the American tradition all employees should receive 'fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of Government.' This is the spirit which prevails in the administration of the present personnel security program.

Executive Order 10450 requires security investigation of every employee of the executive branch of the Government, and establishes a list of categories of attributes which, if found to exist in the case of a person investigated, would at least raise some question as to his suitability for employment on security grounds. The Executive order does not in itself prescribe procedures, even in general terms, for carrying out the President's direction, as stated in the preamble to the Executive order, that:

"All persons should receive fair, impartial and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government * * * [and] that all persons seeking the privilege of employment or privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of the Government be adjudged by mutually consistent and no less than minimum standards and procedures."

Rather, the President, simultaneously with his promulgation of Executive Order 10450, advised the heads of all departments and agencies that the Attorney General had, at his direction, prepared "sample regulations" designed to establish "minimum standards" for implementation of the security program. Each department and agency is, therefore, responsible for promulgation of its own procedures for handling, considering, and determining security cases, subject, according to testimony before the committee, to review of these procedures by the Attorney General to assure that they meet the minimum standards of the "sample regulations."

It must be borne in mind that there is a close relationship between the security program and the ordinary processes of selection, retention, and dismissal of Government employees in accordance with sound principles of personnel management. Thus, although a person may be a security risk in the particular Government position which he occupies or seeks because of derogatory information developed in the course of a security investigation, the very same derogatory information may indicate that even aside from security considerations, he is not suitable for employment in that position. For example, a drug addict, a chronic alcoholic, or a person with definite criminal tendencies would clearly be an undesirable employee in a position of public trust.

According to figures released by the Civil Service Commission covering operation of the personnel security program under Executive Order 10450 from May 28, 1953, to September 30, 1954, a total of 3,002 employees were fired because of security questions falling within the purview of the Executive order, and an additional 5,006 employees resigned before determination was completed in cases where the file "was known to contain unfavorable information" under the security program. The Civil Service Commission's use of the word "known" in this context is unfortunate and misleading, since it connotes that these employees resigned with knowledge that there was derogatory information concerning them without availing themselves of the opportunity of seeking a final judicious determination. Under questioning before the subcommittee, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission stated with respect to these 5,006 employees that the information was "known" to the Government, and not necessarily to the employees who resigned.

These figures warrant further analysis to place the security program in proper perspective. The fact that 3,002 employees are listed as "fired" does not mean that each had been determined to be a security risk.

The bulk of these were, according to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, dismissed as unsuitable employees under civil service regulations and procedures, rather than under Executive Order 10450. Nor does this mean that these employees were dismissed after some kind of adjudication process in which they were apprised of the derogatory information and given a formal hearing with opportunity to clear the record. Those employees dismissed under civil service regulations had only such opportunity to defend themselves as is given in the discretion of their agency heads, and the procedures in such cases vary widely from agency to agency and fall far short of the procedures established for security hearings. In addition, a large proportion of the total number of security dismissals listed are undoubtedly of probationary employees who are not given an opportunity for hearing prior to dismissal on security grounds. Statistics furnished by the Department of Defense reflect that, although the Civil Service Commission's figures of employees fired for security reasons through September 30, 1954, for the Army, Navy, and Air Force were 302, 638, and 371, respectively, only 71, 27, and 16 of these cases, respectively, involved dismissals effected subsequent to a security hearing.

Similarly, it cannot be assumed that the 5,006 Government employees who are listed as "resigned" all possessed attributes which would have required denial of clearance or employment had their cases been prosecuted to conclusion. It would appear that this total would include all Government employees who resigned, whatever the reason and whether or not they were even aware of the existence of derogatory information, whose files contained any derogatory information, of whatever quantity or significance, falling within the Executive order. Thus, the 2,096 cases in which information about "subversion" was present would undoubtedly include many cases in which only the rawest, unevaluated derogatory information was found, indicating some remote connection with left-wing activities or relatives with some possible interest in suspect groups recently or in the remote past.

It is apparent, therefore, that the total figure of 8,008 security separations (3,002 fired plus 5,006 resigned) should not be interpreted as indicating that this number of security risks have been weeded out of the Government service. The actual number of security risks is apparently very much smaller than this figure; the precise number cannot be ascertained, principally because the Civil Service Commission's reporting system is evidently not set up to produce this statistic.

THE PROCEDURAL RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO THE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM

The fundamental assumption underlying the security program, insofar as concerns procedural rights of individuals subject to the program, is that no individual has any "right" to a Government job and that, therefore, such procedural protection as has been afforded under Executive Order 10450 should be gratefully received and not criticized as inadequate. As the Assistant Attorney General stated before the subcommittee:

"When we recall that for over 120 years we permitted our Government to fire without notice and without specifying reasons, it must, it seems to me, be conceded that the present program grants to the employee many substantial and protective rights—in fact, the most that have ever been afforded to a Federal employee."

Three groups of individuals are affected by the security programs: (1) permanent and indefinite employees who have survived their probationary period; probationary employees; and applicants for Government employment. The degree of procedural protection available under the security program varies, depending upon the particular category in which the individual may be.

1. Applicants for Government employment: Applicants for Government employment are, of course, subject to security investigation under Executive Order 10450. Applicants are, however, not afforded any procedural rights of any kind, except in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, to explain or clarify derogatory information which may be developed in the course of the investigation. This means, as a practical matter, that applicants concerning whom significant derogatory information is developed will be denied Government employment almost automatically, even though the derogatory information might be wholly dissipated or its significance greatly minimized if the applicant were afforded an opportunity to learn the nature of the derogatory information and to have some kind of objective adjudication of the charges. In some instances the department or agency may discuss the derogatory information informally with the applicant, but this procedure does not give the applicant a reasonable opportunity to clear the record and his name.

It appears that the Atomic Energy Commission alone has adopted formalized procedures for handling security cases involving applicants. Under those procedures, all applicants for AEC employment are entitled to a formal hearing to resolve doubt as to eligibility for clearance and employment resulting from derogatory information uncovered in the course of the security investigation. They are, moreover, entitled to precisely the same procedural privileges as incumbent employees, since the very same procedures apply equally in both cases. The regulations of the Department of the Air Force specifying the types of situations in which the privilege of a security hearing will be afforded are sufficiently broad to embrace cases of applicants, but representatives of the Air Force testified that there is no general practice of affording hearings to applicants. They did indicate, however, that in exceptional cases involving uniquely qualified applicants who are regarded as essential for certain projects a hearing may be afforded "to clear up the acceptability of this man." The General Counsel of the Department of Defense testified that a similar practice prevails in the Army and Navy Departments, but the regulations of those Departments do not expressly provide for situations of this kind.

2. Probationary employees: Government employees who have not completed their 1-year probationary period are generally not entitled to a security hearing to resolve derogatory information which may be developed in the course of security investigations, although, under Public Law 733 and the Department of Justice sample regulations, they are entitled to written notice as to the reasons for suspension, as specific and detailed as security considerations permit, and to submit a written defense to these charges. Even this privilege, however, applies only if the individual is suspended under the security program, and would not apply if the individual is terminated as unsuitable under the ordinary Civil Service regulations. Some agencies apparently attempt to handle as many cases as possible under Civil Service regulations rather than as security cases. In the case of the Air Force, for example, it was indicated that a case is processed under the security regulations only if it is not possible to remove the employee under Civil Service regulations. This procedure may have considerable merit in that it spares the employee the burden of a security-risk label, but at the same time it denies him an opportunity to clear his name and establish his eligibility for Government employment, since probationary employees may be dismissed at the discretion of the agency head without any notice or hearing.

Again, the Atomic Energy Commission's procedures constitute an exception to the general rule, since AEC grants precisely the same privileges to probationary employees as in the cases of employees who have survived the probationary period. It should be pointed out, however, that this is probably required by section 161 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act which requires that the Commission "make adequate provisions for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee." Representatives of the Department of the Air Force testified that that Department also affords hearings to probationary employees "in order that we might insure proper safeguards."

3. Incumbent employees who have survived the probationary period: Permanent and indefinite employees who have survived their probationary period are entitled under the Executive Order 10450 security program, to a formal adjudication of the question of security risk before they are terminated as security risks under the provisions of the Executive order. The procedures to which they are entitled must meet the minimum standards of the Department of Justice's sample regulations. If, however, the derogatory information brought to light by a security investigation required under Executive Order 10450 raises a question of suitability for employment, as well as of security, the individual may be deprived of his procedural privileges under Executive Order 10450 if the agency head decides to dismiss him under civil-service regulations rather than under the security order. In such an event, the procedures available to the individual for clearing the record vary greatly from agency to agency, with no apparent minimum standards, and such procedural safeguards as are available would generally provide much less protection than those afforded under the security program.

HOW MUCH "RIGHTS" SHOULD THE INDIVIDUAL HAVE UNDER THE SECURITY PROGRAM?

The question of the degree of procedural rights which should be afforded to individuals subject to the security program is a complex one. There can be no doubt that the Government should seek to establish the highest level of standards for the Federal service, and that undesirable, unsuitable, unreliable, and untrustworthy employees should be weeded out. It cannot be disputed that the Government should have effective procedures for making inquiry concerning the background, competence, experience, and character of its employees and applicants for employment, and that it should be able, as in the case of private industry, to refuse to employ applicants who do not meet its standards, and to discharge, without cumbersome procedures, employees who are undesirable.

There is, however, an important distinction between a sound personnel administration program and the present security program. The security program mobilizes the entire investigative machinery of the United States Government to probe into every facet of the individual's background. The investigation is not, like the ordinary personnel inquiry, designed to elicit an objective report on the individual's experience, training, personality, and other characteristics pertinent to a decision as to his suitability for employment. It is designed, rather, to use the words of section 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450, "to elicit information as to whether the employment or retention in employment in the Federal service of the person being investigated is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security." Section 8 (a) then goes on to enumerate the types of information to be developed in the investigation, and the entire enumeration consists of categories of derogatory information, with no reference at all to the desirability of obtaining a balanced, objective picture of the individual's suitability, including favorable

information about him. It should also be recognized that the security investigation, unlike the personnel inquiry, is designed to turn up information about the individual's relatives, and friends, and his and their political beliefs, activities, and associations, some of which does not necessarily have a direct bearing upon whether or not he will be a good, reliable, and trustworthy employee. There is, moreover, no effort to confine the investigation to sources of information which are presumed to be sound and free of personal bias. Rather, the investigators go to anyone who can tell anything about the individual, and many of the informants, even if they are free of malice or prejudice toward the individual being investigated, have highly questionable competence to interpret his political or moral characteristics.

There is a further important distinction. In the case of a true personnel inquiry, the results are interpreted and evaluated, and a determination made, by individuals who are free to weigh and decide objectively in terms of whether or not the individual is capable of doing a job in a reliable and trustworthy manner. In the case of the security program, however, the individuals who evaluate are expected to have the rather parochial function of protecting against possible risk, and the security criteria and procedures place little emphasis upon evaluation of the degree of risk arising from derogatory information, as balanced against the individual's meritorious attributes, in the context of the particular Government position involved.

Still another distinction lies in the impact of the security program upon the individual who is fired as a security risk, or who is denied employment as a consequence of the existence of derogatory information. Once the Government conducts a personnel security investigation which results in the production of significant derogatory information, a situation is created which may have the most profound consequences upon the life of the individual concerned. The impact of the security program is not limited, as has been suggested, to a determination as to whether or not an employee may be a security risk in a particular position in the Government. As a practical matter, an individual who has been determined to be a security risk in a particular position is, by this determination, virtually ineligible for further Government employment. It is true that section 7 of the Executive Order 10450 provides a basis for reemployment of the individual in the same agency upon a determination by the head of the agency that this is clearly consistent with the interests of national security. Indeed, although the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission conceded that an employee found to be a security risk "may be a first-rate Federal employee in some other position," he was not able to inform the subcommittee when he testified as to whether there had been any such reinstatements. Section 7 also makes an employee, who has been suspended or terminated as a security risk, ineligible for employment in any other Government agency, unless the head of such other agency determines such employment is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security and the Civil Service Commission gives its consent. Of 54 cases of this kind which have been brought before the Civil Service Commission to date, only 9 have been found eligible for reemployment in another agency by the Commission. Information furnished to the subcommittee by Mr. Young since conclusion of the hearings reflects that for the period October 1, 1953, to September 30, 1954, only 5 employees terminated under the security program have been reemployed by Government agencies. The most that can be said is that a man found to be a security risk has a remote possibility of reinstatement in a Government job, but even if he is reinstated, his opportunity for advancement would be severely circumscribed by the earlier security determination.

But the impact of the program does not end there. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission conceded that a security file on an individual who has been denied clearance will follow him like a shadow throughout the Government, and into private industry if he seeks employment with firms doing Government work involving security considerations. Indeed, Mr. Young indicated that section 7 was written into Executive Order 10450 for this very purpose. The consequence is that a large area of private employment, embracing upward of 2 million positions in our present private economy, involving access to classified matters would be barred to this individual.

Moreover, it is apparent that many American firms would regard an individual who has been found to be a security risk as wholly ineligible for employment by them in any position whatever, even in positions with no security significance whatever. The representative of Douglas Aircraft Co. who testified before the subcommittee stated that his firm would not hire, and would forthwith fire, any individual who had been found to be ineligible for "Secret" and "Top Secret" clearance by the Department of Defense. Additional information received by the subcommittee indicates that similar practices are followed by many industrial firms, even firms engaged to only a minor extent in defense work.

The same situation prevails with respect to probationary employees and applicants who are fired or refused employment on security grounds without a final adjudication as to whether or not they are security risks. Once significant derogatory information is developed in a security investigation, and is not resolved by a favorable security clearance determination, it will operate as an impediment to employment of the individual elsewhere in the Government and in wide areas of the private economy. Agencies are required to report to the Civil Service Commission on form 73 whether or not an applicant is denied employment as a result of security determination made on the basis of a full field investigation. The ready availability of the national agency check serves to make the derogatory information known, and it is unlikely that an employing officer would knowingly select for employment an applicant concerning whom there is an ostensible unresolved security question over an applicant concerning whom there is no apparent cause for doubt. In a day in which even private employers inquire as to whether or not an applicant for employment has ever been cleared, has ever been denied clearance, or has ever executed a personnel security questionnaire for security clearance, it is readily apparent that unevaluated and unresolved derogatory information developed in the course of a prior security investigation may effectively bar an individual from getting even a toehold in future employment sufficient to permit a security hearing which might resolve the derogatory implications. Indeed, information submitted to the subcommittee indicates that even a long delay in processing a security clearance application to a final conclusion—without any indication that derogatory information has been developed—may make potential employers skeptical of the wisdom of employing an applicant for even those positions in the private economy which are in no way of security significance.

It is apparent that the security program causes substantial deprivations to many thousands of Government employees subject to it, and that these deprivations are not limited merely to loss of a particular Government job. It is callously unrealistic to define the procedural safeguards available to Government employees and applicants for Government employment in terms of the concept that "there is no right to a Government job," or by assuming that no "stigma" attaches to denial of clearance to an applicant or to discharge of a probationary employee. There is little indication that representatives of the Government who are responsible for implementing Executive Order 10450 have an adequate awareness of the impact of the program upon the individual subject to it, or that they have considered what the Government's responsibilities to its citizenry should be in this area. There is an urgent necessity for thorough reexamination of the impact of the security program, and for consideration, as a matter of national policy, of the degree of procedural safeguards which can and should be afforded individuals subject to this impact. It would be well to consider, specifically, the feasibility of affording to all individuals subject to the security program the maximum opportunity to resolve questions of security risk consistent with effective operation of the security program.

A number of specific problems appear to warrant special attention. These are the major problems revealed in the subcommittee's consideration of the personnel security programs, but they are only illustrative of other problems which may exist.

1. Notice to the individual: The sample regulations of the Department of Justice provide that a written statement of charges shall be furnished, and that the statement shall be as "specific and detailed as security considerations, including the need for protection of confidential sources of information, permit." This standard appears to be satisfactory, but there is reason to believe it is not being consistently applied by the various agencies and that some agencies are not complying with the spirit of the standard in formulating the statement of charges. There appears also to be a need for more careful and precise definition of "confidential sources of information."

2. Opportunity to answer the charges: The present minimum standard procedures as found in the sample regulations of the Department of Justice appear, in the main, to provide adequate opportunity for the individual to make his defense if all agencies observe their spirit. In at least one area, however, study might be given to the possibility of improvement. This area concerns the problem of "confrontation."

There can be no question as to the necessity for protecting the FBI's methods and devices for infiltrating the Communist conspiracy. If protecting such sources of information represents a compromise with traditional American concepts of justice and fair play, it is a price which we should be willing to pay, in times of national peril, for an effective security program. But it appears that information from such sources is involved in only a very small proportion of security cases. Mr. Ernest Angell, chairman of the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, who served for several years as Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board for the Second District, testified before the subcommittee on the basis of his experience with hundreds of FBI investigative reports under the loyalty program:

"I could say with confidence that the proportion of those [cases] in which there was any genuine derogatory information against the employee that came from the personal knowledge of the FBI agent or the genuine undercover agent, as distinguished from the great mass public of the so-called casual informant, was very, very low and small. There was no question about that."

The real question of confrontation is whether such casual informants—landlords, neighbors, classmates, business associates, and the like—who furnish derogatory information, and who are usually identified in the investigative reports, should be identified to the individual and subject to confrontation. Discussion of this problem heretofore has been confused by injecting into

it the question of the actual FBI intelligence apparatus, and it is now necessary to consider the problem of confrontation strictly in terms of these casual informants. At the present time the security procedures place a premium on and encourage irresponsible and malicious gossip and information. It may be that broadening the area of confrontation in this manner may dry up sources of derogatory information to a degree which would hamper the security program. Even if this were a consequence, there would still be a basic-policy question requiring balancing of principles of fairness, justice, and responsibility against the requirements of security. It appears to be most desirable that a fresh, objective examination of this problem be undertaken by an independent body.

There is considerable reason to believe that present practices with respect to confrontation are less than adequate and less than would be feasible without detriment to the security program.

The Department of Justice sample regulations provide merely that hearing boards may, in their discretion, invite any person to appear at the hearing and testify, and that the hearing board shall take into consideration the employee's handicap by reason of nondisclosure to him of confidential information or lack of opportunity to cross-examine confidential informants. They provide also that the board shall consider the refusal of an invited informant to appear, as well as the fact that the Government cannot pay witnesses' travel expenses. In addition, the President recently approved the Attorney General's recommendation that every effort should be made to produce witnesses at security board hearings to testify in behalf of the Government so that such witnesses may be confronted and cross-examined by the employee, so long as the production of such witnesses would not jeopardize the national security.

The regulations of the Department of the Army go farther than any others in providing a right of confrontation. Paragraph 37 of Special Regulations 620–220–1 provides:

"Government witnesses: All boards are instructed to invite, as a matter of standard procedure, each nonconfidential witness who has been personally identified, who has given information adverse to the employee and who has not indicated expressly an unwillingness to appear. Geographic distances will be no bar to extending invitations except that invitations need not be issued to witnesses in noncontiguous overseas areas. Such witness will be asked to appear at the hearing to testify in the employee's presence and be subjected to cross-examination. They will also be asked whether they wish to appear privately before the board, whether they would submit a signed statement, permit their names to be disclosed as the source of the information given, and whether their statement previously given may be read to the employee with or without the witness' name being disclosed. The invitation will state that the board cannot pay witnesses fees or reimbursement for travel or other expenses. A suggested invitation to qualified witnesses is contained in appendix II. Whenever a witness signifies a desire to appear before the board in private, the executive secretary will arrange such a meeting, preferably before the hearing. The witness will be heard under oath and a verbatim confidential transcript of his testimony will be made and added to the complete file. A copy of that transcript will not be supplied the employee unless the witness agrees. If the witness agrees to release the transcript, it will be regarded unclassified and the witness' agreement should be included in the questions and answers in the transcript, usually at the end. Adverse witnesses who are employees of the Army Establishment should be urged to attend and commanding officers should be requested to permit such employees to attend. Necessary time to attend a hearing would be recorded as official duty and no charge made to leave."

Although it may be questioned whether even this broad language goes as far as is possible and desirable in affording the right of confrontation, there can be no question that it goes far beyond most agency regulations which provide only that every effort shall be made to produce informants. If the privilege of confrontation on this broad scale is feasible for employees of the Department of the Army without adverse effect upon national security, there is no reason why all departments and agencies should not adopt regulations going at least this far.

A related question is that of subpena. At the present time agencies and departments, with the exception of possibly a few with specific statutory authority, do not have authority to subpena individuals to testify in security proceedings. If it is concluded upon further study that the right of confrontation should be broadened, consideration might also be given to whether the power to subpena informants should be granted. Some Government witnesses before the subcommittee, when asked whether the subpena power should be provided, responded in the negative. They did not say, however, that providing such subpena authority would be detrimental to the national security. Their replies were predicated upon the conceptual notion that security proceedings are not adversary in nature and are administrative rather than judicial. The tendency to discuss security problems in terms of these conceptual labels, rather than in terms of actual impact and effect upon individual rights and Government security, should be arrested. Sufficient it to say that some security cases which have received wide public attention have had many trappings of an adversary proceeding, and, indeed, Government witnesses were subpenaed by the Atomic Energy Commission in the Oppenheimer case.

3. Objective evaluation and determination: There are significant indications that the security program under Executive Order 10450 may, in some respects, lack objective balance, and weight the scale too heavily on the side of finding security risk. Even though the test of eligibility for Government employment under Executive Order 10450—that it be determined that employing the individual is "clearly consistent with the interests of national security"—may be an ideal standard, refinement of the standard so as to reflect the necessity for careful evaluation of degree of security risk in the light of all the individual's attributes would add considerable balance and objectivity.

The most striking evidence of this lack of balance is to be found in the manner in which security hearing boards are instructed to evaluate the evidence and prepare their findings and recommendations for the agency head. The Civil Service Commission's handbook entitled "Guides for Members of Security Hearing Boards Under Executive Order 10450" provides that a memorandum of reasons is to be prepared by the Security Hearing Board in support of its conclusion and decision in each case, for incorporation into the file and use by the head of the agency making the final decision. The handbook states:

"The amount of detail necessary will depend upon the facts and complexity of the case. In some instances it will be necessary or desirable to explain the board's reasoning and conclusion concerning each charge. This probably will be done in every case in which the board reaches a decision favorable to the individual."

The import of this is obvious. A recommendation in favor of the individual must be justified and supported, but a recommendation adverse to the individual need not be. The agency head may fire an employee as a security risk without being convinced, but he must be convinced before he finds in the employee's favor. This language, if it has any meaning at all, necessarily must have some intimidating effect upon members of hearing boards, who, regardless of their integrity, objectivity, and good faith, are well aware of the fate which may befall Government employees who are "soft" on communism and subversion.

This unbalanced language has seeped through to the security regulations of some departments and agencies. The Navy Department, for example, adopted this language in toto. When this language was brought to the attention of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense during his testimony before the subcommittee, he expressed some concern, and the result has been amendment of the Navy Department's regulations so as to require an explanation of the Board's reasoning and conclusions concerning each charge, whether the decision is favorable or unfavorable to the individual.

4. Hearings for applicants and probationary employees: Another problem worthy of study is whether a greater degree of procedural protection should be afforded probationary employees and applicants concerning whom security doubt arises as to eligibility for employment. No convincing reasons have been advanced as to why probationary employees should not have the privilege of a hearing before a security hearing board prior to dismissal on security grounds. In testimony before the subcommittee there were, of course, the conceptualistic arguments that security hearings for such employees are not authorized by statute and that there is no right to a Government job. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission indicated that granting hearings for probationary employees runs counter to the whole "theory and system of having a probationary year for Federal employees * * * to provide an opportunity to see whether or not that person is a qualified, worthwhile Federal employee." He also expressed the view that "good personnel management" dictate against such hearings. But the fact of the matter is that at least the Department of the Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission, among the various departments and agencies, do afford probationary employees the opportunity for a security hearing, and there is no indication of any adverse consequences.

Similarly, there have been no convincing reasons offered for not extending the privilege of security hearings to applicants who would otherwise be barred from Federal employment for security reasons. The only real argument against such hearings was offered by the representative of the Department of State who testified that if applicant procedures were adopted, one of the dangers would be immediately all the Communists would come in to apply for a Federal job just to find out whether the Federal Government knew about them or not. But this concern appears to have been articulated without knowledge of the Atomic Energy Commission's satisfactory experience in affording hearings to applicants during the past several years. Indeed, the State Department representatives were unaware, prior to the subcommittee's hearings, that any agency afforded security hearings to applicants and probationary employees.

LACK OF UNIFORMITY, CONSISTENCY, AND COORDINATION

The Government programs for investigation and clearance of personnel are characterized by considerable confusion and few evidences of uniformity, consistency, or even coordination.

Even within those agencies whose security programs are based in whole upon Executive Order 10450, there are substantial variations. The general structure of the security program under Executive Order 10450 is that each de-

partment or agency head is to establish his own security program within the broad minimum standards established under Executive Order 10450 and the Department of Justice's sample regulations. The only effort at coordination appears to be the review of each agency's regulations by the Department of Justice to assure that the minimum standards are met. But the minimum standards are extremely vague and general, and permit wide variations in substantive and procedural aspects of security proceedings. As an example of these variations, we may consider the regulations of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, three Departments which are subject to some unifying pressures, and which are probably as similar to each other in makeup, personnel, and special problems as any three agencies of the Government could be.

The principal representative of the Department of Defense in the hearing before the subcommittee, its General Counsel, insisted that the employee security programs of the three subdepartments were substantially uniform. The respective regulations, however, do not bear out this contention. A number of significant variations appeared:

(a) Hearings: The Army Department and Navy Department regulations contemplate hearings only for permanent or indefinite employees who have survived their probationary periods. The Department of the Air Force regulations provide hearings as a matter of right only to such employees, but contemplate that hearings for other individuals subject to the security program will be afforded at the discretion of the Central Review Board, which, it is stated, has the policy "to grant such a hearing in all such cases except where the national security would otherwise be immediately affected." Pursuant to this policy, the Air Force grants security hearings to probationary employees as a matter of course.

(b) Confrontation: As discussed above, the Department of the Army regulations require, as a matter of standard procedure, that all nonconfidential informants who have been personally identified in the investigative report, and who have not expressly indicated an unwillingness to appear, be invited to testify, or to submit a signed statement, or to be identified to the employee. The Air Force regulations are almost as broad, but require that such invitations be extended "whenever practicable," and not as a matter of "standard procedure." The Navy Department regulations provide merely that the "Security Hearing Board, in its discretion, may invite any person to appear at the hearing and testify."

(c) Report of Hearing Board: As discussed above, the Navy Department regulations, which have been amended to remedy this deficiency since the hearings before the subcommittee, provided that a full statement of the Hearing Board's reasoning ought to be included in every case in which the Board reaches a conclusion favorable to the individual, but not when the conclusion is adverse to the individual. The Air Force regulations require an analysis of the information and a detailed statement of the reasoning upon which each finding is based, regardless of the outcome. The Department of the Army regulations are silent on this point, but state that complete instructions on preparation of the Board's findings and the memorandum of reasons "will be provided in other media," presumably the Civil Service Commission's Handbook, which, as discussed above, contains a provision similar to that found in the Navy Department's regulations prior to their amendment.

(d) Criteria for determining security risk: The Department of the Army's regulations contain no statements reflecting that the criteria of security risk are to be applied in terms of the specific position occupied by the employee. Nor do the regulations contain any standards for evaluating the derogatory information, weighed against favorable information, to establish the degree of security risk. In sharp contrast, the Navy Department regulations specify that the Board will consider "the nature of the position occupied by the employee and in the light of the derogatory information" and that "a fair decision will be reached only after all the facts, favorable and unfavorable, have been analyzed impartially and have been given due weight in their proper perspective." The Air Force regulations go even further in specifying that derogatory information of the various types included in the criteria are all "relevant to the question of whether because of his * * * employment in the position involved [the individual] might, either intentionally or inadvertently, disclose to unauthorized persons classified security information * * * or otherwise act against the security interests of the United States."

The General Counsel of the Department of Defense suggested that such discrepancies are merely variations in language without substantive significance, but this is not a satisfactory answer. Government officials are to be commended for extending desirable procedural advantages to their employees over and above those required by their regulations, but in the last analysis the individual must look to the published regulations for his procedural safeguards, and there is no reason why the procedures cannot be wholly uniform, selecting the best provisions of each.

It must be recognized that such variations in procedures of the agencies of the Department of Defense, where there is some unification, are found in greatly magnified form among the other agencies' security programs, where the only pressure for consistency comes from the necessity for meeting the minimum standards of the sample regulations of the Department of Justice.

Additional evidence of lack of consistency and coordination may be found in the testimony of the Department of Justice before the subcommittee.

Assistant Attorney General Tompkins testified unequivocally that Executive Order 10450 does not apply to employees occupying nonsensitive positions concerning whom derogatory information about character and habits has been developed. He stated, for example:

"A drunk in a nonsensitive position would not be subject to 10450.

"The gentleman in the nonsensitive position whose habits are not good * * * would not come within the scope of 10450."

But despite this interpretation by a high official of the Department responsible for interpreting Executive Order 10450 for the various departments and agencies, and for assuring that their security regulations meet certain minimum standards, it is apparent that other agencies and departments have been dismissing employees in nonsensitive positions under Executive Order 10450 on the basis of derogatory information as to character and habits. Thus, representatives of the Department of Defense testified that a drunk occupying a nonsensitive position could be dismissed under Executive Order 10450, and statistics for the Department of the Army (the only agency of the Department of Defense for which these figures are available) reveal that of 182 Army employees occupying nonsensitive positions who were dismissed under Executive Order 10450, 143 were dismissed on the basis of derogatory information as to character and habits. Similiarly, according to figures furnished by the Civil Service Commission for the period May 28, 1953, to September 30, 1954, the Department of Agriculture reported that 101 of 102 employees terminated because of security questions were in nonsensitive positions, but only 32 cases involved information relating to subversion; the Department of Commerce reported that 32 of the 77 employees terminated were in nonsensitive positions, but only 12 cases involved information relating to subversion; and the General Services Administration reported that 105 of the 154 employees terminated were in nonsensitive positions, but only 20 cases involved information relating to subversion.

Another example of lack of common understanding of security concepts under Executive Order 10450 may be found in the inability of the State Department witness before the subcommittee to state categorically that other agencies of the Government interpret Executive Order 10450, as he does, as permitting employment of a security risk when necessary to get a job done.

This lack of common understanding as to what security is all about under Executive Order 10450 is reflected in available statistics on the operation of Executive Order 10450.

It is apparent that there is no pattern of statistical correlation. The most complete statistics available are those furnished by the Atomic Energy Commission which, since 1946, has had approximately 504,000 full background investigations conducted for it. AEC, which presumably has a rather stringent security program, indicated that of these investigations, only 5,532, or about 1.1 percent, raised any question as to eligibility for AEC security clearance, and of this number 1,622 were finally granted clearance. Of of the remaining 3,910, 3,416 were not processed to conclusion for one reason or another, and only 494, or just under 0.1 percent, were actually denied clearance. These figures may be compared with figures furnished by the State Department which indicate that 30 applicants were rejected for employment on security grounds under Executive Order 10450 in 1954 out of a total of approximately 2,075 applicant investigations. This would indicate that the State Department would deny clearance to approximately 1.45 percent of all individuals investigated, as compared with AEC's figure of only 1.1 percent which even raise the question of security risk. It would appear likely, on the basis of these figures, that radically different security standards are being employed from agency to agency.

Variations in the security programs are of considerable importance from the standpoint of the individuals subject to the programs. An individual employed by a relatively nonsensitive agency, such as the Department of Agriculture, which apparently has very stringent standards of security risk (as may be judged from the facts of the Ladejinsky case), may find himself fired as a security risk with all the serious deprivations involved, although if he had been employed in more sensitive agencies, such as the State Department or the Foreign Operations Administration, a question of security eligibility might never have been raised. Similarly, an employee whose security status is adjudicated under less adequate or enlightened procedures than would be available in another agency may, for this reason, be severely prejudicated. This does not appear to be the "fair, impartial, and equitable treatment" through "mutually consistent and no less than minimum standards and procedures" ordered by the President in Executive Order 10450.

Testimony before the subcommittee revealed a disturbing pattern of lack of awareness of and interest in these problems. None of the Government witnesses indicated an awareness or interest in the manner in which agencies other than his own were operating under Executive Order 10450. Indeed, some of them did not appear knowledgeable concerning aspects of even their own programs. It was extremely difficult for the subcommittee to elicit useful information as to the manner in which the security program under Executive Order 10450 is being coordinated and controlled to assure "fair, impartial, and equitable treatment" through "mutually consistent and no

less than minimum standards and procedures."

Assistant Attorney General Tompkins stressed the need for coordination in stating:

"All of these efforts in the internal security field must be carefully coordinated. In order to achieve maximum coordination without interfering with the responsibility and authority of any department or agency, interdepartmental liaison has been formalized."

The Interdepartmental Committee on Internal Security (ICIS) is responsible, according to Mr. Tompkins' testimony, for planning and coordination in the field of internal security, other than intelligence matters. But he testified further that ICIS exercises no supervision over security screening of Government employees and does not review the various screening methods and activities.

When asked whether there is any organization in the Government which attempts to ascertain whether the various departments follow a uniform security system, Mr. Tompkins replied that the Civil Service Commission is responsible for reporting to the National Security Council on divergent security procedures, so that this could be brought to the attention of the President for remedial action. He indicated that this is the only method for coordinating the various agencies in the security field. In January 1955, however, the Department of Justice was asked to review Executive Order 10450 and the operation of the security program. Mr. Tompkins distinguished between the Department's role and that of the Civil Service Commission by pointing out that the latter merely "audits" the various agencies, while the former looks for weaknesses in the security structure. Although Mr. Tompkins did not assert that the Department of Justice has any special responsibility for coordinating the security programs of the various agencies, and seemed to avoid assuming such responsibility, he did indicate that he has met personally with security officers and legal counsels of various agencies to "gain more uniformity and to improve the program as much as humanly possible." The representatives of the Department of Defense expressed the view that the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice "heads up the administration's effort in that regard," and that the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission are both responsible for review and coordination. It is doubtful, however, on the basis of his testimony, that Mr. Tompkins would agree that the Department of Justice has a primary responsibility for coordination and achieving a greater degree of uniformity among the various agencies. In any event, representatives of the Department of Justice appeared, in their testimony, to lack knowledge of many of the basic aspects of implementation of the security programs of the various agencies which would be essential to the role of coordination. Mr. Tompkins was not, for example, immediately aware of the scope of Civil Service Commission investigations under Executive Order 10450; he was not aware of the fact that some agencies regard Executive Order 10450 as applicable to cases involving employees occupying nonsensitive positions concerning whom there is derogatory information about character and habits; he was not aware of "what the Civil Service Commission is doing about recommendations or administration of Executive Order 10450," and he was not aware of which agencies conduct their own personnel security investigations rather than use the investigative facilities of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, disavowed that his agency had any "direct coordinating authority" or any "major responsibility in terms of coordination." The role of the Civil Service Commission is confirmed, according to Mr. Young, to inspecting and appraising the application of the program, but he did indicate that discrepancies in the way various agency heads were conducting their programs might be called to their attention, although the Civil Service Commission lacks authority actually to effect changes.

The role of the Civil Service Commission in this respect stems from section 14 of Executive Order 10450, which directs the Commission to make a continuing study of the manner in which the order is being implemented to determine whether there are—

1. Deficiencies in the various security programs which are inconsistent with the interests of, or directly or indirectly weaken, the national security; and

2. Tendencies to deny employees fair, impartial, and equitable treatment, or rights under the Constitution, laws of the United States, or under Executive Order 10450.

Information as to such deficiencies or tendencies is to be brought to the attention of the agency head concerned, and is to be reported by the Commission, with recommendations for corrective action, to the National Security Council.

It is obvious, regardless of whether or not it was the intention of the Executive order that the Civil Service Commission be responsible for coordination, that in fact the Civil Service Commission has not played this role. It has not yet completed even one full cycle of auditing implementation of the security program by the various departments and agencies. Moreover, the Commission apparently is construing its responsibilities under section 14 as narrowly as possible, as is evidenced by its position that it is of no concern to the Civil Service Commission whether personnel security investigators of the agencies of the Government which conduct their own personnel investigations meet the exceptionally fine standards established by the Commission for its own investigators. The Commission apparently would not regard less than adequate investigative staffs as creating any deficiency or tendency within the meaning of section 14 of the Executive order.

The Civil Service Commission has, however, furnished information about the coordinating role of the Department of Justice, which could not be elicited from the Department itself. Mr. Young testified that there is a great deal of active coordination between all of these agencies and departments of Government on this program. He testified that the Department of Justice interprets Executive Order 10450 for the various agencies and departments and reviews their security regulations to ascertain whether agency regulations meet prescribed minimum standards, and is constantly thinking and analyzing the whole basic elements in this program in terms of subject matter and content.

Mr. Young described the machinery for coordination as follows:

"This question of coordination of this program between departments and agencies is a very interesting one, Mr. Chairman. The basic coordination, of course, arises from the fact that you are starting out and working from a basic law, a basic Executive order, and a basic set of sample regulations. Each department and agency then issues its own set of internal regulations pursuant to Executive Order 10450 in line with the sample regulations proposed by the Department of Justice.

"Variations from the sample regulations issued by the Department of Justice are approved by the Department of Justice; so at least there in terms of the basic documents you do have coordination, a coordinated starting point, let us say, at the base of this program.

"Then as you go along on this program and it goes into operation, the Civil Service Commission under section 14 is making these appraisal inspections of the departments and agencies, and if we find that a particular agency has a variation from either its own regulations or the sample regulations, approved by the Department of Justice, so that where we do find things of that sort, you get an additional amount of coordination.

"Mr. Brownell, in his recent letter that you referred to, Mr. Chairman, pointed out the fact that he was holding continuing conferences with security officers of agencies and departments, and in addition, you have the security officer of the Civil Service Commission as well as the Department of Justice, who is in constant touch with these departments and agencies most of the time."

It is obvious that coordination is the top secret of the security program. No one will accept responsibility for it, and everyone seeks to pass off the responsibility to someone else. It is difficult to understand how there can be effective coordination when responsible officials of the Government cannot agree on who is responsible for coordination. It is obvious also that only an absence of effective coordination of and supervision over the present security program could produce a conclusion by a responsible Government official, such as Mr. Young, that the security program has gone exceedingly well over the last 2 years. Quite aside from the pattern of confusion and lack of consistency revealed in the hearings before the subcommittee, and quite aside from the doubts concerning administration of the program voiced almost universally by responsible private groups, the proof of the inadequacies in the program during the past 2 years comes from its principal architect, the Attorney General.

On March 4, 1955, the President approved certain recommendations submitted by the Attorney General to improve the security program, which recommendations were based upon a study of the actual operating practices under the program. Among the recommendations of the Attorney General were the following:

1. The statement of charges "should be drawn as specifically as possible, consistent with the requirements of protecting the national security" in consultation with the chief legal officer of the agency.

2. "Meticulous care should be exercised in the matter of suspension of employees against whom derogatory information has been received."

3. A legal officer should be present at hearings to advise the Board on procedural matters and to advise the employee, if he is not represented by counsel, as to his rights.

4. Each agency head should periodically and personally review the list of persons made available by his agency for service on security hearing boards to assure that they are "persons possessing the highest degree of integrity, ability, and good judgment."

5. "Every effort should be made to produce witnesses at security board hearings to testify in behalf of the Government so that such witnesses may be confronted and cross-examined by the employee, so long as the production of such witnesses would not jeopardize the national security."

6. All violations of law as disclosed in the investigations or proceedings under the program should be reported immediately to the Division of Internal Security, Department of Justice."

Most of these principles reflect fundamental elements of any well-conceived security program, and it would be shocking to find that any security program in the United States has been operating for 18 months without full acceptance of and implementation of at least these elemental safeguards. Indeed, these principles are in some instances expressly stated in the Department of Justice's sample minimum standard regulations, while in other instances they are implicit in these regulations. If operation of the security program during the first year and a half actually

indicated a necessity for issuance of these new recommendations, there is indeed cause for great concern about operation of the security program, and it is difficult to conceive how any responsible Government official could say that the program has gone exceedingly well.

THE INDUSTRIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

In addition to the security program for Government employment, there are other programs for the security investigation and clearance of individuals employed in private industry who require access to classified material. These programs affect even more individuals than are affected by the Government employees' security program.

The Department of Defense program, which affects some 2 million employees of private industry, does not rest upon express or firm statutory foundation, but primarily upon the Department's contracting authority. Defense Department contractors are required to agree in their contracts to establish and maintain a system of security regulations. The system includes provision that only appropriately cleared personnel will have access to classified matter, and the Department of Defense has established requirements for security clearance for access to confidential, secret, and top-secret material. A top-secret clearance is predicated upon a background investigation, and a secret clearance upon a national agency check. Confidential clearance is granted for United States citizens by the contractor, rather than by the Department of Defense, on the basis of a determination that the individual's employment records are in order as to United States citizenship and that there is no information known to the contractor which indicates that the employee's access to confidential information is not clearly consistent with the interests of the national security. The Department of Defense does not, however, establish more specific standards or criteria for use by the contractors in carrying out this responsibility. If, however, the individual is an alien, a background investigation is required, and if access to confidential restricted data is involved, clearance can be granted only by the Department of Defense on the basis of a national agency check. Where a contractor finds, before granting a confidential clearance, that there is derogatory information raising a question as to whether the employee's access is clearly consistent with the interests of national security, the contractor apparently has the option of simply not employing the individual in a position involving access or of referring the case to the Department of Defense for a determination as to eligibility for clearance. The ultimate standard for determination of eligibility for clearance is the same for all three categories of clearance, and is identical to the standard for determining security eligibility for Government employment under Executive Order 10450, i. e., that it is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security. Moreover, the same criteria for making the determination as are employed under Executive Order 10450 are also employed in the industrial security program.

Where doubt arises as to eligibility for clearance, the employee is entitled to a hearing before a regional hearing board and to review by a central review board if his case presents novel questions or if the hearing board arrives at a divided opinion. The entire program is to be coordinated and supervised, under recently adopted procedures, by a director, who in turn is responsible to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Although security clearance determinations by the Department of Defense are explicitly stated by the Department to affect only the individual's right to access to classified information, and not his right to employment by the contractor, it is apparent that many employers will regard denial of security clearance as warranting discharge of the employee, just as the representatives of Douglas Aircraft Co. testified it would do. This means that the industrial security program has a definite impact, directly or indirectly, upon the individual's opportunity to earn a livelihood. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that employees receive the maximum opportunity, consistent with the operation of an effective security program, to defend themselves and to establish their eligibility for clearance. We find, however, that employees subject to the industrial security programs have been afforded no greater procedural protection, aside from the centralized review in some cases, than is afforded Government employees under Executive Order No. 10450. It would appear, therefore, that consideration should be given to broadening the privileges available to these individuals at least to the extent suggested for consideration with respect to Government employees.

The Atomic Energy Commission has statutory responsibility and authority for security clearance of employees of its contractors and licensees, and all others, who are to have access to restricted data. AEC criteria and procedures for determining eligibility for security clearance draw no distinction between such employees and AEC employees, and all cases are considered under the same AEC regulations.

Although the Department of Defense has apparently achieved a highly coordinated and unified industrial security program, there is no indication that there is any coordination in this respect between the AEC and Department of Defense programs. In cases in which the AEC and the Department of Defense both have a security interest in a particular plant, both would exercise independent security control and supervision. There is, moreover, no indication that there is any Governmentwide attempt at coordination of industrial security activities. The Assistant Attorney General testified that the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice does not deal with these activities, and does not have jurisdiction to review or consider these programs. It is difficult to understand why this is so, in view of the similarities between the Government employees' security programs and the industrial security programs, and the fact that individual rights may be even more substantially affected by the latter programs than by the former.

Another industrial security program of a sort is conducted by the United States Coast Guard in screening merchant seamen and waterfront workers under the port security program. Approximately 370,000 persons have to date received port security cards reflecting their security clearance.

It should be borne in mind that the millions of our citizens who have been, are, and will be subject to the industrial security program are not in any sense Government employees. They have not sought positions of public trust and in most instances have not even sought positions in industry involving access to classified information. They are ordinary working people in the 48 States who just happen to be employed by firms doing classified work, and who require security clearance in order that they be of use to their private employer. Through no initiative of their own, save the desire to hold a job or obtain advancement, they may find themselves propelled into the security vortex. They are required to execute a personnel security questionnaire. They, and their relatives and friends, may be subjected to searching security investigation resulting in the formation of dossiers which may follow them for the rest of their lives, even if some information in the dossiers is wholly unreliable or false. Their eligibility for clearance, and their very employment, may be threatened by vague allegations about themselves, or their relatives and friends, which they may have an opportunity to refute and effectively dissipate only if the industrial security programs are operated in a manner calculated to permit this. They are subject to precisely the same difficulties in defending their reputations and livelihoods as the Government employee. They face the same difficulties as Government employees in learning the charges against them, the identities of their accusers, and in obtaining the privilege of confronting their accusers. Their cases are adjudicated under much the same standards and procedures as prevail in the Government employees' security program, are subject to the same diversities of administration and interpretation.

There is clearly a necessity for an industrial security program, and it is probably also necessary that such a program operate with many of the compromises with basic American tradition which characterize the present Government employees' security program. But a program of this magnitude which operates upon the employment, livelihood, and reputation of millions of our private citizens must be carefully designed, controlled, and administered. It should, if the Government is to act in a responsible manner toward its citizenry, be established as a matter of considered national policy, and not as a matter of haphazard growth.

CONCLUSION

The picture of the overall security mechanism developed in the course of the subcommittee's consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 21 is a disturbing one. Most of the mechanism has been constructed only within the past decade, and in the same period of time the security problem has become almost a national obsession. In response to the very real peril to our national security stemming from the nature of the Communist conspiracy, which stands ready to take advantage of the slightest weakness in our security armor, we have acted almost unconsciously, and certainly without considered judgment, in trying to reinforce and strengthen this armor. We have constructed a security mechanism almost at random without regard to duplication and overlapping, without regard to dollar cost, without any effort really to appraise the nature of the peril and the appropriate defense against it, and without any real effort to achieve a logical, consistent pattern of effective security. As pointed out above, the fact that the security mechanism has evolved in this manner does not furnish cause for criticism of any person, persons, groups, or organizations. We were attempting to cope with a new and unique peril, against the pressures of time, and the resulting security structure probably represented the best which could be accomplished under the circumstances.

There can be no doubt that the security mechanism viewed as a whole (including the espionage laws and other criminal statutes relating to security protection, the laws and regulations relating to classification, control, and protection of national defense secrets, and the programs for security investigation and clearance of personnel generally) are less effective and efficient than they can and should be; cost far more than they should for actual security achieved; and afford far less protection for individual rights than is possible without jeopardy to security.

One of the most disturbing aspects of this situation is that all representatives of the Government defend the status quo even though they cannot justify its duplication, loopholes, anomalies, inadequacies, discrepancies, inconsistencies, and costs. Indeed, most of the Government witnesses appeared to learn of many of these problems for the first time when they were questioned about them before the subcommittee. There is little indication of any genuine awareness of or concern about these problems. It is

doubtful, on the basis of testimony received by the subcommittee, that any single official of the Government is today capable of even describing, let alone understanding, the present conglomeration of security laws, regulations, and procedures found throughout the Government.

It is imperative that the United States have a stringent, realistic, effective, and fair security system. But we cannot lose sight of the fact that any security program, if it gets out of control, carries with it a threat to democratic, intellectual, and humanitarian principles. While there is no indication that our present security mechanism has gotten out of control, there is also no indication that it is under effective and rational control.

The time has come to take stock, to face the problem of security with the maturity with which our democratic Government and our people have faced grave issues of national policy in the past. Let us assess the peril which faces us and decide upon a coordinated, cohesive, rational security system which will protect our national secrets and our way of life.

Security is not a partisan issue. The present deficiencies have not been caused or nurtured exclusively by either party, by either this or past administrations, or by either Congress or the executive branch. Rather, they have been thrust upon us by the threat of Soviet imperialism and subversion at a time when we were, as a nation, not fully prepared to meet the threat with complete wisdom and reason. It is not too late, however, to remedy our past errors.

There is much work to be done before the security problem can be brought under rational control. It requires extensive and objective study and analysis. A commission form of inquiry, patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, is the ideal means for coming to grips with the problem, since it would enable representation by the executive branch, the Congress, and eminent public citizens. It would also enable that calm, dispassionate consideration and recommendation, removed from the area of political controversy, which will command public respect and confidence, and provide needed reassurance to the American public in this era of security obsession. This would implement, and be wholly consistent with, the recommendation of the Task Force on Personnel and Civil Service of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government that an official inquiry and appraisal of the personnel security problem be undertaken without delay by a panel of distinguished citizens whose judgment cannot be questioned. The Commission which would be established under Senate Joint Resolution 21 would, however, have a broader function than the study recommended by the task force since it would study all phases of the security mechanism and not only the personnel security program.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak briefly on the pending joint resolution. I know that the Senator from Minnesota will permit questioning at a later time. I have a pressing engagement which I must meet off the floor.

First, I wish to congratulate the entire membership of the subcommittee, which so diligently and seriously considered this far-reaching and perplexing problem, as well as the full committee, which also studied the matter and submitted the report to the Senate.

I believe this is one of the most complicated and far-reaching subjects which the American Government has ever had before it. The seriousness of the problem will continue for decades. I am very glad that this perplexing question was considered impartially and from a nonpartisan standpoint, and that a basic and fundamental study of it was made by the subcommittee and by the full committee.

It is my privilege to be, with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, a cosponsor of a joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security.

I should like to state that my purpose, and the purpose of the junior Senator from Minnesota, in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 21 was wholly nonpartisan. I am delighted by the fact that consideration of this resolution to date by the Committee on Government Operations has also been nonpartisan and that there is substantial support, from both sides of the Chamber, for its enactment.

All Members of the Senate have in the past had occasion to consider various aspects of the security problem. As I look back upon my own experiences in connection with security matters, it seems to me that we have been primarily concerned with peripheral rather than essential phases of the security mechanism. We have never come to grips with the fundamentals of Government security. We have been attempting to deal expeditiously with important problems of security as they became apparent without any real effort to articulate a national policy or approach to these problems.

I must confess that I have found many aspects of the security mechanism to be confusing and incomprehensible. This is not because I have not diligently endeavored to acquire a knowledge and understanding of security. Rather, it is because the development and growth of the security mechanism has been such as to make comprehension impossible. There is little doubt in my mind that most of the members of this body have had similar difficulties. Nor is there any doubt in my mind that even within the executive branch of the Government responsible officials concerned with administration of the security mechanism have not completely understood the force which they are wielding. Indeed, it has been difficult for me to find anyone who is capable of really explaining what security is all about and how the security mechanism operates.

The report of the Committee on Government Operations on this resolution points out, with considerable understatement I am sure, that our security system has developed in a gradual and piecemeal manner over the past decade. As an American and as a United States Senator, I have been deeply troubled by the fact that so many serious questions of justice, morality, and fundamental decency have been raised in almost every security case which has come to public attention. Many of these cases have involved actions by this Government which appear to be at best inexplicable. I am deeply troubled, moreover, by the many indications that, despite all intensive security efforts of the past decade, we still do not have a truly effective security structure which affords adequate protection in vital areas.

The problem of security should not be in any sense a matter of partisan politics. I cannot conceive that there can be any real difference of opinion between Democrats and Republicans in this area, and I do not think there is any difference. I believe it behooves us to enact a basic law on the subject, so that in a presidential election it cannot be dragged in by irresponsible people. I do not believe that the candidates themselves would do it, but it could be done by irresponsible persons, to confuse the people and to destroy their confidence in their own form of government—not merely in the temporary office holders, but in the very form of our Government.

We all recognize the importance of protecting our Government, our institutions, our national secrets, and our defense facilities against subversive depredation. The time has come for us to remove the security problem from the political arena and to construct an effective, realistic, and just security system which will provide the necessary protection against subversion with the minimum possible compromise of the basic rights and privileges of our citizens.

If I may make a personal reference, I served several years as a prosecuting attorney and, later, was honored by serving several years on the bench, and I can fully appreciate the zeal and enthusiasm of a prosecuting attorney, or one acting partly in that role, which may cause him to run by some of the danger signals marked in the Bill of Rights, or in other fundamental principles of our Government. I can fully appreciate the zeal of some legislator or some investigating group, but I am fully cognizant of the absolute necessity of our keeping daily before us the fundamental safeguards which have proven many times over that they are essential to individual liberty and justice. So, while we are protecting our Government we must also ever keep in mind the importance of absolutely protecting the basic rights of the citizens of the Republic.

Let us recognize in all candor that Democrats and Republicans, the former Democratic administration and the present Republican administration, the Congress, and the executive branch, have all made mistakes in the field of security. Let us recognize that these mistakes have not been caused by evil motivation or inept discharge of public responsibilities, but rather were the necessary and inevitable consequence of the necessity to erect immediate defenses, unique in our history, against the insidious and imminent perils of Communist imperialism. Let us all resolve to wipe the slate clean of past fumbling with security issues and of past recriminations in order that we may decide as a matter of considered national policy what security is and how a realistic and effective security program should be conducted.

It is regrettable that so much attention has been focused upon Senate Joint Resolution 21 in connection with the problem of investigation and security clearance of Government employees. This is only one phase, although an important one, of the overall security problem. The resolution provides not only for study of this phase of the

security mechanism, but also for comprehensive study of other phases of the problem as well—our espionage and sabotage laws, the classification of information, the control and dissemination of classified information, and the so-called industrial security programs. The hearings held on Senate Joint Resolution 21 before the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations clearly demonstrate the inadequacies, confusion, and lack of comprehension in these areas. But even without the hearings, it is obvious to any thoughtful person who has been exposed to the security problem that corrective action in these areas is long overdue.

In my judgment, passage of this joint resolution by the Congress will be one of the most significant events of recent years. It will provide for consideration of the fundamentals of security for the very first time in our Nation's history. It will lay the groundwork for intelligent reconstruction and rational planning of our security mechanism. It can have no consequence other than to strengthen our national security, to enhance the welfare of the people of the Nation, and to reenforce public confidence in our national effort to maintain security.

Mr. President, I am indeed grateful for the opportunity of joining with the Senator from Minnesota, who has done such splendid work, together with his colleagues on the subcommittee, in connection with this fine resolution. It is my privilege to commend the resolution to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Let me again thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me. I also wish to thank the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who is waiting for the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as a minority member of the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, I wish to take this opportunity to say a few brief words regarding the pending measure, and regarding the hearings and deliberations of the subcommittee which led up to its action in recommending the joint resolution to the full committee and to the action of the full committee in reporting it to the Senate.

In the first place, Mr. President, as a minority member of the subcommittee who attended nearly all the hearings and followed the resolution with care, I should like to express to the acting chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], my appreciation for the spirit and the manner in which he conducted the hearings and for his approach to the problem.

When he stated on the floor today that he acted, not in a partisan spirit, and not with a desire to create a political issue, I think he was stating the exact truth. He conducted the hearings in a completely fair manner. It was obvious from the start that his purpose, and that of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the cosponsor of the joint resolution, was to create a commission which would make a real contribution to the solution of a most perplexing problem which involves necessarily the functions of our Government.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota on behalf of the minority members of the subcommittee for meeting us in a very fine spirit, and for accepting certain amendments to the joint resolution which we felt should be incorporated in it.

Briefly, for purposes of the record, one of the amendments provided that subcommittees of the proposed commission should consist of three members. It limited to either the chairman of the entire commission or to a majority of one of its subcommittees the power to hold hearings and issue subpenas, thus making it impossible for one member of the commission to travel about the country, summon witnesses, and hold hearings.

Another amendment would protect the investigative agencies of the Government and make it very plain that the executive department, the President, and the investigative agencies, such as the FBI, would not be required to furnish records or to disclose information which would in any way hamper or cripple their activities in the matter of protecting the Nation from subversives and subversive activities.

These amendments were adopted without any opposition and, I think, in accordance with the unanimous desire of the full committee to furnish added safeguards. We also appreciate that fact, Mr. President.

It is a privilege for a comparatively new Member of the Senate and a new member of the committee to work with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]; and also, Mr. President, on our side, to work with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. I particularly wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who spent a great deal of time with me listening to the hearings and then in considering the evidence adduced.

Mr. President, I wish to comment very briefly upon and invite the attention of the Senate to some facts which were brought out in the testimony of Chairman Philip Young, of the Civil Service Commission, who was one of the witnesses before the subcommittee. Mr. Young's testimony indicated that the present program is making good progress. His testimony also developed some important points about the program which were not publicly known or which in the past have been so frequently overlooked.

Mr. Young's testimony showed that a security screening job of enormous magnitude has now been virtually completed by the Government. Approximately 2,200,000 of the Government's 2,300,000 employees have been measured against the security standard of Executive Order No. 10450, and all but a relative handful of those measured have successfully met the test. Still to be completed, at the time of Mr. Young's testimony, were roughly 100,000 additional cases, and they will be finished soon. For all practical purposes, the security program from this time forward will be conducted primarily for the purpose of preventing the employment of any applicant whose employment would not be clearly consistent with the national security.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission also testified that the large bulk of investigations required in the process of screening this huge number of employees was performed by the FBI and by investigators of the Civil Service Commission. He described at length the careful selection of and the training given to civil service investigators, and referred to the fact that the competence of these investigators is generally acknowledged.

During the past year, he said, 40 percent of the full field investigations under the security program were performed by the Civil Service Commission, 25 percent by the FBI, and the remainder by other agencies—chiefly the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department—which have their own, long-established investigative staffs. He cited an average cost to the Civil Service Commission of from $217 to $265 for a full field investigation.

The results of the program, as summarized by Mr. Young, completely explode one of the popular fallacies which have been given such wide circulation, namely, that all or most Federal dismissals have been made for security reasons. Mr. Young pointed out that only 3,002 separations based on security grounds have been recorded; while, during the same period of operation of the Federal employee security program, a total of 28,531 Federal employees were dismissed for cause. Thus only a very small percentage of the total number removed was in the security category.

On the question of confrontation of accused employees by witnesses, Mr. Young cited in detail the steps which have been taken within the Civil Service Commission, in the operation of its internal employee security program, to assure that such confrontation is arranged in all possible instances. He showed that out of 12 cases where hearings were held, witnesses were identified in reports of investigation in 5 cases. A total of 15 witnesses were invited in those 5 cases. Six witnesses appeared in 4 of the cases and were cross-examined.

Mr. Young's testimony also brought out the provision under Executive Order No. 10450 which permits an employee dismissed under the security program to appeal to the Civil Service Commission for clearance of his record. Fifty-four cases have been completed under that procedure, Mr. Young said, and the Commission rendered a favorable decision in 9 cases and an unfavorable decision in 29 cases. Sixteen cases were closed without action, and 11 are pending at the present time.

These are just a few of the specific points of information presented by Mr. Young to the subcommittee concerning matters on which there has been frequent misunderstanding and misstatement.

Mr. President, it was, and I believe is, the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee which considered the measure that it would be greatly for the good of the Nation to have a commission review, dispassionately and without partisanship, the entire security system of the Government, and to recommend to the President and to Congress such measures and steps as in their opinion, would coordinate and solidify it, and make it even more effective than it now is.

However, in the opinion, at least, of the junior Senator from New Hampshire, who listened carefully to the evidence, much progress has already been made, and the revelations made before the subcommittee indicate that both the last and the present administrations have been earnestly and honestly seeking to improve, perfect, and coordinate the security system.

Of the many matters which the evidence before the committee brought to our attention, there are two points I should like to leave with the Senate. I hope Senators will read the evidence. But, boiled down, one of the matters which appealed to me, at least, as worthy of careful consideration was the coordinating of the whole security program.

There is not a shadow of doubt, in my opinion, that steps should be taken, including proper legislative action, to coordinate, fit together, and make more uniform our security activities. However, in justice to the executive branch, it should be remembered that one reason why progress has been difficult in this matter is that Congress itself, in enacting the law, provided that the head of each department should have supreme authority to organize and to operate the security activities of his own department. Congress having enacted the present law, it is more difficult to be certain that uniform practices are pursued in all the departments.

In the second place, in justice to those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue who are working on the program, I wish to point out that, as a matter of fact, a coordinator, unofficially selected from the Department of Justice, and attached to the White House, has been working for many months, seeking, so far as possible under the present law, to coordinate the security activities of the Government. Among the accomplishments of Mr. Donegan, who was especially assigned to the task, has been the formation of a committee upon which the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other departments have representatives, and which has been meeting weekly, trying to encourage and to bring about so far as possible, coordination of the security program.

I believe that much has been accomplished, and that the country should not be given the impression that no effort is being made to coordinate the present program, although I freely admit and agree with the other members of the committee that there is much left to be done.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I congratulate the junior Senator from New Hampshire and the other members of his committee on their constructive approach to the continuing problem of security. I include in the congratulations my distinguished neighbor, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and his associate in the introduction of the joint resolution, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

As the time the matter came before the whole committee, of which I was a member, I reserved my vote, because I had not had an opportunity to read the rather voluminous hearings and to confer with the members of the subcommittee about exactly what they had in mind. Having done both, I can say unreservedly I am a strong supporter of this approach and this resolution. I think history has demonstrated this Hoover type approach to a government problem is the best Congress has been able to devise. In the past the method has succeeded in eliminating partisanship. The resolution provides for adequate staffing, time, and concentration on the problem, and should have good results.

I can concur in what the Senator from New Hampshire has said, that much progress has been made in recent months in coordinating security problems; but, on the other hand, security of the Government is a continuing problem, and we cannot be too careful and cautious in setting up the various elements of Government machinery to accomplish a good result, both from the standpoint of the security of the country and the protection of the rights of individuals. I believe the Senator will agree——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Will the Senator please suspend? The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 1713, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1713) to amend the act of July 31, 1947—61st United States Statutes at Large, page 681—and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, we have a most unusual parliamentary situation. Since, as of last Friday, there was a motion to adjourn rather than recess, therefore now the unfinished business of Friday has been brought up after the morning hour, the hour of 2 o'clock.

I am not too familiar with all the minute details of parliamentary procedure, but if it is in order I should like to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the business which was being discussed up to the hour of 2 o'clock, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a request is in order. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now we may proceed with the colloquy between the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Continuing from where I left off at this timely interruption at the hour of 2 o'clock, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Does the Senator not feel that the problem of security in government is certainly of sufficient importance to justify the small expenditure of money and the great expenditure of effort which will be devoted to the problem by this Commission?

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota most emphatically that I agree with everything he has said, and I appreciate his contribution, because I know of his experience in this field. We on the committee felt that the creation of the Commission and the expenditures which would be incident thereto were worthwhile.

As I said before, and I think the Senator from South Dakota expressed exactly the same thought much better than I expressed it, I was trying to point out we did not uncover some terrible situation or neglect which would shock the country. On the contrary, we found the matter has been progressing well, and has received the earnest, careful, and painstaking attention of the present administration, and of the preceding one, to a large degree. But we did come to the inescapable conclusion that, from the long-time standpoint, it would be wise to go after the problem "man fashion." The time which was devoted to the problem and the money which was spent in connection with it were worthwhile, because security is one of the most vital and necessary factors we must protect in order to save our Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure what the Senator has stated is correct. The senior Senator from South Dakota has had the unusual, and I sometimes think the unhappy, distinction of having served longer on investigating committees than has any other Member presently in office either in the House or the Senate. That experience started under the chairmanship of Mr. MARTIN DIES, in the Un-American Activities Committee, and continued until the time I came to the Senate. In the Senate I have served on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of which I am still a member. I have become increasingly aware of the situation, because security procedure in the legislative and executive branches has grown like Topsy.

I recall, for example, during the long and heated debate which took place during the consideration and passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill, which today comprises the first 17 sections of our Internal Security Act, in the give-and-take of parliamentary debate and in the effort to secure sufficient votes to override a presidential veto of the bill, it was necessary to accept several amendments which were drawn hastily on the floor of the Senate, and which today comprise a part

of the law of the land. Some of those were amendments which I would have ordinarily opposed, such as the one provision in the law which provides for concentration-camp type punishment for certain individuals. I am one who abhors all types of concentration camps, but that provision is part of the law of the land. It represents part of the increasing need for study, and it is hoped that as a result of studies on the part of the Commission there will come forth recommendations that will result in a recodification of the security laws so far as they have emanated from Congress, a careful weighing and a careful study to determine which are needed, which are necessary, and which might be replaced, in view of our later experiences, by new legislation. I would hope there might also come about a recodification of executive edicts, orders, and regulations, which are still in effect, to the extent, insofar as possible—I do not envision that it would be completely possible—of establishing similar criteria to meet similar conditions among our various Government departments and agencies. I am aware that in the FBI, the CIA, or the Atomic Energy Commission different standards and criteria would be needed than would be needed in a department such as the Department of Agriculture or a similar department. I do not say or imply we should let down the bars to permit subversives to work in the Government. We have to be more careful about the record of our Government employees who work in the CIA, the FBI, and the Atomic Energy Commission, than was Caesar about his wife.

I think there was an abundantly clear need shown for a constructive approach to the problem, which I think is going to flow from this type of commission. I congratulate those who offered the resolution and the subcommittee who have urged that it be passed. I support it enthusiastically. I hope it is unanimously adopted.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I have only 2 or 3 more observations, and then I shall relinquish the floor.

Before the Senator from South Dakota made his fine statement, I had just stated that there were two points which, from the standpoint of the Senator from New Hampshire, seemed to loom large in the hearings. The first was the matter of cognation, on which I have touched.

The second is the matter of the protection of the rights of individuals, to which I wish to refer before I close, because, in my opinion, it is one of the most controversial questions involved in this matter, and one which will challenge the best consideration of any commission or group of individuals who may be called upon to act upon the security question.

Many of the witnesses who came before the committee seemed to be more deeply concerned—although I say very frankly to the Senate that that is not my feeling—about the possibility under the present program of the rights of citizens being in some way trampled upon, than they were in the question of whether the present program is effective in protecting the United States of America from espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities.

In the first place, Mr. President, let me say that I served for 5 years on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices appropriations, of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee. During those 5 years, which were critical ones with respect to our security program, we were working on appropriations for—among other agencies—the Civil Service Commission. Each year, we received from the Civil Service Commissioners a complete report about the workings of the security program.

It should be recalled that during those years the work was largely one of screening those who already were employed by the Government when the question of security arose. At that time there was a rather expensive, rather cumbersome, complex and complicated system of investigators, boards of inquiry, and appeals boards by districts and regions. The appeals boards were provided in order that every Government employee who found himself or herself under scrutiny and investigation, and labeled as a security risk, would have every right of appeal and every right to clear his or her name and to demonstrate his or her innocence.

I think everyone concedes that was entirely necessary, because we were dealing with persons who had served the Government for years, most of whom had reached middle life, who had children and families to maintain, who were wedded to their jobs, and who, if thrown out of employment, particularly under such circumstances that a stigma of disloyalty or of being security risks would attach to them, would be ruined, in that they would be unable to obtain new employment. Thus, they and their families would receive a grave blow.

However, at the present time, to all intents and purposes, that phase has been completed. During the past years the persons who have been working for the Government have been tested and screened; at least, that is true in the case of those who in any way are in key positions and handle classified information. From now on, the problem is one of how to deal with the applicant—for instance, the young college graduate or other person—who wishes to work for the Government.

If we are to assume that a person who applies to Uncle Sam for a job, and is told there is no job for him, has placed upon him a stigma which will continue on him for the rest of his days, perhaps there may be good reason for an expensive, cumbersome, unwieldy, complicated and slow system of boards of investigation, appeals boards, and other types of tribunals.

On the other hand, it is contended by many persons—and I am frank to say that I find myself among them—that we should follow a security procedure whereby there would be a screening of all persons entering the employment of the Government, and not merely those who apply for jobs in the performance of which, on the face of things, they might have to do with classified information. Even a young man who seeks employment in the Department of Agriculture, or in some other Government agency, in the most innocuous kind of job which could not by the wildest stretch of the imagination be regarded as one in which he would be in the possession of information which, if improperly used, would hurt this country, should be carefully screened. The situation is such that if every Government employee or applicant for Government employment is not screened, and his habits, his associations, and his loyalty carefully checked, then perhaps 10 years later it will be found that he has gradually risen on the ladder of Government employment until he is in a position in which he handles delicate subjects. In short, we must be sure of all Government employees. Then we shall not find ourselves in the situation of having to discharge from the Government service a man who has been employed for 10 years, and has a family, and has no other means of livelihood except the Government service. After all, Mr. President, when a person has established a long record of Government service, and finds himself in the position to which I have referred, in simple justice we must go the whole way in protecting all his rights.

So, Mr. President, I submit for the consideration of the Senate and of the country that if we are to spend money and to train investigators and to check, at the threshold, any applicant for employment in the Government service, all of them should be checked.

So long as they are not publicly tried, or so long as nothing to cast discredit upon them is done, it is not necessary for us to spend money and time in providing tribunals to enable such persons to appeal again and again, as if such persons will have a constitutional right to work for the Government.

So, Mr. President, we are confronted with these two problems: First, that of coordinating a loose system which, in the words of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and other Senators, has grown up like Topsy; and, second, the question of determining what should be our policy, and how far we should go in protecting the individual. Each of us agrees that a fundamental duty rests upon us to see to it that the individual is protected. But the question is how far we should go in doing that and how far we should go in screening all new employees, regardless of whether they are to serve in sensitive positions. Those are some of the questions which developed at the hearings, and which should be considered most carefully and dispassionately and thoroughly by the proposed Commission.

Mr. MUNDT rose.

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. First, let me congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire for stating very vividly, clearly, and dramatically the challenge which lies ahead in the case of Government employment, if the proposed commission is established. We can work out machinery which will provide that careful, meticulous screening be done of all new Government employees.

I could not agree more with the Senator from New Hampshire, when he says that regardless of whether a young man enters the Government originally in a low echelon or whether he begins in a highly sensitive position, it is imperative that he be screened as an official or as a Government employee, because then we can follow very carefully the doctrine that whenever there is any benefit of doubt to be given, it should be given to the Government and to those who are peaceful, honest, God-fearing, and loyal, who live under the machinery of the administration of that Government.

In earlier days, there were long debates in Congress as to whether a person who already was on the job, and about whom an element of doubt had developed, should have that doubt resolved from the standpoint of having the benefit of the doubt go to the individual or go to the Government. In the first instance, the former administration tried to follow a theory under which the doubt would be resolved for the benefit of the individual concerned. But that did not work, because although it safeguarded a few innocents who were in the Government service, and who otherwise might have been embarrassed, it jeopardized millions of innocent Americans who thus found themselves living under a system in which infiltration could easily be carried on.

So we tried the other philosophy, namely, that of resolving the doubt in favor of the Government, rather than the individual. Under that arrangement, on occasion there was an opportunity for cumbersome practices, and for injustice to the individual employees.

But, Mr. President, certainly at the threshold of Government service we can afford to follow carefully a formula to the effect that if there is any doubt whatever, it shall be resolved for the benefit of the Government, and that those about whom there is any doubt should be screened out.

We should establish the clear concept that association in the form of employment by the Government is not a right but a rare privilege, and that any person who is employed by the Government should be entirely faithful and loyal in that service. Such service is a privilege which comes to the few—the few who seek it, the few who deserve it, and the few who will perform it faithfully.

I should like to suggest one thing further. It is possible that those who read the RECORD—and we are writing here legislative history which is certain to govern the deliberations of this Commission—may sense, in something which the Senator from New Hampshire has said, an impression which I am sure he did not wish to convey when he stated—and stated correctly—that the big problem now is the problem of what to do about screening employees who enter the service of the Government in the future. The impression should not be created that, in the main, the job of screening, investigating, and checking those at present employed has been largely completed.

I simply wish to register the fact—with which I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will agree—that while the job of checking those now employed has in fact been largely completed, it has not been entirely completed, and it will never be entirely completed. It is a continuing problem. It seems to me that we must always have machinery for checking those already on the job, because individuals may change. We have seen individuals in public life switch from one major political party to the other, as is their right. There is nothing wrong in that, so far as loyalty to country is concerned. But we also have sent subversives to the penitentiary as a result of facts developed in committees with which the present speaker has been associated. Certain cases involved young men who undoubtedly originally came to the Government with stardust in their eyes and loyalty in their hearts, but whose connections and associations changed, and who later switched to subversive attachments because of temptations. We must, therefore, always have machinery for weeding out such persons and detecting them, if, as, and when changes take place among those already on the payroll.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. I wish to make it crystal clear that I did not mean we should ever relax our vigilance in dealing with the vast number of Federal employees. However, I was reviewing the mechanics, the technical machinery of the original screening, and bringing out the point that the first step in the screening of present employees had been completed, and that the method of approaching the second step was now before us.

Let me close with one further observation. In the first place, I believe that every member of the subcommittee who listened to the evidence and studied the problem is in agreement that the pending joint resolution is a meritorious measure. None of us has any desire to bring about a duplication of the work of other committees of the Congress, or the work of the executive departments. However, I think we all reached the conclusion that a careful review of this problem, which has grown to be one of our most vital problems, and which will be with us perhaps as long as the Government lasts, should be undertaken by a commission along the lines of the Hoover Commission, outside the Congress. We all commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his activities in seeking to create such a commission.

In the second place, I wish to make it very clear that, for my part, at least, the evidence indicated that in the past few months tremendous strides have been made by the Government, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, in attacking this problem and in improving the efficiency of the agencies dealing with it.

In the third place, I express the hope that if the joint resolution is passed, there will be appointed a commission which will study this problem from the most dispassionate standpoint possible, recognizing that they are reaching into the most intricate mechanism of the entire Government, involving the rights and privileges of individuals, as well as the safety of our country. There is no subject which requires more meticulous, incisive, clear-cut thinking, and dispassionate justice. It is in the hope of establishing such a commission that we who are members of the committee have joined unanimously in recommending the passage of the pending joint resolution.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to express my personal gratification and thanks to the Senator from New Hampshire for his words of commendation and kindness.

I wish to make it crystal clear that the Senator from New Hampshire was most diligent in his attendance upon the sessions of the subcommittee. He is a helpful and informed member of the subcommittee.

I think the Senate should clearly understand that the only conclusion our subcommittee reached was that this area of security needs the kind of study recommended. I want that made clear, because the subcommittee did not consider, point by point, differences of opinion among various witnesses, or even among various members of the subcommittee.

We held hearings. As the Senator from New Hampshire has stated, the printed hearings are rather voluminous. This is the first time in the history of this Government that all the security rules, regulations, Executive orders, public laws, and statutes have ever been brought together in one comprehensive volume, along with the pertinent inquiry and investigation which took place during the hearings, which covered a rather wide range of governmental activity.

If we have done nothing else, we have at least provided a volume of information for lawyers and students, and others who are concerned with the problem of security regulation or who are keenly interested in it.

I believe that what we have done is to indicate, by the hearings, the urgent necessity of two things: First, the best protection humanly possible of the national security; secondly, equating such protection with what we call basic American traditional rights insofar as it is humanly possible to do so consistent with the interest of the national security.

I wish to thank particularly my friend the Senator from New Hampshire, who has done so much in this field. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is also present. He was very helpful to the subcommittee.

I think I should also say that the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] was exceedingly helpful, particularly in the concluding stages, when we were drafting amendments and reaching an agreement on the report.

I thank each and every one.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, before relinquishing the floor, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his observation.

I wish to add to the hope which I expressed with respect to the conduct and work of the proposed Commission the hope that the Commission will be able and careful in its work, and will follow

the same program as that followed by the subcommittee under the able leadership of my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

It was not a question of trying to select individual cases, or digging into this case or that case, or trying to find political ammunition in the treatment of individual cases. At all times we tried to keep our eyes on the main problem.

I make the following statement with some apprehension, but I think it should be in the record: Of course, the Commission cannot study the security system of the Government without knowing something of the individual cases and how they have been administered. But I am sure the Commission can proceed in such a manner that there will be no question of trying to get into its record information which, in the interest of future security, should not be divulged. At the same time, there should be a general, overall, clear-cut presentation of how the security program is being administered and how it ought to be administered.

I hope the joint resolution will pass, and I urgently trust that the Commission, when and if appointed, will do one of the best jobs ever done in this Government, because this is a field which calls for such service.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, first I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] in expressing appreciation for the good work done by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the conduct of the hearings and in the deliberations of the committee on the pending joint resoluton. I was very proud and pleased to join with the other members of the committee in making a study of what I consider to be one of the most important activities and responsibilities of our Government.

Senate Joint Resolution 21 would establish a 12-member Commission of which not more than 6 members could come from the same political party. It would study all phases of the Government's security programs and procedures, and submit appropriate recommendations, with a final report to the Congress and the President not later than December 31, 1956, possibly at an earlier date, if it is agreed upon.

The Commission is patterned after the so-called Hoover Commission, and is designed to be nonpartisan in its approach and implementation.

Under the joint resolution, 4 members would be named by the President, of whom 2 would be from the executive branch and 2 from private life; 4 would be named by the President of the Senate, 2 of whom would be Members of the Senate and 2 from private life; and the remaining 4 would be named by the Speaker of the House—2 from the House membership and 2 from private life. No more than two of those appointed by the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker, respectively, could be from the same political party.

The Commission would study not only the entire Government security program, including the statutes and regulations, but would also have the duty of ascertaining whether the overall security program is in accord with the policy of Congress, that there shall be a sound Government program affecting security, including investigations and clearances for Government employees and persons privately employed or occupied in work requiring access to national secrets.

Basically, the problem or assignment which the Commission is given under Senate Joint Resolution 21 is to find out whether our Federal security program is working well or whether there is need at this time to look it over and revise and amend it.

The approach taken by the joint resolution is by no means the only one; other techniques could be equally appropriate. The important thing is to get the job done and to have it done well.

It is probably not realized, with respect to the present Federal security program, that during the period 1789 to 1911 there were no general limitations whatsoever on the power of the Executive to dismiss Federal employees—hearings, page 103.

In 1912 the Lloyd-La Follette Act was passed. It provided that—

> No person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof; but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearing, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper Department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Civil Service Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same. (Chart, p. 103 of hearings.)

There were no further additions to the law in this field until the Hatch Act was passed in 1939. Section 9 (A) of that act provided that—

> (1) Membership of Government employees in political parties or organizations advocating overthrow of our constitutional form of government is unlawful; and (2) the penalty for violation shall be immediate removal from one's job; no subsequent appropriation for the position filled by the violator shall be used to pay for his compensation (chart, p. 103).

During World War II the Lloyd-La Follette Act was amended by Public Law 808, of the 77th Congress, in 1942, to provide that protections afforded under the act shall not apply to any civil-service employees of the War or Navy Departments or the Coast Guard whose immediate removal is warranted by the demands of national security. Persons thus summarily removed may, if in the opinion of the Secretary concerned, subsequent investigation so warrants, be reinstated and also be allowed compensation for all and any part of the period of such removal. A removed person has the right to appear personally and be fully informed of reasons for removal within 30 days and to submit within 30 days thereafter a statement and affidavits to show why he should not be removed—chart, page 103.

Then, came the Truman loyalty order, Executive Order No. 9835, dated March 21, 1947. It provided that the standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for the belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States—chart, page 103.

The act of August 26, 1950, Public Law 733, 81st Congress, contained the provision that certain heads of agencies—State, Commerce, Justice, Treasury, AEC, Defense, National Security Resources Board, and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—

> May in its absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interests of national security, suspend without pay, any civilian officer or employee. * * * The agency head concerned may, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary terminate the employment of such suspended civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the national security of the United States, and such determination by the agency head concerned shall be conclusive and final (chart, p. 103).

Then came a change in the Truman loyalty order. It was brought about by Executive Order 10241, dated April 28, 1951, and provided:

> The standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, there is a reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved to the Government of the United States (chart, p. 103).

Starting in 1942, every appropriation act has contained a standard rider as follows:

> No part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence (chart, p. 103).

The appropriation act rider has provided as a penalty that a violator who accepts employment, the compensation for which is paid by this appropriation, is guilty of a felony, punishable by a fine up to $1,000 or imprisonment up to 1 year or both. The penalty clause is in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law—Chart, p. 103.

Finally, there is the Eisenhower security order, Executive Order No. 10450, dated April 27, 1953. Section 2 of the Eisenhower security order provides that—

> The head of each department and agency of the Government shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining within his department or agency an effective program to insure that the employment and retention in employment of any civilian officer or employee within the department or agency is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security (chart, p. 103).

As one who has been a Member of the House and the Senate over a period of years, I desire to make it unmistakably

clear that when the Truman loyalty program was inaugurated, I supported it. When the Eisenhower security program was developed and substituted for the Truman loyalty program, I supported that. I am now supporting Senate Joint Resolution 21, which I have already described and which would establish a "Hoover-type" Commission to study all phases of Government security and submit recommendations.

This approach is a logical one in our efforts to achieve an adequate and complete program affecting security and to carry it out fairly.

I believe that no one has stated the essence of the difficulties involved in a Government security program better than did Governor Brucker, General Counsel of the Department of Defense, when he appeared before our subcommittee last March to testify on this resolution. He said:

> Achieving a proper balance between the demands of security for all of the people and the traditional rights of individuals is one of the most difficult problems of our age. There is no panacea. It calls for the wisdom of Solomon and the patience of Job and presents a challenge which all must strive to meet (p. 224).

I would note parenthetically that the choice of Governor Brucker to replace Secretary of the Army Stevens is merited recognition of his outstanding personality and abilities, as well as recognition of his substantial contributions as a public servant over a period of many years.

In the same connection I should also like to call attention to the comments of another witness before the subcommittee, Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins, who is in charge of the Division of Internal Security, Department of Justice. He stated:

> The difficulty of establishing and maintaining a personnel security program now as always has been the problem of striking a balance between authority and liberty because of our historic insistence upon due process of law for the protection of civil rights. National security and individual liberty are the same and one without the other is, in the words of J. Edgar Hoover, "a mockery" (p. 81).

While each has stated the difficulties in his own way, I heartily subscribe to these comments by both of these distinguished witnesses to whom I have referred. They assisted greatly in the work of the subcommittee, as did the many other witnesses who appeared before it.

We have examined briefly the historical background of the Federal security program. A glance at its present structure—the statutes, regulations, and directives under which the program operates—reveals a complex of laws and regulations which concern espionage, unlawful disclosure of information, employee loyalty and security, industrial plant security, and port security.

A further glance at this program reveals a complex of activities which affect not only the whole of Government, but also a large segment of non-Government operations.

There are, for example, the activities of the Defense Department in screening, for security purposes, its military personnel and its civilian personnel.

The latter comprise about 1,150,000, or 49 percent, of all the civilian employees of the Government—page 171. There are also the industrial-security and port-security programs under the Defense Department.

Taking still another look, we find increasingly large numbers of Federal employees engaged in carrying out security programs. To be sure, not all of these employees have assignments which are limited solely to Government security, but to a large extent their assignments are so directed. The Civil Service Commission, according to recent information, has 1,713 employees on its investigative staff—page 502 of hearings. It has been stated that at least 19 Federal departments and agencies have some direct responsibility in the field of internal security—page 10.

With respect to investigation of Federal employees and applicants for Federal employment, the Civil Service Commission in 1954 conducted about 40 percent of the total number of full-field investigations. The FBI conducted 25 percent, and the remaining 35 percent was carried on by other agencies, including the Post Office Department—page 521. These other agencies included the military intelligence units of the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secret Service, and others. There is a separate statutory program, for clearance and the like, for the Atomic Energy Commission.

On the subject of costs there was testimony that each full field investigation made by the Civil Service Commission cost the taxpayer $217.76, on the average, in 1954—page 521.

The foregoing recital, although necessarily quite sketchy, indicates somewhat the vast scope of the assignment which is to be given to the commission proposed to be created for Senate Joint Resolution 21.

But, Mr. President, make no mistake about it, the present Federal security program, in the main, is a good program. It is well conceived and it has been well implemented, especially in the recent past. Chairman Young, of the Civil Service Commission, stated to the subcommittee, as follows:

> This security program within the Federal Government on Federal employees has gone exceedingly well over the last 2 years. In fact, when you consider the difficulties in the size of the operation and getting this sort of thing off the ground and getting it functioning within a relatively short time, with 2,300,000 employees, many of them in all corners of the world, and getting uniform application and interpretation on it, I think it is a great tribute, not only to the Federal administrators, but to everyone who has had anything to do with the application of this program within each department and agency to make the kind of record which they have (p. 519).

I am in complete accord with the views expressed by Mr. Young.

Senate Joint Resolution 21 was introduced last January 18 under the joint sponsorship of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The resolution was referred to the Subcommittee on Reorganization, whose members are: the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], chairman, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]; the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]; and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. In the regretted and enforced absence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] served as acting chairman of the subcommittee ably and admirably in connection with this legislation.

Without any intended reflection upon the other subcommittee members, I feel I would be remiss if I did not make special mention of the effective and conscientious work of our colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] throughout the entire period the measure was before the committee.

Hearings on the resolution were held between March 8 and March 18, inclusive. The hearings were well attended by committee members, and testimony was received from various well-informed and responsible Government officials, as well as some representatives of industry, of labor, of the press, and from other interested groups and individuals.

The printed hearings, with appendix, comprise more than 1,300 pages. Much of the information in the hearings is available nowhere else.

The proceedings have had careful study by the entire subcommittee.

It was agreed from the beginning that the subcommittee would keep political considerations to a minimum. In the main, that understanding has been adhered to. During the hearings, no study was made of individual cases of alleged abuses or alleged maladjustments of the security program. It was understood that individual cases were not to bear on the subcommittee assignment, except as they might bear upon procedures or methods or systems. This understanding was adhered to.

The hearings established, among other things, the need to delve further into questions asked of the various witnesses and into the subject matter of many of their responses. The further study contemplated by the resolution is clerly beyond the scope of the subcommittee's assignment and, if properly complied with, the study of the proposed Commission on Government Security should aid in developing and maturing our security system.

It is a matter of personal gratification to me, not only as a member of the subcommittee, but as a citizen of the United States, that each member of the subcommittee demonstrated a sincere desire to help attain the objective of a mature and complete Federal security program—always, of course, with proper safeguards for individual rights. This objective is the natural evolution or development called for by the greatly expanded Government personnel and the greatly expanded governmental activity in the field of restricted information in a time of worldwide tension.

The safeguards provided in the bill regarding the composition of the Commission justify some emphasis and stress. It is to be a bipartisan Commission and every effort has been made to insure that its study will have the benefit of the thinking of all interested and affected groups and individuals, both in the Government and outside it.

It will be a part of the task of the Commission on Government Security to ascertain the effectiveness of the security program, both in its structure and in its administration. It is to be hoped that the program, when examined in detail, will be found to have a minimum of defects; but I, for one, will wish to assist in remedying any defects which may be found at the earliest possible moment. There are two compelling reasons for this: First, we cannot in the interest of national security have any but the best security program. Second, we cannot tolerate any abuses being perpetrated upon individuals to whom a program may be applied, either because of its structure or its administration.

In closing, I express the hope that the Commission will perform the task assigned it as a patriotic duty to all the people, that Democrats and Republicans alike will dedicate themselves as citizens first and partisans last toward achieving a proper balance between the interests of the State in its fight for survival against its enemies within and without our shores, and the interests of the individual in preserving the very freedoms which are the only justification for the survival of the State itself.

The enactment of this resolution conforms to that objective and is worthy of the support of the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and to the members of the committee for their work on and study of the question of security, and for reporting the joint resolution which is before the Senate for consideration.

I happen to be a member of a committee which was created under Senate Resolution 20, which authorized and delegated the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to make a study and investigation of the administration of the internal security program of the Government. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and I are members of that subcommittee.

From the hearings which have been held, it is my firm opinion that our committee, which is really making an investigation of individual cases, and will continue to do so, can well receive the benefit and advice which would come from a commission such as the one proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 21. After hearing some of the witnesses and some of the testimony, it seems to me that such a study is needed; in fact, I am convinced that the present internal security program is not infallible. The job of protecting America from subversion, without violating the traditional and constitutional rights of individuals is a difficult one. It is for that reason that I shall favor and support the resolution, which provides for such a study. It seems to me that the importance of the program to our Government and to those who are working for the Government is such that we need a searching and thorough study, and need it promptly.

On the basis of the pending joint resolution, which provides for a high-level commission, nonpartisan and bipartisan in character, we can expect a well-considered and helpful report, which will be of value to the Government and to the country.

However, I am concerned about the provision in the joint resolution with respect to the date when the report shall be made to Congress. Under the measure now being considered, the Commission must report to Congress not later than December 31, 1956. I am convinced that a report should not be delayed that long. It is my sincere hope that the Commission may report early next year, in order that the next session, the second session of the 84th Congress, will be in a position to deal with some of the recommendations. I think the questions involved are so urgent and important that the report should not be delayed until December 31, 1956, and be left for consideration by the 85th Congress.

Therefore, I shall offer an amendment which I sincerely hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept. If it be in order, I should like to offer the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have not been disposed of.

Mr. CARLSON. I shall be glad to withhold my amendment until the committee amendments have been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Government Operations was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "quorum", to insert "Each subcommittee of the Commission shall consist of at least three members of the Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 19, after the word "subcommittee", to strike out "or member."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 7, line 1, after the words "subcommittee", to strike out "or member."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 3, after the word "Commissioner", to strike out "of such committee, or any duly designated member", and insert "or the chairman of any subcommittee with the approval of a majority of the members of such subcommittee."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 7, after the word "Chairman", to strike out "or member."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the subhead, in line 22, after the word "Prosecutions", to insert "And Investigative."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 8, line 2, after the word "the" where it appears the second time, to strike out "premature."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 5, after the word "intelligence", to insert "or investigative."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 6, after the word "agency", to insert a comma and "or would jeopardize or interfere with the interests of national security."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 9, after the word "Commission", to strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 12, after the word "than", to strike out "January 15" and insert "December 31."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment just stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "December 31," and insert in lieu thereof "March 1."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment, not only with the Senator from Kansas, but also with other members of the subcommittee, with the exception if the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who is unavoidably absent on official business.

May I ask the Senator from Kansas if he will engage with me for a few minutes in some good, old fashioned American horsetrading, so to speak?

I think the date of March 1, 1956, is a little too short a time. It is my hope that the Commission might be provided with at least an additional month in which to submit its final report, namely, on March 31, 1956, so that there could be a target date for the Commission to make its report.

I think we have faced up to the fact that an extension of time might be needed, but I agree with the Senator that the work should be expedited. In fact, I was desirous of having the report submitted earlier, but I acceded to requests from other members of the subcommittee that the time be extended to December 31, 1956, as provided in the joint resolution. It will be noted that that was a subcommittee amendment.

If the Senator from Kansas, in his spirit of fair play, and also in his good Yankee horsetrading spirit, would like to make the date March 31, as I walk over toward him and get just a little more affable and amicable, perhaps we can settle the question.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am afraid I am going to be out-traded. However, I notice that in the original joint resolution the commission was to have reported by January 15, which I assume would be January 15, 1956.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; but the subcommittee hearings and the study which the subcommittee made took such a length of time that we were unable to report the joint resolution as soon as we had hoped.

As I look back over what I believe was our original plan of action in order to have the joint resolution reported, as it relates to the original date of January 15, 1956, I am led to say that I think March 31, 1956, would be a fair and reasonable compromise between fair and reasonable men.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I realize at what a great disadvantage I am when it comes to horsetrading with the junior Senator from Minnesota. I remind him that the committee had earlier thought of January 15, 1956, as an appropriate date. Having that in mind, I first thought of suggesting February 1. I thought I might reach a compromise on that date. I have now offered my amendment providing for March 1, 1956. Now the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Minnesota, has asked me to make the date March 31. I wonder if he would be willing to compromise on March 15.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The trouble with March 15 is that it used to be income tax day. It was always a sad day.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator knows that the date for filing income tax returns has now been changed to April 15.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the fact that the country thought the date for the payment of income taxes should be moved back to April 15, I feel that the date on which the proposed Commission should report should be moved back to March 31. I know the Senator from Kansas is doing what he believes is right and honorable. I think March 31 would fill the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I assume that I shall have to yield, early or late, so I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment to make the date March 31, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the junior Senator from Kansas to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the junior Senator from Kansas for his spirit of cooperation.

Mr. President, we are approaching the concluding moments of the consideration of the joint resolution. I assure the Senate that the preliminary hearings which were held on the joint resolution were most informative. I believe they will be helpful to the Commission in its study. The members of the subcommittee were attentive to their responsibilities. I believe the subcommittee extracted information which will be of great help in the judicious consideration of whatever recommendations the special Commission may wish to make.

I concur in the expressions made today of the urgent importance of the matter. Our first responsibility is the protection and security of this great Republic.

We also have as our responsibility the protection of the citizens of the United States in their constitutional liberties and privileges. It is a most difficult assignment to equate security with liberty. I point out that the word "liberty" has great historical meaning in America. The word "security" is of imminent importance in an hour of crisis and difficulty, such as we have been experiencing in the past years, and will continue to experience for years to come.

I commend to the attention of the Senate and to those who are students of government, particularly those who are students of the law, the hearings, which comprise approximately 740 pages.

From my attendance at the subcommittee hearings I received a very valuable education in the field of development and preparation of our security and investigative apparatus.

I also wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the appendix of the hearings, which represents, as I said earlier, the first full compilation of all the Executive orders, regulations, administrative orders, statutes, and rules and regulations in reference to espionage and sabotage, classified information, the whole program of Government employee security investigations and clearance, industrial security—indeed, all the dimensions of the security problem and program in the United States of America.

I feel today we are performing a real service for the Republic. I for one have felt that bickering and argument in a partisan spirit over the security program yield little or no good. At the same time I believe the committees of Congress have a continuing responsibility to look into security matters as supplementary to the work of the Commission.

Since I see the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the Senate at this time, I wish to say we have had very good cooperation. There was a clear-cut understanding. We did not go into cases. We concentrated on procedure, law, and regulations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and ask for a vote on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and to be read the third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21), was passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is vital to the welfare and safety of the United States that there be adequate protection of the national security, including the safeguarding of all national defense secrets and public and private defense installations, against loss or compromise arising from espionage, sabotage, disloyalty, subversive activities, or unauthorized disclosures.

It is, therefore, the policy of the Congress that there shall exist a sound Government program—

(a) establishing procedures for security investigation, evaluation, clearance, and, where necessary, adjudication of Government employees, and also appropriate security requirements with respect to persons privately employed or occupied on work requiring access to national-defense secrets or work affording significant opportunity for injury to the national security;

(b) for vigorous enforcement of effective and realistic security laws and regulations; and

(c) for a careful, consistent, and efficient administration of this policy in a manner which will protect the national security and preserve basic American rights.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in the first section of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Government Security (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

(c) Of the members appointed to the Commission not more than two shall be appointed by the President of the United States, or the President of the Senate, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the same political party.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a parti-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Each subcommittee of the Commission shall consist of at least three members of the Commission.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary ex-

penses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(b) All employees of the Commission shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to character, associations, and loyalty and a report of each such investigation shall be furnished to the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall study and investigate the entire Government security program, including the various statutes, Presidential orders, and administrative regulations and directives under which the Government seeks to protect the national security, national defense secrets, and public and private defense installations, against loss or injury arising from espionage, disloyalty, subversive activity, sabotage, or unauthororized disclosures, together with the actual manner in which such statutes, Presidential orders, administrative regulations, and directives have been and are being administered and implemented, with a view to determining whether existing requirements, practices, and procedures are in accordance with the policies set forth in the first section of this joint resolution, and to recommending such changes at it may determine are necessary or desirable. The Commission shall also consider and submit reports and recommendations on the adequacy or deficiencies of existing statutes, Presidential orders, administrative regulations, and directives, and the administration of such statutes, orders, regulations, and directives, from the standpoints of internal consistency of the overall security program and effective protection and maintenance of the national security.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or the Chairman of any subcommittee with the approval of a majority of the members of such subcommittee and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman. The provisions of sections 102 to 194, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from an executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman.

INTERFERENCE WITH CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS AND INVESTIGATIVE AND INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to require any agency of the United States to release any information possessed by it when, in the opinion of the President, the disclosure of such information would jeopardize or interfere with a pending or prospective criminal prosecution, or with the carrying out of the intelligence or investigative responsibilities of such agency, or would jeopardize or interfere with the interests of national security.

REPORTS

SEC. 9. The Commission may submit interim reports to the Congress and the President at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the Congress and the President not later than March 31, 1956. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submission of its final report.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1713) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not planned to have any action on the bill at this time; but I desire to make an announcement to the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to make an announcement for the RECORD, so that all Senators may have information as to the program. The leadership proposes to bring before the Senate at an early date Calendar No. 269, S. 1633, relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska,

Calendar No. 521, S. 1292, to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials.

Calendar No. 542, S. 2220, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of plants and facilities, including acquisition or condemnation of real property or facilities, and for other purposes. That bill, Mr. President, will be the next measure to be considered. It is hoped that we may be able to bring it up tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the majority leader Calendar No. 627, Senate bill 609, to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or aquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

I do not believe there is any major controversy involved in that bill. I thought it might be taken up at the time the other atomic bill was considered, namely, S. 2220. I understand there is only one item which is likely to occasion much debate on S. 2220. I think the bill came out of the committee unanimously, except for the one item.

There is no great controversy over S. 609. Since the representatives of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be on the floor to present one bill, I thought the majority leader might want to have the other bill considered at the same time. I merely suggest that since both are atomic energy bills, and the same Senator will be in charge of both bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to thank the minority leader for his constructive suggestion. As usual, it is a helpful suggestion. I hope we may be able to follow the procedure he has outlined.

Mr. President, I believe the last bill I mentioned was Calendar No. 542, S. 2220.

Following the bills I have mentioned I expect to ask that the Senate consider Calendar No. 579, S. 63, providing for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

Calendar No. 580, Senate bill 1849, to provide for the grant of career conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinte employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment.

I also call attention to the fact that it is hoped the Senate may be able to act, before next Thursday, on the conference reports on four appropriation bills, namely, those for the Departments of State, Justice, and the Judiciary; Labor, Health and Welfare; Defense; and Commerce.

In addition, there was reported today a resolution from the Banking and Currency Committee which would extend the Defense Production Act, the Housing Act, and the Small Business Administration Act, which are due to expire on June 30. The simple resolution extends the

life of those three acts until action can be taken by both Houses. The Senate has already acted.

Also, if the House acts favorably, it is expected to have a conference report on the Draft Act and the Doctor Draft Act.

It is hoped to be able to consider all those measures prior to next Thursday evening. That is as far as the leadership can go in stating the schedule for the remainder of the week.

The public-works bill, which is in the Appropriations Committee, is in the markup stage, I believe. Hearings have been concluded. The Senate probably will have to extend the acts having to do with foreign aid, legislative appropriations, and public works.

I have no other announcement to make.

THE SCHOOL CRISIS

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an interesting article, written by Neil H. McElroy, president of the Procter & Gamble Co., and Chairman of the White House Conference on Education, and published in the June issue of the Woman's Home Companion.

The article describes what is going on in the country today as American citizens tackle their elementary- and secondary-school problems. It tells how people everywhere are being aroused to a more active participation in school affairs, through the President's program to improve education.

In Connecticut, some 600 educators and lay citizens attended a statewide conference on education at Hartford last fall. This spring, in March and April, countywide meetings were held throughout the State as a followup to the State conference to discuss, analyze, and report on educational problems. All told, several thousand Connecticut citizens took part in the program, which was held in cooperation with the White House Conference. Connecticut's educators and lay citizens deserve the congratulations of their fellow citizens for their time and effort in trying to improve Connecticut's educational system. Special thanks are due to our State commissioner of education, Finis Engleman, whom President Eisenhower appointed as Vice Chairman of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education; the conference Cochairmen, Robert W. Hoskins, president of the Connecticut Council on Education; and William H. Flaherty, our deputy State commissioner of education, as well as hundreds of others who worked hard to make Connecticut's conference program a success.

Connecticut's school system has always ranked as one of the finest in the Nation. I am delighted to report that the educators and lay citizens, through their annual conferences on education, are doing their best to insure that Connecticut schools remain among the best in the Nation.

The historic conference next November 28–December 1, at Washington, will be attended by an estimated 2,000 persons—educators and lay citizens. They will discuss six major subjects currently under study by various subcommittees of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education. All six are vitally important. But one that appeals to me in particular, deals with the question, How can we get enough good teachers—and keep them? This is a national problem, is as much the concern of my own State of Connecticut as it is the concern of the other 47 States. I have always believed that the teachers in our public schools deserve far more consideration than they have been getting. This consideration is especially pertinent in regard to their relatively low salaries. They have contributed enormously to the spiritual and intellectual heritage of our Nation. I am delighted to observe that the Nation as a whole is awakening to the salary crisis in the ranks of our teachers. They deserve the attention and help of every citizen—not just the consideration of municipal, State, and national authorities—but of every man and woman who has attended school.

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

THE CRISIS IN YOUR SCHOOL

(By Neil McElroy)

A tremendously exciting thing is happening all over this vast country of ours. People—plain ordinary people everywhere—are beginning to do something about our education crisis.

For months—for years, really—the experts have been warning us of the classroom shortage, the teacher shortage, the onrushing tidal wave of new students. During World War II our school-building program virtually stopped. But our birth rate didn't; it soared to an all-time high and continued high. The situation called for immediate emergency action right after the war. We didn't take that action. That's why we're in trouble now.

Often, I'm sure, the problem has seemed so huge, so overwhelming, that well-meaning people have said to themselves, "Yes, it's true and it's terrible but what can I do about it? I'm just one person. It's too big for me."

Well, the problem looks like bad trouble—and it is. But today, if you put your ear close to the ground almost anywhere from Bangor to San Diego or from Seattle to Miami, you will hear small, apparently unrelated but tremendously heartening sounds. For example:

In Richmond, Va., next year all teachers will receive an across-the-board salary increase of $300. Why? Because a special citizens committee, appointed by the school board, studied the local situation, came up with suggestions which the board approved as sound and realistic. The citizens committee didn't stop working until the increase was made part of the city manager's new budget. This was a good step in the right direction.

In Great Neck, N. Y., where the junior high school had been forced to hold double sessions, votes gave solid approval to the construction of a 1,400-pupil junior high and a 1,200-pupil senior high school. The turnout of voters was the largest ever recorded in town and 80 percent of the voters approved. Why? Because they wanted to provide better educational opportunities for their youth.

In West Des Moines, Iowa, a bond issue was passed last January for the construction of 12 new classrooms. The vote was amazing: 799 in favor, 69 against. Why? Because a citizens committee studied buildings, budget, and school population. It dramatized its findings with charts, brochures, and a detailed survey book. It sold the idea, just the way an insurance salesman sells insurance—and the public bought the bond issues 12 to 1.

These are just three random samples but consider them along with scores of others and you must feel a thrill of excitement chase itself along your spine. These and many other individual examples of civic improvement are, I feel sure, the forerunners of a great national movement. They are true manifestations of one of the mightiest forces on earth: town-meeting democracy in action.

Ever since I can remember, I've held the opinion that the most reassuring thing about America is what people can do about a community problem if they put their minds to it. They may take a little while to size up the situation and organize themselves for effective action. They may need—in fact, they usually do go through—a period in which inertia and apathy seem to prevail. But then, in a great surge of public-spirited energy, they get something done.

This year of 1955, I truly believe, is going to be remembered as the year when our attack on our school problems really began to roll.

In his State of the Union message delivered in January last year, President Eisenhower began this attack when he expressed his concern over our mounting educational problems. He said: "Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population." He went on to say that he hoped the States would hold conferences on these problems that would lead to a White House Conference on Education.

Congress responded by appropriating $700,000 to help defray the expenses of State conferences. In September a letter from the White House went out to 53 States and Territories informing the governors that this money was available and asking them to set up State conferences to study their educational problems and determine what action should be taken.

The response to this invitation was almost unanimous. All 48 States, plus the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have replied affirmatively. Some State conferences have already been held; others will be held this summer and fall. These conferences will be climaxed in Washington next November in a great White House Conference on Education.

President Eisenhower has appointed all the members of a committee to plan and conduct this White House Conference and has named me as Chairman. Dr. Finis Engleman, commissioner of education of Connecticut, is our Vice Chairman. The committee working with us is made up of good citizens from all over the country. They have backgrounds in the fields of education, labor, business, agriculture, industry, and so forth. And in Washington we have a devoted staff headed by Clint Pace, of Dallas.

We hope that the delegates who will come to the White House Conference—and we expect about 2,000 persons—will be made up largely of people who have already participated in the State conferences. Less than half of these people will be professional educators. We have, in fact, recommended a proportion of 2 laymen to 1 educator. Ideally, each delegation to Washington will be as diversified as possible in terms of political, racial, religious, social and economic background. They will meet for 4 days: Monday, November 28, through Thursday, December 1. They won't be talked at; speeches and lectures will be held to a minimum. They will talk with one another at small round-table conferences, each composed of less than a dozen delegates. We are bringing these people together, not to give them the answers but to let them find the answers among themselves. This is truly the American way.

The attention of this conference—first of its kind ever called by a President—will

be focused mainly on our primary and secondary schools, where the most pressing situation exists. We will ask ourselves these six major questions:

1. What should our schools accomplish?
2. In what ways can we organize our school systems more efficiently and economically?
3. What are our school building needs?
4. How can we get good teachers—and keep them?
5. How can we finance our schools—build and operate them?
6. How can we obtain a continuing public interest in education?

Subcommittees of the White House Conference Committee will explore these six basic questions beforehand to break them down in detail and collect material with which to launch effective discussion of them.

No one expects complete agreement from 2,000 strong-minded conference participants and no one is promising any magical, foolproof solutions. My own personal hope and belief are that the final results will provide citizens everywhere with useful facts and recommendations, will reduce tremendous amounts of information to workable terms and will greatly clarify the problems.

Interest in the conference is already high and will continue to mount, I'm sure, as November 28 approaches. It's not confined to any one segment of our population, either. "Mr. McElroy," said one of our office elevator girls when she heard of my appointment, "I sure am glad they've asked you people to tackle the school problem. I think it's just about the most important thing there is."

Would she have felt that way 10 years ago? I doubt it.

We've come a long way in 10 years—something we should remember when the problems that lie ahead look insurmountable. Consider PTA membership. In 1945 it was about 3½ million. Today it's close to 9 million—including 3 million men.

In 1949, when it was first organized, the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools knew of only 17 local citizen groups working in behalf of better schools. Now it's in touch with 2,650 such local groups and estimates that 4 times that number probably exist.

We've come a long way in terms of public awareness but we still have a long way to go in terms of achievement.

In 1949, $4.3 billion was spent for school operating costs. This year, 1955, the figure will reach $6.6 billion. By 1965 the bill will jump to $10 billion or $15 billion.

As for school construction, in the middle of World War II, we were spending $55 million annually. By 1949, it was $664 million. Now about $2 billion is being spent annually on school construction and it's estimated that between now and 1960 a total of more than $16 billion will be needed.

This is a staggering amount of money but our expanding national economy can stand it and I think the citizens are not merely going to endure it—they're going to demand it. They know that a person's earning power matches his education almost directly. Census Bureau figures show that men with high school or college educations earn 80 percent of the incomes over $7,000—and men with only an eighth-grade education or less earn 77 percent of the incomes under $500.

The people know that education—or lack of it—has a tremendous influence on the crime rate, on the amount of juvenile delinquency in any given area.

They know that our actual security as a nation is closely tied to education. Modern soldiers have to be skilled technicians. In five States, Korean war draft rejections because of failure to pass the Armed Forces Qualification Test ran more than twice as high as the national average. These were States where a high proportion of the population between the ages of 25 and 34 had had only 5 years of schooling—or less. Such persons are known as "functional illiterates" and our last census showed that we still have about 8 million of them—an appalling national waste of human beings.

To correct these conditions will cost money. And people, whether or not they think of school taxes in terms of a child of their own, are becoming more and more aware of the value of good schools to all of us.

As president of a large corporation, I feel sure that industry will be found more than ready to shoulder its share of the tax burden. This is not just a matter of idealism or patriotism with us businessmen; it's also a question of plain self-interest. Where can we find our skilled labor or draw our executive personnel from except the ranks of educated young people? Without first-class schools, how can we count on an alert, informed electorate to maintain the system of free enterprise under which we operate? How can we be sure of having voters who will respond to the appeals of enlightened statesmen and reject the rabble rouser and demagog?

Survey after survey has shown us that earning power and living standards go hand in hand with the amount and quality of education available in a given area. No wonder enlightened business leaders have gone on record, when considering new sites for new factories, as being more interested in a good school system than in a low tax rate. Intelligence in our offices, know-how in our factories, initiative, imagination, honesty, energy—we in industry are constantly searching for these qualities in people. They are found oftenest in soundly schooled people.

Today's vast awakening of public interest in education is tremendously exciting to me. You might say I've been in close contact with school problems ever since I was born: my father was a high-school physics teacher and school superintendent; my mother was a grade-school teacher before she married. Nobody had to sell them on the value of education and from the time that my brothers and I were very young our parents were determined that we should go to a fine college even though our family finances hardly seemed to justify such an ambition.

In my case, the labor shortage during World War I made it possible for me, still in my early teens, to get some pretty good part-time jobs. I was able actually to save up $1,000—a lot of money in those days—and this, plus my scholarship aid and modest support from my father, enabled me to graduate from Harvard in 1925. I've been keenly interested in educational problems ever since.

My interest is based partly also on the fact that my wife and I have 3 lively youngsters. I remember that my father, being a teacher, had 3 months more or less free during the summer and was able to be with us much of the time. That companionship was priceless to my brothers and me and I try to give our 2 teen-age daughters and our young son as much time as I can. But the demands of my job and related activities are heavy and I know from personal experience how difficult the pace of modern living makes it for most parents to spend as much time with their children as they'd like. That is 1 more reason why we can't afford to settle for anything less than the best in schools.

One thing I have come to believe: the schools in a community are as good as the citizens make them—and no better. I have little patience with parents who complain constantly about the quality of their children's schooling, the overcrowded classrooms, the shortage of teachers—and then do nothing about it. Something can always be done. It's being proved in hundreds of communities every day.

Here in Cincinnati, for instance, we have a citizens school committee that was originally formed for the sole purpose of endorsing school-board candidates, trying to get qualified persons elected. But its scope has steadily expanded. Right now its working on the problem of getting more community recognition for schoolteachers. Our citizens committee organized a teachers recognition night, with a first-class program of entertainment at the Cincinnati Gardens—an arena capable of seating 14,000 or 15,000 people. The profits are used to stimulate teacher recognition in various ways, the whole purpose being to make these hard-working, loyal people feel that they are appreciated, admired, and a valued and respected part of our city.

In Beloit, Wis., a citizens school committee conducted a joint study with school officials to find out how good was its schools' college-preparatory training. As a result of their survey, courses were added to the high school curriculum, others were strengthened and citizen interest was greatly stimulated.

Out in Lewiston, Idaho, residents were asked to vote on a $900,000 bond issue to finance a 5-year school-expansion plan. Service clubs, the PTA, the board of education, and others who worked in the campaign got an able—and free—assist from radio station KRLC. Spot announcements were broadcast 7 or 8 times a day, with additional comment at night. School officials were interviewed, so were average voters. The bond issue passed by nearly 6 to 1. Much the same thing happened in Muscatine, Iowa, where station KWPC lent a hand.

These are local efforts and the truth is that while our educational problems are national, our schools are local—just as local as I am or as you are. The White House Conference in November will do a sound job, I'm sure, in terms of long-range planning and reducing masses of data to workable terms. But these plans, these tools, become effective only when used on the local level. It takes the active and enlightened interest of the citizen on the spot to turn our educational dreams into realities.

I think it would be a magnificent contribution to our American way of life if, in the next 12 months, thousands of community conferences on education could be held all over this great land of ours. Not everybody can attend a State conference and to some the White House Conference may seem pretty remote. But a local citizens committee for the schools can do wonders in any town if it will (a) be representative of the entire community, (b) base its recommendations on a study of all available facts, and (c) cooperate fully with the legally established school authorities.

If your town already has such a committee, offer it your support. Join it if you can. Check its work in the six discussion areas of the White House Conference. Obviously, school conditions vary greatly from place to place. In your town the classroom shortage may be less acute than, say, the teacher shortage. Perhaps your community has too many school districts for efficient administration. Perhaps restrictive laws are making it impossible to finance a needed program. It's the committee's job to find out the area where improvement is most needed and then work with school authorities to bring about that improvement.

If no such committee exists in your town, the very fact that you have read thus far indicates that you are perfectly capable of starting one yourself. Inexperience in such matters should not deter you. Thousands of worthwhile community efforts have started with some individual who approached other individuals, formed a group, analyzed the problem and started action to solve it.

You don't have to grope your way blindly or work out details alone. A great deal of help is available today just for the asking. Early this year, recognizing the need for such a grassroots effort to tie in with the proposed State and White House conferences, two national volunteer organizations started

working together to aid and stimulate such local ventures in every possible way.

One of these two organizations, the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, has prepared a working guide in the form of a booklet titled "How Can We Discuss School Problems?" It has also made up a planning check list that is a step-by-step outline anyone can follow. These and other extremely helpful booklets are available to any interested person. Just write to the commission at 2 West 45 Street, New York 36, N. Y., and state your needs.

The other organization, the National School Boards Association, has set up a field staff to service communities planning local conferences. Headed by Dr. Maurice Stapley, director of projects for the NSBA, trained advisers will be available to consult with local organizations and individuals and generally lend a hand in setting up such meetings. Dr. Stapley, on leave of absence from Indiana University, may be reached at Box 47, Bloomington, Ind. He is being aided by five regional coordinators whose names and addresses are listed on this page.

Another place to turn for help, of course, is our White House Conference office. We have there full lists of source material you can use as a basis for discussing the six problems we will take up next fall. Simply write to Clint Pace, Director, the White House Conference on Education, Washington 25, D. C.

Why not take advantage of these opportunities to get into the fight for better schools? As I said before, this is the critical year, the year of maximum effort. The great counteroffensive against apathy and inertia has already begun. You will find it, I can assure you, tremendously satisfying to be a part of this crusade.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES E. DANIEL, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A South Carolina Statesman," published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of June 22, 1955; and also an editorial entitled "A Merited Award," published in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C., on June 19. Both editorials refer to the distinguished public-service award presented by the South Carolina department of the American Legion to my distinguished predecessor in the Senate, Charles E. Daniel. I wish to add my hearty approval of the editorials regarding the great work being done by former United States Senator Charles E. Daniel.

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

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of June 22, 1955]

A SOUTH CAROLINA STATESMAN

Mr. Charles E. Daniel, of Greenville, is not only a successful businessman. He also possesses statesmanlike vision.

In his recent address to the American Legion at Myrtle Beach, Mr. Daniel showed a clear understanding of the economic problems which will face South Carolina in the years to come. His concept of a proper program to assure the State's prosperity is a balanced economy. Mr. Daniel stressed the importance of developing agriculture as well as industry.

South Carolina has not even approached the attainment of the vast potentials of its agriculture. We produce commercially 38 of the 52 vegetables grown in this country. Yet we must import agricultural products to feed our own people.

With proper planning, the State could be developed into the food center of the Southeast. This would encourage development of subsidiary indutries such as packing plants, frozen-food units, cheese, and canning factories. The coastal plains of South Carolina could become the home of some of the most profitable truck farms in the country.

Mr. Daniel sees great possibilities from sheep raising in South Carolina. A wool-scouring and combing plant has already been established in Johnsonville. Another is near completion at Jamestown. With proper management, the wool industry will bring millions of dollars of additional income to producers and workers alike.

South Carolina can produce not only the agricultural requirements of its own people, but vast surpluses for export as well. By becoming exporters of food products and farm produce, we can increase considerably the income of citizens and State.

Mr. Daniel, of course, predicts tremendous industrial expansion. He believes that we can double our industrial expansion of the last 10 years to $2 billion within the next decade.

Mr. Daniel is a man of vision. More important, however, if he is a dreamer, he is blessed with the most constructive kind of capacity for dreaming. We call this statesmanship, for Mr. Daniel knows whereof he speaks.

During the critical years ahead, we shall need men of Mr. Daniel's stature in key posts in Government. We hope that the people of South Carolina will not long delay in utilizing his talents in public office. Already he has made a start with a brief appointive term in the United States Senate. Sourth Carolina, as well as the Federal Government, is in dire need of statesmen these days. We cannot afford to bury obvious talent in this respect under a mountain of public apathy.

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of June 19, 1955]

A MERITED AWARD

The South Carolina Department of the American Legion, in conferring on Charles E. Daniel, of Greenville, its distinguished public service award, has honored justly a man who is devoting his life to achieving the ideals the award represents.

In an address which followed the presentation yesterday at the annual Legion convention at Myrtle Beach, the Greenville builder, former United States Senator, college trustee, and director in multi-faceted business enterprises told Legionnaires the things he wants for his native State:

Among them were these:

A continuation of good government as represented by the administrations of Governors Thurmond, Byrnes, and Timmerman, last three of the State's chief executives.

Implementing of plans to make South Carolina self-sufficient agriculturally and end the present necessity of its having to import half of its food products.

Distribution of the present steady stream of new industries flowing into the State (for which Mr. Daniel is largely responsible) so that all of South Carolina's 46 counties will benefit by having at least one manufacturing plant of consequence.

Analysis of State universities and colleges to the ends of allocating important fields of education to the institutions best suited to conduct them, of eliminating competition for students and of increasing the efficiency of each college.

The writing of a new State constitution to supplant the archaic provisions of the present one by which the State has been governed since 1895.

A comprehensive property survey and tax equalization program to bring under taxation all property in the State on an equal and equitable basis.

If and when South Carolina achieves all of these goals, it will have reached political and economic maturity. If and when they are attained, it will be through the vision and efforts of such men as Charlie Daniel.

It is deserved and befitting that he take his place alongside the other winners of the Legion award since it was established in 1927, a company of great South Carolinians among whom are numbered such as James F. Byrnes, Dr. D. B. Johnson, David R. Coker, Dr. Henry Nelson Snyder, Miss Wil Lou Gray, Richard I. Manning, Mrs. A. F. McKissick, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, Dr. D. W. Daniel, and J. C. Self.

THE APPEARANCE OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON TELEVISION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, television is still a novel force in our national culture. In only a very few years, this marvelous new medium of communication has swept across our Nation until soon there will be few communities in which it does not reach into the majority of homes. However, we have not yet had time fully to assess its effects as a source of information and its impact on public opinion.

In combining image and sound—the picture of speaking persons with the sound of their spoken words—television goes far beyond its ancestor, radio, in creating an image of immediacy and persuasiveness. This is a marvelous accomplishment of science. But TV lends itself with equal facility to truth and to illusion. It will impartially show either unadorned fact or the most imaginative flights of fancy. Yet, because of its youth, TV's reputation for truth and veracity is still fairly good. This fact, I fear, gives it a potentially dangerous power in our public life.

As in the case of radio, the role of television is justly conceived to be both in the field of entertainment and in the field of enlightenment. But the medium itself does not differentiate between the two, and therein lies an opportunity for the political huckster, and a danger to the democratic process.

Some of the new techniques for obtaining political publicity on television have recently been discussed by Mr. Douglass Cater, in an article published in The Reporter magazine of June 16, 1955. Mr. Cater describes how Congressmen can have their images dubbed into spectacular television films showing military planes or great Federal atomic installations or travelogs of Washington, or how film strips showing members of the national administration are available to Congressmen of the administration's party for splicing together into a television program apparently showing a live interview between the two statesmen on an issue of current interest—which may then be broadcast as a nonpolitical public service feature by the congressman's hometown TV station.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from The Reporter, entitled "Every Congressman a Television Star,"

be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

EVERY CONGRESSMAN A TELEVISION STAR

(By Douglas Cater)

Just behind the House Office Building, in offices above the dingy old George Washington Inn, a small group of Republican staff workers are pioneering in adapting politics to the midtwentieth century. The group, led by a public-relations expert and a former legman for Fulton Lewis, Jr., works for the National Republican Congressional Committee. To a city accustomed on occasion to the composite photograph in politics, this group has brought the composite political telecast.

Take a recent memo sent by this group to every Republican Member of Congress. Would the Congressman be interested in filming a short discussion with Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey on such items of public interest as the budget, spending, security, more jobs, and the cost of living? If so, he should drop by the Joint House and Senate Recording Facility. He is furnished a written list of questions, which he is to address to a TV camera. Without further fuss, a completed film will be turned over to him in which, as the memo makes clear. "The camera—or the voices if it is just for radio—will * * * switch back and forth between the Member and his guest (Secretary Humphrey) in a smooth manner as though both were present in the same room."

BIG MAN IN WASHINGTON

A reasonably energetic Republican Congressman can now have his supposed familiarity with the highest policymakers widely publicized with little loss of his own time and even less of theirs—in fact, without ever having met them. He might have been seen discussing labor relations with Labor Secretary James Mitchell.

"CONGRESSMAN. There has been a lot of talk, Secretary Mitchell, about the Eisenhower administration's not being prolabor. * * *

"MITCHELL. Now you know, Congressman, * * * that kind of talk makes my hair stand on end. I cannot say it too strongly: The Eisenhower administration is prolabor."

Or he might have been shown discussing the Salk vaccine with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby:

"A 3-minute TV-radio narration on the part the Eisenhower administration is playing in promoting the use of this life-saving vaccine."

Occasionally, the skillful operators of this new craft have run into snags. The script prepared for the interview with Secretary of Labor Mitchell, for example, contained a section in which Mitchell was supposed to say to the Congressman apropos a Democratic argument:

"I do not need to point out to you, Congressman * * * that is entirely wrong. You in * * * have the great * * * industry in * * * and the * * * industry in * * *. These * * * industries have different needs and so do their workers."

Mitchell was to read words to fill the missing blanks for each Congressman, which would be spliced in at the appropriate places in the film. This section had to be dropped. The TV composite cannot be personalized that much yet.

But Republican ingenuity has not ended with the television interview. The omnipresent Congressman, if he chooses, can be dubbed into a real spectacular of rocketing Nikes, or, alternatively, of zooming F-84 Thunderjets, B-47's, and B-36's releasing an incredible string of bomb clusters, which explode against the ground in what seems like a never-ending series of blasts. He can be seen introducing a grand panorama of powerplants and atomic installations while he explains the complex issues of Dixon-Yates. ("Members can arrange to be photographed at the television facility voicing their own opening and closing narrations—or the entire script, for that matter," the Dixon-Yates routine began, reflecting a certain wariness on the part of the ghosts as to whether the Member could handle so tough a subject.) The Member may also be seen behind his desk giving a lecture on paperwork, which he will describe as a "monster threatening to engulf the very function for which the Government was established."

Finally, for the well-rounded Congressman, the National Republican Congressional Committee will supply a 3-minute Washington travelog. ("If you are visited by a group of students or other tourists from your district, our photographer would be happy to shoot some motion picture scenes on the steps of the Capitol showing the group being greeted by you. Then the travelog would be inserted, and your program would explain that these were some of the scenes which the group saw in their tour of Washington.")

GHOST APPEARANCE

In sum, the Republican staff workers are making a valiant effort to move from ghostwriting to the ghost appearance. And it is not a highpriced operation. The film clips of which most such features are composed can be obtained from the armed services or almost as cheaply from the commercial television news companies. The Joint House and Senate Recording Facility, a private studio subsidized by Congress to the extent of rent and taxes, is equipped to make film shots of Congressmen and to edit and prepare finished prints at dirt-cheap prices. A 30-minute print can be bought for less than $150. A 1-minute spot costs the Congressman as little as $4.40.

Best of all, the Republicans are labeling their between-campaign TV and radio offerings as public service features, so that the Congressman can dun his local station for free time. Evidently the rules relating to this kind of thing are fairly lax. The National Republican Congressional Committee, for example, recently sent out a letter to its members describing a newly proposed animated film entitled "The Mystery of the Lost Depression," which it was reported, "factually exposes the alarms and distortions made by the gloomers. * * * The film is free from partisan politics and is designed to be used on TV as a public service," announced the letter with a strictly partisan letterhead signed by the National Republican Congressional Committee's Public Relations Director Harold Slater.

"This use of animation," Slater prophesied modestly, "introduces a new technique in politics which we believe will be most effective. * * *" Cartoons were done by staff artists, the narration by a professional New York actor-announcer. Presumably the bit part played by the lowly Congressman is done live.

THE EISENHOWER SPEECH

Speaking to the radio and television broadcasters on May 24, President Eisenhower pointed to their industry's great capacity for swaying public opinion and argues that this gives them added responsibility "to see that the news * * * is truthfully told, with the integrity of the entire industry behind it. * * * Of course you want to entertain," Mr. Eisenhower added. "Of course you want people to look at it, and I am all for it. * * * But when we come to something that we call news—and I am certain that I am not speaking of anything that you haven't discussed earnestly among yourselves—let us simply be sure it is news."

So far no one has questioned the ghosted appearance, the phony interview, the synthetic repartee, and the other more serious fakeries that seem to be the public-relations experts' notion of how to campaign on TV. One lonely critic, Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, freshman Democrat from Oregon, has raised an alarm about the concealed use of teleprompters and facial makeup by candidates. The Senator wants to pass a law against it. Obviously, however, legislation is not the main answer to fraudulent politics.

One thing is certain. Those now caught up in the business fail to see why there is any need for improvement. One of the group that helps prepare these programs, when queried about some of the practices, answered rather sharply: "You don't think anything about it when a Hollywood movie shows the star singing from the back of a horse. Yet you know he actually didn't sing on horseback. What's the difference?"

During the campaign last fall, this same group in the Republican congressional committee prepared for radio such visceral appeals as this 1-minute radio spot:

(Sound: printing presses.)

NEWS ANNOUNCER. Those are the printing presses of the Communist Party. Listen to them.

(Repeat: sound of presses.)

NEWS ANNOUNCER. The date is April 1954. Those printing presses are turning out the official Communist Party line.

MAN WITH RUSSIAN ACCENT (presumably Soviet official). Defeat the Republican congressional candidates in 1954. That is our order from Moscow. Return America to a New Deal type administration. Moscow orders that.

NEWS ANNOUNCER. Yes, that is the official blueprint for political action in the Communist Party, United States of America, that rolled off the presses in April 1954. Don't take orders from Moscow. Vote for a Republican Congress in 1955 and 1956. Vote Republican in November.

IMPRESSIONABLE PEOPLE

The President also told the radio and TV executives: "* * * with the television or with the radio, you put an appealing voice or an engaging personality in the living room of the home, where there are impressionable people from the ages of understanding on up. In many ways, therefore, the effect of your industry in swaying public opinion * * * particularly about burning questions of the moment, may be even greater than the press.

Of course the President is right again. But perhaps he should have addressed his appeal for responsibility to the politicians—beginning with those of his own party—as well as to the broadcasters.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier in this session I suggested that legislation is needed to assure the TV-viewing public a knowledge of what they are being shown on their TV screens when events and persons of public importance are involved. As a first step toward such basic honestly in televising public affairs, I introduced a bill to require an announcement, before a political TV broadcast, of whether the speaker is speaking extemporaneously or is reading from a hidden teleprompter or idiot board, and whether he is using special television makeup. This modest proposal has won some favorable attention from commentators who have also become concerned about the dangerous temptation to mix the illusions of entertainment into what purports to be factual reporting of events of public significance.

A few persons have misinterpreted my proposal as being one seeking to outlaw makeup, teleprompters, and other artificial aids to television performers; but I have tried to make it clear that I propose only a policy of adequate disclosure, and only with respect to broadcasts of political significance.

I repeat, Mr. President, that only the relative novelty of television could lead anyone to underestimate its potential impact on the political processes of a democracy such as ours, or to consider this a trivial problem.

The foundation of our theory of representative government has been the faith that the people could judge for themselves the ability and integrity of candidates for public office, and their willingness to state clearly and candidly their views on the important issues of the day. To this opportunity for popular judgment, television can obviously make an unparalleled constructive contribution, or a destructive one. If politicians' speeches are to be staged like comedians' jokes, and if public policies are to be merchandised like soap, we shall soon see the effects of a Gresham's law of politics, in which showmanship on the TV screen will take the place of statesmanship, and public officials will be chosen for histrionic aptitude by those who can afford to contribute the immense financial expense of a television buildup.

It is because of this threat to our democratic system, Mr. President, that I hope measures will soon be considered by the Federal Communications Commission and the Congress to set standards of honesty in television broadcasts of public affairs.

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

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

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. W. KERR SCOTT, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCOTT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; 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.

WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to direct my attention for a few moments to the vote which took place yesterday on wheat quotas. The newspapers of today feature some very fine articles on the results of the vote. There are several points which I believe need to be stressed, in order that a proper interpretation of what took place may be made.

I have before me the issue of the Washington Evening Star for Monday, June 27, which carries an Associated Press dispatch on the front page. The article is entitled "Vote for Wheat Quotas Amazes Farm Leaders." The subheadline reads: "Rigid Controls Okayed Decisively—$1.81 a Bushel Price Assured for 1956."

It is fair to say that there was a good deal of doubt as to whether the American wheat farmer would approve the new marketing quotas for the coming crop year, in view of the fact that the farmer had been called upon to take not only a drop in price but also an acreage reduction. Production has been cut severely for wheat farmers, and the price has dropped considerably in the past year and a half. In my opinion a great victory for American agriculture took place on June 25.

The Department of Agriculture expressed a position of neutrality on the wheat referendum. I was very much concerned about the neutrality of the Department, and so expressed myself on several occasions. I protested what I considered to be the failure of the leadership on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates and aides.

A year ago the Department of Agriculture was not very neutral on the subject of price supports. On the contrary, it took a rather vigorous and, I may say, effective position—effective, I will say, from the Department's point of view.

In recent statements of the Department concerning wheat quotas, the Department took a position of leaving it all up to the farmers themselves.

In the past week, after visiting farm leaders, I stated that if the wheat quota referendum were defeated, the whole structure of American agricultural price supports would be threatened, and that the economic results might very well be catastrophic.

It is reassuring, therefore, to note that in yesterday's vote the farmers not only were willing to accept controls, which they always said they would, but that they also acted decisively on the question of quotas. They were away out in front on the public opinion samplers of the Department of Agriculture, and I believe they are away out in front of Congress. The farmers are in desperate need of a sound price support program, and they know full well that they cannot expect one unless they are also willing to accept controls when there is overproduction or overplanting.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us not have any more comment to the effect that all the farmer wants is the unlimited right to plant and to harvest and to sell. The American farmers wants to get no more and no less than fair treatment. He is willing to accept restrictions and limitations if the good of the economy is involved. He is willing to accept severe acreage reductions and quota restrictions and limitations if it is necessary to do so in order to get a reasonable price for what he produces.

Regretfully, Mr. President, the wheat farmer was compelled in this instance to acknowledge his allegiance to a price-support program, even though that price-support program is inadequate.

Some farm organizations made it quite clear—for example, I refer to the National Farmers Union, which represents a large number of farmers—that if the quotas were turned down it would be a major blow against agricultural income and agricultural price supports. Those organizations made it quite clear that if the quotas were turned down, it would be in the nature of advice to Congress that farmers were not interested in an effective price-support program. Likewise, they made it clear—and when I say "they," I mean the leaders of those organizations, particularly of the National Farmers Union—that if farmers wished Congress to hear the voice of agriculture in a positive and direct way with reference to the need of an effective price-support program, they should vote in the wheat referendum for marketing quotas.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the story which I alluded to a few moments ago, which appears in the Washington Evening Star, and which is a feature story by the Associated Press. I should like to read a paragraph or two from it, and make some comments as I read the words:

> By a decisive majority, the Nation's wheat farmers have voted for tight controls on their next year's crop in return for a Government-guaranteed price averaging $1.81 a bushel.
>
> In doing so, the growers caused Secretary of Agriculture Benson to lay aside a proposal that they seek broader markets at home and abroad by offering the grain at considerably lower prices than would prevail otherwise.
>
> The heavy support given quotas came as a surprise to many farm leaders because advance reports from various producing areas had indicated a closer vote. These reports stressed farmer dissatisfaction with

sharp income reductions resulting from already imposed cutbacks in wheat production. Some growers had voiced the opinion that a new wheat program should be sought.

There has been speculation, too, that farmers would vote against quotas as a way of registering disapproval of the Eisenhower administration's flexible-support program under which Mr. Benson can set price props on most basic crops at between 75 and 90 percent of parity, depending on the size of supplies.

I should like to comment on that paragraph.

Apparently, the writer of that item is a good writer, but he does not quite understand American agriculture. The truth is that had this quota failed, price supports would have gone down to 50 percent. The farmers are not going to register disapproval of the farm program by making it less effective. The real story behind it is that the farmers of the Midwest, in particular—and I am very proud of my own State of Minnesota, where there was a much larger participation this year than last year, and where the farmers gave greater support this year than last year—felt that this was the only alternative they had, except to take little or nothing, namely, 50 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I issued a statement yesterday in reference to this vote of the farmers and I ask unanimous consent to have the statement incorporated 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:

WHEAT REFERENDUM STATEMENT

America's wheat growers have shown they have a better understanding of their problem than the present administration has. I am highly gratified by this overwhelming evidence of their willingness to cooperate in necessary production adjustments.

I hope the proper interpretation is put upon this vote. It is in no sense an endorsement of administration policies. Instead, it is a reflection on the growers' confidence in Congress changing such policies as now depriving them of decent prices. The facts cannot be ignored. Secretary Benson did not once encourage a favorable vote, in spite of the chaos that would have existed in all our farm programs if the quotas had been rejected. Instead, he encouraged a negative vote behind a veil of neutrality, by talking at the last minute about having a new wheat program ready to submit to the Congress. All the encouragement for a "yes" vote came from advocates of higher price supports, who pledged farmers a continuing fight for more effective supports. I consider this vote a mandate to the Congress to keep faith with our farmers, and match their willingness to cooperate in necessary production adjustments by restoring 90 percent of parity for the crop they produce within their quotas.

While growers were offered even lower support prices in return for approving quotas this year than last, they approved acceptance of quotas by an even larger percentage than last year. That doesn't in any sense mean acceptance of the lower support prices. It means instead an overwhelming rejection of those who have cried so long and loud about regimentation, in the hopes of fooling farmers into destroying the farm programs they have worked so many years to achieve.

Farmers have shown willingness to do their part toward production adjustments, despite every discouragement Secretary Benson has thrown in their path. Is Secretary Benson now willing to do his part by ending his crusade against effective price supports, and cooperating with the Congress in giving farmers decent prices for their more limited production?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite attention to the last paragraph of my statement, in which I said:

Farmers have shown willingness to do their part toward production adjustments, despite every discouragement Secretary Benson has thrown in their path. Is Secretary Benson now willing to do his part by ending his crusade against effective price supports, and cooperating with the Congress in giving farmers decent prices for their more limited production?

We are going to have an opportunity in this Congress, Mr. President, to rewrite the agricultural program. I say "rewrite" because I do not think we can afford merely to patch up what we have. The Agriculture Department is not doing the job it should do. Under its present policy the present administration is guilty of encouraging insolvency in agriculture, depression in agriculture, dropping of income in agriculture; and neither one of the alternatives is desirable.

I suggest that we direct our attention in the months ahead toward preserving the family-type farm pattern by an effective price-support program and by an improved credit program for the benefit of low-income farmers.

Finally, Mr. President, I suggest that the Department of Agriculture turn its attention now to the important task of furthering the sale and disposal of our usable surplus commodities. Much more can be done than has been done. While I have the floor, I should like to direct the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture to a study which I have made as to the use of surplus wheat by converting it into a palatable product which will be a substitute for rice in the rice-producting areas of the world. I have called it Boulgar wheat. Over the weekend it was my privilege to talk with processors of this particular type of wheat. We think it may be made useful to and edible for the peoples in the Near East and the Far East. If the administration would spend a little more time figuring out how it can package and sell this product, we would be making the progress we should be making in disposing of some of our surplus commodities.

I shall speak further on this subject and shall address communications to the Department, as I have done heretofore, and ask that they get off dead-center and quit talking about their problems and start talking about solutions. An administration which cannot figure out what to do with wheat, which the whole world needs, will be in trouble when it goes into conferences with the Bolsheviks. If they cannot solve this problem, how can they solve the problem of disarmament? If we cannot figure out what to do with a surplus of one of the greatest foods in the world, how can we successfully come to an agreement on disarmament with representatives of the Kremlin?

I suggest that as a token of good faith to the American people the Department of Agriculture spend a little time putting its best brains and best talent to the task of solving this problem, and if it has not enough talent at the present time, that it get some new talent to give attention to the matter, quit griping about the blessing of the fruits of the earth, and do more to create a better and more stable society.

CONVEYANCE OF TRACT OF LAND IN MACON COUNTY, GA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 564, House bill 2973.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2973) to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator for Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the bill. I am a little surprised that it is to be considered at this time. I thought we had succeeded pretty well in establishing the policy that Federal interest in property should receive some compensation by the taxpayers of the country from local governmental units. I think that here is a case in which the Morse formula, calling for 50 percent of the assessed fair market value of the reversionary interest, should be followed. I do not know what it is worth. I understand it is not worth very much. I have always insisted upon a uniform application of the Morse formula including transfers of property in my own State.

If the reversionary interest involved in this bill is worth only a small sum, the State of Georgia ought to pay 50 percent of it. It is a principle of fair compensation which we should protect. I refuse to believe that the great State of Georgia cannot raise a very small sum of money to pay 50 percent of the appraised fair-market value of this reversionary interest. I have had an interesting experience with this problem as I have discussed it around the country. I have found almost a unanimity of support of the principle of the Morse formula in the grassroots of America.

I remember the situation in a town in Oregon where I discussed the matter. The case involved one-fifth of an acre of land. I talked with the local authorities, and they said, "We did not understand the purpose of the Morse formula, but we would have been willing to pay 100 percent of the value of the one-fifth of an acre of land. It was land we needed to straighten out a street, and we were not seeking it for nothing." In that case Members of Congress thought they would win votes by trying to get it for nothing.

Of course, Mr. President, I cannot speak for Georgia, but I would be very

much surprised, if the responsible officials of Georgia had an opportunity to understand what the problem is all about, if they would not raise in some way, somehow, 50 percent of the appraised fair-market value of this reversionary interest.

I wish to be absolutely fair about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator should be apprised of the fact that this conveyance was made prior to the time the so-called Morse formula went into effect.

Mr. MORSE. I was about to talk about that when I said I wished to be perfectly fair about this.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon is far too good a lawyer to try to suggest something which is ex post facto.

Mr. MORSE. I am not applying the Morse formula to this case as something which is ex post facto.

Mr. RUSSELL. The reversionary interest in the land, if used for other than educational purposes, is about as ephemeral as a cloud. I do not think the Senator would find any person who would possibly pay $5 for the land. The Government would lose money trying to negotiate a sale under these circumstances.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Georgia is an excellent lawyer. Would that I were half so good. But I am good enough to know that I am not talking about something which is ex post facto. What I am talking about is a Federal reversionary interest in land the title to which is now vested in the Federal Government. There is nothing ex post facto about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Technically, the Senator is correct. But the real value involved had already been transferred prior to the time the Senator from Oregon enunciated his formula.

Mr. MORSE. I want to discuss that point, because I think the record must be made perfectly clear on it.

The property was conveyed prior to the general adoption by the Senate in 1946, with an exception now and then, of the Morse formula.

Ever since 1946, in most instances with some unfortunate exceptions, when the Morse formula has been circumvented by way of motion the Senate has required 50 percent of the fair appraised market value for the transfer to local governmental units for public purposes of the Federal interest in property in which it has reversionary interests.

The record is perfectly clear that that has been done in the case of reversionary interests.

But, as the Senator from Georgia points out, the original conveyance was to the school authorities of Georgia, with the reversionary clause relating to mineral rights reserved to the Federal Government. I think the Senator from Georgia is correct in his statement that the land probably is not of very much value. But who are we to be certain? I mention a hypothetical possibility. Suppose the Senate passed the bill this afternoon, and next week oil was found under the land. The Senator from Georgia would not then be heard to say that the reversionary interest was of little value. It might be of tremendous value.

Why have we rather consistently, in the transfer of Federal property, followed the policy of reserving the mineral rights in the Federal Government? It is because sometimes mineral deposits of great value are found.

I may also say good naturedly, and I am certain my friend from Georgia will enjoy this with me, that I am delighted to feel that I have won a recruit, in the person of the junior Senator from Georgia, in support of my long-proposed legislation for Federal aid to education, because the Senator from Georgia really is for Federal aid to education in principle in this bill. When all is said and done, the principle of Federal aid to education to the State of Georgia is represented by the bill. The reversion has value, if it be only one copper, and that value will be given to education in Georgia by the Federal Government as a form of Federal aid to education.

I might be sold on the principle of this bill if a uniform doctrine could be applied, under which all States would receive equality of treatment, and would not be dependent on whether a Senator introduced a bill in order to secure special consideraiton for his State.

Also, I would be less than fair to the Senator from Georgia if I did not frankly admit that we are dealing with a matter of small consequence, so far as materiality is concerned. But I think we are dealing with something of great consequence, so far as principle is concerned.

I simply cannot follow an inconsistent policy on the floor of the Senate in regard to this matter, even though I should like to accommodate the two Senators from Georgia so far as the material matter is concerned. The benefit will go to a school district. I support as a general policy aid to schools. Nevertheless, I simply cannot accommodate the Georgia Senators, because I think the bill would not result in uniform treatment of schools. I think it violates the principle of the Morse formula of which I have spoken.

I think we cannot be certain that an exception such as that which is proposed may not boomerang, because some day we may wake up to find that we gave away much more than we thought we were giving, in that oil or some other valuable mineral might be found under this land.

I have mentioned the fact that the bill involves a transfer which dates back to the early 1940's, around 1944 or 1945, when the Morse formula was not in effect. But that does not change the fact that what was retained by the Federal Government was a Federal property interest. I should have much preferred having the Senators from Georgia try to have the officialdom of Georgia find a way to pay 50 percent of the fair appraised market value of this reversionary interest. They not having done so, I must object, and I have to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk 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 may be rescinded.

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

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-17-55-A" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be conditional upon the Georgia State Board of Education agreeing to pay to the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, in return for the interests conveyed, an amount equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of such interests to be determined by the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration after appraisal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment speaks for itself. It is simply a clear statement that, whatever the reversionary interest is worth, the State of Georgia shall pay 50 percent of its appraised fair market value.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let the RECORD show that the Senator from Oregon voted against this giveaway bill.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 559, Senate 1713.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1713) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires the floor, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty and ever-blessed God, we are lifting our hearts unto Thee in adoration and gratitude, for Thou art the source of our blessings, the answer to our problems, and the goal of all our aspirations.

Grant that in these troubled days, when there is so much of tension and estrangement and sinister forces are trying to bring discord and division among the nations, we may know how to keep aglow the light of freedom and righteousness.

Help us to believe that Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace and that all things are working together for good if we seek to do Thy will, and all will be well when we are on Thy side.

Inspire us to hasten the coming of the time when there shall be peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 23, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions; and

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes.

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

S. 48. An act to provide for the disqualifications of certain former officers and employees of the District of Columbia in matters connected with former duties;

S. 182. An act to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia;

S. 256. An act to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association;

S. 665. An act to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 666. An act to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 972. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended;

S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located on property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions;

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 1391. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States;

S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes;

S. 1739. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes;

S. 1741. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 1855. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended;

S. 2171. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act so as to provide that upon the expiration of his term of office, a member of the Board shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified;

S. 2176. An act to repeal the requirement that public utilities engaged in the manufacture and sale of electricity in the District of Columbia must submit annual reports to Congress;

S. 2177. An act to repeal the prohibition against the declaration of stock dividends by public utilities operating in the District of Columbia; and

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution recognizing, on the occasion of her 75th birthday, June 27, 1955, the efforts of Miss Helen Keller in behalf of physically handicapped persons throughout the world.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6499) entitled "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."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1956

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRESTON, THOMAS, ROONEY, YATES, SHELLEY, FLOOD, CANNON, CLEVENGER, BOW, HORAN, MILLER of Maryland, and TABER.

THE DEBT LIMIT

By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. COOPER submitted a privileged report to accompany the bill (H. R. 6992) to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I call up the bill (H. R. 6992) to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill to extend the debt limit?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman explain what it proposes to do? Does it go beyond the $6 billion?

Mr. COOPER. It just proposes to extend the present limitation for one more year.

Mr. PATMAN. That is for the $6 billion additional over the $275 billion?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public-debt limit," approved August 28, 1954 (31 U. S. C., sec. 757b), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6992 would continue for another year the existing temporary $6 billion increase in the ceiling on the public debt. The present permanent statutory ceiling on the public debt is $275 billion. Last year the Congress enacted legislation increasing temporarily this ceiling by $6 billion, or to $281 billion, through this Thursday, June 30.

The Secretary of the Treasury appeared in public hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means recommending that this temporary increase of $6 billion be continued through June 30, 1956. This bill carrying out the request of the Secretary, was unanimously reported by our committee. During the public hearings the Secretary stated:

We have lived within the limits, but the basic problems are still with us. They are, in fact, even more acute their year than last. Their debt stood at $270.8 billion on June 30, 1954. On June 30 this year, it is expected to be almost $3 billion higher. Thus, the Treasury will have even less elbowroom to handle its seasonal borrowing needs in the months ahead under a $281 billion temporary limit than it did last year. Even more crucial will be the problem of getting the debt back to $275 billion by the close of the 1956 fiscal year.

The Secretary then assured the committee:

It is our firm intention to attempt to live under the present debt limit with this temporary extension. It is also our firm intention to have any temporary increase in debt back to the present limit of $275 billion by the end of the year on June 30, 1956.

As I stated, Mr. Speaker, this bill has the unanimous and bipartisan support of our committee. However, I must also say that it is regrettable that the present administration has not been able to balance the budget as it had promised to do. During the Presidential campaign in 1952, those of us who have had to face the problem of raising the money to finance the Government knew that the glib campaign promises which were being made of a balanced budget were more a matter of political convenience and opportunism than fiscal realism. The record of the Democratic Party is clear that we are just as interested in a balanced budget and the end of deficit financing as anyone else.

Regardless of the promises and the desire of a balanced budget, we are faced with the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury—who is responsible for managing the fiscal affairs of the Government—states that he needs the temporary $6 billion increase in the debt ceiling continued for another year. I am just as reluctant to increase, even temporarily, the ceiling on the public debt as any Member of the House, but under present circumstances, I do not feel that we have any choice other than to comply with the request of the Secretary.

We must remember that it is the Congress itself which has the final say-so in the amount of money which the Government is authorized to spend, and once expenditures have been authorized and commitments have been made, it is the obligation of the Congress to protect the fiscal integrity of the Government. I would like to point out that, although holding down the ceiling on the public debt is a very effective deterrent to expenditures, it is at best an indirect avenue to reduced expenditures and it may be a very direct avenue to impairing our internal strength.

The Secretary stated to the committee that the $6 billion increase in the ceiling to June 30, 1956, is a minimum. We must remember that it is in the first part of a fiscal year—that is, the period beginning July 1 and running to March—which is the crucial period in the management of the debt ceiling, because of the fact that our tax collections come into the Treasury predominantly in the latter part of the fiscal year. If we should not provide this temporary increase, it is possible that the permanent ceiling on the debt would be exceeded in the early fall. In order to preserve the fiscal integrity of the Government, a special session of the Congress might be necessary if we fail to act favorably on this legislation.

We must also remember that the Treasury needs to maintain a minimum balance of cash in order to provide some flexibility in fiscal operations.

I urge that the bill be passed.

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

Mr. COOPER. If I have time.

Mr. WIER. I wanted to express myself on this occasion if the bill is going to be taken up this afternoon. I voted against the increase at the last session and I am opposed to it today. I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to this action.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And speaking about balancing the budget, the Republican 83d Congress reduced taxes $7,500,000,000. Had that not been done would the budget have been balanced?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman take more time?

Mr. COOPER. I cannot have more time except by unanimous consent.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was trying to get the thing cleared up as to whether we would have a deficit if we had not reduced taxes $7,500,000,000. That was my first question.

The other question I was going to ask the gentleman from Tennessee was, how much would the debt be if we had put through the $20 individual tax reduction? I am just wondering what the deficit now would have been. It is amazing the way the gentleman speaks here this morning, for he sponsored the $20 reduction for everybody in the United States; so I just wondered what the deficit would be in case that kind of bill had gone through. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio can tell me if there would have been a reduction had they not had the reduction of $7,500,000,000. I voted for it according to good thinking. How near would we have come to balancing the budget?

Mr. JENKINS. We are nearer now than we have been for some time; there is no question about that.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield, answering the gentleman's first question the answer is, we would not.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota by his question indicated that he voted against the extension of the debt limit. I voted against the first one, but I am convinced that I might have been wrong then. At any rate I think that the debt limit with which we are dealing today should be allowed.

Today we are asking that this temporary debt limitation be extended. The Secretary of the Treasury came before the committee and made a statement, which was in line with his usual frankness and which shows him to be a statesman and financier. He presented a plan clearly and convincingly and thoroughly justified his claim for the extension of the debt limit. Extending of the debt limit does not mean that one extra cent will be spent; it does not call for the expenditure of any money. No money can be spent unless it passes through the Appropriations Committee and through the House and the Senate.

This immense country of ours would be in terrible shape if all of a sudden it should develop that somebody had presented a bill to the Government for goods sold or services rendered and that the Government had declined to pay it because of no funds. If it should develop that we could not pay our debts or obligations, and that this report was spread out over the country, nothing could injure us as much as that. Of course, I can argue with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] but there is no question but that the financial position of our country is better than it was 2 years ago or last year. It is better because business in the country is better. This matter before us now is not a po-

litical issue. It is a question of finances. Are we going to say to our Secretary of the Treasury: You may have this privilege to see to it, not that you are going to spend any more money, but see to it that our country will not be in the shape where it cannot pay its bills?

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

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If we did not spend $2 or $3 billion in foreign aid, could we or could we not balance the budget?

Mr. JENKINS. It would go far toward balancing the budget.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What are the estimated balances as of June 30 this year, the estimated unexpended balances held by the Government?

Mr. JENKINS. I cannot give the gentleman those exact figures.

Mr. GROSS. It is about 1 or 2 billion dollars.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe those figures represent approximately the cash balance on hand. However, I believe that the unexpended obligations which the Bureau of the Budget estimates will exist on June 30 amount to $59.3 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman anticipate that the next step will be to make this temporary increase permanent?

Mr. JENKINS. No. We only ask for it for 1 year. If conditions continue as they have, it may not be necessary next year. I am not making any promises because I do not run the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the Secretary of the Treasury say that it may be possible to squeak through with this extension and did not the Secretary of the Treasury ask that the debt ceiling be increased?

Mr. JENKINS. The Secretary of the Treasury makes the finest appearance before our committee of nearly anybody. He comes before our committee, especially in connection with these financial matters and speaks frankly because he knows. He tells us what is going on. As I said in my first statement, this however does not give him the power to spend money.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the finances of the country, not about the appearance of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6992 extends for 1 more year the present temporary $281 billion debt limit. It does not provide any permanent increase in the debt ceiling. It does not affect the present permanent limit of $275 billion. It simply continues on a temporary basis the $6 billion increase provided last year. All this does in effect is to give the Treasury a reasonable leeway in dealing with periodic fluctuations in Government income and outgo. It is anticipated that the permanent debt will be approximately the same at the termination of the proposed extension as it is today.

The administration has made a great achievement in bringing the debt under control. The fact that the total debt has not been reduced is not a true measure of this very real accomplishment. The public debt has been held at approximately an even level while at the same time the Nation's economy has undergone the greatest growth in our history. The amount of the debt today represents a far smaller proportion of the gross national product, of total personal income, and of other recognized indices of the economy than it did when the present administration took office. The tremendous expansion which our economy is now undergoing is being achieved without reliance on deficit financing. It is being achieved without the stimulus of inflation. In other words, our present economic growth is real and not a paper growth alone. This fact is borne out by recent statistics which have shown that the cost of living index has remained relatively stable since 1953 while take-home pay has risen appreciably.

Mr. Speaker, these facts are tremendously significant. They are the true measure of the fiscal accomplishments of the present administration. In the face of this magnificent record, we can have full confidence in the continued sound management by the administration of the public debt. I strongly urge that this bill be adopted as reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that this bill should be rushed to the House floor this afternoon without prior notice to the Members.

I will oppose this extension as I did the temporary increase a year ago. I said then that this procedure is the sure road to fiscal irresponsibility and folly; that the answer to financial stability on the part of the Federal Government is reduced spending, not steadily increasing debt.

The Presidential budget has estimated that as of the close of this fiscal year, June 30, 1955, the Government will have unexpended balances totaling some $82 billion. This Member of Congress insists that before there is an extension of the debt ceiling, and certainly before an increase is given the slightest consideration, that these unexpended balances be drastically reduced. Congress has no real control over spending as long as these huge authorizations are outstanding but unexpended.

A $275 billion direct debt, much less $281 billion, is far more than this Nation should owe. But this is only part of the story for the Federal Government has additional contingent liabilities totaling some $250 billion, largely in the form of guaranteed and insured loans.

Time after time have I warned of the devastating effects of deficit spending upon the value of the dollar. Nothing has contributed more since 1940 to inflation and loss of purchasing power than the billions that have been expended by the Federal Government over and above income.

Instead of extending and increasing the debt ceiling, there must be spending within income—a balanced budget—and ultimate reduction of the Federal debt.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa, if it is any consolation to him, that the Secretary of the Treasury in appearing before our committee said he was asking for $281 billion because he was asking for a temporary extension. However, he said that if he were asking for a permanent extension he would ask for $290 billion. We tried to find out why he asked for $281 billion on a temporary basis and $290 billion on a permanent basis. He gave us no answer. I do not know whether there is any answer to the question. I asked him whether he anticipated that the national debt would increase to $290 billion under the Republican administration in the years immediately ahead and he refused to answer that question. He is asking for $281 billion as a temporary extension but he would prefer to have $290 billion as a permanent extension. I offer this information for whatever consolation it may give.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is this not a correct statement of the picture or position we are in, and I refer to the country as a whole. Brushing aside the fact that the promise of a balanced budget has not materialized, that promise having been broken, and brushing aside the promise of a reduced national debt, which has not been carried out and has been broken also, the fact remains that we are in the position where this action today is necessary in the fiscal integrity of our country?

Mr. McCARTHY. We are within five or six hundred million dollars of the ceiling now. The debt is approximately $274.6 billion with the permanent ceiling at $275 billion. In order to conduct the business of the Government this increase on a temporary basis is necessary. It seems to me that the Secretary should have asked for a larger increase since when he came in a year ago the national debt was about $271 billion, and he settled for $281 billion as necessary to conduct the business of Government. Unless the administration has in mind devices such as certificates of interest and other kinds of outside financing devices which will not show in the record, it seems to me he should have asked for a $10 billion increase to allow for operation of the Government this year as he did last year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is it true or is it not that the budget estimates balances of approximately $82 billion as of June 30 of this year?

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the gentleman mean unexpended funds?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. McCARTHY. But obligated. They are obligated.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand that all these balances are all obligated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, I understand they are all obligated or at least appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman recall the testimony before the committee on that?

Mr. McCARTHY. We discussed the matter of the obligated funds, obligated by the last Congress and of earlier Congresses, but there was some discussion of the obligations inherited by this administration when it took over. It was indicated that the financial condition of the country would not be so bad but for this inheritance. We could not get a statement from the Secretary as to which of those old obligations the administration would have repudiated if it could have repuidiated them.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree that this debt situation is a timely topic of discussion, coming as it does only a day before consideration of the multibillion dollar foreign giveaway bill?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—ayes 267, nays 56, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

AYES—267

Addonizio
Albert
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Bowler
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Buchanan
Budge
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrnes, Wis.
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chase
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clevenger
Cole
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Gary
George
Gordon
Green, Oreg.
Gregory
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Minshall
Morano
Moss
Murray, Ill.
Natcher
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Richards
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sadlak
Saylor
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Short
Sieminski
Siler
Simpson, Pa.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—56

Abbitt
Abernethy
Andrews
Ashmore
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Fla.
Brooks, Tex.
Cannon
Carlyle
Celler
Chelf
Colmer
Dies
Dorn, S. C.
Evins
Flynt
Gavin
Gentry
Grant
Griffiths
Gross
Haley
Hand
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Jones, N. C.
Kilgore
Krueger
Landrum
Mason
Mollohan
Multer
Murray, Tenn.
Passman
Phillips
Poff
Preston
Rhodes, Pa.
Robeson, Va.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
Shuford
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Staggers
Thomas
Tuck
Utt
Weaver
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Winstead
Wright

NOT VOTING—111

Adair
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Barden
Barrett
Becker
Bentley
Blitch
Boland
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Boykin
Buckley
Burdick
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Chatham
Clark
Davidson
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger
Donovan
Dowdy
Doyle
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Fine
Fino
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gathings
Granahan
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Halleck
Harrison, Nebr.
Heselton
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holt
Holtzman
Horan
Jackson
James
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Kee
King, Pa.
Klein
Knox
Knutson
Laird
Lesinski
Lovre
McConnell
McDowell
McGregor
McIntire
Mack, Ill.
Magnuson
Mailliard
Martin
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N. Y.
Morgan
Morrison
Moulder
Mumma
Nelson
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Konski
Polk
Powell
Quigley
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Riehlman
Rivers
Robsion, Ky.
Roosevelt
St. George
Scherer
Sheppard
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Vanik
Van Pelt
Velde
Wainwright
Williams, N. J.
Wilson, Calif.
Withrow
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mrs. Blitch with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Polk with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Lovre.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Bosch.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Broyhill.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Williams of New Jersey with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Davis of Tennesse with Mr. James.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Hagen with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. FLYNT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6239) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other ac-

tivities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RABAUT, PASSMAN, NATCHER, CANNON, WILSON of Indiana, JAMES, and TABER.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the so-called foreign-aid bill.

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

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE TRADE AGREEMENT REVISION ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6059, the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOPER, DINGELL, MILLS, JENKINS, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

SILLIMAN EVANS

Mr. PRIEST. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow and regret that I announce the death yesterday of Silliman Evans, publisher of the Nashville Tennessean. Mr. Evans passed away in Fort Worth, Tex., where he had gone to attend the funeral of another great publisher and his lifelong friend, Mr. Amon Carter.

In the passing of Mr. Evans, American journalism has lost one of its most vigorous, progressive, and courageous publishers.

He became publisher of the Tennessean in 1937 after a varied experience, including a period when he served as Washington correspondent of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram. His experience as a working newspaperman was brought to bear in the publication of the Tennessean, and under his direction that paper became nationally known as a progressive and fearless journal, dedicated to the public good.

Mr. Evans was a man of strong convictions which he defended with vigor and consistency. He believed that when given the facts the American people always will make the choice that is best for their own welfare.

He was a man of great energy and his interests included a wide range of subjects affecting the public welfare. The impact of his vision was felt in many areas far removed from the borders of Tennessee.

As a former member of the staff of the Tennessean, I join his many friends in extending deepest sympathy to his family and loved ones.

SALK ANTI-POLIO VACCINE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. 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 gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to have the Federal Government purchase sufficient quantities of the Salk antipolio vaccine to provide for the innoculation of all of the children in the United States under the age of 20.

The vaccine so purchased would be turned over to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for allocation and distribution by the foundation, but under the general supervision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But it would be up to the national foundation—and, of course, that is the logical organization to have that authority and responsibility—to see to it that all of the children get this vaccine in the most equitable and efficient manner, deciding where it is needed most geographically and which age groups should have it first, and so on. The inoculations would be free. This is an idea on which I have been working since May 13 when Dr. Scheele appeared before us in the Banking and Currency Committee. I think it is the best approach.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ASHLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to meet during general debate in the House this week.

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

There was no objection.

HELEN KELLER'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. ELLIOTT. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, today is Helen Keller's birthday.

This remarkable woman, stricken deaf and blind in infancy, has for more than 50 years tirelessly devoted herself to the battle for the economic, cultural, and social advancement of the physically handicapped throughout the world.

Her conquest of her own physical disabilities is a symbol of hope for millions.

Alabama, Helen Keller's native State, shares the pride that people all over the Nation feel in the accomplishments of this great woman.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader what program is contemplated for the balance of the week, if he is prepared to give us the information at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of the bills that will be taken up by the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the military construction authorization act will be the next order of business. And the termination of that bill, and if a rule is reported out, which is expected, the Foreign Operations Act will be the next order of business. Of course, on tomorrow we will have the conference report on the extension of the Selective Service Act, with the doctors provision therein. That will

be the first order of business tomorrow. In between, if necessary, conference reports can be taken up and any continuing resolutions which must be acted upon before June 30.

Following that, there is the atomic energy authorization bill, which if it can be brought up today, it will be, there is the military reserve bill, there is the housing bill, there is the social security amendments of 1955, and then the Mexican labor bill extending the Agricultural Act of 1949.

I realize that is a very stiff program, but I am programing it in the event we can bring those bills up during this coming week.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I did not hear the gentleman say when the mutual security bill would be brought up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Immediately after the passage of the military construction authorization act, but if that bill should pass today, not until tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is there any reason why the mutual security bill must be brought up tomorrow and why it could not be brought up later in the week? The reason I ask the question, as I understand the hearings are not yet available to the Members of the House, and there are some of us who would like to take a look at the figures and the justifications for those figures in this bill, and we will not have an opportunity by tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have announced that before, and I will announce it again. The leadership must have in mind that we want to get through here as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am wondering if something else could not be substituted for tomorrow so that the membership would be in a little better position to consider it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could, but I am constrained to answer my friend from Mississippi that I cannot, because the appropriation bill for FOA cannot come up until after the authorization bill is passed. So, we have got to keep that in mind in connection with the adjournment of this session of the Congress. Now, if we get this bill out of the way, there is a reasonable chance of Congress adjourning a week or 10 days earlier than it otherwise would adjourn, if we wait until later in the week. So, much as I would like to comply with the gentleman's suggestion, I am constrained to say that I am unable to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman understands I make the suggestion merely in the interest of intelligent legislating.

Mr. McCORMACK. I could never conceive of the gentleman making any suggestion on any other premise than that.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Has the gentleman stated whether we are likely to be in session Saturday or not, because a good many of us have commitments at home over this particular weekend.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would feel more pleasant if the gentleman would ask me that question Wednesday.

Mr. JUDD. It is pretty hard to make plans that late.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that, but it is very difficult for me even to project myself 2 days. I can assure the gentleman that the leadership will do everything possible to get away as early as possible this week, and definitely has in mind this coming weekend. However, I cannot make a definite commitment, but I will assure my friend I have that prominently in mind. And, I recognize that next Monday is July 4, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has some other thoughts in mind which he will take up with the leadership on the gentleman's side, having in mind justifiable considerations of the Members over the coming weekend who have speaking engagements and other problems confronting them on July 4.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I hope we will work early and late these first 5 days so that those of us who have to go a long distance will have an opportunity to plan in advance.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SPECIAL SERVICES COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5892) to authorize officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia voluntarily to perform certain services on their time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty and to receive compensation therefor, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Special Services Compensation Act."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Chief of Police and the Fire Chief may permit officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as the case may be, to volunteer for assignment to perform duty for the protection of the public at, on, and about the licensed premises referred to in paragraphs 20 (a), 20 (c), and 23 (a) of section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902, as added by the act approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1109; secs. 47–2320 (a) and (c) and 47–2323 (a), D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), and in title II of this act, on their time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty. For such purpose the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief, respectively, are authorized to compile and maintain registers of the names of those officers and members of such force and such department who volunteer for assignment to perform such duty. Assignments to such duty of those officers and members whose names appear on such registers shall be made on an equitable basis. To the maximum extent practicable, officers and members assigned to such duty shall be selected from among those who volunteer.

SEC. 102. Each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia performing such duty voluntarily on time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty shall be entitled to receive for each hour of such duty, compensation at the respective basic hourly salary rate in effect for each such officer and member on the first day of the month in which such duty is performed, in lieu of any other regular or additional compensation provided by law.

SEC. 103. Each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia performing such duty on time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty shall be entitled to all rights, benefits, and privileges, and shall be subject to all obligations and duties to which he is entitled or to which he is subject on any period of regular duty, except as otherwise provided herein.

SEC. 104. The compensation paid under this act to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia (1) shall not be considered as salary for the purpose of computing retirement compensation or relief payments under section 12 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1916, as amended (secs. 4–301—4–517, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), and (2) shall not be subject to deduction as provided in section 5 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930, as amended (sec. 4–504, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.).

SEC. 105. For the purpose of this act the term "basic hourly salary rate" means one-eightieth of the basic biweekly salary rate.

SEC. 106. There is hereby authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund account to be known as the Policemen and Firemen's Special Services Fund. All fees and advances required to be paid by the second subparagraph of paragraph 20 (a), the second proviso in paragraph 20 (c), and the second subparagraph of paragraph 23 (a), respectively, of section 7 of such act approved July 1, 1902, as added by the act approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1109), and by title II of this act, shall be deposited to the credit of such fund and shall be available only for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia for services voluntarily performed on time off

from regularly scheduled tours of duty as provided in this act; for refund of unearned and excess fees and advances, and for transfer as provided in section 108 of this act.

SEC. 107. No person shall be entitled to compensation pursuant to this act for the same period of time for which he is entitled to compensation as provided in the act approved August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 447) as amended (sec. 4-904, supp. III, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 108. In the event there are not sufficient volunteers, other officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and of the fire department of the District of Columbia who are on duty may be assigned when deemed necessary by the chief of police or the fire chief, as the case may be, to perform duty as provided in section 101 of this act. Such officers and members of such force and such department shall be paid their regular compensation out of funds appropriated to such force and department, respectively, but the amount of the fee for their service shall be transferred from the trust fund established by this act and deposited to the credit of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Armory Board established by the act approved June 4, 1948 (62 Stat. 339; sec. 2-1702, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) shall, when it leases or rents the District of Columbia National Guard Armory, or any part thereof, for the secondary purposes as set out in such act, be regarded as manager of a building or premises subject to the second proviso in paragraph 20 (c) of section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902, as added by section 2 of the act approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1109; sec. 47-2320 (c), D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "added" and insert "amended."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "secs. 4-301" and insert "secs. 4-501."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, in the 80th Congress, Public Law 837 was enacted, which gave the chief of the fire department and the chief of the police department authority to post police and firemen at, on, or about licensed places in the District of Columbia for the protection of the public. These licensed places have always paid the charges for the police and fire protection. However, the men used in such details have been drawn from the regularly assigned police and firemen. There are 4 such licensed places in the District of Columbia who regularly use men from the police and fire departments and who reimburse the District of Columbia Government. These 4 places are Turner's Arena, Uline Arena, Griffith Stadium and Constitution Hall. The only purpose in the proposed legislation in H. R. 5892 is to also make the charges for police and fire protection applicable to the Armory, which has always been exempt from paying for such police and fire protection the same as other similar concerns in the District of Columbia.

The bill would also permit a pool of volunteers to be made from off duty police and firemen, who would be assigned to perform such duties at the pleasure of the chief of fire department and the chief of the police department. Charges for such services would be paid by the licensed businesses to the commissioners of the District of Columbia, where it would be set up in a trust fund and paid to the employees who perform such services.

During the fiscal year 1954 in policing the licensed businesses enumerated under this bill a total of 13,451 man-hours was taken from regularly assigned policemen in the District of Columbia and diverted to these licensed places at a cost of approximately $30,091.62. If the proposed legislation is enacted 13,451 additional man hours will be available to the police department and these extra detail duties will be covered by off-duty policemen.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department and many other public-spirited citizens.

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.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6259) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948 (sec. 2-1706, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking the proviso in the fifth sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the Disbursing Officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Armory Board, upon requisitions previously approved by the Accounting Officer of the District of Columbia, sums of money not to exceed $11,000 at any one time to be used for office and sundry expenses of the Armory Board, including use for change-making purposes: *Provided further*, That, an amount not to exceed $3,000 in any fiscal year shall be available for promotional expenses in the furtherance of the secondary purposes of this act, and the certificate of the Armory Board shall be sufficient voucher for such expenditure.".

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of explaining the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is twofold. First it provides that the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Armory Board, upon requisitions previously approved by the accounting officer of the District of Columbia, sums of money not to exceed $11,000 at any one time to be used for office and sundry expenses of the Armory Board, including use for changemaking purposes.

Under existing law the Armory Board may not have on hand a sum in excess of $1,000 and because of the fact that the Armory Board was compelled, in the protection of its own interests, to supervise and control the sale of tickets at the Armory when paid admissions are charged for entrance to activities, it became necessary to furnish a change fund of considerable size. Prior to the beginning of the fiscal year 1954, this change fund was furnished by the ticket-sale contractor, for which he was paid a nominal fee. Subsequent to June 30, 1953, the contractor refused to continue furnishing this fund, and it was necessary, therefore, that the fund be furnished by the Armory Board.

The second provision of the bill sets up an amount not to exceed $3,000 in any fiscal year, which shall be available for promotional expenses in the furtherance of the secondary purposes of this act. There is keen competition among municipal and civic auditoriums, armories, and arenas in large cities for contracts from reputable national organizations and producers of well-known shows for conventions, expositions, trade shows, theaters, banquets, and so forth. To obtain this business the manager must engage in a certain amount of promotional activities designed to convince the other parties of the advantages of the District of Columbia Armory for their events and activities.

This legislation has the approval of the District of Columbia Armory Board, of which the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is an active member.

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.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6574) to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended (sec. 40-102, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence of subsection (d) of said section the following: "The owner selling or otherwise transferring such vehicle or trailer may register another motor vehicle or trailer for the unexpired portion of the registration year upon payment of a fee of $1 and a sum equal to the difference between the registration fee originally paid and the fee computed for such other motor vehicle or trailer under section 3, in case the latter is the greater."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of explaining the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to reestablish the former fee of $1 for the transfer of motor vehicle registration plates from one vehicle to another during the course of a registration year in the District of Columbia. Such a transfer fee was provided for in section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), but last year in title VI of "An act to authorize the financing of a program of public works construction for the District of Columbia," new flat fees for motor vehicle registration were established, and provision for the $1 transfer fee was stricken out—section 601, public law 364, 83d Congress. The old registration fee consisted of a weight tax—$5, $8, or $12 depending on the weight of the vehicle; a personal property tax of $2 per $100 of valuation of the vehicle, and an inspection fee of $1. The new fees, eliminating the weight tax and personal property tax on motor vehicles, are now $22 for vehicles weighing less than 3,500 pounds and $32 for vehicles weighing over 3,500 pounds. The $1 inspection fee is added in each instance. In both the old and new fees, provision was made for a mid-year reduction of 50 percent in the weight tax and new flat fees. Under the old fee system, the motor vehicle property tax was reduced one-twelfth with the passing of each month.

Elimination of the $1 transfer fee has resulted in many complaints, particularly from persons who had already paid the year's registration fee and who upon trading in the old car for a new car, learned that the full registration fee—new flat fee—for a year or half year would have to be paid again.

An example of operation of the new law: The owner of a 1946 small car—under 3,500 pounds—registered his car and paid $23—a $22 registration fee and $1 inspection fee, during March 1955, for the registration year beginning April 1, 1955. One month later he trades in the 1946 car on a newer model, say a 1953 small car, and in transferring his registration plates from the 1946 car to the 1953 car, he finds that under the new law, just a month later, he must pay another $23 fee, in lieu of the old $1 transfer fee.

Explanation that payment of another registration fee is in lieu of the former personal property tax and transfer fee has failed to satisfy the public, and the committee is of the opinion that fairness compels restoration of the $1 transfer fee. An examination of State laws discloses that nominal fees, 25 cents to $1.50, are charged for the transfer of motor vehicle registration plates in 37 States.

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.

HOSPITAL CENTER AND FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5852) to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill, S. 666, which is similar to the bill H. R. 5852, and consider the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897), as amended, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities to private agencies in the District of Columbia, to provide a basis for repayment to the Government by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," is further amended by substituting "June 30, 1957" for "June 30, 1955."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of explaining the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed bill is part of the legislative program for 1955 of the General Services Administration. It does not involve the expenditure of any funds. It removes a technical objection to the consideration of subsequent requests for appropriations, within the amount originally authorized, by extending from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1957, the period of authorization of appropriations.

Authorization of appropriations of $35 million for the period ending June 30, 1952, for the construction of a hospital center and the making of grants for hospital facilities in the District of Columbia was contained in section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946, in 60th United States Statutes at Large, page 897. By the act of June 28, 1952, in 66th United States Statutes at Large, page 288, the period was extended to June 30, 1955.

An administrative limitation of $21,700,000 was established on the total authorization for the purpose of construction of the hospital center. The sum of $2,200,000 was appropriated for the purpose by the Independent Offices Appropriations Acts of 1948 and 1949, in 61st United States Statutes at Large, page 595, and 62d United States Statutes at Large, page 184, and a contract authorization of $19,500,000 was made by the latter act. An appropriation of $19,500,000 was made by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, in 68th United States Statutes at Large, page 682, to liquidate a portion of the contract authorization.

On November 10, 1954, contracts were awarded to the Standard Construction Co., Inc., and Westinghouse Electric Corp., elevator division, respectively, for the construction of the hospital center and installation of the elevators.

During 1955 this agency will seek an appropriation of $9,700,000 to be available for the fiscal year 1956, to liquidate an additional portion of the contract authorization. During 1956 this agency will seek an appropriation of $5,300,000, to be available during the fiscal year 1957, to complete liquidation of the contract authorization.

During the fiscal year 1955 this agency will also seek a further appropriation of $1,610,000 for grant purposes, which is within the amount originally authorized for appropriations, occasioned by the addition of the Georgetown University Hospital to the list of facilities eligible for assistance.

Section 6 of the amended act should accordingly be further amended to conform with the proposed making of appropriations for hospital purposes during fiscal year 1956 and, to take care of any delay which may occur at the end of that year, during fiscal year 1957.

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.

H. R. 5852 was laid on the table.

PRACTICE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5853) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 870; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended (a) by striking from the first sentence thereof the words "shall have been a bona fide resident of said District for 3 years last past before appointment, and each, during said period," and (b) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the words "for a period of 3 years immediately prior to such appointment."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the said act of February 1, 1907, is amended (a) by striking "some veterinary college authorized by law to confer the same, which college shall require at least 2 sessions of study of veterinary medicine of not less than 6 months each prior to the issue of such diploma, and graduates of 2-year colleges shall accompany their diplomas by satisfactory evidence that they have practiced veterinary medicine for 5 years last past subsequent to the issue of such diplomas," and inserting in lieu thereof "a veterinary college having a curriculum equivalent to that required by the American Veterinary Medical Association Council on Education for approved schools and authorized by law to confer said diploma, which college shall require at least 4 sessions of study of veterinary medicine of not less than 9 months each prior to the issue of such diploma," and (b) by striking from the fifth

sentence the words "in January, April, July, and October of each year," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at least once a year."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. May I say for the benefit of the House that all eight of these bills were cleared from the Committee on the District of Columbia unanimously. That is the reason no one over here is objecting or asking for any time, in order to expedite matters.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to accomplish the following:

First. Remove the present requirement that each member of the board of examiners in veterinary medicine be a bona fide resident of said District for 3 years last past before appointment.

Second. Increase the course of study required of licensees to four 9-month college sessions, in place of the present requirement of the two 6-month college sessions.

Third. Delete the provisions in existing law relative to the licensing of graduates of 2-year colleges who have had 5 years' practice.

Fourth. Provide for holding examinations at least once a year, in lieu of the present requirement that examinations be held in January, April, July, and October of each year.

This legislation was introduced at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

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.

MENTAL DISORDER AS A CRIMINAL DEFENSE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6585) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 927 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (sec. 24–301, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 927. (a) Whenever a person is arrested, indicted, charged by information, or is charged in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, for or with an offense and, prior to the imposition of sentence or prior to the expiration of any period of probation, it shall appear to the court from the court's own observations, or from prima facie evidence submitted to the court, that the accused is of unsound mind or is mentally incompetent so as to be unable to understand the proceedings against him or properly to assist in his own defense, the court may order the accused committed to the District of Columbia General Hospital or other mental hospital designated by the court, for such reasonable period as the court may determine for examination and observation by the psychiatric staff of said hospital. If, after such examination and observation, the superintendent of the hospital, in the case of a mental hospital, or the chief psychiatrist of the District of Columbia General Hospital, in the case of District of Columbia General Hospital, shall report that in his opinion the accused is of unsound mind or mentally incompetent, such report shall be sufficient to authorize the court to commit by order the accused to a hospital for the mentally ill unless the accused or the Government objects, in which event, the court, after hearing without a jury, shall make a judicial determination of the competency of the accused to stand trial. If the court shall find the accused to be then of unsound mind or mentally incompetent to stand trial, the court shall order the accused confined to a hospital for the mentally ill.

"(b) Whenever an accused person confined to a hospital for the mentally ill is restored to mental competency in the opinion of the superintendent of said hospital, the superintendent shall certify such fact to the clerk of the court in which the indictment, information, or charge against the accused is pending and such certification shall be sufficient to authorize the court to enter an order thereon adjudicating him to be competent to stand trial, unless the accused or the Government objects, in which event, the court, after hearing without a jury, shall make a judicial determination of the competency of the accused to stand trial.

"(c) When any person tried upon an indictment or information for an offense, or tried in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for an offense, is acquitted solely on the ground that he was insane at the time of its commission, that fact shall be set forth by the jury in their verdict.

"(d) If any person tried upon an indictment or information for an offense, or tried in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for an offense, is acquitted solely on the ground that he was insane at the time of its commission, the court shall order such person to be confined in a hospital for the mentally ill.

"(e) Where any person has been confined in a hospital for the mentally ill pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, and the superintendent of such hospital certifies (1) that such person has recovered his sanity, (2) that he will not in the reasonable future be dangerous to himself or others, and (3) in the opinion of the superintendent, the person is entitled to his unconditional release from the hospital, and such certificate is filed with the clerk of the court in which the person was tried, and a copy thereof served on the United States attorney or the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia, whichever office prosecuted the accused, such certificate shall be sufficient to authorize the court to order the unconditional release of the person so confined from further hospitalization at the expiration of 15 days from the time said certificate was filed and served as above; but the court in its discretion may, or upon objection of the United States or the District of Columbia shall, after due notice, hold a hearing at which evidence as to the mental condition of the person so confined may be submitted, including the testimony of one or more psychiatrists from said hospital. The court shall weigh the evidence and, if the court finds that such person has recovered his sanity and will not in the reasonable future be dangerous to himself or others, the court shall order such person unconditionally released from further confinement in said hospital. If the court does not so find, the court shall order such person returned to said hospital. Where, in the judgment of the superintendent of such hospital, a person confined under subsection (d) above is not in such condition as to warrant his unconditional release, but is in a condition to be conditionally released under supervision, and such certificate is filed and served as above provided, such certificate shall be sufficient to authorize the court to order the release of such person under such conditions as the court shall see fit at the expiration of 15 days from the time such certificate is filed and served pursuant to this section: *Provided*, That the provisions as to hearing prior to unconditional release shall also apply to conditional releases, and, if, after a hearing and weighing the evidence, the court shall find that the condition of such person warrants his conditional release, the court shall order his release under such conditions as the court shall see fit, or, if the court does not so find, the court shall order such person returned to such hospital.

"(f) When an accused person shall be acquitted solely on the ground of insanity and ordered confined in a hospital for the mentally ill, such person and his estate shall be charged with the expense of his support in such hospital.

"(g) Nothing herein contained shall preclude a person confined under the authority of this section from establishing his eligibility for release under the provisions of this section by a writ of habeas corpus.

"(h) The provisions of this section shall supersede in the District of Columbia the provisions of any Federal statutes or parts thereof inconsistent with this section."

SEC. 2. Section 928 of such act approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 928. Any person while serving sentence of any court of the District of Columbia for crime, in a District of Columbia penal institution, and who, in the opinion of the Director of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia, is mentally ill, shall be referred by such Director to the psychiatrist functioning under section 405 of title IV of the act approved June 29, 1953 (67 Stat. 105; sec. 24–106, Supp. III, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), and if such psychiatrist certifies that the person is mentally ill, this shall be sufficient to authorize the Director to transfer such person to a hospital for the mentally ill to receive the same treatment as other patients during the continuance of his illness."

SEC. 3. Section 929 of such act approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 929. (a) When any person confined in a hospital for the mentally ill, charged with crime and subject to be tried therefor, shall be found competent to stand trial in the opinion of the superintendent of such hospital, the superintendent shall certify such fact to the clerk of the court in which the indictment, information, or charge is pending, in accordance with the procedure specified in section 927 of this act, and deliver such person to the court according to its proper precept.

"(b) When any person confined in a hospital for the mentally ill while serving sentence shall be restored to mental health within the opinion of the superintendent of the hospital, the superintendent shall certify such facts to the Director of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia and such certification shall be sufficient to deliver such person to such Director according to his request."

SEC. 4. The act entitled "An act relating to the testimony of physicians in the courts of the District of Columbia," received by the President May 13, 1896 (29 Stat. 138; sec. 14–308, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"That in the courts of the District of Columbia no physician or surgeon shall be permitted, without the consent of the person afflicted, or of his legal representative, to disclose any information, confidential in its nature, which he shall have acquired in

attending a patient in a professional capacity and which was necessary to enable him to act in that capacity, whether such information shall have been obtained from the patient or from his family or from the person or persons in charge of him: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to evidence in criminal cases where the accused is charged with causing death of, or inflicting injuries upon a human being, and the disclosure shall be required in the interests of public justice: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to evidence relating to the mental competency or sanity of an accused in criminal trials where the accused raises the defense of insanity, or in the pretrial or posttrial proceedings involving any criminal case where a question arises concerning the mental condition of an accused or convicted person.".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "observation", insert the phrase "and for care and treatment if such is necessary."

On page 3, line 25, after the word "that", strike out the word "he" and insert the following: "in the opinion of the Superintendent, such person."

On page 6, line 13, after the word "receive", strike out the words "the same" and substitute the words "care and."

On page 6, line 14, strike out the words "as other patients" and add the word "mental" prior to the word "illness."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to public law 85 of the 83d Congress, approved June 29, 1953, a Council on Law Enforcement of the District of Columbia was set up to make a continuing study and appraisal of crime and law enforcement in the District of Columbia and to make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the beginning of each session of Congress. On October 25, 1954, the Council on Law Enforcement of the District of Columbia appointed a committee on mental disorder as a criminal defense to study and report on the substantive and procedural law of the District of Columbia bearing on mental disorder as a defense in a criminal prosecution.

After a great deal of study this committee, under date of April 25, 1955, submitted a report in which they recommended this proposed legislation, which is explained below in a section by section analysis.

Section 1 provides that this section supersedes in the District of Columbia the provisions of any other statutes wherever inconsistent therewith. The purpose of this is to assure that there be prima facie evidence before the court to support a motion to commit the accused for mental observation. This reestablishes the rule in effect in this jurisdiction prior to the decision in the Wear case.

Second. To authorize the court to commit for treatment a person found insane or incompetent to stand trial by the psychiatric staff of a mental hospital, but reserving to the accused the right to a judicial determination to determine sanity or competency if he so desires. This is designed to speed up procedures without prejudicing the accused.

Third. To permit the court to order to trial an accused who had been found incompetent to stand trial on the basis of a certificate from the superintendent of the hospital that the accused has recovered, except in case where the accused or the Government objects, in which case a judicial determination, after hearing without a jury would be required. This is designed to avoid the burden of a judicial hearing and determination unless the accused or the Government desires it.

Fourth. To provide that in every case where an accused is found not guilty of a crime solely by reason of insanity he shall be confined in a hospital for the mentally ill. This is designed to protect the public against the immediate unconditional release of accused persons who have been found not responsible for a crime solely by reason of insanity.

Fifth. To provide that a person who has been held not responsible for a crime by reason of insanity and committed to a hospital for the mentally ill shall be unconditionally released therefrom only on order of the court after the superintendent of the hospital has certified the accused has recovered his sanity and will not in the future be dangerous to himself or others; that notice of an impending release be given to the office which prosecuted the accused a reasonable time before the accused is released; that the court, on its own motion, may hold a hearing, and on objection by the office which prosecuted accused, must hold a hearing, before release, and that the court, on recommendation of the superintendent of the hospital, and with the same notice and opportunity for hearing above provided, may order the conditional release of accused to a legal guardian or other person subject to such conditions as the court may impose. These changes are designed to protect the public against premature release of insane accused persons and also to give maximum protection and treatment to such accused persons.

Sixth. To provide specifically that nothing in the section shall preclude a person from establishing his eligibility for release by habeas corpus at any step of the proceedings. This is deemed desirable to eliminate the possibility that it might be construed that the release provisions in the section were exclusive of habeas corpus proceedings.

Section 2 provides that a prisoner serving a sentence for a crime in a District of Columbia penal institution who, in the opinion of the Director of the Department of Corrections, is mentally ill, shall be referred to the Legal Psychiatric Services Rivision of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health; and that, if the psychiatrist of the Legal Psychiatric Services Division certifies the person to be insane, the Director is authorized to transfer the prisoner to a mental hospital for treatment. The purpose of this amendment is to make full and proper use of the recently created Legal Psychiatric Services Division, and to eliminate the delay created by having to obtain the assent of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the commitment of such person as is now required.

Section 3 amends section 929 of the act of March 3, 1901—section 24-303, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition—relating to procedures to be followed where a person found incompetent to stand trial, or a prisoner found to be insane while serving sentence, has recovered his competency or sanity, so as to conform with and be consistent with sections 1 and 2 of the bill.

Section 4 amends the act of 1896—29th United States Statutes at Large, page 138; section 14-308, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition—by adding thereto a further proviso that the physician-patient privilege shall not apply to evidence relating to the mental competency or sanity of an accused in criminal cases where the accused raises the defense of insanity, nor shall it apply in the pretrial or post-trial proceeding in any criminal case where the mental condition of the accused is in question. The purpose of this amendment is to permit the Government to offer competent psychiatric testimony where an accused pleads insanity as a defense, and also to offer such testimony in any criminal case where the mental condition of an accused or convicted person is brought into question.

The bill was referred to a subcommittee of the House District Committee and a hearing was held on this legislation on June 8, 1955.

At the time of the hearing members of the committee recommending the legislation were present and testified as well as a representative from St. Elizabeths Hospital, a representative from the District of Columbia General Hospital, a representative from the office of the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia, and a representative of the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department. All who appeared and testified on this legislation favored the bill. No one appeared in opposition to it.

Minor clarifying amendments were recommended to this legislation, three of which were adopted by the committee. The legislation also has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia appointed on October 25 of last year a Committee on Mental Disorder as a Criminal Defense. That committee was composed of Mr. George L. Hart, Jr., prominent Washington attorney, chairman; Mr. Donald A. Clemmer, director of Department of Corrections; Leroy H. McKinney, Washington attorney; Hugh F. Rivers, member of the District of Columbia Parole Board, and Vernon E. West, corporation counsel. They submitted a report on April 25, 1955, to the Council on Law Enforcement, with a recommended bill, and that is the bill I introduced which is now under consideration, H. R. 6585. It corrects certain conditions which exist in view of several decisions of the Appellate Court of the

District of Columbia involving insanity as a criminal defense.

The principal points involved are:

First. The "some evidence" rule to overcome the presumption of sanity, as established by the Tatum case, and, as explained by the Wright case.

Second. The "mental disease or mental defect" test for determining criminal responsibility, as established by the Durham case.

Third. The "frivolous or bad faith" test for a motion, under title 18 United States Code, section 4244, for mental examination to determine competency to stand trial, as established by the Wear case.

Fourth. The procedures provided in the Gunther and Contee cases requiring a judicial determination of competency to stand trial of an accused who has previously been found incompetent and committed until recovered.

Fifth. Statutory provisions, District of Columbia Code, 21–301—1951—for commitment to mental hospital of defendants acquitted on the ground that they were insane at the time the crime was committed.

Sixth. Practice and procedures followed for release from mental hospitals of defendants who have been committed under District of Columbia Code 24–301 (1951).

Seventh. Effect of the Taylor case on ability of prosecution to present competent psychiatric evidence of sanity where defendant pleads insanity as a defense.

This bill is very much needed. The committee appointed by the Council on Law Enforcement made a comprehensive report on this situation, which is included in the committee report on this bill. It is very clearly set out there, and I will not take the time at this moment to go into it, but I refer all interested persons to this report of the committee which is carried in the committee report beginning on page 5.

This bill corrects these deficiencies and clears up some vague and uncertain phases of this law which resulted from these decisions that were handed down.

Mr. Speaker, unless there are some questions, I think that takes care of the situation.

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.

BONDING CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 391) to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the last paragraph of section 2 of the act approved June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 103, ch. 180), entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," as added by the first section of the act approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 430), as precedes the proviso in said last paragraph, is amended to read as follows:

"The said Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered to determine which officers and employees of the District of Columbia, or which positions occupied or to be occupied by such officers and employees, shall hereafter be bonded for the faithful discharge of the duties of such officers and employees or of such positions, and to fix the penalty or penalties of any such bond;".

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to obtain blanket position schedule, or other type of surety bond covering their civilian officers and employees required by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. Each bond shall be of the most suitable type available for the number and type of personnel required to be bonded, and shall be conditioned upon the faithful performance of the duties of the persons so bonded, and the term "faithful performance of the duties" shall be deemed to include the proper accounting for all moneys or property received by virtue of the bonded persons' positions or employment and all responsibilities and accountabilities imposed by statute or regulation issued pursuant thereto. The bond premium may cover a period not exceeding 3 years and may be paid in advance from funds available for administrative expenses when the contract is made or continued. If the initial or subsequent premium cost exceeds $500 for any bond procured under authority of this section, advertisement for bids shall be required therefor and procurement shall be made from the responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the District of Columbia, price and other factors considered.

SEC. 3. Whenever any officer or employee of the District of Columbia, as a prerequisite to entering upon the duties of his office or employment, or as a condition to his holding such office or employment, is required by any provision of law or regulation to execute or furnish bond, notwithstanding such provision of law, if any bond obtained by the Commissioners pursuant to the authority contained in this act covers such officer or employee, or covers the position of such officer or employee, in the amount and for such period as may be prescribed by such provision of law, such bond obtained by the Commissioners shall be in lieu of the bond required to be executed or furnished by such officer or employee.

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 305 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953, approved June 29, 1953 (67 Stat. 90, 101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The premium on any such bond may cover periods not exceeding 3 years and may be paid in advance."

SEC. 5. Section 561 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (31 Stat. 1189, 1279; sec. 1–504, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by adding at the end of said section the following sentence: "Where any such notary public is an officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia whose notarial duties are confined solely to Government official business, any bond covering such officer or employee for the faithful performance of such notarial duties obtained by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia pursuant to the authority conferred on them by law shall be in lieu of the bond required by the first sentence of this section."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia and for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia.

As of June 1, 1954, some 309 officers and employees of the District of Columbia, other than officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, were bonded in amounts ranging from $1,000 to $100,000. The total amount of the bonds was $1,246,500, for which the individual employees paid premiums totaling $2,141.57. Further, in addition to the officers and employees of the District government who are required to be bonded by reason of the positions they hold, there are approximately 97 persons in the employ of the District who hold commissions as notaries public for the purpose of performing notarial services in connection with the work of the District government, and who, as a condition of their being commissioned as notaries public are required to give bond in the amount of $2,000.

It is believed that inasmuch as the bonds of officers and employees of the District protect the government and the public, the government, rather than the individual, should bear the cost of such protection. Moreover, the Commissioners are of the view that certain positions in the District government, rather than individuals, should be covered by bonds in appropriate amounts, since the bonding of positions would permit flexibility in the assignment of personnel, while at the same time affording protection to the public and the government.

This measure will relieve many District employees of the burden of paying for bonds for the protection of the public and the District government, and at the same time will permit the Commissioners to secure bonds adequately protecting both the public and the government of the District of Columbia, in many cases permitting the more flexible use of District personnel.

Section 1 would authorize the Commissioners to bond positions in the District government as well as officers and employees.

Section 2 would permit the Commissioners to pay the bond premiums for a 3-year period, which would result in a considerable saving; and would require advertisement for bids on all bonds with a premium cost in excess of $500, the award to be made to the bidder submitting the most advantageous bid.

Section 3 provides that if the Commissioners obtain a bond for any officer or employee, when the individual is required by law to furnish bond, then the bond obtained by the Commissioners shall be in lieu of that required by law.

Section 4 would permit the Commissioners to pay the premium for 3 years rather than annually, on the bond covering the Metropolitan Police force.

Section 5 provides that if the Commissioners obtain a bond for a notary public whose notarial duties are confined solely to District of Columbia business,

then the bond obtained by the Commissioners shall be in lieu of that required by law.

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.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file the conference report on the judges' salary bill.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 286) providing for the consideration of H. R. 6829, a bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, 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. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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. COLMER. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule as the reading would indicate providing for 3 hours of general debate and then the reading of the bill in Committee of the Whole under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation. It is very extensive in its scope. I wonder at times whether we really appreciate the full significance of these tremendous authorizations and appropriations. This one bill authorizes the expenditure of more money than possibly the cost of running this entire Government during the first 25 years of its existence.

The bill is divided into five titles and it proposes to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States and for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, the total authorization in this bill is for the sum of $2,368,998,900.

Breaking this figure down, Mr. Speaker, the Army would be given a total authorization of $551,105,000. This would be further broken down so that $238,778,000 would be allotted for use inside continental United States. The sum of $78,334,000 would be authorized for outside the United States, while $223,993,000 would be authorized for classified use by the Army and $10 million would be authorized for emergencies.

The authorization for the Navy in this bill would be $596,140,900, of which $331,607,200 is proposed to be spent in continental United States while $107,191,300 is to be spent outside the country. The classified allocation for the Navy is $151,342,400 while the sum of $6 million is proposed to be authorized for emergency use by the Navy.

The Air Force has received the largest authorization, for its total in H. R. 6829 is $1,165,453,000. Out of this sum it is proposed that $709,480,000 be allocated for expenditure within continental United States while $450,973,000 would be spent outside of continental United States, and finally $5 million would be set aside for emergency use.

Title IV of the bill would provide the sum of $300,000 to be allocated, if authorized, for the use of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, while title V proposes to authorize the sum of $56 million for the Central Intelligence Agency. This all makes the grand total of $2,368,998,900.

I think it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the report indicates that the Army authorization this year, if passed, would be more than twice the authorization of $236,060,000 which was granted for fiscal year 1955.

There are several interesting points which the membership of the House may wish to be especially cognizant of in title II; that is, the section dealing with the Navy authorization. First of all the bill proposes to authorize the development of two new installations, which, according to the report, are needed in order to provide advanced training for Naval and Marine Corps aircraft pilots. One of the new installations would be in southern Louisiana and the other would be in southern Texas.

H. R. 6829 proposes to authorize the relocation of the aviation training facilities at the Naval Academy to another site near Annapolis since the present site is considered inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, the report indicates that a program of aviation flight clearance is proposed in this bill, which is necessitated by the development of heavier and faster jet planes. These planes need an extremely wide turning area in order to simulate the conditions under which they must land on carriers at sea.

The Air Force authorization would include moneys to be spent on the constructon of facilities of 255 important bases, of which 151 would be in the area of continental United States and 104 outside of continental United States. According to the report on the bill, Mr. Speaker, the authorization for the Air Force is in line with the effort of the Air Force to build a 137-wing Air Force. The bill includes the authorization for two new Air Defense Command bases, one of which would be at Fort Myers, Fla., and the other to be some place near Milwaukee, Wis. The bill also proposes facilities for five new locations in the United States Air Force in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6829 proposes the addition of a new installation for the Army at the West Coast Ammunition Terminal in California; the addition of 3 new installations for the Navy and 2 new installations for the Air Force. The two new installations for the Air Force I have mentioned above, but the new Navy installations would be at Port Isabel, Tex., New Iberia, La., and at Annapolis, Md.

The Committee on Armed Services added three new authorizations which were not included in the original proposal from the Department of Defense and these are first, $8 million for an Army hospital at Camp Jackson, S. C.; $16,900,000 for the Naval Air Facility near Annapolis; and $7,500,000 for an addition to Bancroft Hall at the Naval Academy and for fill to provide land area an authorization of $3,785,000 is given.

Title IV, Mr. Speaker, specifically would authorize the construction or rehabilitation of five units of housing, a communication facility, and some other items for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and certain commissioned officers and enlisted personnel attached to his staff.

The report points out that each of the Chiefs of Staff is provided with appropriate quarters but that this has never been done for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, authority is granted in this bill for the acquisition of large areas of lands which I think should be called to the attention of the House membership. Under the authorization contained in this bill, if passed the Army could acquire some 55,814 acres of land within the United States at a cost of $7,773,000, while in Okinawa some 52,088 acres may be acquired at a cost of $30,500,000.

The Navy would be authorized to acquire some 54,000 acres—fee—and some 138,000 acres—easement—at a total cost of $33,444,000.

The Air Force under the provisions of the bill, as reported from the Committee on Armed Services, would authorize the acquisition of some 16,800 acres—fee—and 23,000 acres—easement—at a cost of $9,900,000 while mineral rights would be acquired on 72,000 acres at an estimated cost of $332,000, and finally mineral rights will be extinguished on about 2½ million acres in Alaska at a cost of $50,000.

Mr. Speaker, the rescissions in this bill amount to $1,300 million and if the bill is enacted into law some $2,368,998,900 of Federal money will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most important bill; we are talking here today about vast sums of money, which, if authorized and appropriated, must be raised somehow. I am not in a position to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not need these expenditures, and neither am I in a

position to say we do need to make these expenditures. Therein lies the whole trouble, that we, the Members of the Congress, the representatives of the taxpayers, the people who must put up the money in the final analysis, are dependent upon our military authorities, upon our Armed Services, and Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, and we are incapable of going into these matters in detail, and determining whether they are justifiable or not. Frankly, I think this is one of the weaknesses of our system of operating in the Congress. I wish there were some way we could have a breakdown of these things and a justification for them without relying entirely upon the people who propose them and who say they are necessary.

In that connection—and I want to say this is no reflection upon the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] the very able chairman of this committee, or upon the individual members of that committee. As a matter of fact, I think they have done a splendid job in housekeeping, in spelling out, so that those who are sufficiently interested can look at their hearings, their reports and the bill and see just what is authorized. There should be some other machinery, not only in this type of legislation but in all legislation that is brought to this floor whereby some agency of the Congress, set up by the Congress and responsible to the Congress alone, could give us the justification for these tremendous expenditures; could give us both sides of the picture.

Such a bill has passed the Senate. Such a bill is pending in committee in this House, a bill that would authorize a joint committee on the budget, made up of members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, with provision for an adequate staff, a staff that is responsible to that joint committee and to the separate Committees on Appropriation in the two Houses, and responsible to them alone. The Senate has passed such a bill in the last three Congresses, the McClellan bill. We have tried to pass a similar bill in the House, H. R. 34, a bill which I have the honor of sponsoring. We failed to consider that bill in a previous Congress by 16 votes, because of the opposition that was urged upon the floor of this House. The chief opposition that was made to that bill in the House was that there was some apprehension that if we passed that bill, then the other body would control the appropriations. Under the provisions of the House bill which I am sponsoring, the House is given additional proportionate representation on that committee. In fact, it is given 9 Members from the House compared with 7 from the other body.

Under the provisions of the House bill the chairmanship of that joint committee rests solely and permanently in the House and does not even alternate. Therefore, as one Member of the House, just a humble Member of the House, I am not willing to concede such inferiority complex; with 7 Members of the other body and 9 Members of this body and the chairmanship in this body that the other body would run away with the committee. Some people say they have such an apprehension. I cannot see it.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this is the answer, but I do know that we need some independent agency that is responsible to the Congress and the Congress alone. What happens in these matters? And again I disclaim any idea of reflecting upon any agency, group, or any Member of Congress, but here is what happens. The so-called big brass—and I merely refer to them that way as a designation that is generally accepted—figure these things out; they send them to the President, and the President's Budget Bureau goes over them; then the President following the recommendation of his Budget Bureau sends them down to the Congress. Bear you in mind that the Pentagon, the so-called big brass, has millions and millions and millions of dollars, and hundreds and hundreds of experts, with their point of view, to justify their recommendations. Their requests come up here to the appropriate committee of the Congress, and that committee is largely at the mercy of the so-called big brass in the final analysis; and then when the matter gets on the floor we are all at the mercy of these experts that have been selected by the people who are interested—just as I am today.

I am going to vote for this bill, because in the dark I know not what else to do. But if this Congress were armed with a groups of experts—and you can get them—who came in here and said to the Congress as employees of the Congress: "This item should be approved;" or "This item should go out," I would feel a lot better about it.

I come back to my oft repeated theory: The Kremlin wants neither war nor peace; it wants to call all the signals. When Mr. Molotov smiles, the free world smiles; when Mr. Molotov frowns, we get scared. They call the signals; we run the defensive plays. They want neither war nor peace; but they want to require us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy, and we are doing a pretty good job. I again call your attention to Lenin's formula, "The way to defeat the United States is to make it spend itself into bankruptcy." We just got through a moment ago extending the debt limit, again increasing the borrowing power, again increasing the national debt that our grandchildren and great-grandchildren will be called upon to pay if this glorious Republic of ours lasts that long.

I have no pride of authorship in H. R. 34. I just want to call it again to the attention of the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle, I want to call it to the attention of the Appropriations Committee, so vitally concerned. I hope that we can give further consideration to at least attempting through this method or some other method, if somebody will come up with a better one, to give this Congress the tools with which to work.

That House bill is nesting up there in the Committee on Rules, my committee. I have not made an attempt to have it reported because I have not found any evidence of a change of sentiment among those who defeated it on the previous occasion, but I give it to you at this time for your careful consideration, for your prayerful consideration, if you please, because if this Republic is to survive it is first going to have to have a stable economy and a stable fiscal policy.

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

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

Mr. VURSELL. I want to commend and congratulate the gentleman for the splendid remarks he has just made. Like him, I believe we should have experts protecting the interests of the Government when the justifiers come before the Appropriations Committee to testify. I think it is high time that all of the Members of this Congress realize that we have been fed the doctrine of fear, that we are being promoted into a bankrupt country by listening too much to the Communist propaganda.

The important thing the gentleman has said, in my judgment, is that we ought to have experts to bring light to the problems that confront us and we ought to realize that we are loading the coming generations with an insufferable debt they will have to pay if, as the gentleman wisely said, this glorious Republic is not thrown into bankruptcy by the executive departments of Government and largely by the Congress itself.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has explained this rule thoroughly and also the bill it makes in order. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. 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. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

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. 6829, with Mr. METCALF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 96]

Adair	Becker	Bolton, Oliver P.
Alexander	Bentley	Bonner
Allen, Calif.	Blitch	Bosch
Barrett	Boland	

Boykin	Harrison, Nebr.	Merrow
Buckley	Heselton	Miller, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hinshaw	Mollohan
Canfield	Hoeven	Morgan
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Morrison
Chatham	Holt	Moulder
Cole	Holtzman	Mumma
Coudert	Horan	Nelson
Davidson	Jackson	O'Brien, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.	James	O'Konski
Denton	Jensen	Polk
Diggs	Johnson, Wis.	Powell
Dingell	Jonas	Prouty
Dodd	Jones, Mo.	Quigley
Dollinger	Kean	Reece, Tenn.
Donovan	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Dowdy	Kearns	Riehlman
Doyle	Kee	Rivers
Eberharter	King, Pa.	Roosevelt
Edmondson	Klein	St. George
Ellsworth	Knox	Scherer
Fino	Knutson	Sisk
Frelinghuysen	Krueger	Taylor
Fulton	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Gamble	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Garmatz	Lovre	Thompson, Tex.
Gathings	McConnell	Vanik
Granahan	McGregor	Van Pelt
Gray	McIntire	Velde
Green, Pa.	Machrowicz	Vursell
Gubser	Mack, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Hagen	Mailliard	Williams, N. J.
Hale	Mason	Withrow
Halleck	Meader	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed 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. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installation, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum he caused the roll to be called when 319 Members responded to their names, disclosing that a quorum was present, and he handed in the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is what is termed a public works bill. It provides in this authorization $551 million for the Army, $596 million for the Navy, $1,165,000,000 for the Air Force. That, along with titles IV and V, makes a total of $2,368,998,900.

This bill was considered for 6 consecutive weeks by the Committee on Armed Services, sitting on an average of from 4 to 5 hours a day constantly.

There are over 400 named military installations in the bill, and in addition there are a great number of classified installations inside and outside the United States.

It is obvious from this that the presentation of details with respect to the bill could go on here on the floor of the House for a long time; but in this magnificent report that we have filed we think you will find material to aid you in seeing what the committee had in mind and the scope of their inquiries.

Now, let us take up the Army. In the Army title, 30 percent of the program of $160 million is for antiaircraft facilities. This includes what is known as Nike sites. They, as you know, are established all over the United States in various places, and in the hearings a great many are identified and a great many are being built all the time.

Some 12 percent, or $64 million is for troop housing and troop support facilities; 17 percent, or $88 million, is for family housing, and this presents 5,765 badly needed family quarters.

Thirty-eight million dollars, or 7 percent of the program, is for land acquisition. In this connection I wish to draw your attention to page 22 of the report, which sets out the land proposed for acquisition by all of the military departments. In the case of the Army, most of the money and about 50 percent of the acreage is in Okinawa. Most of the land required in the United States will be for 2 installations: The expansion of Fort Sill, Okla., which will involve some 20,000 acres of privately owned land, and the West Coast Ammunition Terminal, in California, which will involve some 22,000 acres. NIKE installations will require some 2,500 acres.

Four percent of the program, or $26 million, is for further permanent construction in Alaska and Okinawa—two of our most important strategic areas today.

This is a total of $372 million, or 70 percent of the Army portion of the bill.

The remaining 30 percent will provide for additional construction in Iceland, construction for research and development here in this country.

Now, on page 3, the Army's program is broken out in detailed categories. It indicates whether the construction is in the United States or overseas. Underneath that table you will note that each of the technical services and each of the continental armies is dealt with individually by the type of facility to be constructed and the portion of the program it represents. This description continues on page 4, where the Military Academy, the special weapons project, and some of the other items are described, as are the overseas areas.

Section 102 of the bill contains an authorization of $224 million for classified military construction, and section 103 is an authority granted in most of the public works bills to cover emergency construction, that is, where facilities are destroyed by fire, hurricane, or other catastrophes.

The remainder of the Army title, that is, sections 104 and 105, merely authorizes the transfer of authorizations previously granted at Fort Knox, Ky., and Woodbridge, Va.

Now let us turn to the Navy.

The Navy title, which totals $596 million, is another increment in the program to keep the Navy's shore establishment up to the ships, aircraft, and weapons which it must service.

The Navy would get authority under this program to construct almost 3,100 units of family housing; bachelor officers' quarters for 5,600 officers; and about 11,000 barracks spaces for enlisted personnel.

One of the important new elements in the Navy's program is a large-scale acquisition of property for 40 of the naval air stations throughout the United States. Nineteen of these are used for carrier landing practice, and appropriate easements will be purchased from the surrounding landowners to permit pilots to develop the kind of technique that is necessary for landing on carriers—and to do this in a safe manner.

The effect on the surrounding landowners is not as great as might be expected, since in virtually every case farming and other normal activities can be carried on as before. The major requirement at these bases is that there be no structures or trees above 50 feet.

Here is the reason we are forced to do this: These pilots who will learn to land on an airplane carrier must first be trained to land on what is called a ground pattern. A ground pattern must be such that they can go around this field, and there will be no obstructions on either side, and land as they do on an airplane carrier. It will be necessary to purchase and acquire by easement the rights of removal of any objects higher than 50 feet off the ground.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say where this land is being acquired?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes. It is being acquired at these 19 stations that are already established. All we are doing is getting the easement rights to fly closer to the ground as we circle these 19 bases so that these pilots will learn how to land on a carrier deck.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that we have an inactivated station at Ottumwa, Iowa, where there is a considerable amount of land already.

Mr. VINSON. We are not building a single new station in this part of the program. We are merely clearing out the timber or trees that interfere with this type of training.

Mr. GROSS. You already have that at Ottumwa.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to my very able friend I do not see why they have not utilized that magnificent field out there. I am satisfied that with his persistent efforts and the cooperation of the Armed Services Committee it will probably be put in use.

This is a program which the committee viewed with great favor as one which will not only provide proper and safe training, but will prevent the expenditure of great sums of money in the future.

At the bottom of page 5 of the report you will note a table which breaks down by category the Navy's program. The table sets out everyday operational facilities totaling 58 percent, or $345 million; troop housing about 12 percent, or $71 million; and family housing about 9 percent, or $56 million. Research and development, training facilities, the navigation-easement program that I just mentioned, are also indicated in the table, along with a small amount for morale, welfare, and recreational facilities, pollution-abatement programs, and land acquisition.

The Navy's land acquisition, both fee and easements, is spread over a large number of installations. The only substantial acquisitions at particular areas are those involving the training bases at New Iberia, La.; Port Isabel, Tex.; and the air facility for the Naval Academy.

Following the table, on pages 6 and 7, the whole Navy program is broken down into 11 classes. Shipyard facilities would total $51½ million, fleet base facilities $44½ million, aviation facilities $314 million, and you will note that this last category is again broken down into 5 different kinds of air stations, each of which is described in detail.

Page 7 sets out the amounts authorized for supply facilities, $9,254,000; Marine Corps facilities, $61.6 million; ordnance facilities, $21 million; and service school facilities for $30 million. The only two other relatively large amounts are $26 million for communications facilities and $34 million for yards and docks.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force again this year would get an authorization about equal to the other two services combined. This construction would be spread over 255 principal bases, 151 of which are in the United States and 104 overseas.

All of this program for the Air Force is, of course, aimed at 137 wings.

When the 137-wing Air Force is attained, in 1957, there will be 346 principal installations. One hundred and eighty-six of these will be in the United States, and 160 overseas. These, of course, do not include some 2,000 minor installations, such as communication sites, radar stations, and so forth.

On pages 9 to 13, the Air Force program is broken down in detail by the various commands. As would be expected, the Strategic Air Command gets the largest share of the authorization, with about $224½ million in the United States. The aircraft control and warning system gets $100 million in the United States and almost the same amount overseas. I do not need to emphasize the importance of this part of the program.

The Air Defense Command is next in amount of authorization, with the other commands getting varying amounts according to the status of their programs today.

The land acquisition program of the Air Force is quite small compared with the other two services, with a total of less than 17,000 acres to be acquired in fee and 23,000 in easements.

The only two large acquisitions are those for the Buckingham Weapons Center, in Florida, and the air defense base in the Milwaukee, Wis., area. These acquisitions are respectively 6,000 acres, of which 4,000 will be donated to the Government, and 4,000 in the case of the Milwaukee base.

As I mentioned before, in the case of all of the three services an effort has been made in the report to break down the program in several different ways, in order that whatever the particular interest of the Member may be he can find the information he wants easily and without undue study.

You can find what each of the commands is getting in authorization, while on page 13 of the report the table there shows the program broken down by categories. For example, airfield pavements is the largest part of the program, with operational facilities next, family housing, and so on down the line.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention, and the attention of the committee, to the new installations in the program. These are always of particular interest, and they appear on page 15 of the report.

The Army had only one, the West Coast Ammunition Terminal in California. The Navy has three, all of them air facilities. The first one is at Port Isabel, Tex.; the second at New Iberia, La.; and the third, which was inserted by the committee, is an air facility for the Naval Academy.

The Air Force has two new installations: Buckingham Weapons Center, Fort Myers, Fla., which will be the east coast facility for training our fighter pilots in gunnery—the west coast one being at Yuma, Ariz. The other new Air Force base is also an Air Defense Command installation and it will be in the greater Milwaukee, Wis., area.

Although the Department of Defense submitted a good program, the committee added certain items which are set out on page 15. No new item was added for the Air Force, but a hospital at Camp Jackson, S. C., was added for the Army, and the Naval Air Facility at the Naval Academy was added for the Navy. This is the same facility I just mentioned.

This air facility was recommended by the Board of Visitors at the Naval Academy, as were the other two items at Annapolis—an addition to Bancroft Hall and some of the fill necessary to provide additional land area.

Another important construction item added by the committee appears in title IV of the bill. This would authorize the construction or rehabilitation of five units of housing, a communications facility and other related items for the chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff and four of his assistants. At the present time all of the Chiefs of Staff are provided with adequate housing. For example, the Commandant of the Marine Corps has some 15,000 square feet in his house, while Admiral Radford's house is something a little over 3,000 square feet.

These buildings are to be erected on land adjacent to the Naval Observatory.

Now, in addition to that, it is recommended here that $56 million be made available to the Central Intelligence Agency to establish a permanent building to house its activities. There are a great number of people employed by the Central Intelligence Agency here in the District of Columbia, and they are being housed in some 33 or more buildings. Mr. Dulles, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, feels that being housed in many units, as they are, jeopardizes the security that is required. Now, you know what the Central Intelligence Agency is. So, we provide here an authorization of $56 million for land and a building.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Are these buildings for the Central Intelligence Agency, estimated to cost $50 million, to be constructed within 30 or 35 miles of the District of Columbia? Can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. VINSON. During the hearings Mr. Dulles designated certain places. Some were outside the District of Columbia. But, he did feel that it was absolutely essential, in view of the character of the work he does, to be within reasonable distance of the District of Columbia. I would say 35 to 40 miles from the District or probably more, but that was the line of testimony.

There were about 125 amendments to the original bill, which totaled at the time it was submitted, about $2,354,000,000. The bill that you have before you totals almost $2,369,000,000. This is an increase of about $14½ million. In the process of its consideration, the committee eliminated items in the amount of over $33 million and added items in the amount of about $48 million.

You will note at the bottom of page 15 and on page 16 of the report that the committee gave special consideration to several of the controversial items which naturally arise in every public-works bill. One of these is the land acquisition in Okinawa, another was the expansion of Fort Sill; two of the Navy proposals involving New Iberia and Port Chicago were also in the same category.

A number of the members of the Maryland and Ohio delegations were heard with respect to the proposed move of the headquarters of the Research and Development Command from Baltimore to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

A matter of particular interest, as evidenced by the mail which the committee has received, relates to the effect of the Government's construction of family housing on Wherry projects.

I want to draw your attention to the table set out on page 21 of the report, which contains every installation at which there is a Wherry project and at which housing would be constructed under this bill. If you will look at the last column you will see that in every instance, even after taking into consideration every conceivable kind of housing, there still is a large deficit at those installations.

Of course, the second last column indicates only about 4,500 housing units to be constructed at these bases. The whole bill contains about 17,000 units, but these other houses are to be constructed at bases where there is no Wherry housing.

Last year Congress authorized 11,600 family housing units. This bill, as I say, will authorize about 17,000 units. They will vary in cost, with the overall average in the United States being $13,480. Of these 17,000 houses, 3,500 represent replacements of quarters that can no longer be lived in. Five thousand two hundred and seventy-one are for officers, and 11,700 are for enlisted men.

All of this housing will be of permanent construction and located for the most part at permanent installations.

Section 609 of the bill, appearing on page 70, would permit a military department to acquire, upon the application of the project owner, any Wherry housing project at an installation at which housing would be constructed directly by the Government under this bill. I want to draw your particular attention to the fact that the project owner has to want to get rid of his project and make application that it be purchased by a military department before this can be done.

To my mind a project owner would probably want to have the department acquire his project only if it has proved to be an unprofitable business venture. In any event, I want to stress that it is entirely a voluntary act on the part of the private owner.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill and that it represents a sound program. It was unanimously reported by the House Armed Services Committee.

I respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. Chairman, to show you how carefully we considered this bill, I should like to say this. I am proud of what the committee did with this bill. We worked 6 long weeks and read every item, line by line, in order to approve this proposed authorization of $2,369,000,000. It takes a long time to find out how to spend that much money, and we took the time.

We amended the bill in 125 different places and reduced the authorization requested. But when we added these authorizations in Maryland and South Carolina, it increased the total. As I say, there were about 125 amendments to the original bill, the total of which when it was submitted was $2,354,000,000. The bill before you now calls for a total of $2,369,000,000, an increase of about $14,500,000.

In the process of its consideration, the committee eliminated items in the amount of $33 million and added items in the amount of $48 million.

Had it not been for the fact that we felt the circumstances warranted it, such as the hospital at Camp Jackson and the activities at the Naval Academy, as a result of our screening and careful scrutiny of the bill, which we passed on in a line by line consideration, there would have been a reduction of $33 million.

I want to say this further. This is a department measure. It is recommended by the Director of the Budget. It is recommended by Mr. Floete's office, which was created for the purpose of scrutinizing and coordinating these public works.

I ask that the bill be enacted because the facts and circumstances warrant it. It is absolutely essential to carry on this public works construction to keep our military forces in the shape in which they should be kept.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I notice on page 17 of the report mention is made of a suggestion of moving the Fifth Army headquarters from Chicago to Des Moines. Would the gentleman explain that?

Mr. VINSON. A great many suggestions come before the Committee on Armed Services. Oftentimes it seems they are sowed in fertile soil and bear fruit. Sometimes they fall among thorns and thistles. I am afraid that suggestion has fallen among thorns and thistles. I do not think the gentleman need disturb himself about it, because Secretary Stevens said that he was going to examine it, he did examine it, and concluded that the facts at this time did not warrant that proposal.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman will recall that some weeks ago I telephoned him when there was such a report in Chicago, and asked him about it.

Mr. VINSON. I want to compliment the gentleman who represents the city of Chicago for being so alert. I have always known that he was right here on the job and his inquiry substantiates my conclusion.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, in his usual forceful and comprehensive fashion, has covered every major element of the bill and there is little that I can add to his statement.

I would like to join him, however, in directing the attention of every Member of the House to the report on the bill, for in it, as Chairman VINSON has said, one can find about every important aspect of the bill dealt with in detail sufficient for a quick understanding of the program.

The Air Force portion of the bill is just about equal to the Army and Navy portions combined. This is understandable since it is a new service and one which is in the process of building up. The other services have had their bases of operation and their physical facilities for many years.

I would like, therefore, to devote a little time to a discussion of the Air Force portion of the bill, and specifically to the Air Defense Command mission of the Air Force.

During the past 4 years the Communists have built up a military strength without parallel in history. They have created a whole new air force in Red China and have made it the fourth most powerful in the world. They have made achievements in nuclear development almost equal to our own. They have paraded numbers of new medium jet bombers and a new long-range jet bomber comparable to the best in our Air Force. They have kept the world's largest standing army at peak strength, and never relaxed their vigilance in the training of their units.

In Korea they showed us that their pilots could fight, and that they had a first-rate plane to fight with. There is evidence that they are putting vast resources into guided missile production and into the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile with sufficient range to destroy targets in the United States. In countless ways they have indicated that they are preparing for war, and are not adverse to engaging in it. They constantly create irritants on the international political scene that try our patience, and test our forbearance. They show no volition to live at peace with the world, but consistently follow a philosophy that recognizes war as a natural state.

In a world now divided between those nations who support us in our efforts for peace, and those nations that look to the Soviets for guidance in national as well as international policy, we have no alternative but to prepare against aggression they may commit against us. We know what happened in 1917, what happened in 1941, and we know how peace was violated in 1950. We know also that at none of these times were we truly prepared for the war we were compelled to wage.

From our knowledge of the past, however, we have learned a lesson we must henceforth remember. That lesson is that the best way to avoid war is to have available those forces and weapons which will insure complete and final defeat of any aggressor who attacks us. By our own preparedness we can make aggression an enterprise of disaster for any potential enemy. The Air Force program for the defense of the United States is based solidly on that premise.

The missions of the Air Force commands, established by Act of Congress, are well known. The mission of the Air Defense Command is to provide air forces for the air defense of the United States and to coordinate all operations pertaining thereto. Such operations are conducted by the Continental Air Defense Command, a joint command, including elements of the Army, Navy, and Air Force under single control; by the Alaskan Air Command and the Northeast Air Command in the Western Hemisphere, and by such theater commands as the Far East Air Forces and the United States Air Forces in Europe.

It is not surprising that in appropriations for military construction, the largest amounts called for, next to the request for the Strategic Air Command, are for the Air Defense Command and its related activities, the Aircraft Control and Warning System, in the United States, in Canada, and elsewhere.

The share for the Air Defense Command of the continental United States program amounts to almost 17 percent. The money appropriated will permit initiation of construction on two new bases—one in Florida and one in Wisconsin—and provide a second increment at the six new interceptor bases initially authorized last year.

In addition to base construction, these funds will permit the construction of rocket assembly and storage buildings for strange new types of weapons that are rapidly becoming familiar in the modern arsenal—rockets and guided missiles. These weapons must be stored on the flight line in order to be available when needed. In addition, we must have storage with certain temperature and humidity controls and special facilities for processing missiles from dead to live storage. The development of new weapons is an expensive thing. The providing

of facilities for their employment is also expensive. But the national security does not permit us to cavil at the expense. America must be defended.

As with the Strategic Air Command, facilities for personnel are important to the success of the mission of the command. Buildings for the readiness crews are as important to the success of the Air Defense Command's mission as are the planes the crews must fly. Time required to place an interceptor mission in the air must be held to a minimum. Crews on ready status must remain in the immediate vicinity of their aircraft for extended periods of time. The buildings provided for them must have a diet kitchen, and sleeping quarters, and recreational quarters of a modest sort. These buildings are their homes for a good part of their service lives.

Family housing must also be provided. In an emergency, immediate and maximum readiness is jeopardized by crews having to travel long distances from home to duty posts. The family housing which the Air Defense Command seeks funds to build is essential, not only from the personnel or welfare point of view, but also because it will allow crews to be close to their planes and stations, even when they are not on duty in the readiness buildings. The modern airman must live close to his plane.

Part of the authority requested is for construction of taxiways and airfield pavements necessary to increase the operational effectiveness of each base. Part is for airfield lighting, to provide the necessary illumination to accommodate sustained bad weather and night operations at each fighter interceptor base. Part is for additional maintenance facilities. All funds are requested to permit the Air Force to take full advantage of the latest developments in all the fields of research, and, as quickly as new methods or procedures are perfected, to integrate them into the overall defense system.

But the first step in the air defense of the United States is to provide the combat elements with sufficient warning of an impending attack to enable them to intercept and destroy hostile forces before such forces reach the line for their bomb release. To accomplish this, a series of radar warning systems are either in being or under construction. The most northern of those scheduled is commonly referred to as the DEW line—or "Distant early warning line"—which runs across the Arctic. There is also the Mid-Canada System, operated to a large extent by the Dominion of Canada. Within the United States proper, an extensive radar system is being constructed. Two other radar systems operated by the Air Force further extend the zone of coverage and provide additional protection. The first of these is an airborne operation hundreds of miles off our ocean coastlines; the second consists of fixed radar stations on "Texas towers" being constructed on shoals approximately 75 miles off the eastern coast of the United States. But all these systems, though separate in nature, are coordinated by the Continental Air Defense Command and are part of Air Defense Command operations.

So in the request for funds for military construction for this command there are two sizable items—$100 million for aircraft control and warning system in the continental United States and $98 million for continental defense located outside the continental United States.

With this money the Air Force can complete facilities at 31 permanent sites. It will be able to place equipment on 74 unattended sites in the United States and additional ones in Canada. It will be able to build a fifth "Texas tower" to provide seaward extension of contiguous coverage off the northeast Atlantic Coast, and it will be able to do necessary construction work on the DEW line to insure implementation of this line to meet the established operational date.

The ramparts we watch are no longer within our sight, but they must be watched with a vigilance that keeps them under our control and out of the hands of the enemy. The Air Defense Command defends our homes by not permitting the enemy to make our cities and our homes the targets for their bomb drops. There are no more important items in the military-construction program than the items for construction of the required facilities of the Air Defense Command. America must be defended, but the defense, if it is not also to involve destruction of our cities, must be kept as remote as possible from the boundaries of the United States.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield gladly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows of my continuing interest in the Grandview Airport near Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I see there is an appropriation here for the Grandview Airbase. Can the gentleman tell me whether the Continental Air Command has ever been moved to that base?

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. It has not been moved.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will insist that it be done since that was the basis of arguments in favor of spending millions for the construction of this base.

Mr. VINSON. I doubt very seriously if it will be done this session or next session.

Mr. GROSS. Or the next session?

Mr. VINSON. But with the learned gentleman's constant observation and persistence I am satisfied something will be accomplished. Anticipating that the gentleman was going to inquire about Grandview I have had a little brief prepared on Grandview, and I will be glad to read it or to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's personal comment but I am also interested in the spending of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. VINSON. I knew the gentleman was going to bring up Grandview so I had this statement prepared.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may be allowed to insert his statement at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

GRANDVIEW AIR FORCE BASE, MO.

As you know, Grandview Municipal Airport, Kansas City, Mo., was selected because of its central location in the United States for the headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force, and because of the necessity of establishing a base for fighter-interceptor squadrons for protection of the huge Wichita-Kansas industrial area. In addition, the Air Force proposed to move the headquarters of the Continental Air Command from Mitchell Air Force Base, N. Y., to Grandview. On January 1, 1952, Grandview Municipal Airport was leased by the Air Force for a period of 25 years for the sum of $1. The donation in fee of the Grandview Air Terminal to the United States Government was authorized by the city of Kansas City at the November 1952 election.

Headquarters, Continental Air Command, was never moved to Grandview because of a decision by the Air Force that Mitchell Air Force Base was not economically expandible for conversion to a modern tactical air base. Consequently, to obtain maximum utilization of our large pre-World War II investment at Mitchell, it has been retained as an administrative base and utilized by the Continental Air Command.

At the present time, Grandview Air Force Base is the headquarters of the Central Air Defense Force. This defense force is responsible for the air defense of that portion of the United States located between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains. In addition, a fighter-interceptor wing, large communications center, Air Reserve activity and a segment of the A. C. and W. Radar Network are located on Grandview Air Force Base.

The total amount of construction authorized for this installation through fiscal year 1955 is $19.3 million. Total amount of funds applied to this authorization through fiscal year 1955 is $15.6 million.

The fiscal year 1956 military construction program contains line items in the amount of $3,402,000 for future construction.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] may insert his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I do not speak in opposition to H. R. 6829, which carries authorization for $12,148,000 for the proposed jet base set forth in the bill as Traverse City area. I do favor the selection by the Air Base Command of a site in northern Michigan. The selection of this site has become a very controversial issue, as many of the Members of Congress are aware that the first site selected by the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, was in Grand Traverse County.

There were objections raised by the Interlochen Music Camp, operated jointly by the University of Michigan and the State of Michigan, under the directorship of Dr. Maddy. The second site was selected in Benzie County, which was objected to by the Committee

on Armed Services because of interference with the Interlochen Music Camp. There were several other sites offered by communities for the construction of the proposed jet base.

Secretary Talbott then selected Cadillac as the location of the base. I believe it to be a well-known fact that considerable opposition generated throughout the Congress and in the communities because of this selection.

The Committee on Appropriations then directed Secretary Talbott to submit justifications for the selection of the Cadillac site which resulted in a resurvey of the Cadillac site, and a site known as Kalkaska site, 14 miles from downtown Traverse City, and any other sites that the Secretary believed to be desirable for the construction of the base. The results of the resurvey were made known to the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee and a copy of the communication was submitted to the Committee on Armed Services. The communication from Secretary Talbott to the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee stated that he had eliminated the proposed Benzie site, known as the Homestead site, because of its nearness to the Interlochen Music Camp, and further stated "the remaining two sites are both satisfactory in operational aspects." Talbott reported that although the initial construction cost at Kalkaska site is estimated at about 9 percent less than Cadillac, he felt that the location of Cadillac City, only a few miles from the base site, provided readily available community support that would outweigh this differential in original cost, basing his opinion on the fact that the city of Cadillac can take care of additional Air Force dependents with existing schools and recreational facilities. Talbott further stated "This is not the case at Kalkaska."

I believe the Secretary was well aware that there never was any intent that the village of Kalkaska was able to absorb any great influx of children in their public schools, but he has not given credit to the availability of the fine schools, churches, and recreational facilities offered at Traverse City. The Secretary stated that it is approximately 18 miles from the Kalkaska site to Traverse City. This, of course, is excessive, and the actual mileage would be 14 miles.

Now, I call to the attention of the Congress, using the Secretary's own words in this statement to the congressional committees, that he admits that the Kalkaska site and Cadillac site are both satisfactory in operational aspects. The Secretary further points out, and he has served notice on the Congress that the site he has selected at Cadillac will cost 9 percent more to build than at Kalkaska.

Now let us take a look and see just how much money is involved in this 9 percent which is the Secretary's own percentage figure. With the approval of the bill now pending before the House, the amount of money involved would be $12,148,000, so at 9 percent of this figure the Congress could save the Government $1,093,320, by constructing the base at the Kalkaska site. I do not believe that the Congress is ready to appropriate $1,093,320 more to construct the base in one locality than it would cost in another locality as long as the Secretary is in complete agreement that the base at the lower figure is satisfactory for operations.

We are cognizant of the fact that the Air Force has a base at Kinross, Mich., which is 18 miles south of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Sault Ste. Marie being the supporting town for educational, religious, and recreational facilities. Last summer, Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly requested that I contact the people and the organizations of the Sault Ste. Marie area to determine their willingness to cooperate. This I did and met with 100-percent approval for establishing a permanent base at Kinross along with the expansion program. If there is justification for the Air Force to expand an airbase 18 miles from the supporting city, then I can see no justification for the Air Force to object to constructing a base 14 miles from the supporting city, which in this case would be Traverse City supporting the Kalkaska site with a direct saving of $1,093,320 to the Government.

In conclusion I repeat that the Air Force Secretary, Mr. Talbott, has served due and sufficient notice upon the Congress that the site at Kalkaska is satisfactory and comparable to Cadillac as far as operations are concerned, and further serves notice upon the Congress that the project will cost $1,093,320 more to build at Cadillac than it would at Kalkaska.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am serving notice on the Congress that I am opposed to the reckless spending of public funds when such spending in my opinion cannot be justified or produce greater accomplishments in behalf of the Air Force, but merely to satisfy the Secretary of the Air Force who has produced no sane justification to make such a request of the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee, the chairman of the committee, and the ranking minority member for the very kind and sympathetic consideration they gave to problems which came up in this bill which affect the people of the district in California which I represent.

There was one proposal which came before the committee, which, had it been approved by the committee, would have surrounded and isolated a town of 3,000 people, the town of Port Chicago, Calif. The committee was kind enough to give consideration to many resolutions of the county organizations and to the people of the town involved and to strike the particular proposal from the record. Let me say I think it was a very considerate position that the committee took to recognize the problems of local communities such as Port Chicago.

There is another proposal in the bill, in county, also in my district, the West Coast Ammunition Terminal. It is my understanding after talking with the chairman and the ranking minority member that, although this proposal is included in this bill, before final action is taken to acquire the property involved for the West Coast Ammunition Terminal, a subcommittee of this committee will be going to California this fall and the subcommittee will inspect this property proposed to be acquired by the West Coast Ammunition Terminal, the Real Estate Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I think that is the situation, and I ask the chairman if I have made an accurate statement of my understanding.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from California has made an accurate statement. I may say that in the matter of acquisition of land, as no doubt the Members well know, while it may be authorized in this bill, and money may be appropriated, yet before the Government purchases the land it must again be scrutinized by the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. So when the subcommittee goes out to look at the situation in regard both to Port Chicago and the West Coast Ammunition Terminal they will take those two subject matters into consideration and advise the committee, before 1 foot of land is acquired.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman for that statement and that understanding.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time to make an observation regarding the family housing situation at some of our military installations in England and in the European theater. I realize that the members of this committee have gone into the situation very thoroughly, but, having been a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling military construction features, we visited some of these installations last year.

The housing situation at these bases, for instance Dreux and Evreux in France, were deplorable. While I realize we have a guaranteed housing program in that theater, especially in France, my observation was that it is not working. It seems impossible to get guaranties for housing in any areas except such as Paris or some of the large metropolitan areas. When we go into some of these smaller communities where we have these bases nearby we find, as far as our airmen are concerned, it is impossible for them to bring their families there and give them the kind of housing they are entitled to.

As I said before, I realize this is a problem that has complexities, not the least of which are agreements between the foreign countries in which they are located and ourselves, but it seems to me that we ought to give serious consideration to the building of these family units on the airbase at a given location. It seems to me impossible for these people to live under the conditions that we expect them to.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, has the committee given any consideration to the locating of family housing at some of these out-of-the-way airbases, for instance, on the particular base itself?

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that that has been a subject matter that is constantly before the committee. We are constantly giving close scrutiny to it. As a matter of fact, subcommittees have been over there at least once or twice during the recess trying to ascertain what is the proper thing to do. You must recognize the fact that in dealing with that question there is, for instance, one phase of the Commodity Credit Corporation involved and another phase the rental guaranty program. The gentleman may rest assured that the committee is conscious of it and is giving the matter all the consideration we possibly can.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am reminded of a question that might be asked at this time of the chairman of the committee. I overheard the gentleman from Missouri mention that included in this bill is additional authorization for instruments on the six new fighter interceptor bases that were authorized originally last year. Of course, included in the original six is a very controversial one in the State of the gentleman now addressing the House. I wonder whether the committee did not have some hesitancy about granting additional authorization to the Michigan base where this controversy is very warm at the present time with reference to whether or not a site has been agreed upon where these additional authorized structures are to be placed.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that as far as the Armed Services Committee is concerned, we have been advised that the Secretary is definitely reaffirming his views in selecting Cadillac as an area referred to in connection with the Traverse City area. I have my personal views, but nevertheless those are the facts of the case.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The chairman then has more faith in the repeated confirmation of this site than he had in the repeated confirmation of the sites that were given last year.

Mr. VINSON. All I can say is that the Secretary advised the committee in writing that he had reaffirmed after further examination his previous choice, and reached the conclusion that Cadillac was the place where he was going to place it. Of course, if I had been making the selection, somebody might not agree with it, but that is how it stands.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It was on that basis, then, that the further authorization for this site was included in this bill?

Mr. VINSON. That is with reference to the Traverse City area arrangement. They laid it out in broad language, and then the Department goes before the Committee on Appropriations and says that he has selected Cadillac as the place. We do not pinpoint it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will reluctantly vote for this bill which calls for the appropriation of nearly $2½ billion.

I have the feeling that there is altogether too much fat in this military construction bill but it is wellnigh impossible for a Member of Congress who is not a member of the Armed Services Committee to know where reductions can properly be made.

I cannot understand why, for instance, funds should be authorized for the building of a new Navy aviation training facility in Texas when the permanently constructed facility for this purpose stands unused near Ottumwa, Iowa.

Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have voted for practically all appropriations that have been requested for the building of this Nation's defenses, but I want it understood now that these costs have got to decrease in terms of new installations. If there is the proper construction and housekeeping, these bills can be drastically reduced and that is exactly what must occur if this Nation is to remain solvent.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish or develop military installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Technical services facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $1,736,000.

Black Hills Ordnance Depot, S. Dak.: Family housing, $78,000.

Blue Grass Ordnance Depot, Ky.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $509,000.

Erie Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Operational and maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,933,000.

Frankford Arsenal, Pa.: Utilities, $855,000.

Lordstown Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Operational and maintenance facilities, $875,000.

Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colo.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $1,843,000.

Red River Arsenal, Tex.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $140,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Research and development facilities and community facilities, $2,865,000.

Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.: Operational and mantenance facilities, $347,000.

Rossford Ordnance Depot, Ohio: Utilities, $400,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Ill.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $342,000.

Seneca Ordnance Depot, N. Y.: Community facilities, $129,000.

Sierra Ordnance Depot, Calif.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $1,075,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.: Troop supporting facility, and research and development facilities, $1,247,000.

Wingate Ordnance Depot, N. Mex.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $632,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Ga.: Storage facilities, $84,000.

Belle Meade General Depot, N. J.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $174,000.

Fort Lee, Va.: Troop housing, community facilities, medical facility, storage facilities, training facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $8,589,000.

Memphis General Depot, Tenn.: Family housing, $99,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pa.: Family housing. $568,000.

Sharpe General Depot, Calif.: Utilities and family housing. $337,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,248,000.

Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah: Maintenance facilities, $92,000.

Camp Detrick, Md.: Utilities, $452,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Troop housing, hospital and medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities and family housing, $1,129,000.

Pine Bluff Arsenal (including Midwest Chemical Depot), Ark.: Land acquisition, $3,000.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colo.: Operational and maintenance facilities and utilities, $773,000.

(Signal Corps)

Decatur Signal Depot, Ill.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $303,000.

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, utilities, and family housing, $4,648,000.

Lexington Signal Depot, Ky.: Maintenance facility, and family housing, $538,000.

Fort Monmouth, N. J.: Community facilities, $615,000.

Sacramento Signal Depot, Calif.: Troop housing, maintenance facility, and family housing, $715,000.

Tobyhanna Signal Depot, Pa.: Troop housing, $649,000.

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif.: Community facilities, and family housing, $1,298,000.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Va.: Community facilities, storage facility, and operational and maintenance facility, $695,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Army Map Service, Md.: Operational and maintenance facility, $62,000.

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Troop housing, community facilities, research and development facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, utilities, and family housing, $4,608,000.

Grante City Engineer Depot, Ill.: Operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $1,822,000.

Marion Engineer Depot, Ohio: Storage facilities and utilities, $1,146,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Base, N. Y.: Utilities, $1,055,000.

Charleston Transportation Depot, S. C.: Storage facilities and utilities, $329,000.

Fort Eustis, Va.: Troop housing, community facilities, training facilities, medical facility, and operational and maintenance facilities, $6,597,000.

New Orleans Army Base, La.: Storage facility, $117,000.

Oakland Army Base, Calif.: Community facilities, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $1,923,000.

Fort Story, Va.: Utilities, $41,000.

West Coast Ammunition Terminal, Calif.: Dredging and land acquisition, $12,860,000.

(Medical Corps)

William Beaumont Army Hospital, Tex.: Hospital and medical facilities, $586,000.

Brooke Army Medical Center, Tex.: Hospital and medical facilities, $549,000.

Madigan Army Hospital, Wash.: Hospital and medical facilities, $333,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C.: Hospital facilities, research and development facilities, and training facilities, $7,632,000.

FIELD FORCES FACILITIES

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Mass.: Troop housing, administrative facilities, and family housing, $7,275,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Community facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $6,698,000.

Fort Jay, N. Y.: Waterfront facilities, $731,000.

Fort Niagara, N. Y.: Storage facilities, $209,000.

Fort Totten, N. Y.: Utilities, $170,000.

(Second Army Area)

Fort Holabird, Md.: Troop housing, $612,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Troop housing, training and administrative facilities, community facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $8,990,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Md.: Community facilities, training and medical facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $923,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $10,392,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, airfield pavements, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $15,659,000.

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $12,377,000.

Camp Gordon, Ga.: Community facilities, $261,000.

Camp Jackson, S. C.: Medical facilities, $8 million.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $2,611,000.

Camp Rucker, Ala.: Airfield pavements, and operational and maintenance facilities, $2,070,000.

Camp Stewart, Ga.: Troop housing, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $967,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $4,645,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $12,922,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Tex.: Troop housing and operational facilities, $805,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Community facilities, medical facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $3,053,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colo.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, airfield pavements, storage facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $7,487,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Hospital and medical facilities, training facilities, and operational facilities, $8,615,000.

Camp Lucas, Mich.: Community facilities, $145,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Troop housing, community facilities, training and administrative facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $8,657,000.

Fort Sheridan, Ill.: Family housing, $1,268,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Camp Hanford, Wash.: Waterfront facilities, $167,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Troop housing community facilities, training facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and family housing, $15,275,000.

Presidio of Monterey, Calif.: Troop housing and training facilities, $1,878,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Community facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $1,407,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.: Liquid fuel dispensing facilities, $144,000.

United States Disciplinary Barracks, Calif.: Community facilities, $184,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Family housing, $709,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, N. Y.: Community facilities and utilities, $756,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

Sandia Base, N. Mex.: Family housing, $1,231,000.

Various installations: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $3,014,000.

(Tactical Installations)

Various locations: Family housing, $8,135,000.

(Rehabilitation)

Various locations: Rehabilitation of facilities for family housing, $2,661,000.

Outside continental United States

(Alaskan Area)

Big Delta: Troop housing and community facilities, and family housing, $3,638,000.

Eielson Air Force Base: Maintenance and storage facility, $1,047,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Storage facilities and liquid fuel dispensing facilities, $266,000.

Fort Richardson: Troop housing, community facilities, storage facilities, operational and maintenance facilities, and utilites, $9,079,000.

Whittier: Community facilities, and operational and maintenance facilities, $1,183,000.

Wildwood Station (Kenai): Troop housing and community facilities, $469,000.

Various locations: Rehabilitation of facilities for family housing, $1,656,000.

(Far East Command Area)

Okinawa: Community, troop supporting, and medical facilities, operational, maintenance, and administrative facilities, utilities, family housing, and land acquisition and resettlement, $43,983,000, of which sum the total amount available for resettlement may be paid in advance to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

(Pacific Command Area)

Helemano, Hawaii: Family housing, $714,000.

Camp O'Donnel, Philippine Islands: Utilities, $832,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Storage and community facilities, $3,162,000.

Waiawa (Waipio) Radio Transmitting Station: Hawaii: Community facilities and family housing, $363,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Family housing, $2,350,000.

(Icelandic Command Area)

Keflavik Airport: Operational and training facilities, and family housing, $3,793,000.

Classified installations: Family housing, $5,799,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by the acquisition of land and the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, in a total amount of $223,993,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a toal amount of $10 million.

SEC. 104. Public Law 534, 82d Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Field Forces Facilities" (Second Army Area) in section 101 as follows:

"Fort Knox, Ky.: Training buildings and facilities, research and development facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $11,411,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Fort Knox, Ky.: Training buildings and facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $9,411,000."

(b) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Technical Service Facilities" (Army Medical Service) in section 101 as follows:

"Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Operational facilities and research and development facilities, $731,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., and Forest Glen, Md.: Operational facilities, and research and development facilities, $2,731,000."

SEC. 105. Public Law 534, 83d Congress, is hereby amended by striking so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "(Signal Corps)" in section 101 as follows:

"Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Woodbridge, Va.:"

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Department of the Army transmitting station, vicinity of Camp Detrick, Md.:"

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of Navy is authorized to establish or develop naval installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Naval shipyard, Boston, Mass.: Utilities and replacement of piers, $8,441,000.

Naval shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Wash.: Drydock facilities, $200,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.: Research and development facilities, $14,302,000.

Naval industrial reserve shipyard, Charleston, S. C.: Land acquisition, $427,000.

Naval minecraft base, Charleston, S. C.: Site preparation, waterfront facilities, administrative facilities, training facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $5,800,000.

Naval shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, Calif.: Waterfront facilities and sandblasting facilities, $4,553,000.

Naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va.: Replacement of wharf, $308,000.

Naval underwater sound laboratory, New London, Conn.: Family housing, $66,600.

Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Fla.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, training facilities, helicopter facilities, ammunition storage facilities, waterfront facilities, research and development facilities, and land acquisition, $3,379,000.

Naval shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Utilities and drydock facilities, $946,000.

Naval electronics laboratory, San Diego, Calif.: Land acquisition, $143,000.

Naval repair facility, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, $629,000.

Naval shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, steam test facilities, and land acquisition, $4,369,000.

Fleet base facilities

Navy Department, District of Columbia: Family housing, $81,000.

Naval station, Green Cove Springs, Fla.: Utilities, $72,000.

Naval station, Newport, R. I.: Personnel facilities, $1,583,000.

Naval base, Norfolk, Va.: Waterfront facilities, pavement, utilities, and land acquisition, $9,972,000.

Naval station, Orange, Tex.: Personnel facilities, $399,000.

Naval station, San Diego, Calif.: Utilities, $57,000.

Naval station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, Calif.: Personnel facilities and utilities, $3,147,000.

Naval station, Tacoma, Wash.: Waterfront facilities, $3,024,000.

Naval station, Tongue Point, Astoria, Oreg.: Personnel facilities, $92,000.

Aviation facilities

(Naval Air Training Station)

Naval auxiliary landing field, Alice-Orange Grove area, Tex.: Airfield pavements and land acquisition, $1,487,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Barin Field, Foley, Ala.: Airfield lighting facilities, $151,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.: Storage facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $1,953,500.

Naval air station, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Navigational aids, training facilities, and land acquisition, $664,000.

Naval air station, Glynco, Ga.: Aircraft, station and equipment maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,886,000.

Naval air station, Hutchinson, Kans.: Utilities, $81,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, operational facilities, navigational aids, storage facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $3,686,000.

Naval air station, Memphis, Tenn.: Utilities, $759,000.

Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.: Airfield pavements, navigational aids, personnel facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, research and development facilities, ammunition storage facilities, land acquisition, and plans and specifications for aircraft overhaul and repair facilities, $3,453,000.

Naval auxiliary air station: Port Isabel, Tex.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, fuel storage facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, security facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $5,544,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, New Iberia, La.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, operational facilities, navigational aids, maintenance facilities, communication facilities, training facilities, administrative facilities, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, covered and cold storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, personnel facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $24,361,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Family housing, $385,000.

(Fleet Support Air Stations)

Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, seadrome lighting facilities, seawall, dredging, and land acquisition, $3,729,000.

Naval air station, Atlantic City, N. J.: Storage facilities, and utilities, $233,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Brown Field, Calif.: Family housing, $214,600.

Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, communication facilities, storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $3,200,000.

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, operational facilities, covered storage facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, security facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $7,400,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, and land acquisition, $366,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.: Operational facilities, community facilities, family housing, and personnel facilities, $1,172,700.

Naval air station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Airfield pavements, communication facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $2,224,000.

Naval air station, Key West, Fla.: Fuel storage facilities, and boathouse, $211,000.

Naval auxiliary landing field, Mayport, Fla.: Waterfront facilities, communication facilities, family housing, and security facilities, $812,000.

Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.: Storage facilities, training facilities, personnel facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,370,000.

Naval air station, Moffet Field, Calif.: Fuel pipeline facilities, airfield pavements, and operational facilities, $2,581,000.

Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities,, training facilities, communication facilities, operational facilities and land acquisition, $5,260,000.

Naval air station, Oceana, Va.: Airfield pavement, storage facilities, personnel facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and fuel dispensing facilities, $5,281,000.

Naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $1,062,000.

Naval air station, San Diego, Calif.: Training facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, and utilities, $2,748,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Fla.: Family housing, $188,900.

Naval air facility, Weeksville, N. C.: Cold storage facilities, and maintenance facilities, $342,000.

Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, and land acquisition, $1,958,000.

Outlying field, Whitehouse Field, Duval County, Fla.: Airfield pavements, and land acquisition, $1,087,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.: Airfield pavements, communications facilities, navigational aids, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $4,649,000.

Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, waterfront facilities, navigational aids, airfield lighting facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $1,762,000.

Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, communication facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,492,000.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Edenton, N. C.: Family housing, $1,421,500.

Marine Corps air station, Miami, Fla.: Land acquisition, $1,223,000.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $2,305,400.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, N. C.: Airfield pavements, medical facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilites, operational facilities, training facilities, and utilities, $2,762,000.

(Special purpose air stations)

Naval air facility, to be known as John H. Towers Field, Annapolis area, Md.: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, personnel facilities, airfield lighting facilities, airfield pavements, aircraft and station maintenance facilities, communication facilities, cold storage facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, utilities, medical facilities, petroleum storage facilities, site preparation, and land acquisition, $16,900,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Chincoteague, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and operational facilities, $2,858,000.

Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif.: Research and development facilities, $2,615,000.

Naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.: Research and development facilities, storage facilities, navigational aids, and aircraft maintenance facilities, $16,311,000.

Naval air test center, Patuxent River, Md.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, oil storage facilities, and utilities, $8,677,000.

Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, communication facilities, and research and development facilities, $926,000.

Naval air station, South Weymouth, Mass.: Testing facilities, $270,000.

Naval photographic interpretation center, Suitland, Md.: Operational and photographic preservation facilities, $2,345,000.

Various locations: Land acquisition, and obstruction removal, for flight clearance, $23 million.

Supply facilities

Naval fuel depot, Jacksonville, Fla.: Family housing, $15,200.

Naval supply depot, Newport, R. I.: Waterfront facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,041,000.

Naval supply center, Norfolk, Va.: Cold-storage facilities, warehouse freight elevators, and (at Cheatham Annex) highway crossing and land acquisition, $777,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.: Utilities, and easement, $62,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Ga.: Storage facilities, community facilities, cold-storage facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $3,157,000.

Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, Calif.: Storage facilities, community facilities, cold-storage facilities, personnel facilities, security facilities, and land acquisition, $501,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Personnel facilities, security facilities, and utilities, $1,059,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,654,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Utilities, $648,000.

Marine Corps clothing depot, Annex No. 3, Philadelphia, Pa.: Utilities, $30,000.

Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va.: Covered and ammunition-storage facilities, medical facilities, training and personnel facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $9,357,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.: Pavements, and personnel facilities, $120,000.

Marine Corps training center, Twenty-nine Palms, Calif.: Family housing, $47,300.

Ordnance facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C.: Ordnance facilities, $193,000.

Naval aviation ordnance test station, Chincoteague, Va.: Research and development facilities, $644,000.

Naval ordnance aerophysics laboratory, Daingerfield, Tex.: Research and development facilities, $1,111,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Earle, N. J.: Refrigerated storage facilities, $59,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif.: Ordnance and ammunition storage facilities, $514,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev.: Barricaded sidings, and utilities, $1,424,000.

Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md.: Research and development facilities, and utilities, $1,107,000.

Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif.: Community facilities, $375,000.

Naval torpedo station, Keyport, Wash.: Ordnance facilities, $376,000.

Naval ordnance plant, Louisville, Ky.: Ordnance drawings storage facilities, $927,000.

Naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga.: Ordnance manufacturing facilities, $3,800,000.

Naval underwater ordnance station, Newport, R. I.: Testing facilities, $370,000.

Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, $241,000.

Naval ammunition depot, St. Juliens Creek, Va.: Utilities, $420,000.

Naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, $1,029,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Shumaker, Ark.: Barricaded transfer depot facilities, $765,000.

Naval ordnance laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Research and development facilities, $1,976,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va.: Ammunition storage and testing facilities, $113,000.

Service school facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Utilities, cadet housing, and fill in Dewey and Santee Basins in Severn River, $11,467,000.

Naval station, Annapolis, Md.: Personnel facilities, $307,000.

Naval receiving station, Charleston, S. C.: Community facilities, $553,000.

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif.: Personnel facilities, $1,402,000.

Fleet air defense training center, Dam Neck, Va.: Training facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,942,000.

Naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Training facilities, family housing, and personnel facilities, $8,038,800.

Naval powder factory, Indian Head, Md.: Personnel facilities, $780,000.

Naval postgraduate school, Monterey, Calif.: Personnel facilities, $119,000.

Naval receiving station, Philadelphia, Pa.: Personnel facilities, $1,428,000.

Naval retraining command, Portsmouth, N. H.: Security facilities, $42,000.

Fleet sonar school, San Diego, Calif.: Training facilities, $2,753,000.

Medical facilities

National naval medical center, Bethesda, Md.: Plans and specifications for the Armed Forces Medical Library, $350,000.

Naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.: Family housing, $192,500.

Naval hospital, Corona, Calif.: Family housing, and conversion of existing structures to family housing, $256,800.

Naval hospital, Corpus Christi, Tex.: Family housing, $162,100.

Naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.: Plans and specifications for certain medical facilities, $750,000.

Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Fla.: Retaining wall, $46,000.

Naval submarine base, New London, Conn.: Medical research facilities, $755,000.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: Utilities, $60,000.

Communications facilities

Naval radio station, Northwest, Va.: Communication facilities, $436,000.

Office of naval research facilities

Naval research laboratory, Washington, D. C.: Research facilities, and utilities, $163,000.

Naval research laboratory, Chesapeake Bay Annex, Randle Cliffs, Md.: Research facilities, and land acquisition, $52,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Naval construction battalion center, Davisville, R. I.: Waterfront facilities, and storage facilities, $5,397,000.

Public works center, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities, $2,510,000.

Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, $1,225,000.

Various locations: Facilities for abatement of water pollution, including the acquisition of land, $15,149,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Fleet activities, Sasebo, Japan: Personnel facilities, $57,000.

Fleet base facilities

Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Family housing, $2,485,000.

Naval base, Guam, Mariana Islands: Administrative facilities, $1,835,000.

Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $56,000.

Naval base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Personnel facilities, medical facilities, utilities, and family housing, $15,253,700.

Fleet activities: Yokosuka, Japan: Family housing, $6,540,800.

Aviation facilities

Naval air station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, personnel facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $6,525,000.

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Operational facilities, and family housing, $8,589,800.

Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan: Personnel facilities, and family housing, $1,978,800.

Naval station, Bermuda, British West Indies: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $91,000.

Naval air facility, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, earthwork, personnel facilities, communication facilities, ordnance facilities, fuel-dispensing facilities, and utilities, $8,260,000.

Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Fuel pipeline facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $2,977,300.

Naval air facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Personnel facilities, $975,000.

Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, T. H.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, and family housing, $3,227,600.

Naval station, Kodiak, Alaska: Family housing, $2,613,100.

Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Communication facilities, ammunition storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $4,411,000.

Naval station, Midway Island, T. H.: Communication facilities and operational facilities, $1,518,000.

Naples, Italy: Operational facilities and storage facilities, $155,000.

Naval air facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Cold-storage facilities, and family housing, $1,958,500.

Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities and airfield pavements, $3,721,000.

Naval station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands: Family housing, $522,900.

Supply facilities

Naval supply depot Guam, Mariana Islands: Waterfront facilities and storage facilities, $5,427,000.

Naval supply depot, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Cold-storage facilities, $1,318,000.

Naval supply center, Pearl Harbor, T. H.: Operational facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $270,000.

Ordnance facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H.: Testing facilities, and railroad facilities and barricades, $1,132,000.

Naval ordnance facility, Sasebo, Japan: Personnel facilities, $66,000.

Service school facilities

Fleet training center, Pearl Harbor, T. H.: Training facilities, $44,000.

Medical facilities

Naval hospital, Guam, Mariana Islands: Community facilities, $269,000.

Communication facilities

Naval communication station, Adak, Alaska: Communication facilities, $439,000.

Naval radio facility, Kami-Seya, Japan; Communication facilities, and family housing, $2,564,700.

Naval communication station, Kodiak, Alaska: Site preparation, communication facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $6,991,000.

Naval communication facility, Philippine Islands: Communication facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $8,061,500.

Naval communication facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, utilities, and family housing, $2,848,600.

Yards and docks facilities

Fifteenth Naval District, Canal Zone: Utilities, and acquisition of family housing, $3,069,000.

Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities, $940,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by the acquisition of land, and the construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and family housing, in the total amount of $151,342,400.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of $6 million.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized to establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by the acquisition, construction, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works in respect of the following projects, which include site preparation, appurtenances and related utilities, equipment and facilities:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Air Defense Command

Buckingham Weapons Center, Fort Myers, Fla.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $11,577,000.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $1,200,000.

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colo.: Utilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $1,808,000.

Ethan Allan Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting, and utilities, $213,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Airfield pavements, troop housing, storage facilities, and family housing, $1,716,000.

Glasgow site, Montana: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $4,706,000.

Grand Forks site, North Dakota: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $5,822,000.

Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $3,402,000.

Greater Milwaukee area, Wisconsin: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $16,608,000.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Coraopolis, Pa.: Training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $404,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $1,501,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $2,029,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, relocation of facilities, and family housing, $3,943,000.

Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Airfield pavements, relocation of facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $2,042,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and family housing, $2,959,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn.: Airfield pavements, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $582,000.

Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Minneapolis, Minn.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $1,423,000.

Minot site, North Dakota: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $5,339,000.

New Castle County Municipal Airport, Wilmington, Del.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $504,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,748,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, messing facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $6,076,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,445,000.

Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Wash.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,039,000.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and family housing, $2,056,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $5,526,000.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, and messing facilities, $343,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, N. Y.: Navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, $112,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $2,207,000.

Traverse City area, Michigan: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $1,881,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $1,263,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $2,511,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $742,000.

Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Ariz.: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,107,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $4,170,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $15,803,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Airfield pavements, and airfield lighting facilities, $2,386,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,945,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, and administrative facilities, $9,522,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $3,205,000.

Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $21,264,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, and land acquisition, $3,375,000.

Searsport Air Force Tank Farm, Searsport, Maine: Fuel storage facilities, $133,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Storage facilities, $205,000.

Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio: Utilities, $305,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, and administrative facilities, $18,001,000.

Various locations: Storage facilities, $170,000.

Air Proving Ground Command

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Airfield pavements, communications, and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, research, development and test facilities, and storage facilities, $7,966,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Tex.: Training facilities, $98,000.

Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, and utilities, $914,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.: Land acquisition, $3,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Airfield pavements, troop housing, and land acquisition, $1,650,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and medical facilities, $2,816,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyo.: Troop housing and messing facilities, $1,403,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $4,081,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $349,000.

Headquarters technical training, Air Force, Gulfport, Miss.: Acquisition of land and facilities, $313,000.

Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex.: Communications and navigational aids and troop housing, $446,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, $883,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and family housing, $1,525,500.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $3,695,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo.: Troop housing and messing facilities, $1,217,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $1,557,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Communications and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,516,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Operational facilities, and land acquisition, $104,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and family housing, $4,322,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, and troop housing and messing facilities, $1,153,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $956,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, $549,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.: Troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $1,076,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Troop housing and messing facilities, $1,247,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Messing facilities, $80,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, personnel facilities, and family housing, $4,187,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $478,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Troop housing and messing facilities, and land acquisition, $871,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Shop facilities, and family housing, $2,410,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational facilities, and troop housing and messing facilities, $1,045,000.

Air University

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Troop housing, $275,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, $2,661,000.

Continental Air Command

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Land acquisition, personnel facilities, and family housing, $2,125,500.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Troop housing, $590,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Airfield pavements, and personnel facilities, $758,000.

Mitchell Air Force Base, Hempstead, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, $1,891,000.

Wolters Air Force Base, Mineral Wells, Tex.: Operational facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $331,000.

Headquarters Command

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.: Personnel facilities, $520,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Medical facilities, and personnal facilities, $1,098,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and land acquisition, $4,032,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $7,073,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $5,564,000.

Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Fla.: Operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, and personnel facilities, $818,000.

St. Louis Aeronautical Chart Information Center, St. Louis, Mo.: Administrative facilities, $861,000.

Research and Development Command

Carabelle Test Site, Carabelle, Fla.: Land acquisition, $1,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, research, development and test facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $12,429,000.

Hartford Research Facility, Hartford, Conn.: Research and development facilities, $22,375,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, utilities, research and development facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $4,965,000.

Indian Springs Air Force Base (Kirtland Auxiliary No. 1), Clark, Nev.: Operational facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $555,500.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and shop facilities, $905,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $3,705,000.

Mount Washington Climatic Projects Laboratory, Mount Washington, N. H.: Research and development facilities, $588,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, research and development facilities, and shop facilities, $7,600,000.

Various locations: Research, development, and operational facilities, $20 million.

Strategic Air Command

Abilene Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative and community facilities, $4,214,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and family housing, $2,920,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $7,379,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, utilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and shop facilities, $1,770,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, troop housing, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $2,427,000.

Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.: Airfield pavements, communications, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and shop facilities, $1,975,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Airfield lighting facilities, troop housing, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $2,322,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and administrative facilities, $4,453,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $10,208,500.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $6,629,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $7,803,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, rehabilitation, land acqusition, personnel facilities, community facilities, and shop facilities, $11,155,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $11,168,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $1,707,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $4,753,000.

Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Tex.: Troop housing, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $482,000.

Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Airfield pavements, communications, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $5,435,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $4,428,000.

Hunter Air Force Base Savannah, Ga.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $4,115,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, and personnel facilities, $2,396,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Airfield pavements, fuel-dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $6,595,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities,

storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, $5,317,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $8,571,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $2,930,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $5,251,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, and personnel facilities, $3,741,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, and family housing, $5,961,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Utilities, and land acquisition, $128,000.

Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilties, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $4,118,000.

Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, $21,988,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and family housing, $24,850,000.

Sedalia Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $9,646,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, shop facilities, and family housing, $8,773,500.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $2,125,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and land acquisition, $3,744,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Airfield pavements, troop housing, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and personnel facilities, $5,259,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, land acquisition, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $7,716,000.

Tactical Air Command

Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, La.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, and personnel facilities, $2,684,000.

Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Okla.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $6,800,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, $208,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, and administrative facilities, $559,000.

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, N. Mex.: Training facilities, and family housing, $2,570,500.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, and medical facilities, $2,403,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing, and family housing, $4,624,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Airfield pavements, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $1,598,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,384,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Airfield pavements, utilities, medical facilities, and personnel facilities, $3,574,000.

Myrtle Beach Municipal Airport, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $6,303,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, N. C.: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $2,548,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, personnel facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,589,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $7,429,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $7,035,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $387,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Fuel dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids, operational facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $100,382,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaskan Air Command

Elelson Air Force Base: Medical facilities, storage facilities, and community facilities, $1,307,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and shop facilities, $23,275,000.

Galena Airfield: Airfield lighting facilities, and storage facilities, $518,000.

Kenai Airfield: Airfield pavements, $356,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Training facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $1,510,000.

Naknek Airfield: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $1,863,000.

Caribbean Air Command

Albrook Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Communication facilities, $163,000.

Far East Air Forces

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and community facilities, $42,017,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Airfield pavements, airfield lighting facilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and harbor facilities, $4,978,000.

Johnston Island Air Force Base: Johnston Island: Communication facilities, $182,000.

Midway Island: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, and airfield lighting facilities, $303,000.

Wake Island: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, and navigational aids, $2,991,000.

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, personnel facilities, and family housing, $11,393,000.

Northeast Air Command

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing, utilities, storage facilities, and shop facilities, $23,601,000.

Strategic Air Command

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, utilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, and harbor facilities, $2,149,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing and messing facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, and shop facilities, $234,996,000.

Area control navigational aids

Various locations: Communications and navigational aids, $526,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, and utilities, $293,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, troop housing and

messing facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, personnel facilities, administrative and community facilities, shop facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, harbor facilities, and land acquisition, $98,552,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized through the construction, rehabilitation, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, apppurtenances, and related utilities and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount of $5 million.

SEC. 303. Public Law 534, Eighty-third Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) With respect to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Strategic Air Command" in section 301 strike "$2,248,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,750,000."

(b) With respect to Matagorda Island Air Force Range, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Strategic Air Command" in section 301 strike "$607,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$847,000."

(c) With respect to Bismarck-Minot area, North Dakota, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "Bismarck-Minot area, North Dakota" and "$6,494,000" and insert in lieu thereof "Minot Site, North Dakota" and "$12,124,000", respectively.

(d) With respect to Fargo area, North Dakota, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "Fargo area, North Dakota" and "$7,055,000" and insert in lieu thereof "Grand Forks Site, North Dakota" and "$10,903,000"; respectively.

(e) With respect to Glasgow-Miles City area, Mont., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "Glasgow-Miles City, area, Montana" and "$8,391,000" and insert in lieu thereof "Glasgow Site, Montana" and "$10,660,000", respectively.

(f) With respect to K. I. Sawyer Airport, Marquette, Mich., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "$8,556,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,949,000".

(g) With respect to Traverse City area, Michigan, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "$8,635,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,267,000."

(h) With respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Training Command" in section 301 strike "$1,073,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,478,000."

(i) With respect to Webb Air Force Base, Big Springs, Tex., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Training Command" in section 301 strike "$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$135,000."

(j) With respect to Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Materiel Command" in section 301 strike "$4,303,000" and "$2,183,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,735,000" and "$2,615,000", respectively.

(k) With respect to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Materiel Command" in section 301 strike "$5,847,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,849,000."

(l) With respect to Atlantic City Consolan Station, Atlantic City. N. J., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "$72,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$285,000."

(m) With respect to Nantucket Consolan Station, Nantucket, Mass., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "$107,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$224,000."

(n) With respect to Pescadero Consolan Station, Pescadero, Calif., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "$107,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$224,000."

(o) With respect to Point Conception Consolan Station, Point Conception, Calif., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Air Defense Command" in section 301 strike "$72,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$232,000."

(p) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof delete the amounts "$389,125,000" and "$398,954,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amounts "$405,176,000" and "$415,005,000," respectively.

SEC. 304. Classified location: The authority granted by section 302, of the act of July 14, 1952, may be utilized to the extent of $8,127,400 for the direct construction of family housing.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Secretary of a military department, is authorized to provide family housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and certain commissioned officers and enlisted personnel attached to his staff by the construction or rehabilitation of 5 units of family housing, and protected communication facilities, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

SEC. 402. Appropriations available to the military departments are hereby made available for the purposes of this title in an amount not to exceed $300,000.

TITLE V

SEC. 501. The Director of Central Intelligence is authorized to provide for a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency by the acquisition of land at a cost of not to exceed $6 million, and construction of buildings, facilities, appurtenances, utilities, and access roads at a cost of not to exceed $50 million.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the establishment or development of military and naval installations and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV of this act, and the Director of Central Intelligence is authorized to proceed with the establishment of a Central Intelligence Agency Headquarters Installation as authorized by title V of this act, without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The authority under this act of the Secretary of a military department to provide family housing includes authority to acquire such land as the Secretary concerned determines, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in connection therewith. The authority to establish or develop such installations and facilities shall include, in respect of those installations and facilities as to which family housing or the acquisition of land is specified in titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this act, authority to make surveys and to acquire lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, and to place permanent or temporary improvements thereon whether such lands are held in fee or under lease or under other temporary tenure.

SEC. 602. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act, but not to exceed—

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, $238,778,000; outside continental United States, $78,334,000; section 102, $223,993,000; section 103, $10 million; or a total of $551,105,000;

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, $331,607,200; outside continental United States, $107,191,300; section 202, $151,342,400; section 203, $6 million; or a total of $596,140,900;

(3) for public works authorized by title III: Inside continental United States, $709,480,000; outside continental United States, $450,973,000; section 302, $5 million; or a total of $1,165,453,000; and

(4) for public works authorized by title IV: $300,000.

(5) for public works authorized by title V: $56 million.

SEC. 603. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 5 percent in the case of projects within the continental United States, and 10 percent in the case of projects outside the continental United States, but the total cost of all projects so enumerated under each of such titles shall not exceed the total of all amounts specified in respect of projects in such title.

SEC. 604. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction, including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

SEC. 605. Whenever—

(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this act; and

(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress.

SEC. 606. All contracts entered into by the United States pursuant to the authorization contained in this act shall be awarded, so far as practicable, if the interest of the national security shall not be impaired thereby and if such award is consistent with the provision of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 607. Section 407 of the Public Law 765, 83d Congress, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease of otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, by the expenditure of the $100 million through the use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for such family housing in a dollar amount equivalent to the value to the foreign currencies used pursuant to the authority contained in this section. For the purpose of such reimbursement, the Department of Defense may utilize appropriations otherwise available for the construction of military public works.

"The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives quarterly reports, the first of which shall be submitted 3 months subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the 3-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter."

SEC. 608. All housing units constructed under the authority of this act shall be subject to the net floor area permanent limitations prescribed in the second, third, and fourth provisos of section 3 of the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 375), or in section 3 of the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), other than the first, second, and third provisos thereof: *Provided*, That such limitations shall not apply to the unit of family housing authorized by title IV of this act for the use of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor shall the limitations on the cost of family housing that are prescribed by section 608 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1956 (H. R. 6042) apply with respect to such units of family housing.

SEC. 609. When housing units are constructed under the authority of this act at installations at which housing units shall have been constructed and a mortgage thereon insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, may, upon application by the mortgagor, accept on behalf of the Government the mortgagor's title to or leasehold interest in the housing units and underlying land, subject to the outstanding mortgage thereon, and assume the payments thereafter becoming due under any such outstanding mortgage and the cost of maintenance and operation thereafter accruing with respect to such housing units. Such housing units shall thereafter be under the jurisdiction of the military department concerned. The Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize appropriations otherwise available for construction of military public works for the liquidation of any outstanding mortgage assumed by the Government.

SEC. 610. As of July 1, 1956, all authorizations for military public works projects to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military, naval, or Air Force installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts approved prior to October 1, 1951, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except (1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in such acts in the titles that contain the general provisions, (2) authorizations for military public works projects as to which appropriated funds shall have been obligated in whole or in part prior to July 1, 1956, and authorizations for appropriations therefor, and (3) the authorizations with respect to military public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 829).

SEC. 611. Section 504 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services in connection with public work projects which are not otherwise authorized by law."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment, and that the bill be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statistics which have recently been published by the Pentagon concerning contract awards to the 100 largest prime contractors. You will remember than on January 11, 1954, the Department of Defense issued a report, cumulative in nature, showing data on contracts made during the period July 1950 through June 1953.

The report showed that a total of $98,723,000,000 had been awarded in prime contracts during the period. It showed that 64 percent or $63,165,000,000 had been awarded to 100 companies and corporate groups.

It showed that the General Motors Corp., through 32 of its divisions, had contracts amounting to $7,095,800,000, or 7.2 percent of the $98.7 billion total.

The next nine, in order of rank, were:

Company	Millions of dollars	Percent of total
Boeing Airplane Co	$4,402.9	4.4
General Electric Co	3,459.2	3.6
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc	2,867.8	2.9
United Aircraft Corp	2,816.4	2.8
Chrysler Corp	2,199.9	2.2
Lockheed Aircraft Corp	2,152.1	2.2
Consolidated Vultee Aircraft	2,072.1	2.1
North American Aviation, Inc	1,931.6	2.0
Republic Aviation Corp	1,877.7	1.9

Significantly, this report carried a blocked-in space which reads:

This is the final issue in this series of reports, which has covered 3 fiscal years of expanded procurement activity following the start of the Korean conflict. The report is being discontinued for economy reasons.

During the remainder of 1954, despite many requests for current information on the large prime contractors, the Pentagon failed to make this information available to the public.

On May 16, 1955, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—issued an "Analysis of large military prime contractors in the period from July 1, 1953 to December 31, 1954." The transmittal letter explained that this report is for the 18-month period only and is not cumulative as the former reports had been. About $16 billion in contracts had been awarded and the 10 largest contractors with their percentages of the total, $16 billion, follow:

Company	Millions of dollars	Percent of total
United Aircraft Corp	$1,061.4	6.5
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc	1,041.8	6.4
North American Aviation, Inc	910.2	5.6
Boeing Airplane Co	764.9	4.7
Lockheed Aircraft Corp	740.8	4.5
General Dynamics Corp	597.9	3.7
Grumman Aircraft Engineering	377.1	2.3
Curtiss-Wright Corp	340.1	2.1
Republic Aviation Corp	329.5	2.0
Hughes Tool Co	313.3	1.9

Now, I do not know why the format of the report was changed. General Motors, for example, lost its preeminence and was dropped from the No. 1 ranking on the January 11, 1954 report to almost obscurity on the May 16, 1955 report. Actually, I would think that the former chairman of the General Motors Corp. would have been hurt at this drop in rank and prestige with his well-known economic-political philosophy on "what is good for what." When I read that report my heart really went out in sympathy for General Motors. I could not understand why Charles Wilson as Secretary Wilson should discriminate against this company. But as we view the real statistics the picture is different. So that the statistics might be consistent, I have added the last report to the former and have again made the rankings on a cumulative basis. For the period from July 1, 1950 through December 31, 1954, the total awards were $115,060,200,000. The order of ranking of the 10 largest is as follows:

Company	Cumulative total	
	Millions of dollars	Percent
General Motors Corp	7,036.9	6.8
Boeing Airplane Co	5,167.8	4.49
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc	3,909.6	3.4
United Aircraft Corp	3,877.8	3.3
General Electric Co	3,672.5	3.19
Lockheed Aircraft Corp	2,892.9	2.5
North American Aviation, Inc	2,841.8	2.4
Curtiss-Wright Corp	2,086.3	1.8
American Telephone & Telegraph Co	1,755.3	1.5
Ford Motor Co	1,663.2	1.4

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It is my understanding, and it was brought out in general debate during the $31½ billion appropriation bill for the Department of Defense, that 85 percent of these contracts are let by negotiation and not by competitive bids; is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do this simply to ask the majority leader—so what? General Motors today has more than 10 percent of all the machinery of these industries producing war goods. If we want to get our war goods produced and produced on time, shall we ignore the largest, most efficient industrial producing company in the world and say, "Because you are so large we

cannot give you anything at all; we will go out and organize new companies to produce these goods with consequent delay, and so forth?"

In my opinion that is all nonsense. I am sure you will find that the contracts let for war production will be let in proportion to the size of these industries that will be named. This one, being the largest, we will say will have 7 percent; this one, being the next largest, we will say will have 5 percent; and so on down the line.

What is wrong with that? That is the reason this administration has men who know how to get things done when we need them done.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. First of all, I want to raise the question as to the appropriateness of the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] during this military construction bill. I am sure those companies he mentioned are not involved, and are not going to be involved in the construction that this bill contemplates. Secondly, I want to correct the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] which statement he has made on this floor a number of times and compounded his error by the repetition, that 85 percent of the defense contracts are let on a basis of negotiation.

One particular phase of the aircraft program was mentioned on this floor as being done upon that basis. If the gentleman from Tennessee wants to take the responsibility of opening up the many complicated phases of aircraft research and development and materiel development in the field of aircraft procurement to anyone who desires to bid, whether they be foreign, whether they be American, whether they be responsible or otherwise, that will be his responsibility.

I have not heard anything on the floor to indicate that he is so much interested in competitive free enterprise in this country to be sure he would want to do that. In fact, some of the things he had to say in connection with the appropriation bill affecting the Tennessee Valley Authority and the contracts relating to it here a couple of weeks ago led me to question seriously whether he really is interested in free competitive enterprise in this country.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I end up by saying, So what?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of drawing this into a personal debate. However, since the gentleman has seen fit to question my authority and my motives regarding certain statements I have made on the floor I feel that I should rise to defend myself.

It always seems to be a point of personal defense against any subject being discussed to attack anyone who seems to be interested in TVA. I am proud to be recognized among the TVA adherents. I would like to invite the gentleman from Wisconsin to come down and inspect that great development sometime, and perhaps he would learn a few things that he does not know about this great country of ours.

As far as the 85-percent figure is concerned that I gave on the floor here under direct questioning of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he made the statement that 85 percent of the money spent under that bill for material procurement was through negotiation. As far as competitive bidding is concerned to the aircraft companies, and so forth relating to security I picked up a newspaper the other day and saw where the Russians already had all of the engineering plans and the scale drawing of an airplane that was classified as absolutely secret by our Defense Department, and they had had it for some 4 months and it had been published in a newspaper in Russia.

I believe we have but a very small percentage of our defense appropriation spent on secret materiel. Under those conditions, I believe it should be negotiated. I agree with the majority leader. I do not know particularly that General Motors should be awarded 7 percent of our defense contracts simply because, as I have heard said, they have a negotiator on each side of the table. At any rate, I firmly believe we could save at least 10 to 15 percent of the money we spend on defense every year if our contracts were awarded on a competitive basis.

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

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It amuses me to see how sensitive some Members are when you mention the name of General Motors, when you simply state the facts to show that they still are the largest prime contractor on defense contracts by far, by at least 33⅓ percent above the next company.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Dealing in the same type of enterprise.

Mr. McCORMACK. They ask, "So what?" What about the small independent businessmen of this country? What about them? How much are they being awarded? What consideration are they receiving as a result of these large contracts? How much are they cut down in their contracts?

What about the mergers going on, more mergers by 300 percent during any one of the last 3 years than took place in the largest year during the two decades prior to that? Those are some of the questions the gentleman from Illinois, my friend Mr. MASON, should also consider. So when we take the floor to tell the facts in cumulative form showing that General Motors has not been discriminated against, my good friend gets very sensitive; and the more he gets sensitive the better I like it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. We do not want General Motors to be discriminated against, certainly not, but at the same time we do not want other companies to be discriminated against.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all sensitive about the remarks that have been made. I am sure the gentleman was not referring to me when he used those terms. But I do not like to see errors compounded on the floor of this House by people who are not acquainted with the facts. I am just as sure, as I am of the fact that I am standing here, and I happen to serve on the same subcommittee and heard the same information which the gentleman from Texas did, and the statement made by the gentleman from Texas was entirely correct about the 85 percent because it related to the aircraft procurement of the Department of Defense. Shortly thereafter, under circumstances that did not permit correction at that particular moment, the gentleman from Tennessee who just addressed the House referred to five-sixths of the entire $32½ billion appropriation in the Defense Department appropriation bill, something that was ridiculous on its face. There is too much in that amount which is not contracted for at all, which cannot be a matter of negotiation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman so that the gentleman can correct himself.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I referred to that part of it which is used for material and procurement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Then, if you had not made a statement about the five-sixths of $31½ billion, you would have been correct. I am glad to see that you are correcting the impression that you created in the statement made on the floor of the House in relation to it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me to say, of course, we realize that part of the $31½ billion is for salaries of personnel and many other things. I am talking about that part of the $31½ billion which is spent for material and procurement.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am glad to give the gentleman an opportunity to correct himself.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 34, line 18, strike out the colon and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "Air base to be known as 'Richard Bong Air Force Base'."

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have accepted that amendment, and I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that at this point he insert a statement in regard to the outstanding achievements of this great aviator.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it is a real privilege and an honor for me to suggest that the Greater Milwaukee area air base proposed for Kansasville, Wis., which is in

my congressional district, should be designated as the Richard Bong Air Force Base in honor of this Wisconsin boy who was an ace of aces in World War II. He achieved the greatest combat record for destroying enemy air planes during the war in the Pacific of any other American.

It is fitting and proper, therefore, that I propose an amendment to H. R. 6829, which would authorize the establishment of this base, and which when completed will bear the name of this outstanding Wisconsin hero.

I am indebted to the distinguished Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, for his approval of my amendment and to the distinguished minority leader on the Republican side [Mr. SHORT] for a similar courtesy which he has extended.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I am setting down for posterity a statement of the military service of Richard Ira Bong, who was born on the 24th day of September 1920, at Superior, Wis., and whose mother and father still reside at Poplar, Wis.

Aviation cadet, May 29, 1941; second lieutenant, AC, Reserve, January 9, 1942; first lieutenant, Army of the United States, AC, April 6, 1943; first lieutenant, Army of the United States, August 9, 1943; captain, Army of the United States, AC, August 24, 1943; captain, Army of the United States, February 24, 1944; major, Army of the United States, AC, April 12 1944; major, Army of the United States, August 1, 1944; first lieutenant, AC, Reserve, January 9, 1945.

Rating: Pilot.

SERVICE

Richard Ira Bong enlisted in the Regular Army at Wausau, Wis., on May 29, 1941, in the grade of flying cadet. He was assigned service number 16022192 and transferred to Tulare, Calif., where he completed his primary pilot training on August 16, 1941. From August 19, 1941, until October 31, 1941, he was assigned to Gardner Field, Calif., receiving his basic pilot training. He received his advance pilot training at Luke Field, Ariz., from November 4, 1941, to January 9, 1942, on which date he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Air Corps Reserves, and rated pilot.

After receiving his commission he was immediately called to extended active duty with the Air Corps and given an assignment as flying instructor at Luke Field, Ariz. On May 2, 1942, he was transferred to Hamilton Field, Calif., for combat training in P-38 type aircraft. Successfully completing this transition training early in September 1942 he was alerted for foreign service and departed the United States via air for duty in the Pacific area. Upon arrival in Australia he was assigned to the 9th Fighter Squadron, 49th Fighter Group, as combat fighter pilot. On November 14, 1942, he was reassigned to the 39th Fighter Squadron, 35th Fighter Group and destroyed 5 enemy aircraft before being returned to the 9th Fighter Squadron on January 11, 1943. He continued as fighter pilot with this organization flying P-38 type aircraft until November 11, 1943, when he was given 60 days leave and reassigned to Headquarters, 5th Fighter Command in New Guinea as Assistant A-3 in charge of replacement airplanes. While holding this assignment Major Bong continued flying combat missions and increased his individual total enemy aircraft destroyed to 28.

In April 1944, he was returned to the United States and assigned to the Matagorda Peninsula Bombing Range, Foster Field, Tex., for the purpose of receiving and checking on the latest gunnery methods and instructions. In September 1944, Major Bong returned to his assignment with the 5th Fighter Command in the Pacific Area and was placed in charge of gunnery training with that organization. In addition to his duties as gunnery instructor, though not required or expected to perform combat duty, he voluntarily flew 30 more combat missions over Borneo and the Philippine Islands, destroying 12 more enemy aircraft, bringing his total to 40 enemy aircraft destroyed. For his achievements during this second tour of overseas duty, Major Bong was awarded the Nation's highest decoration, the Medal of Honor. After completing over 200 combat missions for a total of over 500 combat hours, he was released from his assignment with the 5th Fighter Command in December 1944 and returned to the United States.

Upon his return to the United States, Major Bong was assigned as test pilot with the 4020th Army Air Force Base Unit at Wright Field, Ohio, making functional tests and ferrying missions in single and twin engine fighter-type aircraft. On June 23, 1945, he was transferred to Burbank, Calif., and given an assignment as Chief of Flight Operations, Office of the Army Air Force Plant Representative, in the Lockheed Aircraft Plant. Since this company was engaged in the development and manufacture of the new P-80 jet-type aircraft, Major Bong received a full training course prescribed for this type airplane at Muroc Lake Flight Test Base, Calif.

Major Bong was killed on August 6, 1945, when the P-80 aircraft he was flying crashed near Burbank, Calif., due to power failure, reasons unknown.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Marjorie Ann Bong, whose last known address is 5640 Franklin Avenue, Hollywood, Calif. He is also survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl T. Bong, Poplar, Wis.

AWARDS

Medal of Honor, War Department General Orders 90, December 8, 1944.

Distinguished Service Cross, General Orders 62, Headquarters, USAFFE, October 20, 1943.

Silver Star with one Oak Leaf Cluster: Silver Star, General Orders 2, Headquarters, 5th Fighter Command, January 24, 1943; first Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 287, Headquarters 5th Air Force, November 19, 1943.

Distinguished Flying Cross with six Oak Leaf Clusters: Distinguished Flying Cross, General Orders 110, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, June 14, 1943; first Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 135, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, June 28, 1943; second Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 104, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, February 22, 1944; third Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 116, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 1, 1944; fourth Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 139, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 15, 1944; fifth and sixth Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 345, Headquarters, FEAF, December 28, 1944.

Air Medal with 14 Oak Leaf Clusters: Air Medal, General Orders 22, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, April 23, 1943; 1st Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 186, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, August 26, 1943; 2d through 9th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 287, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, November 19, 1943; 10th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 117, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 2, 1944; 11th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 131, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, March 11, 1944; 12th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 262, Headquarters, 5th Air Force, April 28, 1944; 13th Oak Leaf Cluster and 14th Oak Leaf Cluster, General Orders 345, Headquarters, FEAF, December 28, 1944.

Australian Distinguished Flying Cross.

American Defense Service Medal.

World War II Victory Medal.

American Campaign Medal.

Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one Silver Service Star for participation in the Leyte, Luzon, New Guinea, northern Solomons, and Papua campaigns.

Distinguished Unit Citation Emblem with one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one Bronze Service Star.

Philippine Republic Presidential Unit Citation Emblem.

Philippine Independence Ribbon.

Aviation Badge "Pilot."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to add my own words of appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin, my colleague, in whose district this base is to be located for his amendment which would name this installation after this greatest of all Wisconsin military heroes in modern times. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member for their agreement on this highly appropriate amendment at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished majority leader, my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], said something that rather touched me personally where it is tender, when he said that we on the Republican side get a little sensitive whenever the name of General Motors is mentioned.

It so happens that I have four or five General Motors factories in my district. My memory is not so short but what I remember well that during the last war Detroit, Mich., and that area was known as the arsenal of democracy. We made the things, the sinews of war, that were needed to defend ourselves and the freedom of this world. General Motors did its full share, a major share in that program of production, and the people of Michigan, whom I represent, were proud of that record.

The statement has been made which, in my judgment, brings into disrepute and gives the impression that there is something dishonest about the contracts which are made with General Motors.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] said something about General Motors having negotiators on both sides of the table. It so happens that I know Mr. Charles E. Wilson, and I defy anybody on either side of the aisle to point to one dishonest, one unmanly thing that he has ever committed in public or private life. He is a man of integrity, highest character, great ability and is making a terrific sacrifice to serve our country. If we are to attract men and women of public spirit and ability we must treat them fairly. It so happens that General Motors has factories all over this country, and naturally the contracts are given to them. I am surprised that the number and percentage is as low as it is, when you consider that General Motors has factories which can do the job all over this country. And it must also be remembered that hundreds of small, independent companies contribute to the

work through subcontracts. What is wrong about that?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I will let you explain to the House in your own time about having negotiators on both sides of the table.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I did not mention the name of the Defense Secretary. You are the one who mentioned his name; nor did I intend to attack his honesty or integrity to any degree.

Mr. DONDERO. But no one on this floor who knows anything about the fine man who is at the head of our Defense Department could possibly get any other impression except that you were pointing the finger of scorn and dishonesty at Mr. Wilson of the Defense Department. I hope the gentleman will clear that up.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would also like to remind the gentleman there are several former General Motors' employees in the Department of Defense, so I am told.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be, but they do not control the making of contracts. I have never heard anything or seen anything in the public press that the contracts which General Motors gets from the Federal Government were unfairly obtained. I am amazed how low the percentage is, and what it means to the economy of this country. Let us keep this thing above the belt and be fair to a great company that has made its vast contribution to the welfare of our country, and especially in time of need, when we needed the materials of war to defend ourselves. War material contracts are generally urgent and must be made to secure prompt delivery. They must also be adequately contracted. Surely you would not spend the people's money inefficiently or improperly.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], ought to do some explaining. He says he did not mean the Secretary of Defense but some other employees of General Motors. I think we ought to get that clear, because if there are any employees of General Motors who are acting as negotiators for General Motors and not the United States Government, and there is collusion involved, we ought to know about it. If the gentleman has any information, he ought to name those people. I come from Michigan, and I am proud of General Motors. And I am proud of the employees who work for them.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If you will let me correct you, I said "former" employees of General Motors.

Mr. CEDERBERG. How are they on both sides of the table?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not have to explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Well, you ought not to make statements if you cannot back them up.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentlemen who are involved in this controversy will answer in their own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Renumber section 609 as section 609 (a) and after the end thereof add the following new section 609 (b):

"(b) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to acquire by purchase housing units which are located near military installations, which are adequate and suitable for housing military personnel and their dependents, and as to which a mortgage is insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VI or title IX of the National Housing Act, subject to the outstanding mortgage thereon, and to assume the payments thereafter becoming due on such mortgage. The Secretary of the military department concerned may utilize appropriations available for the construction of military public works for the liquidation of any outstanding mortgage assumed by the Government."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to lodge discretionary authority in the three Secretaries so that, if in their judgment the facts and circumstances warrant it, they may acquire houses that have been built under title VI and title IX of the FHA Act. It is not mandatory; it just gives the Secretary of Defense an opportunity to look over the field in the location where he needs housing and see what he may be able to buy instead of build.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does this language include the possibility of the Defense Department taking over Lanham Act houses that are being closed out?

Mr. VINSON. No; it does not permit that. This is a business proposition which permits the Secretary, where the facts and circumstances warrant it, to negotiate for the purchase of these FHA-insured houses that meet the requirements standards of the armed services. It is purely discretionary authority, that is all.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent amendment. I offered substantially this same amendment in the Committee on the Armed Services and there was considerable debate in reference to this and another amendment offered by one of my colleagues. In the end we did not vote on the amendment; but this, I think, is an excellent amendment, and it does permit the defense departments to utilize housing which might be available to the United States Government if it meets all of the requirements.

I think we ought to give the Defense Department this opportunity to take advantage of what is available to us, some of which might otherwise be handled at a direct loss to our taxpayers. I am therefore very much in favor of the amendment and see no objection to it. I hope the other Members agree with me in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there are no further amendments from the committee.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this military construction bill before us at this time is on the whole a good bill. The committee has worked long and arduous hours in going into detail on this measure.

I want to congratulate the chairman, the Honorable CARL VINSON, for the special effort that he has placed on this bill. I doubt if there is a person in the United States, in the service or out, that has a better understanding of the various military installations of our country than does the gentleman from Georgia.

This bill calls for a great deal of money, perhaps too much. We have in the past spent enormous sums of money on our various military installations, and at times in the past I fear this money has been spent in a haphazard manner—without the proper planning and end in view. This condition is excusable during a war. We are now attempting to work toward a definite goal, a goal that will provide proper installations for our armed services at home and abroad, and in a sufficient capacity for our permanent defense forces.

I hope and believe that now we have arrived at a construction program where we can see diminishing expenditures within a few years. Much of the money in this bill is for family and troop housing. Proper living quarters and conditions should go a long way toward making the armed services more attractive as a career and encourage reenlistments. We hope that the services can be so attractive that in the foreseeable future we can do away with the draft and depend upon purely voluntary Armed Forces.

Many people believe that we are spending too much money for the construction and improvement of our air, army and naval bases. If we are going to have peace which will last for many years, we are spending too much money, but if we are faced with war in the foreseeable future, and I am one who believes that we are not, then the money which we have spent on military construction is well worth while. It is something on which none of us want to gamble.

It is only human that we should make errors on this program, but on the whole I want to assure you that we are working toward a definite and foreseeable goal. I want to be fair with you, however, and state that there are items in this bill which I believe are unnecessary, items to which I and some other members of the committee are opposed. One special item which I want to mention is the authorization for Camp Carson, Colo. This camp has at the present time all the

facilities necessary to take care of all of the troops there. Yet the Army has now launched a program with plans to spend over $200 million on this post. The plan is to keep all of the present buildings on the post in a state of readiness and repair and, in addition, to ultimately spend over $200 million on new construction. This planned program, if finally carried out, will result in twice the number of buildings at Camp Carson than are necessary.

The principal excuse the Army gave for this great expansion and expenditure for Camp Carson is that it is used as a support base for Camp Hale, some 80 miles away in the mountains. Camp Hale is used for the winter training of Army units. There are but few permanent buildings there, and few are contemplated. Camp Hale could be supported from many other locations. It is not necessary to expend $200 million on a permanent fort to support a mountain camp that is only used a few months a year. In addition, there is a shortage of water at Colorado Springs, where Camp Carson is located. Also, the Air Force is constructing its new Air Academy in the same location. This will further tax the already low water supply. There are many reasons why a military camp the size of Camp Carson should not be located and expanded in the immediate vicinity of the Air Force Academy, reasons which are apparent to anyone acquainted with the situation.

The chairman of the committee, Hon. CARL VINSON, pointed out many objectionable features to expanding this camp. On page 3742 of the hearings he said of this authorization for Camp Carson:

> And we are going to spend $140 million to $175 million to build up an Air Academy. * * *
>
> We are building it. And here comes along Camp Carson, right in that neighborhood. And now you want to expand it. * * * So I don't think we should expand Carson one iota.

I have spoken in committee, as well as on the floor, against the authorizations for Camp Carson. However, I realize it is unfair to vote against this entire bill just because of improper items contained therein. This is merely an authorization bill, and I trust in the future this expansion of Camp Carson can be stopped either by the Department of Defense, the Army, or the Appropriations Committee.

Some of the members of the committee also unsuccessfully opposed the expansion of Fort Sill. In this bill Fort Sill is authorized to take approximately 30,000 acres from the Wichita Mountains wildlife and game refuge and neighboring communities. This wildlife refuge is one of the finest in the country and is visited by many thousands daily. The local communities were bitter against this annexation. Fort Sill already has 74,000 acres. I, for one, believe this expansion was unnecessary. However, the majority of the committee thought otherwise. It is only natural that there will be differences of opinion on a bill of this magnitude.

I want to point out again that while there are parts of this bill that I cannot agree with, on the whole the bill is good, and I believe it is planned and coordinated toward a sane and well-balanced defense.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am voting "present" on the rollcall on H. R. 6829, authorizing construction for the military departments and the Central Intelligence Agency.

To me, this is the only sound position open because I have not been able to find in the extensive hearings and the report the facts I feel I need in order to pass on this $2.36 billion authorization for the purchase of more real estate by the Department of Defense, which already holds properties costing more than $24.8 billion with some of it being carried at ridiculously low acquisition costs. This holding comprises 61 percent of the acquired real property of the United States Government. In addition, the Department of Defense leases 190 locations including 1,983,686 acres for which it pays an annual rental of $19,697,000.

I cannot say that the armed services do not need every facility provided in the bill before us today—but, after reading the hearings, I do have some reasonable doubts. Neither can I say that the armed services do need these facilities and this land in every case.

In the brief of authorizations, under title I, the Army lists $223,993,000, or 40 percent, of its construction authorizations as "classified." The Navy, under title II, lists $151,342,400, or about 25 percent of its construction funds as "classified." I am pleased that the Air Force seems more detailed and forthright in its justifications throughout and does not hide behind the term "classified" for projects most of which are being built right here in the United States, where all our citizens can observe daily the steam shovels, bulldozers, and steelworkers working on the projects so carefully "classified" from Congress.

I have been unable to discover just what is the construction included in title IV for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Evidently this $300,000 did not appear in the original H. R. 5700 as introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], at least not in title IV where it is now. Is this a house for Admiral Radford? Is it an elite housing project to provide for his personal staff, too? How many facilities can you provide for an admiral for $300,000? I am not saying that this is necessarily either an unwise or an unjustified expenditure; I would just like to know what it is for and what we get for the money. Such items as "Chairman, JCS, $300,000," do not explain to me what use is to be made of the taxpayers' money any more than I can be completely satisfied with general phrases such as "Operational and maintenance facilities," "Community facilities," and "Storage facilities," as justifications for the expenditure of billions of dollars.

I do not know whether the CIA needs a $6 million building site and a $50 million building, or not. I do not know or have any idea of how many employees CIA now has. I do not know what they do or to whom they are really accountable. Perhaps if I knew these things I would want to increase the CIA construction authorization, but I guess I will never know. Perhaps those of us in Congress will, someday, create a Joint Committee on Intelligence to provide congressional guidance to CIA modeled on that which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has developed in its field. Certainly we exercise no controls over this super secret agency through a check on the purse strings.

The Committee on Armed Services deserves due credit for their application and diligent work on this piece of legislation. The hearings total 4,091 pages, accumulated in approximately 50 hours and 25 minutes of on-the-record hearings spread over 21 days. Rapidly calculating, I estimate that the committee considered this authorization at about the rate of $789,666 per minute of open hearing time, an evidence of unusual efficiency especially when you consider that their considerations ranged from Alaska to the Midway Islands including the British West Indies, the Canal Zone, Cuba, French Morocco, Hawaii, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Johnson Island, Mariana Islands, and the Marshall Islands in between. Without being able to tell what went on in the off-the-record hearings, one can wish the Army and Navy had justified their requests as forthrightly as the Air Force.

The Army will be authorized $551,105,000 in this bill as contrasted with $236 million granted in fiscal 1955—an increase of over 100 percent. The Navy will be authorized $596,140,900 in this bill to accomplish public works as compared with about $202 million for fiscal 1955, an increase of well over 100 percent. The Air Force will be authorized $1,165,456,000 in this bill, an increase of more than 300 percent over last year's authorization of $398,954,000.

Is this too much, or is it too little? Can we use this real estate instead of weapons against an enemy? I just do not know. On the basis of the information furnished me I have no way of reaching a sensible conclusion. So, I voted "Present."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. METCALF, 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. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 283, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on final passage I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 2, answering "present" 2, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—316

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Bowler
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Buchanan
Budge
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Cole
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Dixon
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Gary
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gordon
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn
Haley
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Holmes
Hope
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krueger
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mahon
Marshall
Martin
Mason
Matthews
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Moss
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Phillips
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rutherford
Sadlack
Saylor
Schenck
Scott
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—2

Bailey
Harvey

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—2

Brownson
Scrivner

NOT VOTING—114

Adair
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Anfuso
Barden
Barrett
Becker
Blitch
Boland
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Boykin
Brooks, Tex.
Buckley
Burdick
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Chase
Chatham
Davidson
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Dollinger
Donovan
Dowdy
Doyle
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Engle
Fino
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gathings
Granahan
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagen
Hale
Halleck
Harrison, Nebr.
Heselton
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holt
Holtzman
Horan
Ikard
Jackson
James
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Kee
King, Pa.
Klein
Knox
Knutson
Laird
Lesinski
Lovre
McConnell
McGregor
McIntire
Mack, Ill.
Magnuson
Mailliard
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N. Y.
Morgan
Morrison
Moulder
Mumma
Nelson
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Konski
Polk
Powell
Quigley
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Riehlman
Rivers
Robsion, Ky.
Roosevelt
St. George
Scherer
Schwengel
Sheppard
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Velde
Williams, N. J.
Wilson, Calif.
Withrow
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Halleck.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Kean.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. James.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Polk with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Anfuso with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Williams of New Jersey with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Engel with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Utt.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Gamble.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Ikard with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Lovre.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Hagen with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 95 I was necessarily absent at the Pentagon. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ELIZABETH KEE—WEST VIRGINIA'S DAUGHTER OF THE YEAR

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, in the June 17 issue of the White Sulphur Sentinel, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., Miss Pat Sullivan in her column "Saunterings" congratulates the State of West Virginia for having such an illustrious daughter as our colleague, the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE, Fifth District, West Virginia. I have known Elizabeth as the wife of my good friend and former colleague, the late John Kee. I have known her as a vivacious woman and an active, sincere representative for her district.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks I include this article in the RECORD.

I plume myself I'm getting up in the world—on my acquaintance list are not only West Virginia's queenly royalty of festival

days and the hermit of the Alleghenies, but I also claim acquaintance with the former West Virginia mother of the year, the beloved Mrs. Alex Thompson of Alderson. I count as my close friends a few people rich enough to be retired. But this "bla bla bla fanfare" is to tell you I also know West Virginia's daughter of the year. My gracious friend, the Honorable ELIZABETH KEE, of Bluefield, W. Va., and of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., received this distinct honor last May 7 when the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia held its annual son-and-daughter banquet honoring West Virginia's outstanding son and daughter of the year 1955. Mrs. KEE was selected as our State's most distinguished daughter and she was presented with a beautiful plaque by a former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Jennings Randolph. Just naturally letters and telegrams of applause poured into her mailbox from friends and acquaintances expressing their confidence and appreciation of her integrity and eminent service to her people. The Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, paid tribute to ELIZABETH KEE in appreciative poetic phrases that were written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 10, 1955, plus letters like orchids from such biggies as Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Senator H. M. KILGORE, and GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho, and a half dozen others were applause in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for West Virginia's favorite daughter. Humbly I add my soprano cheers for my favorite politician. Once a year at least we meet at the State fairgrounds at Fairlea, W. Va. But where in heck were you last summer, ELIZABETH KEE? I missed you. I want to complain also about your pictures on the roadside billboards, because the pictures were not nearly so pretty as you are. Congratulations, Daughter of 1955, room 1016, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

AMENDING THE TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. YOUNGER.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Consent Calendar to be called on Tuesday, July 5, and that it also be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members for suspension of the rules on the same day.

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

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 283) 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. 6795) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, 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 vice chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 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. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 283 which will make in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 6795, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 283 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 6795 has been reported unanimously by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 modified the Commission's authority to seek appropriations in such a manner that it become necessary for the Commission to obtain "congressional approval of new construction or expansion of its plants." The bill which we are presenting under this rule today is the first authorizing legislation resulting from the change in the Commission's authority to seek appropriations.

Specifically H. R. 6795 would authorize the appropriation to the Commission of $267,709,000 for the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and itemizes the projects for which this money may be appropriated, together with an estimate of the cost of each.

The bill also specifies the various projects which may be developed under the authorization contained in this bill. The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule, and the bill also sets forth the limitations imposed in the proposed bill upon the expenditures and the projects proposed.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule that is proposed here today. Amendments may be offered from the floor, and the bill is, therefore, amendable from the floor if the House so desires to amend the bill. We all know that these atomic projects are vitally important to the national welfare of this country, and for this reason H. R. 6795 deserves the careful consideration of this House. I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the House will then proceed to give serious consideration to the merits of the bill itself.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a vital part of the national defense. There is no opposition, either in the legislative committee which considered the same or the Committee on Rules.

I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. 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. 6795) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, 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. 6795) with Mr. McCARTHY 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 North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina may proceed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, this legislation, the bill H. R. 6795, which is before us today, is somewhat of a milestone and new approach to atomic legislation. As was pointed out a few minutes ago by the gentleman from New York, a member of the Committee on Rules, the Atomic Energy Commission has previously simply gone to the Appropriations Committee and secured money to build whatever items it could get approved by that committee.

Last year's act, as you all recall, brings the Atomic Energy Commission into line with other Government agencies, which I feel is sound legislative procedure. The items included in this bill are needed by the Atomic Energy Commission; the joint committee has gone over each of them very carefully and approved them. There is but one item in the bill that has not yet been approved by the Budget Bureau: that is, one for $5 million for research reactors abroad. The committee added this item after the President's

announcement at State College, Pa., on the extension of the atoms-for-peace program which he hopes to initiate with friendly countries.

The bill, H. R. 6795, is authorizing legislation resulting from the change in the Commission's statutory authority to seek appropriations. Since 1946 the House and Senate Appropriations Committees have done a magnificent job in meeting the needs of the Atomic Energy Commission and supporting this agency and the part it has played in our national defense through the development of new weapons.

We have before us legislation which combines, in my opinion, the best of the control features over the financial operations of the Commission, while at the same time it allows financial leeway to permit the most rapid progress in all of the Commission's essential programs.

The committee considered this bill at great length, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. The legislation sets forth by line and item the essential construction projects which the committee believes necessary to allow the Atomic Energy Commission to develop atomic energy at the maximum rate both for national defense and for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will be explained more fully by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], chairman of the joint committee's Subcommittee on Authorizing Legislation and who held the hearings on the items in detail. He has done an excellent job.

The bill and report, as you see them before you, outlines each item, which facilitates the committee's check and review of the Commission's program and expenditures.

There is one item which the committee has authorized and on which it placed a limitation. That is the training school at the National Laboratory at Chicago. We all recall when we adopted the new atomic legislation last year it carried with it rather broad authority for foreign students to come to this country and learn to use atomic energy for peaceful purposes. We have, therefore, initiated a training program for foreign students to assist those countries which do not have the trained personnel and which also lack the technical know-how which is basic in the peaceful use of atomic energy. That training program has resulted in a flood of applications from students of foreign countries. Most of them have a doctor's degree in engineering or science. They want to come to this country immediately and secure the best training we have to offer. The committee felt it wise therefore to go along with the request of the Commission for additional classrooms and highly specialized equipment because we want to carry out our promise. We have some 70 foreign students there now. This year the Commission wants to train approximately 124 foreign students at that school. There is but one school in this country at the present time that has the reactor on a college campus which can be used for the training of students. Therefore, it was necessary to expand the Argonne School. The committee, however, placed a limitation of 3 years on this training program. We believe that in 3 years many universities will have these reactors on their campuses and the Commission would no longer have to carry on this type of program.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman who has been in the past chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee a couple of questions. I have read the report and a portion of the bill. How much of the $267,709,000 is for what we would generally classify as peaceful purposes and how much is devoted to defense purposes? Could the gentleman give us that roughly?

Mr. DURHAM. I think it would be very difficult to break it down to an exact figure because anything you do in developing a reactor, for example, has a twofold purpose. It can produce power for peaceful purposes and it can be used as laboratory reactor for cancer research, or basic scientific research. Also, at the same time, it can produce materials for weapons, or can propel a warship. It would be very difficult to draw a line and say, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, what is for peaceful purposes. Further if we stop military production, you know, we could use most of this entire investment for peaceful purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman will recall that a few days ago the President gave out a public release in which they had initialed the agreement, for instance, with the Government of Pakistan to supply them with a reactor, as I understood, and that was to be for peaceful purposes. I understand what the gentleman means, but I am trying to get at the division. Is this 50–50 or one-quarter for peaceful purposes and three-quarters for defense?

Mr. DURHAM. I would hazard and guess and say it could be used either way you wanted to use it. If it became necessary, if we had an emergency, we could use all of this special nuclear material for national defense. We do not lose a grain of it. If we put it in a reactor, we do not lose one grain of this material, you understand. We hold ownership of it where it is sent. Consequently it is a very difficult thing to put it on a percentage basis.

There is $5 million in the bill for the program the gentleman just mentioned to build reactors for friendly countries under agreement for cooperation, and I think Pakistan is one of them, or at least I hope it is.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to ask the gentleman one further question, and I do not know that it necessarily applies to this bill. But, I do believe the House likes to be assured when these matters arise, and I know the gentleman has been present at practically all of these joint meetings.

Mr. DURHAM. Practically all of them.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can the gentleman assure the House that in the atomic energy field we are keeping up with our competitors so far as our national defense is concerned?

Mr. DURHAM. I believe I can assure this House that we are pre-eminent, and we expect to be and expect to continue to be.

Mr. SPRINGER. To remain ahead of all of our competitors in this field?

Mr. DURHAM. That is right. I can assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this bill, it will be noted, consists of five sections, the first of which lists the various construction items for which authorization is being asked, together with what is felt to be a reasonable upper dollar limit for the project. It will be noted that authorization is being given for the start of or continuation of certain long-range programs for which all of the money will not be expended in fiscal year 1956—that is to say, aircraft reactor test facilities.

The joint committee has weighed these items on the scales of programmatic justification with a secondary consideration of the estimated cost of the project. The committee feels that the final determination of the amount to be appropriated for these programs rests with the appropriations committees of both Houses.

Drawing upon its own experience and not inconsiderable experience of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, the joint committee has written into this bill, in the second section, section 102, certain restrictions on the authorization which it seeks to give the Atomic Energy Commission.

Heretofore it will be recalled that the Commission was entitled to start construction on a project if, at the time the project was initiated, the estimated cost thereof would not exceed by 35 percent the original estimated cost when the budget was prepared.

The joint committee now feels that the Commission has matured to the point where it is capable of making rather accurate estimates of the cost of its proposed facilities. Additionally, the committee feels that many of the factors which heretofore have influenced the final cost of any of the Commission's facilities no longer obtain. The committee has in mind such things as scarcity of construction materials, the crash nature of most of the Commission's earlier programs in which the construction of $100 million facilities was undertaken before scarcely more than a hand-drawn sketch of that facility had been completed.

In other words, it is now felt that the program has matured along with the agency to the point where the cost of programs can be anticipated and where the normal conventional way of drawing up blueprints, taking of careful cost estimates, and seeking bids, can be—and should be—the order of the day. With the foregoing in mind, the committee, as it will be noted, has divided the Commission's requested construction items into three categories, the first of which permits the Commission to initiate construction if at that time the cost is esti-

mated not to exceed the original estimate by 25 percent. The construction items in this group have elements of uncertainty which the committee feels makes them eligible for the larger percentage of deviation. The second category of items, it will be noted, has been limited to a 10-percent deviation. These items, the committee feels, are more or less conventional run-of-the-mill type of buildings and facilities for which estimates should be quite accurate and therefore minimum flexibility is provided. The third category of items, which are in this instance the access roads for the uranium-mining program, are of so routine a nature that the committee felt that no deviation from estimated cost was necessary.

This bill provides authorization for all items requested by the executive department except its request for $21 million to start construction on the so-called nuclear propelled cargo ship. After the Joint Committee's Authorizing Legislation Subcommittee started conducting its hearings on this bill, the executive department submitted this item as an addition to the construction projects to be undertaken immediately by the AEC. The joint committee had no previous knowledge that such a request would be made.

Expert testimony by Commission personnel indicates that this cargo-ship project, as submitted, calls for the construction or modification of a standard cargo-ship hull and the construction and installation of a *Nautilus* type nuclear powerplant.

After full review, it was the concensus of the joint committee that this project would be an extremely expensive way of accomplishing this purpose. I say expensive in that it would divert the Commission personnel from other projects which hold great promise for advancing the art of nuclear power in important ways; it provides nothing new in the field of nuclear power design and construction; and in using an enlarged but duplicate copy of a now out-of-date pioneering-type of nuclear powerplant it would be extremely uneconomical in operation.

After full review, the committee voted to eliminate this item and to urge the executive department to accelerate the development of a new advanced type surface propulsion system provided for in project 56–b–3 of section 101 of this bill, identified as surface ship reactor facility. This project, as it was originally submitted, would authorize the appropriation of $25 million for the construction of a prototype nuclear propulsion system for large surface ships primarily for military purposes. If the Commission would accelerate its efforts on this particular item, this propulsion system gives promise of being a great step forward in the development of nuclear powerplants over that of the pioneering reactor now installed in the *Nautilus* and would be, on a smaller scale, suitable for installation in a truly worthwhile cargo ship. This would better serve the purpose for which the administration requested the $21 million item which has been deleted and would do so much more efficiently and more economically and at the same time advance the art of reactor design. There would be little or no delay in the delivery of such an advanced vessel and powerplant and it would be a much more reliable and convincing display of American accomplishments in the field of peacetime power from atomic energy.

I therefore urge that everyone consider the committee's position as being one not opposed to the basic idea of a cargo ship but as one in favor of a really economic and convincing example of America's advanced position in the field of practical application of the atom for peacetime purposes.

In furthering the executive department's desire to demonstrate the American will to make the atom a tool for the betterment of mankind, the committee added another item which will be found in this bill which would authorize the appropriation of $5 million to be expended in furtherance of the President's wish to provide those nations which are willing to enter into bilateral agreements to cooperate with scientific and medical type reactors. This amount of money, authorizing project 56–g–7, would provide a minimum of 10 "swimming pool" type reactors on an outright contribution basis or as many as 20 if arrangements can be made for the recipient country to finance half of the cost thereof. The committee is wholeheartedly in favor of vigorously pushing this program and was unanimous in its vote to include these additional funds for this worthwhile purpose.

Section 103 of the bill authorizes the Commission to make use of funds available to it to initiate construction design and advance planning and provide itself with architectural services for new projects.

The committee feels this authority is needed by the Commission for two reasons: First, in a fast developing art—such as atomic energy—it is necessary to plan ahead for new facilities which will replace old ones rapidly made obsolete by advances made in the business; the second, is that without such preliminary planning and design work no accurate or precise estimate can be made of the costs involved. The committee feels that both of these factors are of sufficient importance to warrant the authority granted by section 103.

Section 104 provides the Atomic Energy Commission with the authority to utilize whatever moneys it might have available to it to initiate the replacement or repair of any of its facilties which might be damaged or destroyed by natural or other kinds of catastrophes.

Section 105 authorizes the appropriation of such funds as may be currently available to it for carrying out the purposes of this act. This authority is in addition to the authority granted by section 101 of this bill.

Section 106 of the bill provides the Commission with authority to transfer moneys authorized by this bill to substitute construction projects but only when the proposed substitute meets very precisely defined criteria and provided, further, that the Commission certifies that the new project is essential to the common defense and security of the United States. The project substituted under this section of the bill must not exceed in cost the authorized project for which it is being substituted. Further, the new project must be required by changes which have come about under certain changes in weapon characteristics or logistic operations and, finally, the Atomic Energy Commission must certify that it was unable to enter into a contract with any person on terms satisfactory to the Commission to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided by the new project.

The joint committee recognizes the need for flexibility in the Commission's fast-moving, highly technical program which forms so important a base of our national defense effort. However, after full consideration, the joint committee believes that sufficient latitude can be given the Commission to enable it to meet its program goals and at the same time afford a closer control to the Congress on the initiation or modification of construction, acquisition, or expansion of plants and facilities.

I, therefore, earnestly urge the passage of this bill so that the program of the Atomic Energy Commission which has been thoroughly reviewed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may go forward without further delay.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. I have been somewhat concerned in recent weeks by the number of bills which have gone through the Congress that required acquisition of land by the Federal Government; that is, taking it from the States or from private ownership and putting title in the Federal Government.

I notice language in the report here which would seem to indicate that considerable additional land is being acquired by the Atomic Energy Commission. I wonder if the gentleman could advise us as to how much land is to be acquired and generally the location of it and the need for its acquisition?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is only one item that I know that has to do with land in any considerable acreage and that is for some additional test facilities in a desertlike area. I do not believe it is carried as an item in this particular bill.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. There is very little land acquisition in this bill. Most of this is to be built on already existing projects. There is a small amount of land in here in connection with a $20 million project which is a testing facility which will be necessary. Outside of that there is very little land acquisition.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is very little land with the exception of such small areas.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield further.

Mr. BUDGE. Will the gentleman advise me as to the approximate location

of that area and the approximate number of acres to be acquired?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That matter has come up since our hearings. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] if he has further information on that.

Mr. DURHAM. That is a classified project and has not yet been released. The site has not been located.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested in this bill and I hope he will consider very carefully a bill which I introduced to create an academy of science.

We have the Military Academy, we have the Naval Academy, and we have the Air Corps Academy. As we seem to be behind in our scientific development, according to some of the experts, I feel it would be very valuable to have such an academy. It is a little along the line of the gentleman's bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The committee will be glad to examine the gentlewoman's bill if it comes before it. Right at this time at the Argonne Laboratory we are taking care of some hundreds of students from all over the United States and some from abroad, in the field of reactor technology. Regular training throughout the United States in the field of physics is pretty well taken care of by institutions like Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the gentlewoman's State, the California Institute of like kind, and the Chicago University, and other very fine universities throughout the United States. It is when students leave these college instruction courses and they want to go into the specialized field of reactor technology that additional help can be given them outside the universities.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is very much interested in this. Recently, one of the first of these reactors has been built at the University of North Carolina. We are hoping that we can blend in the regular university courses for the time being, instruction in this very specialized field, without having to go to the expense at this time of a tremendous new academy. I recognize there is a shortage of scientists in the United States, and certainly I am in favor of doing anything we can to enlarge the field of scientific learning in other fields, as well as in the field of atomic technology.

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

Mr. COLE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In addition to the experimental reactor on the campus of the University of North Carolina, there is already 1 on the campus of the State University of Pennsylvania, and possibly 10 others now under construction on the campuses of colleges throughout the country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman very much for his information.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire or intention to engage in further discussion of the bill before us, beyond the explanation already given by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The Members can see that the items authorized in this measure are of a very technical and complicated nature. Even though it were necessary to explain each of these items to the Members, I doubt if that would add much enlightenment, because of their complicated nature. Further, some of the items, by their very nature, are highly classified and could not be discussed.

However, there is one item not in the bill which I would like to discuss for a few moments, and that is with respect to the item which the Atomic Energy Commission requested of the joint committee, authorizing an appropriation of $21 million for the construction of a reactor to carry out the suggestion made by President Eisenhower for the construction of a surface merchant vessel propelled by atomic energy. That request was not approved by the joint committee, by a rather narrow margin. I think it can be said without contradiction that all members of the joint committee, even those who voted against this particular authorization, applauded the objective which the President had in mind when he made this suggestion.

That objective was that our Government should demonstrate to the world that this new force, atomic energy, has the inherent capacity of being adapted to the propulsion of merchant ships in peacetime commerce. This particular project, however, involved the use of a type of reactor which is already in operation in the submarine *Nautilus*. Therefore, it can be conceded that the same reactor will propel a ship on the surface of the water with the same measure of force it propels the ship underneath the surface of the waters; and since the project did not involve any new type of reactor, thereby giving to this country and to the world in general further information of reactor design and capabilities, the committee felt that the expenditure of a total of $33 million was not justified.

Mr. Chairman, I felt it necessary to make this brief observation as to the attitude of the Joint Committee toward the President's proposal because, I repeat, the joint committee was not in opposition to the objective the President sought. Rather, a majority of the members of the joint committee felt that the suggested means of carrying out the President's basic idea was not as practical as the amount of money involved should require.

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

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I am glad the gentleman brought up this point because what he said is absolutely correct. All of the members of the joint committee believe that while the objective of the President is something we want to attain, the method proposed lacks feasibility and practicability, since it contemplates the use of a reactor which has already been used in the *Nautilus* and is not well suited to merchant ship use. I am certainly glad the gentleman from New York mentioned the matter, and I join him in his statement.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SEC. 101. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission the sum of $267,709,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, as follows:

(a) Atomic weapons: Project 56-a-1, production or development plants or facilities, $20 million.

(b) Reactor development:

1. Project 56-b-1, power reactor development acceleration project, $25 million.

2. Project 56-b-2, fast power breeder pilot facility (EBR-II), $14,850,000.

3. Project 56-b-3, surface ship reactor facility, $25 million.

4. Project 56-b-4, submarine advanced reactor facility, $23,140,000.

5. Project 56-b-5, submarine advanced reactor development facilities, Schenectady, N. Y., $3,100,000.

6. Projcet 56-b-6, aircraft nuclear propulsion program plant and test area, Arco, Idaho, $13 million.

7. Project 56-b-7, aircraft reactor test plant, $1,437,000.

8. Project 56-b-8, modifications and expansions to ANP ground test plant, Idaho, $1 million.

9. Project 56-b-9, special reactor facilities construction program, $2 million.

10. Project 56-b-10, reactor core test facility, Arco, Idaho, $600,000.

(c) Physical research: Project 56-c-1, particle accelerator program, $10 million.

(d) Special nuclear material:

1. Project 56-d-1, metallex pilot facility, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $1 million.

2. Project 56-d-2, reactor facilities modifications, Hanford, Wash., $11,900,000.

3. Project 56-d-3, special reactor facilities equipment, Hanford, Wash., $5,600,000.

4. Project 56-d-4, modifications to separations and processing facilities, Hanford, Wash., $2,560,000.

5. Project 56-d-5, conversion of pilot plant and facility to production plant and facility, Fernald, Ohio, $600,000.

6. Project 56-d-6, barrier plant addition, Oak Ridge, Tenn., $750,000.

7. Project 56-d-7, new barrier development plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn., $404,000.

8. Project 56-d-8, expansion of metal recovery facility, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $370,000.

(e) Source and other raw materials:

1. Project 56-e-1, expansion and modification of ore processing plant, Monticello, Utah, $1,550,000.

2. Project 56-e-2, storage sites for vanadium tailings, $500,000.

(f) Atomic weapons:

1. Project 56-f-1, art construction project, fiscal year 1956 increment, $17,873,000.

2. Project 56-f-2, expansion of weapons material fabrication plant and facility, $15 million.

3. Project 56-f-3, new Sigma Laboratory, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $4,015,000.

4. Project 56-f-4, detonator production plant, $3,750,000.

5. Project 56-f-5, base construction, Pacific proving ground, $1,568,000.

6. Project 56-f-6, Rocky Flats, Colo., plant and facilities, $1,330,000.

7. Project 56-f-7, base construction, Nevada test site, $927,000.

8. Project 56-f-8, addition to technical laboratory shop building, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $735,000.

(g) Reactor development.

1. Project 56-g-1, engineering test reactor facility, $14,350,000.

2. Project 56-g-2, reactor training school, Argonne National Laboratory, $712,000.

3. Project 56-g-3, chemistry cave for radioactive materials, Argonne National Laboratory, $448,000.

4. Project 56-g-4, reactor engineering building addition, Argonne National Laboratory, $295,000.

5. Project 56-g-5, high level chemical development facility, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $230,000.

6. Project 56-g-6, research reactor, Philippine Government, $500,000.

7. Project 56-g-7, research reactors for the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy under Agreements for Cooperation, $5 million.

(h) Physical research—

1. Project 56-h-1, conversion of existing building to development plant, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $1,150,000.

2. Project 56-h-2, fabrication plant for development equipment, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $440,000.

(i) Biology and medicine: Project 56-i-1, medical research plant and facility, Brookhaven National Laboratory, $6,040,000.

(j) Community:

1. Project 56-j-1, additional housing units, Monticello, Utah, $250,000.

2. Project 56-j-2, new community hospital, Oak Ridge, Tenn., $2,900,000.

3. Project 56-j-3, water and sewer replacements and improvements, Richland, Wash., $160,000.

4. Project 56-j-4, housing program (group 18), Los Alamos, N. Mex., $3,500,000.

(k) Source and other raw materials: Project 56-k-1, offsite access roads, $4,165,000.

(l) General plant projects: $17,960,000.

SEC. 102. Limitations:

(a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (a) through 101 (d) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 percent the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (e) through 101 (j) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 percent the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start the project set forth in subsection 101 (k) only if the currently estimated cost of the project does not exceed the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(d) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101 (l) only if it is in accordance with the following:

1. For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $10,000.

2. For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such a project shall be $100,000.

3. The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101 (l) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 percent.

SEC. 103. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, in connection with projects which are not otherwise authorized by law, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 104. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds necessary to restore or to replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 105. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission by section 101 of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission to accomplish the purposes of this act such sums of money as may be currently available to the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 106. Funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this act may be used to start any other new project for which an estimate was not included in this act if it be a substitute for a project authorized in subsections 101 (a), 101 (d), or 101 (f), and the estimated cost thereof is within the limit of cost of the project for which substitution is to be made, and the Commission certifies that—

(a) the new project is essential to the common defense and security; and

(b) the new project is required by changes in weapon characteristics or weapon logistic operations;

(c) it is unable to enter into a contract with any person, including a licensee, on terms satisfactory to the Commission to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided in the new project.

Mr. DURHAM (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments? [After a pause.] There being no amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCARTHY, 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. 6795) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 283, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTEREST RATE ON CERTAIN LOANS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1755) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is legislation that takes away from the Department of Agriculture the power to fix interest rates and sets the rate at 3 percent.

Mr. POAGE. It fixes the rate at 3 percent. It now is discretionary with the Department, and some of these loans are being made at 5 percent, others are, I believe, at 3 percent. This bill fixes the rate of 3 percent.

Mr. MARTIN. This is disaster loans?

Mr. POAGE. It covers two different types of disaster loans; I believe this gets all disaster loans on a 3 percent basis, although there will still be some of what might be called commercial loans on which the Secretary can charge 5 percent. These are all disaster loans, but there are two different types of disaster loans. There is the loan that covers your country in New England, there is the loan that covers the disaster on account of the drought in the western part of the country, but they are not under the same law. This covers both of them.

Mr. MARTIN. This is by unanimous vote of the committee?

Mr. POAGE. No; there was one vote against it.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 43; 12 U. S. C., sec. 1148a-2 (a)), is amended by striking out the last sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such loans shall be made at such rate of interest, not to exceed 3 percent per annum, and on such general terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for such area or region.".

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 2 of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C., sec. 1148a-2 (b)), is amended by striking out the last sentence of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such loans shall be made at such rate of interest, not to exceed 3 percent per annum, and on such general terms as the Secretary shall prescribe for such area.".

SEC. 3. Clause (4) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit", approved August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 999), is amended to read as follows: "be made at such rate of interest, not to exceed 3 percent per annum, and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for such area or areas; and".

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.

EMERGENCY LOANS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1582) to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the legislation that our colleague from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] was interested in?

Mr. POAGE. The Senate bill is identical with the McIntire bill and relates to the New England disaster.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the act entitled "An act to provide emergency credit", approved August 31, 1954 (Public Law 727, 83d Cong.), is amended by striking out "1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5822) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARMFUL TARIFF POLICY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly surprised to learn recently that our Government has made further concessions to the Japanese regarding entry to this country of certain textile cotton fabrics widely utilized by the American people. I was under the impression, from reading preliminary reports concerning these concessions, that they involved no greater than 40 percent decrease in current rates. That would be extremely unfavorable to the textile industry, to be sure. But it has come to my notice since that time, upon further analysis of the question, that the American Cotton Institute, Inc., estimates that in a textile market already entered freely by the Japanese, existing tariff rates have been slashed as much as 50 percent.

Now I think I have made it perfectly clear in my previous statements that I favor a sensible and forward-looking approach to the question of reciprocal trade. I am not opposed to the principle of reciprocal trade. I think it has decided merit and advantages. If properly implemented, it could be helpful in strengthening our foreign relations and in promoting national and world trade. But I am of the opinion that in many of the negotiations our Nation has made concessions to foreign countries far beyond the scope intended by Congress and certainly some of which have been exceedingly detrimental and damaging to many American industries.

I recognize that by all means we should move in ways, consistent with our own self-interest and the welfare of our industry and people, to assist the Japanese to rebuild and, where necessary, to reshape their economy within the orbit of the free world. But I submit that the present agreements are very harmful to our own textile industry and to other industries and will inevitably bring added deflationary forces into play in this country and result in additional unemployment in areas already beset by very serious unemployment.

I am informed that the new agreements are giving the Japanese a guaranty of excess profits on 75 to 85 percent of cotton fabrics worn by the American people and are in effect a guaranty of excess profits on each yard of cloth, a figure which is larger than the profit per yard being earned by American mills. This is so, I am informed, because Japanese goods are being sold here in quantity in competition with American-made goods.

I have scrutinized detailed documentation to bear out the above contentions, but it is too voluminous to insert in the RECORD. Apparently the cuts affect print cloth woven of medium weight yarn, which constitutes the larger parts of American cotton production.

On unbleached cotton cloth from Japan, for example, the ad valorem in these ranges is reduced about 27 percent. The Japanese agreement also reduces the minimum specific duties by 25 percent, despite a special differential to provide a measure of protection on bleached, printed, dyed, or colored cotton cloth woven of medium weight yarns, adopted in 1936 and maintained for the past 19 years.

Under the present agreement, the 1936 rate differential has been abolished, together with the preexisting value differential. The Geneva agreement slashed these tariff rates by about 48 percent. It is very interesting to note the changed relationship the new rates impose on profits from Japanese and American goods sold in our own markets. On one of the basic fabrics the tariff cut is twice as large as the United States mills' profit on the cloth. It should be pointed out also that Japanese mills use twice as much foreign-grown cotton as American cotton.

Another major fact is that imports of cotton cloth have been rising rapidly even under the old higher tariff rates. For instance, in the first quarter of 1955 these imports were double those for the first quarter of 1954 and the Japanese imports represent two-thirds of the total. It can readily be seen, therefore, that under the new tariff rates in this basic category, which has sustained a 48-percent cut in the rates, there will automatically be a further increase in the already rapidly expanding imports of printed, dyed, and colored cotton cloth from Japan.

Of greatest concern to my district and to me is the fact that the agreements did not stop with cotton cloth. They have unreasonably imposed very substantial cuts on other cotton textile items such as towels and rugs. One major type of towel was cut from a rate of 40 percent to 20 percent; cotton sheets and pillowcases, from 20 percent to 12½ percent, cotton chenille rugs also from 40 percent to 20 percent.

I would be less than frank if I did not express my sense of shock, distress, and strong disapproval concerning these incredible slashes in existing protective rates in these categories in the textile industry. I think that this particular agreement is a good sample of the unscientific, discriminatory operation of the trade treaties. It is obvious to me that in the process of establishing these rates far more consideration was given to setting up a formula by which Japan would be assured of very profitable trading with this country than to the most important question of maintaining the health and prosperity of a great American industry, which in my region alone employs over 200,000 people in periods of prosperity.

The bizarre economic theory that lies behind this agreement challenges every canon of common sense and every dictate of the true interests of a great American industry. Unquestionably, the results will inflict serious damage upon this industry, which for one reason or another, is already having its troubles. If such a rule is applied, across the board, as well may be the case, to other industries, the overall results could very understandably be, not only damaging, but disastrous, to many parts of the American economy. With all sincerity and vehemence, I protest against this policy of economic folly and stagnation.

I hope that measures may be taken at an early date to forestall the damaging effects that are bound to ensue if the current agreements are fully implemented.

In include herein as part of my remarks an interesting, forceful article entitled "In a Textile Market Already Entered Freely by the Japanese, Existing Tariff Rates Have Been Slashed as Much as 50 Percent," prepared by the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.:

IN A TEXTILE MARKET ALREADY ENTERED FREELY BY THE JAPANESE, EXISTING TARIFF RATES HAVE BEEN SLASHED AS MUCH AS 50 PERCENT

The bellwether fabric of the textile industry is a print cloth 39 inches wide, 4 yards to the pound of cotton, with 80 threads to the inch in both directions (80 square).

Eighty-square print cloth is the single, most important fabric in the industry.

This construction alone, out of the industry's entire range of products, accounts for 750 million yards of annual production.

The reduction of duty on 80 square amounts to 3.3 cents per pound or eight-tenths of a cent per yard.

Eighty-square (grey goods) has been selling in New York for 18¾ cents per yard.

The average profit on sales after taxes earned by United States grey goods mills in 1954 was about 2 percent.

The United States mill's profit on this cloth in the grey is currently about four-tenths of a cent per yard on the average.

Therefore the tariff cut is twice as large as the United States mill's profit on the cloth.

This tariff cut is comparable to 3.3 cents per pound import subsidy on raw cotton.

(The above example is taken from the grey cloth classification where the minimum tariff cut occurred. The same cloth, when bleached, dyed, or printed, is given a 48 percent tariff reduction, the equivalent of 1½ cents per yard.)

TEXTILE TARIFF CUTS AT GENEVA

At Geneva this spring the United States Government agreed to cut sharply its tariff on cotton textiles imported from Japan.

Previously, practically all cotton cloth imports have paid different rates of tariff depending upon whether they were valued above or below certain prices. This value differential was a recognition that the United States textile industry was entitled to more

protection against the Japanese industry with its low oriental wage-price scales than as against the industry of Western Europe. For unbleached (grey) cotton cloth the value brackets were above and below 70 cents per pound for most types of cloth. This differential implied nothing so far as quality of product is concerned. Identical cloth imported from Britain and Japan might pay different rates of duty because British prices were above 70 cents and Japanese below. There were similar value divisions in the tariff schedules for bleached cotton cloth and for printed, dyed, or colored cotton cloth.

At Geneva these value differentials were abolished. The lower rates were made applicable to all imports of the same cloth regardless of value.

The major part of the American cotton cloth production is woven of medium weight yarns. Here, too, is concentrated the greatest Japanese import competition potential. On unbleached cotton cloth from Japan the ad valorem tariff in these ranges is reduced about 27 percent. The tariff schedule for unbleached cotton cloth provides a minimum specific duty of so many cents per pound of cloth imported which must be paid whenever the tariff calculated as a percent of value would result in a smaller payment. The Geneva agreement reduces these minimum specific duties by 25 percent.

On June 20, 1936, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on the advice of Secretary of State Cordell Hull, the father of the reciprocal trade program, proclaimed sharp increases in the lower bracket tariff rates on bleached, printed, dyed, or colored cotton cloths woven of medium weight yarns. This was done to give the domestic industry needed protection against the emerging Japanese threat. The Japanese import competition, then as now, was potentially the greatest in these ranges, and in bleached, finished, dyed, or colored cloths, for the additional processing involved in those operations multiplies the Japanese 10 to 1 labor cost advantage. This special differential has been maintained for 19 years.

Now, just as the Japanese threat to the American cotton textile industry is once again becoming a serious matter, the State Department has abolished the 1936 rate differential and in addition abolished the preexisting value differential. Here the Geneva agreement cuts the tariff rates by about 48 percent.

Cotton cloth which can be described by counting the number of threads per inch constitutes about 90 percent of the total output of the American cotton-textile industry. Because of the flexibility of cotton-mill equipment, an individual mill can shift readily from one cloth to another within wide ranges. As a result, the cost-price-profit relationship between the various cloth constructions is a finely graduated one. Hence the impact of the tariff cuts on all countable cotton cloth can be indicated by reference to their impact on a typical construction.

For this purpose we have selected a bellwether fabric, 1 of the 17 basic constructions of gray cloth used by the United States Department of Agriculture in calculating mill margins—the 39 inches wide, 4 yards to the pound print cloth, with 80 threads to the inch in both directions (80 square). This print cloth is the single most important fabric in the industry's entire range of products, about 750 million yards of it being turned out annually.

Its ad valorem tariff duty as is the case with all other textile items is levied on the wholesale value of the imported merchandise in the country of origin. The most comparable Japanese construction has been valued in Japan recently, according to United States consular reports, at between 12 and 14 cents per yard. At the higher figure this is 56 cents per pound.

The reduction of duty in this case brought about by the Geneva agreement is 3.3 cents per pound or eight-tenths of a cent per yard. Recently, American-made 80-square print cloth in the gray (that is, unbleached) has been selling in New York for 18¾ cents per yard. The average profit on sales after taxes earned by United States gray-goods mills in 1954 was about 2 percent. Applying this profit rate to the going price of 80 square as gray goods indicates that the United States mills' profit on this cloth is currently about four-tenths of a cent per yard. In other words, the tariff cut is twice as large as the average United States mill's profit on the cloth.

Put another way, this tariff reduction of 3.3 cents per pound on cotton gray cloth imports is comparable to a 3.3 cents per pound import subsidy on raw cotton. As is well known, because of the strict United States import quota on raw cotton, practically 100 percent of the raw cotton consumed by American mills is American grown. Overseas mills use mostly foreign-grown cotton. Japanese mills, for example, use twice as much foreign grown cotton as they do American.

Of major significace is the fact that imports of cotton cloth have been rising rapidly even under the old, higher tariff rates. In the first quarter of 1955 such imports were almost double those received in the first quarter of 1954, and the Japanese supplied two-thirds of the total.

The new tariff rates establish an entirely new situation which can only mean a further increase in the already rapidly expanding imports of printed, dyed, and colored cotton cloth from Japan because in this category the deepest percentage cuts (40 percent) were made in tariff rates. For the same reason a great expansion in imports of bleached cloth from Japan is to be expected. The new competitive situation in gray cloth has been analyzed in detail above.

The State Department did not stop with cotton cloth, however, but also has imposed deep cuts on other cotton textile items such as towels and rugs. One major type of towel was cut from a rate of 40 percent to 20 percent; cotton sheets and pillow cases, from 20 percent to 12½ percent; and cotton chenille rugs from 40 percent to 20 percent, for example.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to a bill which I am introducing today. The bill has to do with giving to the servicemen the right to exercise their GI bill when large highway construction passes through the subdivisions that have been built for the use of GI purchasers.

In California particularly, to my own personal knowledge, there are a large number of superhighways being built with their hub in the city of Los Angeles. These large highways go out like the spokes of a wheel all around the city of Los Angeles and take in a strip of territory in many instances 200 feet wide and many, many miles long.

Some of these highways go through veterans' housing projects. Under existing law the veterans' rights expire on July 25, 1957. This applies to veterans of World War II. The rights of Korean veterans go to 1965. My bill will give to World War II veterans the same right for reimbursement of their homes and utilization of their GI rights in case of condemnation by State or local political subdivisions as is now given to the Korean veterans. It brings up from 1957 to 1965 the World War II veterans' rights. This bill has been carefully drawn by the legislative counsel of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I am hopeful that there will be some action on this bill before the conclusion of this Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to be a very meritorious bill. I should think it would go through the committee and the House without question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have conferred with some of the members of the committee, and it has been drawn by your very able counsel, and I think it is recognition of the fact that these various communities are expanding their highway activities. They are not only in California, I might add; they are around almost all of the large metropolitan cities, and where they have put through these highways they have taken out several hundred veterans' homes. If the veterans have to move out of their subdivision, even though they have paid for their homes, they are not allowed to have another chance at obtaining a home at the same interest rate. This will allow them to reinstate, by replacement, their second home when their first home was taken away by condemnation because of public developments such as highways.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems rather just.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution and continued interest in the welfare of veterans.

SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHLEY. Today, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which of itself may appear to be a matter of small concern to this body. However, the very necessity of having to introduce this bill is, I think, a matter which merits the attention of each of us because it affects directly the lives of many persons throughout the United States in the important fields of education and health.

The legislation which I have introduced today is simple, indeed, and, on its face, is local in nature. The bill simply provides for the transfer of about 37 acres of surplus Government real estate to a local school authority and to a church group.

Why is this legislation necessary? The answer to this question, Mr. Speaker, is the vital concern of everyone of us here today and to millions of citizens whom we represent.

No longer ago than June 3 of this year, the Congress of the United States clearly reaffirmed its intention concerning the

utilization of surplus Government property for education and health purposes, when the President approved an act, Public Law 61, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, in order to improve the administration of the donable property program.

The report of the House Committee on Government Operations on H. R. 3322, which became Public Law 61, made very clear the intent of Congress in the following language, later set forth in a Senate report on the same measure:

The Congress under article IV, section 3, paragraph 2, of the Constitution has sole authority over the disposition of surplus Federal property. In the exercise of this authority, the main consideration in the disposal of surplus property is to decide what method or methods will best serve the interests of the taxpayers who are, in the long run, the owners of the property. The Federal agencies which hold and utilize the property are merely the custodians. Whether the property should be sold, donated to public institutions, destroyed to keep it from injuring industry and employment, or disposed of by some other method are questions for the Congress to answer by law. (Rept. No. 206, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 14, 1955, p. 2.)

Mr. Speaker, this question has been answered by law, especially by Public Law 152, 81st Congress, and by succeeding amendments in Public Law 754, 81st Congress, and Public Law 61, 84th Congress.

What has happened to this law? Is congressional intent being carried out by proper administration of Public Law 152? Is property being transferred to health and educational institutions for the welfare of the people of this Nation? Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

As you know, the program established by Congress provided that the regional offices of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should receive, investigate and process applications of educational and health institutions for surplus property. The regional HEW offices then clear with the offices of General Services Administration at the regional level. Recommendations of transfer are then sent from the regional HEW offices to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington, where the property is transferred to the local authorities.

All over the United States the regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare established the procedures necessary to screen applications and make recommendations on the basis of which the Secretary of that Department make a final determination.

But we are faced with a situation, today, where the very agency which has the responsibility for implementing this program finds its hands tied and its feet shackled by another agency of the administration.

Last April, reputable and respected hospitals and educational institutions in Toledo, Ohio, after considerable time and effort, submitted applications in the belief that the law that Congress had written had some meaning and some substance.

Despite the fact that these applications were approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and that the applicants have urgent need of the properties concerned, these organizations have been unable to conclude the arrangements by which surplus property would be transferred to them. Nor—and this is equally deplorable, Mr. Speaker—have they been able to get any clear-cut, honest statement from responsible administration officials concerning their status at the present time or what it will be in the future. How can organizations dedicated to public service be expected to carry out their work under circumstances of this sort?

I, myself, was in daily communication with officials of both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the General Services Administration for almost 6 weeks with the same barren result. On May 4, 1955, I finally wrote to the Administrator of General Services a letter in which I said:

I have now learned from discussions with officials of your administration and with the interested applicants that GSA has requested that these transfers for health and educational utilization be held in abeyance for your determination as to whether this character of property, generally, might better be sold privately and returned to the tax rolls as being in the best public interest.

Will you please advise me of the policies which your administration may have established for health and educational transfers of real property or as to whether your request for deferral of transfer of these particular areas may now be withdrawn.

Some 3 weeks later I received a reply from the Administrator of the General Services Administration in which he wrote:

The executive branch is currently reviewing and reevaluating policies and practices with respect to health and educational transfers as against sales. During the pendancy of this review, we are holding in abeyance all assignments of surplus real property for health or educational purposes.

We hope to have this review completed in the immediate future in order that the disposal of the VA hospital site at Toledo, as well as other similar surplus real property, may be resumed in a normal manner.

This letter, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, was received by me on May 24, and even today, there continues to be no clarification of policy in this matter but only a perpetual reviewing and reevaluating of policies which, as I understand it, were established by Congress in Public Law 152 and later legislation. In fact, as early as April 20, 1955, the General Services Administration issued a letter to all regional GSA offices freezing the assignment of certain surplus real property to HEW for transfer for public health and educational purposes. It is therefore clear, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time and for the past 2 months, there has been no surplus-property program so far as the transfer of vacant land and land with permanent-type improvements, where the improvements are designed for use other than health and educaiton, is concerned.

It also seems evident, Mr. Speaker, that there is a basic conflict in this matter in which GSA and the Budget Bureau, on the one hand, are interested only in the sale of surplus Federal property without regard to the legitimate, clear-cut and urgent needs of health and educational institutions in the United States, or without regard to the clear expression of the will of Congress. On the other hand stand the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Congress. The Department seeks to carry out the expressed intention of Congress in transferring surplus property for health or educational purposes. This is an intention which, as I have tried to make clear, is now being frustrated in important respects.

There are, I understand, about one hundred cases throughout the United States where transfers of surplus real property are currently being held up, many of them because of this continuing conflict in administration policy. When this conflict will be resolved, or whether it will ever be resolved, is impossible to say.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of my bill which will direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to transfer some 37 acres of surplus property for educational purposes to two applicants in the Toledo area whose applications have been approved and recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This property was assigned to HEW by the General Services Administration to be used for the very purpose for which GSA has discretion to recommend transfer. The Administrator of General Services has now exercised his discretion. The local organizations are ready to receive the land and HEW is willing to transfer it. My bill will accomplish the goal.

I urge support of this bill because the institutions concerned are now far behind schedule in breaking ground on projects which will be of tremendous benefit not only to members of the groups directly involved but to others in the Toledo community. But even beyond this obvious and urgent need, Mr. Speaker, I urge the close attention of this body to the manner in which one agency of the administration has so tangled with another agency to frustrate the intentions, clearly expressed in legislation, of the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I am glad to yield to our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is referring to real property being declared surplus, is he not?

Mr. ASHLEY. I am.

Mr. McCORMACK. The law is very plain; the intent of Congress is very plain.

Mr. ASHLEY. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that some kind of a freeze has been put on?

Mr. ASHLEY. That is exactly what I am aware of.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman ascertained where that freeze came from?

Mr. ASHLEY. It appears to me that the freeze has come from the General Services Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. That is my information. But has the gentleman gotten information as to who gave instructions to the General Services Administrator?

Mr. ASHLEY. I do not have any particular information on that point. I believe it is the Bureau of the Budget, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is satisfied that instructions from some place else have been issued, on a higher level?

Mr. ASHLEY. I certainly am, than Mr. Mansure, of the General Services Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am inclined to think it is the Office of the General Services Administration rather than some higher source. I think they take the authority unto themselves. I have found them very unsatisfactory in dealings before this bill went through, when I was trying to get General Services to take care of matters in Massachusetts.

Mr. ASHLEY. I think the gentlewoman from Massachusetts reflects the experience of her colleague from Ohio.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That was before this bill went through, and since then.

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes; and since then.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Except in one instance.

Mr. ASHLEY. I believe the gentlewoman is correct; except in a single instance.

WATER SHORTAGE IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a letter which was sent to the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Douglas McKay, by Mr. Sidney Kessler, chairman of the board of the Virgin Isle Hotel, with carbon copies to others as noted in the letter, calling the attention of these people here in Washington to the water shortage that has existed for 3 weeks in the Virgin Islands. It has now gone so far it is endangering the health and life of the people there as well as property and industry. They are asking that the Navy rush some water there by boats. The Navy is doing it now with just a couple of boats, but they want 2 or 3 more in order to get water provided for relief. The hospitals and other facilities there are presently in danger due to this water shortage.

The letter is as follows:

JUNE 25, 1955.

Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCKAY: The water shortage which has now been in existence in St. Thomas, V. I., for the past 3 weeks is now in a critical stage which is endangering health, life, property, and industry. This letter is not an alarmist one; it is a factual report on one of the gravest situations that has confronted the residents of St. Thomas, its institutions, business firms and industry.

Attached is a self-explanatory water report prepared by the chief engineer of the Virgin Isle Hotel as it pertains to the largest hotel on the island (125 rooms), and which, in essence, summarizes this critically dangerous situation not only for the Virgin Isle Hotel, but the entire island as well.

Many homes have been without water for days, some hotels with guests have water service for only 1 or 2 hours per day, gutters in the streets are filling with refuse, people are drinking any and all water mostly dangerously unsafe, and, in general, health, safety, and property are hourly being even further endangered.

To consider only the No. 1 industry of this island—tourism—the efforts of the past 5 to 10 years to build up the backbone of the island's economic stability is daily being endangered by the obvious fact that unless relief reaches us immediately, the largest hotels will be forced to close down, its guests sent away, and the expenditures covering tourist promotion will be irreparably wasted because of the adverse publicity which will result. This situation here, should it becomes generally known to the people in the United States who now look to the Virgin Islands as the showcase of the Caribbean, would reflect disastrously on the local government of these islands and without doubt, most unfavorably to the Washington administration. The situation here has reached disaster proportions, and in such cases the United States Government traditionally provides the relief the world has come to expect.

Quite apart from the municipal hospital, the public schools, the Pearson Gardens housing project with its hundreds of families, our many business firms, and the homes of the residents here, the plight of the Virgin Isle Hotel points the way to the obvious climax of this situation. As of today, the Virgin Isle Hotel—a luxury hotel—has 125 guests in residence, on July 2 approximately 212 guests will be at the hotel, and beginning on July 5 Paramount Pictures comprising 99 persons will begin to arrive to remain at the Virgin Isle Hotel for approximately 4 weeks while filming the "Magnificent Devils." At the luxury Virgin Isle Hotel, guests are being provided with water only 4 hours of the day, salt-water flushing has replaced the hotel's normal flushing procedure, but which within a month will render the toilet lines of the hotel inoperable under these conditions; dishes are being washed by hand rather than by steam machines—a most serious sanitation infraction—and linen is piled high with reserve supplies nearly exhausted and no prospect of laundering it either in the hotel or in other laundries on the island. It is apparent under these circumstances that the Virgin Isle Hotel will have to close within a week, if not before then. When the Virgin Isle Hotel was closed last summer for eight months in order to make necessary improvements, etc., the entire economy of the island suffered and there was widespread unemployment since the fortunes of all business here are inextricably linked to the operation of the Virgin Isle Hotel. Private business and the local government have been engaged for the past 6 months in spending private, public, and Federal funds on tourist promotion, and all of this money now stands ready to be lost, almost overnight, if relief does not reach us promptly.

Already guests at hotels are beginning to leave because of this water shortage and resultant inconvenience while many of those in residence are heaping abuse on management since management is endeavoring to minimize the situation in fear of the adverse and far-reaching unfavorable publicity.

While we could continue on indefinitely outlining the dangers of this water shortage and repercussions which will result unless our present situation is improved at once, we are confident your chief concern is to know how best to relieve us in this emergency. The recommendations of the Chief Engineer of the Virgin Isle Hotel concisely state the alternatives toward relieving and improving our present predicament:

(a) That a tanker with three or four million gallons of water be brought in immediately and the water pumped directly into the water storage at the airport and not unloaded at the Submarine Base.

(b) That a Navy ship be sent here to stand by until the emergency is entirely over in order to distill salt water into potable water.

If either of the above measures cannot be done, then not only the Virgin Isle Hotel will be forced to close, but undoubtedly other hotels, guest houses, institutions, and business firms as well.

Two years ago when we were faced with the same situation but on a lesser scale, a Navy ship was sent here and stood by for many days while distilling water and pumping it into the water supply system for general consumption. From this experience alone, it is our opinion that this is the best and most feasible manner in which to assist us at this time—by sending a Navy ship here for the same purpose. That, or any combination of measures to insure the speediest relief is urged and recommended.

Will you please cable us as quickly as possible after receipt of this letter and let us know what measure can or will be taken to relieve us in this emergency.

Sincerely yours,

VIRGIN ISLE HOTEL, INC.,
SIDNEY KESSLER,
Chairman of the Board.

(Endorsements of associations in St. Thomas attached. Engineer's water report attached.)

ST. THOMAS, V. I., *June 25, 1955.*

In a special meeting today with the officers of the Virgin Isle Hotel, we have carefully considered this letter written by Mr. Sidney Kessler, chairman of the board, and entirely subscribe to the views expressed by the Virgin Isle Hotel and earnestly ask that the assistance requested in Mr. Kessler's letter be given your immediate attention. We earnestly urge that immediate relief measures be taken as outlined.

C. C. BUSCH,
President, Chamber of Commerce.
ALTON A. ADAMS,
President, The Hotel Association of the Virgin Islands.
CHARLOTTE PAIEWONSKY,
President, Gift Shop Association.

JUNE 25, 1955.

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Fishman, Mr. Kessler, Mr. Kimelman.
From: Jack Temple, chief engineer.

Following are my findings regarding the critical water situation existing at the hotel and my reasons why I consider it impractical to operate the hotel under the prevailing conditions:

1. There are at present 4 barges per week bringing a total of 760,000 gallons of water to St. Thomas, of which we receive approximately 35 percent, or 280,000 gallons per week.

2. Our requirements are as follow:

[In gallons]

	50 percent occupancy		100 percent occupancy	
	Per day	Per week	Per day	Per week
To operate laundry and kitchen	5,000	35,000	10,000	70,000
To operate balance of hotel	20,000	140,000	40,000	280,000
Total to operate entire hotel	25,000	175,000	50,000	350,000

The above does not include flushing nor air conditioning.

3. Six barges are the maximum that the present inadequate municipal water system can process. This would provide the island with a total of 1,020,000 gallons per week, of which the hotel will receive approximately 350,000 gallons per week. This would be sufficient to run the hotel at 100-percent occupancy, but without air conditioning and with salt water for flushing.

4. The following is my reason for stating that the present municipal water system can process no more than six bargeloads per week. We have been informed by Admiral Hall, of the 10th naval district in San Juan, that the only facilities he has available for providing water are a boat carrying 240,000 gallons and a barge carrying 130,000 gallons.

	Hours
Unloading time 2 barges, 16 hours each	32
Pumping time after barges are unloaded	16
Processing time before pumping to us	12
Total hours required from time 2 barges arrive until water is pumped to consumers	60

It is evident, therefore, that if 60 hours, or 2½ days, are required after the arrival of each two barges before the water can be prepared for consumer use, it is impossible for the municipal system to process any more than six barges per week.

5. We have hauled 20,000 gallons of water from the chamber of commerce cistern, courtesy of Mr. Herbert Lockhart, and thousands of gallons from the Virgin Islands distillery. In addition, we have purchased many thousands of gallons from the West Indian Co. during the past week. This supply is now exhausted, and there is no other source of water available that we know of.

6. To obtain the water referred to in No. 5 above, it has cost us $1,336 as follows:

Emergency water lift to Virgin Isle Hotel from June 17 to June 24, 1955	
West Indian Co.: 21 trips, 14 loads theirs, 7 loads ours, June 17–22, 18,900 gallons	$210
Virgin Isle Distillery and Chamber of Commerce:	
33 trips, June 20–24, 33,000 gallons (Riise Truck)	125
24 trips, June 17–24, 24,000 gallons (Virgin Isle Hotel truck)	125
Total, 75,000 gallons	460
Purchase of gasoline bronze-water pump	215
Overtime to man salt water pump 160 hours at $1	160
Installing salt water lines, 6 hours labor and materials	140
Gratuities	25
Purchase of 10,500 pounds ice at $2 per 100 pounds	210
Feeding of men on trucks, 126 meals at $1 each	126
Total cost of emergency water lift to Virgin Isle Hotel, June 17 to 24	1,336

7. Recommendations:

(a) That a tanker with 3 to 4 million gallons of water be brought in and that the water pumped directly into the water storage at the airport and not unloaded at the Submarine Base. This is to be done no later than June 28, 1955.

(b) That a ship stand by to distill water.

(c) If the above not possible, that the Virgin Isle Hotel be closed.

OPERATION SKIDOO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that the partial test evacuation known as Operation Alert, which was undertaken on June 15, should not be taken seriously.

However, such has been the case.

Only approximately 15,000 people were involved.

These 15,000 were made up of so-called top Government officials, a self-constituted elite corps.

Members of Congress were not included among the officials evacuated, leaving the clear intimation that Congress is expendable.

Information facilities placed at the disposal of press, TV, and radio were either inadequate, inefficient, or altogether lacking.

The exodus from Washington by car, plane, and autogyro—at a low-traffic hour—was such that it could easily be handled by the existing bridges to nearby Virginia and the existing roads to nearby Maryland.

The use of railroads in the June 15 evacuation practice was given little—if any—thought.

Congress took the Operation Alert seriously.

The average family in the District of Columbia and in adjoining Virginia and Maryland took it seriously.

The responsibility for making Operation Alert a farce lies directly at the doorstep of officials of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the top echelon Federal employees who included themselves in on it.

The Congress is still the governing body charged with the responsibility of running the affairs of the District of Columbia.

The Congress is still constitutionally responsible for voting funds for bridges, roads, and for the continued existence of the Federal Civil Defense Administration itself.

Congress must eventually answer the question, "Shall Washington evacuate or shall Washington dig in?"

It is my considered opinion that Operation Alert did not provide Congress with enough facts on which to base a major decision. This situation is obvious to me. The first session of the 84th Congress has had a noticeable and outstanding characteristic: agreement. What might have been controversial issues in other Congresses have passed this Congress by well-nigh unanimous votes.

Yet, in this House of Representatives, there are practically 435 different concepts of what should be done in Washington, D. C., in the case of atomic attack. We do not differ because we are prone to differ. We differ because we have not, as yet, been given the proper data on which to base our decision.

I call attention to the words "proper data."

A departmental press release may flutter on our desk one day which states the supposed purpose of an evacuation test. The very next day the release of the previous day may be—and it has been—utterly contradicted.

It is an impossible task to straighten out "bugs" in civil defense when the only authoritative information we get is—if anything—more confused than we are.

In a superbly written article in the Washington (D. C.) Star of June 23, Francis P. Douglas tells us that—if Washington should be bombed tomorrow—the casualties would be "more than the 96,000 figure of fatalities (estimated) in the June 15 attack."

Mr. Douglas, citing civil defense authorities, says that these authorities attribute this frightful loss to public apathy and indifference.

I wonder if these civil defense authorities and I have been speaking to the same public.

During my trip to the Soviet Union late in 1954, I was impressed by the military preparations of the lords of the Kremlin. As a member of the House Committee on the Armed Services, I have heard sober military men give their ideas of the capacity of the U. S. S. R. to manufacture atomic weapons and the power they have to deliver them.

Since my return from the Soviet Union, I have made literally dozens of talks in and about Washington. I have yet to meet this indifference. I have yet to encounter this apathy. My experience leads me to believe that the people in this area are maturely aware of the danger from and disaster of atomic attack.

But, I have heard another kind of echo from the late Operation Alert. I have heard "operational" employees state that they have no doubt that they will be sacrificed for the more "important" policymakers. I have heard that these "apathetic" citizens deeply resent not being taken into partnership on any atomic escape test.

As a Member of Congress, I am inclined to agree with them.

What should be done?

A full-scale evacuation test should be made.

Get everybody out of Washington, leaving only those a real evacuation would keep here as a rear guard—to put out possible fires, to prevent looting, to maintain physical plants.

When the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima it did away with century-old class distinctions in Japan. Lord and coolie were no more. It was one mass of suffering humanity. Let us be realists—and, as realists—plan to make such suffering here, should it be our lot, the least possible suffering.

Get everybody in Washington and surrounding area out of the bombed region. Use planes, railways, our 475,000 cars and trucks—to do the job. Certainly, that will bring traffic jams. Certainly, there

will be accidents, and there could even be deaths.

But, then, we will have some data to work on.

After such an operation, the experts can truly evaluate.

If improvement or new construction is needed on all major Maryland roads within 50 miles—and I am sure that would be the case—such an operation would prove it.

If 5 new bridges—and superhighways each 50 miles long—or 10—must be built to nearby Virgina, your Congress will then know about it.

If medical supplies, food, water must be made available to certain evacuation depots, then your Congress will know about it before the real disaster strikes.

If atomic shelter or if atomic evacuation is the answer to atomic attack it may only be answered by a wholesale evacuation. We will not know it until we try it.

Mr. Speaker, I propose a total test evacuation of Washington as the only true means at our disposal to arrive at an intelligent idea of what must and should be done if Washington might—and it is my prayer that it may never be—faced with the burning destruction of atomic attack.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, June 27 through July 1, 1955, on account of being on the Committee on Un-American Activities that is holding hearings in Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include a press release which she has issued, also copy of a bill which she is today introducing covering the distribution of antipolio vaccine.

Mr. WRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANT.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. TUMULTY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TUMULTY and to include an editorial.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. STAGGERS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY.

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HIESTAND.

Mrs. KEE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 48. An act to provide for the disqualifications of certain former officers and employees of the District of Columbia in matters connected with former duties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 182. An act to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 256. An act to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 665. An act to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 972. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1275. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located on property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1391. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1739. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1741. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1855. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2171. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act so as to provide that upon the expiration of his term of office a member of the board shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

S. 2176. An act to repeal the requirement that public utilities engaged in the manufacture and sale of electricity in the District of Columbia must submit annual reports to Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2177. An act to repeal the prohibition against the declaration of stock dividends by public utilities operating in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution recognizing, on the occasion of her 75th birthday, June 27, 1955, the efforts of Miss Helen Keller in behalf of physically handicapped persons throughout the world; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; 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.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 67. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

928. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

entitled "A bill to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post-office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

929. A letter from the Secretary, United States Olympic Association, Inc., transmitting the report of an audit of the United States Olympic Association, Inc., made by Edward J. Roslon, Trenton, N. J., for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to Public Law 805, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

930. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

931. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

932. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

933. A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the report on the Business Organization of the Department of Defense, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 196); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 23, 1955, the following bill was reported on June 24, 1955:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2090. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 23, 1955, the following bill was reported on June 25, 1955:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2126. An act 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 27, 1955*]

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. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Part 2, Minority Views on S. 2090. An act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6992. A bill to extend for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit; without amendment (Rept. No. 914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1755. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; without amendment (Rept. No. 915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6871. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Senate Joint Resolution 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; with amendment (Rept. No. 917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 273. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt; without amendment (Rept. No. 918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3702. A bill to amend sections 2311, 2312, and 2313 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend the punishment for the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce to tractors, commercial truck trailers, and truck semi-trailers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 919). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of Conference. S. 727. An act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 920). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 256. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; with amendment (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2854. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government; without amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5522. A bill for the relief of the Florida State Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 278. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 5421, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2090, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 933). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6059. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines; with amendment (Rept. No. 934). 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. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 273. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 2458, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1940. A bill for the relief of James J. Andrews; with amendment (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of the F. Delizia Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4763. A bill for the relief of Elzie C. Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5535. A bill for the relief of S. H. Prather; with amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6158. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carlo de Luca; with amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6232. A bill to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War; with amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6709. A bill for the relief of Harry M. Caudill; with amendment (Rept. No. 930). 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. ASHLEY:

H. R. 7007. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States of a portion of the Veterans' Administration hospital site, Toledo, Ohio, to certain school authorities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7008. A bill to amend Public Law 587 by permitting the withholding by the Federal Government from wages of employees certain taxes imposed by municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7009. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 7010. A bill to create the Office of Senate Delegate in the Senate of the United States for former Presidents of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 7011. A bill to provide books and sound-reproduction records for certain physically incapacitated persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7012. A bill to amend section 209 (a) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 7013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by individuals, to promote thrift, and to stimulate expansion of employment through investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 7014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the tax treatment where taxpayer recovers amounts held by another under claim of right; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 7015. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7016. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the validity of a lien for taxes as against a mechanic's lien; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7018. A bill to authorize subpenas in connection with the enforcement of the narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7019. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes", approved June 20, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 7020. A bill to amend section 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act so as to limit the registration and induction of certain medical and dental specialists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 7021. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Indian River Bay Channel via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del., for navigation and flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 7022. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7023. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7024. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7025. A bill to amend section 1321 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 7026. A bill to provide for the purchase by the United States, and the distribution by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, of a sufficient supply of poliomyelitis vaccine to immunize all children in the United States under 20 years of age against paralytic poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 7027. A bill to create a Hall of Fame on Ellis Island honoring outstanding foreign-born citizens of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7028. A bill to increase the peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 7029. A bill to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 7030. A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7031. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 7032. A bill to provide for the termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7033. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to restore entitlement used to acquire homes subsequently taken by condemnation, destroyed by natural hazard, or otherwise disposed of for compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 7034. A bill to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7035. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720); to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 7036. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to conform its provisions respecting retirement income tax credit to the corresponding liberalized provisions of the social-security amendments of 1954, and to extend its provisions to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7037. A bill to require certain vessels to have a two-way radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7038. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and Maritime Administration for the design, construction, and installation of a nuclear-propelled merchant ship; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7039. A bill to readjust size and weight limits on fourth-class (parcel post) mail matter at the post office at West Warren, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 22, 1955, as National Olympic Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain countries should be granted membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the right of national self-determination by the Slovakian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution to designate the period from September 17 through September 23 as Constitution Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution to erect on the Capitol Grounds a memorial bell tower in memory of Robert A. Taft; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 178. 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to construction of a supercarrier at San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to levees on the San Joaquin River and the Stockton Deep Water Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging study of the "red tide" in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal appropriations for the construction of dams, locks, and basins in Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 7040. A bill for the relief of John Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7041. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary D. Lay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 7042. A bill for the relief of Mary Tarlich Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 7043. A bill for the relief of certain Korean war orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7044. A bill for the relief of Eva Glockner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7045. A bill for the relief of Takeko Ann O'Neill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7046. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James L. Brewbaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 7047. A bill for the relief of Charles Black; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7048. A bill for the relief of Dan M. Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 287. Resolution for the relief of the F. and M. Schaefer Brewing Co.; 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:

334. By Mrs. CHURCH: Resolution of the Baltic American Committee of Chicago, Ill., adopted on the 14th anniversary of the deportation of citizens from the Baltic States by the Communists and commemorating the 15th anniversary of the seizure of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and appealing for the restoration of the sovereign rights and self-government to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

335. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Lan Nielsen, Aurora, Mo., and other citizens of Aurora, Lawrence County, Mo., protesting legislation permitting alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

336. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, the Eighth Congressional Townsend District, Oakland, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress to take action on the bills H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, pay-as-you-go Federal social security for all; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

337. Also, petition of the president, Baltic States Joint Committee, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to vigorously protesting against the continued Soviet Russian occupation of the Baltic States, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address Delivered by Hon. W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina, at a Breakfast Group Meeting of Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently I requested our colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] to lead the discussion at a breakfast group meeting of Senators. Preparation time was brief indeed, but Senator SCOTT greatly impressed all his hearers with his practical commonsense, his sound advice and counsel, all of which served as a challenge as well as an encouragement.

I think his words of wisdom and counsel carry a splendid message to the people of America. I believe they convey a special message of inspiration and guidance to the youth of our country and I therefore ask unanimous consent that Senator SCOTT's remarks be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Further, I wish to commend him for his noble thoughts and the practical guidance of his counsel.

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

DON'T PARK HERE

Many years ago, an inspired poet wrote the immortal lines:

"Heaven is not reached at a single bound;
But we build the ladder by which we rise
From the lowly earth to the vaulted skies.
And we mount to its summit round by round."

And as we consider the words of the poet we should also recognize that it seems to be a trait of human nature to be eternally on the lookout for a place to park—not only one's automobile but one's self. As we ride through the streets of our cities today we repeatedly face the words "don't park here."

We find them in the business and residential sections and on the side streets.

They stare at us from the fire hydrants, from in front of the theaters, the bus and streetcar stops, from public buildings, and numerous other places.

As we ride along the lonely places of country highways we are constantly admonished to "keep off the shoulders" and we are told not to park on fills, curves, or highways.

In the parks we are told to "keep off the grass" and at the intersections the policeman tells us to "step lively."

Restrictions, admonitions, and exhortations are to be seen and heard on every side touching every facet of life.

"It is well that we should thus be warned," for as the German proverb runs: "If we rest, we rust."

And remember, if water rests, it stagnates; if a tree rests, it dies; if our lungs rest, we cease to breathe, and if our hearts rest, we die.

Only yesterday (June 21, 1955) Senator ALEXANDER WILEY introduced in the Senate a bill which I commend to your attention for it recognizes that many people who are forced by provisions of the Retirement Act to retire are still mentally and physically very much alert. It recognizes that these people do not want to park but rather want to continue making their contribution to society.

Yes, "don't park here's" are found in nature, science, and human life and they are designed for our own protection. Yet in spite of all such warnings and exhortations, man still continues to park in many places where he should not.

As we read in Pilgrim's Progress, Christian on his way from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City was frequently tempted to turn aside and park awhile, especially in the Town of Vanity Fair. Christian resisted the temptation and successfully reached his journey's end. This cannot be said of all, and, as a consequence, we find today that men and women too often are parked at various places along the journey of life.

To some of these places I would call your attention.

Some men and women park beside their failures.

Some youths study hard in school. Examinations come and they fail. They accuse the teacher of dishonesty and prejudice to cover their own failures, quit studying, quit school, and park idly beside the highway of intellectuality.

I recall how impressed I was as a freshman in college with the fact of how ill-prepared I was, as well as many other farm boys were, for college training. I observed that the boys who came from prep schools and highly organized city schools were much better prepared than we farm-bred boys were. I particularly recall two boys I have never seen since my college days who were well prepared for college training but who never graduated. They loafed along waiting for the rest of us to catch up, and as a result of their parking, they failed in their examinations and dropped out of school. Parking can be dangerous.

For others a broken home is the excuse for parking along the highway of life.

For others, business becomes dull, crops fail, banks burst, and all is lost. That is, all that is material at the moment and the victim gives up and parks beside his failures or disappointments.

What a tragedy it is to find a boy or girl, a man or woman parked beside some failure or handicap and thus missing the best things of life and losing the spirit to contribute to the welfare of others. At an early age, Theodore Roosevelt was an invalid and had to be carried from place to place in his father's arms. Refusing to park beside such a handicap, he took his doctor's advice and daily, enduring much pain and anguish, he exercised his body, and later became the leader of the Rough Riders and President of the United States.

Remember what happened to Brer Rabbit when he parked for awhile. Mr. Terrapin won the race.

Have you been tempted to park beside some failure or handicap? If so, then take to heart the lesson taught Robert Bruce by the spider. Robert Bruce was King of Scotland during the 13th century. He was a brave fighter, an ardent patriot, and he carried the fortunes and misfortunes of his beloved Scotland in his heart. Late in life he was defeated on the field of battle. Fleeing for his life, he came to an old cave in the mountains. Across the entrance of it a spider had woven a web. Brushing the web aside, Bruce entered to await the end. As he sat facing the entrance he noticed that the spider was again weaving her web and within a few minutes she had completed it. Just then the pursuers of Bruce came and one of them said, "Let's look in this old cave." "No," said the leader, "No one could have entered there without destroying the spider's web." So on they went.

Bruce had entered the cave defeated in battle, broken in spirit, discouraged and ready to give up. But as he sat there and watched the spider quickly adjust herself to her misfortune and begin all over again, he said, "If a spider, without an immortal soul, having the foundation knocked completely out from under her, can begin all over again, by the grace of God, Robert Bruce can come back, too." Slipping beneath the web, he went forth again and freed Scotland from her enemies.

In early January of this year I had one of my dairy barns, which housed 100 head of cattle, burn to the ground. This building had been used successfully for 35 years and I had gotten my money out of it insofar as use was concerned.

I was confronted with making the decision of whether to build a new barn or sell the cows.

My family, because of my age, urged me to sell the cattle and start restricting my activities and take it easy. I pondered long with the realization that I had been born and reared in a dairy-farm family and that most of my life's experience had been in turning worn out agricultural land into lush pastures and in producing milk, which is nature's most complete food. I was reminded of the philosophy of the Chinese which goes something like this: If an idea is good even if it takes 300 years to bring it to fruition, go ahead and do your part if you can and pass it on to others to complete.

I felt that my knowledge in this field and that handed down by my forebears for five generations who had lived on this same land justified, yes, demanded, that I pass on to my sons those things which I had gained through experience and frugal living.

I became convinced that I had no right to coast out the balance of my life and that I had no right to park but that I should go ahead and build back the barn even though I might never receive material benefit from what it would cost to rebuild it.

Oh, my friends, whatever you do, don't park beside your failures and losses.

Then there are those who park beside their successes.

Such people study hard; become the honor men of their class; become captain of the football team or the star of the basketball team; deliver the valedictory, and full of pride, finish school to rest beside past glories.

Others may park after wooing and winning, becoming happily married, having a lovely home, beautiful children, and then sit back and let the rest of the world go by in the belief that they have done their bit for society.

Others establish businesses, outstrip their competitors, become wealthy, and then contentedly pat themselves on the back and proceed to park beside their successes.

An examination of the biographies of the 400 exclusive millionaires of New York society shows that 380 began life as poor boys—boys who refused to park beside their first, second, or third, or any other success.

But of all the parking, there is none more devastating in the lives of men than the parking beside the successes and failures of a man's spiritual life.

If ever a man had justification to park beside either success or failure, the Apostle Paul did. But standing steadfast, Paul said:

"Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended—but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, I press on toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

"This one thing I do," says Paul, "I am reaching forth. I am pressing on." It is true that I have had failures, I made a mistake in Athens, I presecuted the church. I have been the chiefest of all sinners. But those things are behind. Christ has forgiven those. So I have forgotten them. And then too I have had success. Why! I have seen Christ. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. I have already won my crown. Yet I haven't time nor the inclination to park beside any of these things. But on the contrary—"This one thing I do"—"I am reaching forth." "I am pressing on." "Toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

The lesson taught here is that if we, as Christians and as church members, are to reach the mark and win the prize there can be no parking in the individual's or church's program.

Another great lesson is to be found in the history of the erection of a statue of the immortal Gen. Robert E. Lee in the city of Richmond, Va.

When the news reached Richmond that the statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee, now standing on Monument Avenue, was at the depot, someone said, "My, it will take a lot of horses to pull all those tons of metal uptown." And someone (it must have been a blessed woman) replied, "Horses, oh, don't let horses pull General Lee—let's pull him ourselves."

The idea caught like wildfire and swept the city. The newspapers were full of it. The day was set. The schools declared a holiday. Flags, bunting, popcorn, peanuts, and red lemonade were everywhere. The sidewalks, stoops, porches, and windows were filled with happy throngs.

Out there in the middle of the street were three large trucks tied together, with a drawing cable a block long. Pulling on the cable was one of the motliest crowds ever gathered together. An ex-governor was there with several millionaires. There were rich men, poor men, fat men, lean men, white men, black men, school girls chewing gum, and society ladies tripping about on their spool heels pretending that they were pulling. Amid the laughter and tears, songs and cheers, they drew the general in triumph to the place where he sits today on Traveler, looking ever toward his beloved Southland.

As soon as they reached their destination, every man drew his pocketknife and cut off a little piece of the great rope and put it in his pocket. For days after, everywhere in the city, a man would pull out his little piece of hemp, hold it up, and with great pride say to his friends, "I had hold of the rope. Did you? Did you?"

The mission of the church is to bring the throne of our Savior to its rightful place in the hearts of men. I am hoping with a mighty hope that when that task is brought to its triumphant end there will not be a single Christian who will not be able to look up into the face of the King and say: "Master, I had hold of the rope! I had hold of the rope! I did not park!"

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] last week was interviewed on the grave international situation in which this Nation is involved by the editorial staff of the Sunday Star. The questions and answers were printed in full in yesterday's issue of the Star. The views of the Senator from Montana are so penetrating and clear that I feel they should be made available to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore request unanimous consent that they may be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

MANSFIELD SEES DANGER IN POLICY, SAYS SENATE LACKS NEEDED DATA

(Following is the text of an interview conducted by members of the Sunday Star editorial staff with Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, an outspoken critic of the administration's "limited nuclear war" policy. The questions and answers that follow were transcribed from a magnetic tape exposed in Senator MANSFIELD's Capitol Hill office.)

Question. You have criticized the administration for adopting a "limited nuclear war" policy which you say is dangerous. Why?

Answer. I think anything that has to do with atomic energy is potentially dangerous. I think also that we are emphasizing the destructive aspects and not paying enough attention to the beneficial ways in which atomic energy can be used.

You will recall that Secretary of State Dulles, on an occasion a few months ago, made a statement that we had "precision" atomic weapons. To the best of my knowledge, the smallest atomic weapon we have is equivalent to 3,000 tons of TNT. As you know, the largest conventional bomb we had in the Second World War amounted to about 10 tons of TNT.

Mr. Dulles seems to have the impression that with this "precision" atomic bomb you could just wipe out military installations and nothing else. But one has only to look over this country to see that there is hardly such a thing as an isolated military installation. There are always civilian installations—towns, villages, factories, and what not nearby.

Question. You don't believe, then, that Mr. Dulles' "precision" bombs are precise enough?

Answer. No. If you go back and look over the Nevada tests, you will recall that on a number of occasions there have been delays in experiments because weather conditions were not just right. And you will recall also that the effects were felt far beyond the confined area which the Atomic Energy Commission had laid out and that on one occasion, as I recall, planes were grounded. This grounding happened just last spring in Denver. For 8 hours planes were not allowed to fly because, I assume, of the possible effects of radioactivity or some related matter.

Question. Do you think the people know enough about nuclear matters?

Answer. I think the administration has not given the people the amount of truth they should have about the atomic, the hydrogen, the cobalt, and now the U-bomb. And I believe that because of this lack of knowledge, we are lulling ourselves into a false sense of security as to our position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

PEACEFUL ASPECTS

Question. Did you mean a moment ago, Senator, that the administration is concentrating too much on the bellicose aspects of nuclear weapons and not enough on the peaceful side of atomic energy?

Answer. By and large, yes, although I notice that in recent months, even say recent days, they have entered into bilateral agreements with some countries for a certain amount of exchange of atomic information and also on a cooperative basis for the setting up of reactor plants.

Then, too, the President came out with an idea for an atomic ship to cruise the world. I think if he would help other nations develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy (insofar as security will permit), if he would allow more use of atomic energy in the medical and scientific fields for the benefit of mankind, that would be better. In the idea of an experimental ship I don't see much value. If you're going to launch such a ship I think it should be one that will carry out regular commercial missions, not one put out for display purposes alone.

Question. Senator, do you think enough atomic energy information can be disseminated under present security rules?

Answer. No. Much of the secrecy involved in atomic matters is just secrecy for the sake of secrecy. I've noticed that many American scientists think more information should be given to the American people. There are indications that practically everything we have done in atomic science has been duplicated and perhaps surpassed by the Russians and the German scientists they captured in the course of the Second World War.

I think there is a tendency in this country to underestimate the Russians in this field.

IS LIMITED WAR POSSIBLE?

Question. Getting back to your attitude on limited nuclear war, do you think such a thing is possible?

Answer. No, I do not. Referring again to Secretary Dulles' statement about "precision" atomic weapons, the idea implicit there was that in case of war on the Chinese mainland we could limit the conflict to purely military objectives. But I think, using the Chinese mainland as an illustration, that atomic weapons there would create a wave of horror and terror and distrust on the part of all the peoples of Asia.

The Asiatic would say the Americans would use the atomic bomb only against Asians. And we couldn't explain what circumstances would have been responsible for the bombings.

You must consider, also, that this kind of action would not bring the Chinese people to their knees. As a matter of fact, I think it would mean a resumption of the war in Korea. I think it would mean stepped-up activity in Indochina. I think it might mean, if the going got really tough, that the Chinese Communists would call on the Soviet Union to honor the Sino-Soviet treaty of mutual security of 1950.

If you got to this point, and war came between the Soviet Union and the United States, then I do think all weapons would be used. And they would be used on a wholesale basis, far beyond the old-style atomic bomb.

Question. Why do you think the use of atomic weapons would snowball into the use of the ultimate ones—the T, the U, and the cobalt?

Answer. Because once you start you're not going to be able to stop. I think the terror which these weapons inspire is one of the best reasons why, at the present time, we have a sort of cold peace. Certainly the Soviet Union knows what damage would devolve on them if these bombs are used. And despite the fact that we haven't had too much information in this country, I think the American people have a pretty strong idea of what would happen to us in case of atomic war.

NONNUCLEAR WAR

Question. If the prospects in event of nuclear war are so bleak, do you think we could win a so-called conventional, or nonnuclear war today?

Answer. I think that any war we go into we will go into to win, and if all possible we will win. But I want to point out that nobody wins wars any more and that many times the winner, so-called, turns out to be the loser. He has to occupy countries. He has to disburse his own wealth and material to rehabilitate the area which supposedly has been defeated.

As far as conventional arms are concerned, the Russians have 175 thoroughly modernized, mechanized divisions, comprising some 4 million men, the same strength they have had since the end of the war in 1945. In addition, there are 88 satellite divisions of undetermined quality, and the Chinese Communists have something like 4 million men under arms. In the air, it is my understanding that the Russians are ahead of us in every field except the B-47. Under the sea, I understand they have undoubted superiority as far as numbers of submarines are concerned.

The administration seems to be very happy about what we have, but I am afraid the figures won't back up their optimism because I notice that what they talk about is what we have in being, but they never mention the ability of our Air Forces to deliver what we have.

Question. Well, if we can't compete in nonatomic weapons, don't we pretty much have to rely on atomic weapons?

Answer. Oh, yes; and I'm not opposed to that. I think we'll have to keep on experimenting and doing everything possible to develop our atomic and defensive skills. But I do think we ought to tell the truth to the American people insofar as security will permit.

According to the information I get—which is purely from the public prints—it appears to me that a lot of information the American people should have hasn't been told. For example, why did it take Admiral Strauss so long to tell the people of the United States factually what the effect of Bikini-type explosions would be on an area such as from Norfolk, Va., to somewhere up in New Jersey?

Question. Would you care to take this opportunity, now, to tell the truth to the American people as you know it? You are a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. You've been around a good bit. What do you regard as the truth?

Answer. That's not for me to say because I haven't had access to the truth except as it appears in the public prints.

"IN A VACUUM"

Question. Are you implying then, that the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who have a lot to say about the foreign policy of the United States—or should have a lot to say about it—are operating in a vacuum?

Answer. Yes, but a vacuum of our own making, because we haven't requested that information.

Question. If this information is necessary in order to make a sensible evaluation of foreign policy, why hasn't it been given to you?

Answer. Well, none of us has requested it. I think if we were to request that kind of information we might be given it. But then we would get it under the veil of secrecy and wouldn't be able to do anything about it.

Question. What we are trying to get at in these questions, Senator MANSFIELD, is this: The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is charged with keeping an eye on the foreign policy of the United States. Is that correct?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. You don't make policy, but you watchdog it. Secondly then, the foreign policy of the United States is by necessity based on the possession of certain atomic weapons, it is not? In other words, if we didn't have those weapons, we'd have a different foreign policy, wouldn't we?

Answer. That is very likely true, in the details of policy, at least.

Question. So how can you evaluate the foreign policy of the United States and its effectiveness unless you know what our situation with respect to atomic energy is?

Answer. Well, what we are doing, I'm afraid, is evaluating the foreign policy of the United States—as far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned—on the basis of the old conventional methods of evaluation.

Question. So what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is doing now is using obsolete information to arrive at modern conclusions. Is that what you're saying?

Answer. No, I wouldn't say that. But we have not, to my knowledge since I've been on the committee, had a member of the Atomic Energy Commission before us to give us his views. We assume that when the Chief of Staff or the Secretary of State or any other officials appear before us, they have had contacts with the AEC and that they supposedly have looked into the atomic implications of any field of foreign policy in which they may have interest.

Question. And you are assuming that, having this information, they have arrived at the proper conclusions?

Answer. I'm afraid that's what it amounts to.

Question. Isn't that a rather large assumption?

Answer. Well, that's true. But the point is that in Congress we've got to make large assumptions because there are so many things before us that we just haven't got the time, individually or collectively, to get all the answers to all the questions that could be raised.

Question. Do you anticipate asking a member of the Atomic Energy Commission to come before the Foreign Relations Committee?

Answer. You are presenting an idea I hadn't thought of, but I think it would be a good idea at some time in the near future, if the schedule isn't too tight, to have some of these people come before us and give us an explanation of what they think we should be told. And perhaps we could ask them some questions and draw them out a little bit further.

Thank you, Senator MANSFIELD.

Why the President Opposes TVA—His Uncompromising Position Regarding Dixon-Yates Deal Is Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and practice since being a Member of this body to send out from my office each week a weekly newsletter touching upon topics of interest to the people of the district and State which it is my privilege to represent.

In response to numerous inquiries, I took occasion in the newsletter dated June 27, 1955, to answer the question: "Why is the President against the TVA?" In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this particular issue of our weekly newsletter in the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

WHY THE PRESIDENT OPPOSES TVA

Following the recent fight in the House for funds for a needed expansion program for the TVA—a fight which failed following the personal intervention of President Eisenhower—the Representative of the Fourth District of Tennessee has received numerous letters and inquiries asking the basic question: "Why is the President against TVA?"

It is a normal question to be asked by Tennesseans and others who in the past regarded President Eisenhower's statements of friendship and approval of TVA on their face value and as statements outlining a firm and solid personal position.

The fourth district representative does not, of course, presume to intrude himself into the thinking of the Chief Executive. Over the past 2 years, however, and in the light of developments and actions emanating from the White House and elsewhere, he has, as have others, taken occasion to form a few

views in this regard and submits this newsletter report as responsive to the many inquiries received on this subject.

President Eisenhower has advocated a number of measures which have been right and worthy of support, among these being his advocacy of the Cordell Hull policy of reciprocal trade agreements programs, and his course with regard to our foreign policy. On these and on other issues, I consider the position of the President sound and thus worthy of fullest possible support.

The number of issues on which President Eisenhower has exhibited accord with measures promoted and carried forward by previous administrations have, in fact, been numerous and for this reason his political advisers may have decided that opposition to some programs of the previous administration should be undertaken. The TVA would appear to be a logical target for such opposition in view of its apparent—to some—regional nature. In other words, his advisers may have persuaded him that he cannot "stand for all things" but must be "against" some things—and the TVA would be a good "horse" to ride, and ride hard.

Still other factors would seem to have exerted a strong and irresistible influence in the President's thinking, chief of these has been former Gov. Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire, now chief administrative assistant to Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. Adams is reputed to be, in fact, the "assistant President," and through whom virtually most matters are "'filtered" or cleared at the White House. Further, former Governor Adams is a New Englander and an arch foe of public power, and as such, is a natural leader of the school of thought that New England is rapidly losing industry to the cheap-power region of the TVA. This is fallacious reasoning, but it is nevertheless a banner under which the enemies of TVA rally forcefully. As indicated, Governor Adams, President Eisenhower's No. 1 adviser, is known as a traditional enemy of TVA.

Another factor of vast importance in the President's adamant and uncomprising position against TVA and for the invasion of public power into the region, was the presence in the Bureau of the Budget of Adolf Wenzell, a former vice president of the First Boston Corporation, the financing agency looking to the working out of the so-called Dixon-Yates deal for the administration. Mr. Wenzell, as an unpaid but powerful and strategic appointee creditable to the big business and private power trust—friends of which are known to be well placed in the administration—can be credited with much of the force behind the Budget Bureau's anti-TVA position and its advocacy of the private power invasion of TVA. This anti-TVA opposition within the Bureau of the Budget and elsewhere has supported any measure to cripple the agency—whether it be cutting its appropriations, denying needed facilities, tight and restrictive financing proposals, and other slow-death maneuvers. A position which, in effect, issues the call to "get TVA at any cost."

Individuals in high positions within the administration, together with the traditonal opposition of ancient enemies of TVA, together with the determination of the administration to find an issue, together with the fact that President Eisenhower has surrounded himself with big business, financiers, and others whose knowledge of TVA is gained only through hearsay, have constituted an irresistably persuasive force at the White House.

The President himself, though he should not be excused, has not apparently been receptive to pro-TVA information and, therefore, has not received such information. His advisors, being opposed to TVA, have provided him with only one side of the story. So far as is known he has not pressed for information to give him a complete and accurate picture of this great agency.

Those of the President's party who were too clever and experienced to write their anti-TVA views into the party platform, have succeeded in making the President a captive of their unprogressive and backward philosophy with regard to public power. The pity of it is that President Eisenhower, many feel, is not fully aware of what has happened to him—captured by those with whom he has surrounded himself.

But that something has happened to him—that he has become a captive of anti-TVA influences and TVA foes—can be easily judged by a simple comparison of his campaign speeches on TVA—advocating TVA operations at maximum efficiency—with his more recent assertions against TVA as an example of creeping socialism and like statement emanating from the White House.

Proposed Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to the proposal to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy to review the operation of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and to recommend changes in the act.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

There can be little disagreement over the need to amend the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. The coauthor of the act, a House Judiciary Committee Report on its administration and those officials of the Government charged with administering the act have all indicated the desirability of amending certain sections. President Eisenhower, the leaders of both political parties, and representatives of major religious, labor, civic, and other groups have called for amendments. Some minor amendments have passed without most of us realizing it. Since passage of the act, 10 bills have been proposed in the Senate and about 50 in the House to revise it; and it has been involved in approximately 28,000 court cases, in many of which the courts found difficulties or conflicts in interpretation.

The difficulty is in determining exactly what amendments are desirable at this time. The entire subject of immigration—which involves a legal jungle of complex and technical details that very few Members of Congress are able to comprehend in their entirety—has become further confused with issues of partisan politics and emotional and prejudicial exchanges of extravagant praise and criticism. Very little has been said about the actual operation of the act during the past 2 years, and its consequences on our economy, security, foreign policy, and social welfare. It is my hope that a bipartisan blue-ribbon commission, including representatives of the executive and legislative branches as well as the public, will take this controversial subject out of politics, impartially analyze the administration of the act, and provide a detached and dignified report on which a large part of the Congress and the public can agree. Such a study, it seems to me, would be of value to both the supporters and the critics of the act, as well as those charged with its administration and enforcement.

Although a commission appointed by President Truman in 1952 performed a valuable service in its study of the law, the McCarran Act had not yet gone into operation at the time its findings were made. Moreover its hearings were conducted in the midst of a heated political campaign; and, inasmuch as the appointment of the Commission and its report were considered by some to be partisan in nature, these findings have been largely discarded.

A new, bipartisan, high-level commission would now be able to examine actual experience under the act. Several experts in immigration law, while disagreeing on the merits of the act and the direction in which any amendments should move, have agreed that the time is ripe for a reexamination of this problem. As I recall, the sponsors of the present act urged at the time of its passage that the law be continually reexamined in the light of experience with its various provisions. Many administrative practices under the act have been criticized by its sponsors as well as its opponents; and both groups have from time to time called for a review of the act and its operations, as has the President.

Although there are many of us on both sides of this controversy who would prefer to see immediate amendments enacted by the present session of Congress, it is apparent that such amendments are not llikely in the supercharged atmosphere that presently surrounds the act.

Government Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to go on record as being in favor of the Government Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1955, S. 67, since I was unavoidably detained from casting my vote on this measure when it first came up on the floor. I was returning from Florida and my plane did not arrive in time to permit me to be on the floor when the vote was taken. As a matter of fact, I reached the floor only minutes after the vote was taken. I would like the RECORD to show, as I have previously stated, that I was in favor of the bill and had planned to cast my vote in full support of it when it was first brought up on the floor of the House. However, I was present and voted for the passage of the bill after it had been agreed upon by the conference committee.

It is my feeling that our Government employees are entitled to and deserve a raise in salary; certainly their salaries should be kept commensurate with salaries paid outside governmental service.

I believe this group of efficient, loyal, and hard-working employees deserve this small raise.

Farmer Public Relations Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in news releases for the press, for radio, and for television, in speeches and magazines, thousands of words critical of American farmers have been beamed to city dwellers. With evil sounding overtones, such words as "surpluses," "subsidies," "waste," and "inefficiency," are drummed into city ears. The farmers' customers in town are told that farmers are pricing themselves out of their markets, with a hint that they are living a high life on fat Government checks. The farmer has been ridiculed from one end of the land to the other. It even is suggested that consumers revolt against farmers.

Moreover, a rather successful attempt has been made to divide farmers, to set one group or one region against another.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when those of us who are interested in the welfare of farmers—and, indeed, in the welfare of our country—must find a way to present the truth about agriculture to the people—especially to the great urban populations of the Nation.

Therefore, I take the floor to propose to the House a positive public relations program for agriculture.

More particularly, it is my purpose today to urge the passage of an integral part of that program which is embraced in House Joint Resolutions 317 and 318 introduced respectively by myself and my distinguished colleague, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas.

These resolutions would designate the last week in October of each year as Farm-City Week, to honor America's farm families and to promote understanding between farm and city people.

I shall submit later in these remarks detailed proposals for a public relations program for farmers, along with a brief recitation of the urgent need for such a program. But, first, I want to discuss the resolutions to establish Farm-City Week. These resolutions embody the only legislative enactment that now is essential to the overall public relations program that has been conceived as an effort to tell the truth about our farmers, to encourage understanding between farm and city people, to promote the well-being of agriculture, and thereby to lay a solid foundation under the prosperity of our total economy.

Our farmers have made the United States the best fed and the best clothed Nation in the world. I think all Americans will welcome an opportunity to honor the people who have contributed so much to our civilization and, moreover, they will want to use this Farm-City Week to gain a better understanding of the needs, problems, and opportunities of our farm people.

The resolutions authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges, the Agricultural Extension Service, and all other appropriate agencies and officials of the Government, to cooperate with farm organizations and other groups in programs observing Farm-City Week, including plans for public meetings, discussions, exhibits pageants, and press, radio, and television features.

This specially designated week would permit many civic, social, and other organizations to fit farm programs into their regular weekly meeting days, and generally would increase the opportunities for joint meetings of farm and city people.

It is especially appropriate right now that we open this broad opportunity for understanding and friendship between the people who produce our food and fiber and those who consume it. For agriculture's position in the whole economy is the most pressing domestic problem confronting our country, and the least understood.

It is essential that city people understand agriculture. It is to their own self-interest that agriculture be prosperous and not become a depressing drag upon the whole economy.

We must remind America that our great strength as a Nation has its roots in the soil and large dependence upon the people who till the soil. Farmers want to join city people, and we want them to join us, in establishing and assuring a condition of permanent prosperity in this Nation.

The resolutions to establish an annual Farm-City Week now are pending before the House Judiciary Committee. We are hopeful that these resolutions soon will be presented for a vote in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the truth about our farmers is the heart of the public relations program for agriculture I present here today.

Probably 75 percent of our people in the cities have little or no understanding of agriculture. More alarming is the fact that many of these have a poor opinion of farmers.

Jim Roe, managing editor of Successful Farming, published in Des Moines, recently wrote in that magazine:

> A rapidly growing number of our customers in the cities are being led to believe a farmer is a sort of rural racketeer. A man who is living—and living much too well—primarily on fat checks from a misled and overprotective Government. A man responsible for high food prices.
>
> That's a character sketch which adds up to a not-so-admirable character. But he makes a wonderfully handy villain. Nonfarm groups always quickly point at him when confronted by irate ladies having trouble with their budgets. He is especially amiable villain, for he seldom answers back.
>
> Small difference that the charges are monstrously false. That prices of food at the farm have gone steadily down while grocery-store prices went up—that in 1953 farmers were able to keep as net income only 36.5 percent of their gross receipts—the smallest percentage since the well-remembered year of 1932.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the future of agriculture is imperiled by the prejudices against farmers that have developed throughout this country and, unless we find some way to put across the truth, our farmers will suffer, and ultimately this whole country will pay a woeful price for the folly of these prejudices.

We cannot permit these prejudices to promote a continued deterioration of farm income and to create a condition in agriculture such as plunged the whole economy into the great depression of the 1930's.

We in agriculture are largely at fault for the poor opinion many people have of us, because we have become divided among ourselves and we have the poorest public relations of any large group in our national life—in fact, hardly any public relations program at all.

This must be changed.

We must begin by correcting some of the serious misunderstandings and misconceptions on agriculture and public policy relating to farmers. The farmers' salvation will rest on our willingness and our effort to put across the truth.

The people have not been told that our farmers, even in relatively good times, have received less than half the per capita income of the people who live in the towns and cities—that half the farm homes in the United States still are without running water.

They do not know that consumers get more and better food today with an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than at any other period in history—that in 1914 the average factory employee could buy only 3.5 pounds of bread with an hour's earnings; in 1929 he could buy 6.4 pounds, but in 1954 his hour's earnings would buy over 10 pounds of bread—that the average hour's wage would buy only 1 pound of butter in 1929, compared with 2.6 pounds in January 1955; only 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 compared with 7.9 quarts now; 1.1 dozen eggs in 1929, and 3.6 now; 17.7 pounds of potatoes in 1929, and 34.7 in 1955.

Few people know that the farmer gets only about 2.7 cents for the wheat in the 17-cent loaf of bread; that there is only 25 cents worth of cotton in a $4 shirt; that, for instance, tobacco farmers receive only about $800 million for that part of their crop consumed in the United States, while Federal, State, and local taxes on the crop amount to approximately $2,100,000,000 each year.

Were the consumers in Chicago told that last June housewives there paid 25 cents a quart for milk delivered at their doors, while the farmers who supply the Chicago market received only 6.5 cents a quart of class I milk?

Is anyone spreading the word of the wonderful efficiency of our agriculture; that the output per farmer has increased by more than 50 percent in a few years; that in Russia half the total population work on farms, and still cannot meet the Communists' needs for food and fiber, while in America each farmworker feeds 18 persons; that the efficiency of our farmers releases over 86 percent of our population for other work in factories, in mines, in shops, in transport, in all the other pursuits which makes the

United States standard of living the envy of the world?

Mr. Speaker, we must get the farmers' story before the American people.

We must suppress the prejudices against our farmers.

We must let farmers' friends in the cities know that it is because food is so cheap that American families have three-fourths of their income to invest in their homes, in their institutions, and in the comforts and conveniences that make up this American way of life.

We must remind America that in many nations of the world today the people are hungry because their farmers have been neglected and ill-treated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a small, representative group that has been devoting its thought and efforts to the problem, I propose immediate steps to establish a positive public-relations program for farmers; a program to plant the truth about agriculture wherever it cannot now be found; a program to bring all farmers together in a common bond; a program to cultivate understanding between farmers and their customers in the cities. We propose the development and growth of this program in two parts:

First. By creation of an interim committee to (a) enlist the aid and counsel of everyone interested in improving public understanding of agriculture; (b) study the size of agriculture's public relations problem, and its possible solutions—to serve as agriculture's research laboratory for this important, untouched farm problem; and (c) try out, on a small, pilot-plant scale, a limited number of specific projects designed to improve agriculture's relations with all other aspects of our national community of enterprise and aspirations.

Second. To use the experience and work of this interim committee for the establishment of a permanent public relations organization, adequately staffed, to create understanding of the problems of farmers and the importance of agriculture to the well-being of the total economy and also to promote food—to convince America that food is the best thing that money can buy.

The program must be supported financially by all of agriculture—by individual farmers, farm organizations, and industries serving agriculture—or it should not be started at all.

It should hew to these basic principles:

First. It would be based on facts. It could never deal with half-truths or evasions. Fortunately, our self-interests and the public interests are the same. The truth about agriculture is the best public relations it could have.

Second. It would never deal with political matters.

Third. It would attempt to unite agriculture, and give all agricultural groups something to be for. If, through a public relations effort, farm organizations can find common ground for united action, we shall have rendered agriculture a very great service.

Fourth. It would explain the essentiality of agriculture. The security of abundance has never been put across to our people. Housewives are happy to have their pantry shelves filled but they have been taught there is something evil about having abundant food in our warehouses. "Surpluses" actually represent only about 5 percent more food than our people will clear from the market-places at present prices. We should see that America gives thanks for the fact that we are 5 percent over our goals, instead of 5 or 15 or 20 percent under—as is the case over most of the world.

Fifth. It would explain the efficiency of farmers and what this means in better food and reasonable prices, and it would show the science, the flavor and romance of food.

Sixth. It would show what farm products will do for people, for health, and in terms of a good life for every American family and each member of it.

To accomplish this, we have only to use a generous sampling of well-tested public relations tools. Here are some of the things we can do:

First. We should be supplying facts—the truth—to the important writers, magazines, and newspapers of the United States. We have allowed a vacuum to come into being. The result is many people seldom hear of agriculture except in connection with unpleasant, or seemingly unpleasant, events. I feel that the great newspapers of the country will be friendly to us when we are able to put the facts before their editors.

Second. We should have a speaker's bureau, with well-qualified persons ready to present, primarily for city audiences, the true story about agriculture. Moreover, farmers or local farm organization folks often are invited to speak before their fellow citizens. But farm people have little time to write speeches. We should aid these people by giving them fact sheets for use in such public discussions.

Third. We should arrange tours of food growing and processing areas by editors and other urban leaders. Much of our agricultural public-relations problem is due to the fact that most editors of large circulation city magazines and newspapers have little opportunity to see agriculture work. Thus, they have little appreciation of our problems and do not personally know anyone to whom they can turn to explain agricultural questions as they arise. Industry for many years has used the group-tour method to acquaint people with its personnel and its processes. Agriculture should do the same.

Fourth. We should be quick to capitalize on current news—to explain our operations and the importance of our products. Every major industry and trade association in the country does that. For instance, when the Soviet regime was seriously embarrassed by its failure to provide enough food for its people, we did nothing to assure American consumers as to their own supply of food and the continued ability of American farmers to produce that supply.

Fifth. We should point up agriculture's importance, its problems and its dreams, in staged events. We should have a national farm-city week. We should give more attention and more promotion to the county fair. These, by and large, have been allowed to drift away from a portrayal of the agriculture of the area and, instead, we have allowed horse races, stock-car races, and a succession of carnival acts to come in and make use of the funds which in most cases are still appropriated by the county for an agricultural fair.

Sixth. We should promote the idea of farm summer scholarships for city schoolchildren. A number of city boys and girls could be selected by their school authorities to spend a month or two actually working for pay on farms. They would more than earn their way and could go back to their city classrooms in the fall to share with fellow students an understanding of present-day farming and farm people.

Seventh. We should encourage the teaching of agriculture in grade schools, high schools, and universities.

Eighth. We should acquaint farmers with the importance of joining wholeheartedly in their local civic groups and activities. Other businessmen in our small towns and villages know it is important for them, both in a social and business way, to be acquainted with their fellow businessmen and to be identified with community improvement. We, too, are substantial businessmen in our communities, and must accept these community responsibilities.

Ninth. We should rescue food from its present "residual expense" category. By and large, Americans buy food with the money they have left over after making the payment on the mortgage, the car, the television set, the gas company, and the tax man. There may be ways to end this situation, and we should explore them.

Tenth. We should enlist the aid of industry public-relations staffs. Many huge American industries sell a substantial portion of thier products to American farmers. Yet many of those same industries do little to help the farmer with his public-relations problem. We should show these folks how they can be of aid to agriculture. After all, their customers' problem is their problem, and farmers are their customers.

Eleventh. Eventually, agriculture should find some means of financing adequate institutional advertising to tell the agricultural stories which it will not be able to tell in any other way. Too, such an operation would give agriculture one more important point of contact and liaison with America's mass media.

Twelfth. There is more than a possibility that agriculture could develop a very worthwhile continued television program, which would be of interest to farm and city people alike. One of the outstanding examples of such a program is the Johns Hopkins Science Review. Agriculture, too, has much to tell in the way of science. We would do well to investigate this method of telling it.

These are some of the things we can do in an effective public-relations program for agriculture, in an effective program to tell the farmers' story.

This is a program in which everyone interested in agriculture can join.

It is not a political proposition. It is not a 90-percent or a 75-percent of parity proposition.

It is a proposition to undo the damage that has been done. It places no blame. It will be born, if it is born, in the hope that all of us in agriculture, and whose well-being depends upon agriculture, henceforward can sit down together, resolve our differences, work out our problems, promote the prosperity of our pursuits, contribute to the strength and stability of our total economy, and enjoy the fruits of understanding and friendship among all our people.

The need and the demand for a program to tell the farmers' story straight from the shoulder was first impressed upon our House Committee on Agriculture 2 years ago during its grassroots tour, under the chairmanship of Mr. HOPE, of Kansas. Our committee traveled 20,000 miles to study agriculture, and everywhere it went farmers would tell the members that agriculture had the worst public relations of any segment of our economy.

Back in February a few of us got together in a little informal meeting, to discuss what could be done. Among those present were Hon. Clifford R. Hope, Hon. W. R. Poage, of Texas, Mr. Louis Wilson of the National Plant Food Institute, Mr. Jim Roe, managing editor of Successful Farming, Dana Bennett of the Foundation for American Agriculture, and Hollis Seavey, of the Clear Channel Broadcasting Service. Politics had no consideration in the situation. We explored every means of getting the farmers' story told. Then we asked Jim Roe to draw up a plan embracing the things we had discussed.

That is the positive program of public relations for agriculture I present today.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically called "Bananas on Pike's Peak." They are typical of the unfounded exaggerations being made by that area in an attempt to defeat the upper Colorado River project, and I submit they should be more accurately called "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

Any consideration of the Colorado River storage project should at all times keep in view the real basic issue, which is this:

The water under discussion belongs to the four upper basin States of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. The Colorado River storage project would provide the way to develop and use that water in those States, where it belongs. If the storage project is not built, that water—the most precious of all resources in the semiarid climate in which we in the West live—will be stolen from us. It is as simple as that.

The water is ours by every right, both legal and moral. More than 90 percent of the water which flows in the Colorado River system falls in the form of snow on the mountains of our four upper basin States.

We did not selfishly try to hold onto all of that water, even though it is produced on our land. By terms of the 1922 Colorado River compact, we agreed to a division of water with the lower basin States, through which the river flows. Terms of that compact are more than generous to the lower basin, but we are not disputing them. We only want the right to develop the water that is ours, under the law of the land and under the laws of justice and equity.

There is no other major source of water to which our four States may turn. Without it, the final limits of our growth and development are very sharply defined. Our future is dead.

With that water—and once more let me remind you that it is our water—we can continue to grow and develop, not only for ourselves but for the benefit of the entire Nation. We can fully develop the mineral treasure chest of the Nation which lies in the upper Colorado River Basin. We can, and will, contribute steadily to the wealth and to the security of these United States.

If we are not given the right to develop our resources, through construction of the Colorado River storage project, there can be no doubt of what will happen to the water—our water. Water, unchecked and uncontrolled, inevitably runs downhill. The natural course of the Colorado River takes it to Mexico and to southern California, which has already built a tremendous agricultural and industrial economy through development of its own share of Colorado River water. Development largely accomplished through the reclamation program financed by the Government.

Let us not be led astray by false issues and the red herrings with which the opponents of the Colorado project are constantly trying to confuse the people. We are only asking for our obvious and lawful right—to develop our own water for essential use and to pay for that development from the resources of our own region. Do not let this right be stolen from us.

Establishing a Transportation and Public Utilities Service To Serve Agencies and Departments of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter that I received from Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator, General Services Administration, advising me that he has issued necessary orders "establishing a Transportation and Public Utilities Service under the direction of a new Commissioner to serve all executive agencies and departments of the Federal Government," which is in line with a suggestion that I made to Administrator Mansure some weeks ago. This is decidedly a move in the right direction and will result in the saving each year of many millions of dollars to our taxpayers and the Federal Government.

I congratulate Administrator Mansure on this constructive action.

The letter follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1955.

Re reorganization of transportation setup in GSA

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: Reference is made to your recent letter concerning the reorganization setup in GSA. We have directed that transportation and public utilities be taken out of the Federal Supply Service.

Accordingly, we are establishing a Transportation and Public Utilities Service under the direction of a new Commissioner to serve all executive agencies and department of the Federal Government. This is in line with your suggestion.

Our first objective is to effect the movement of Government traffic, ocean, motor and rail, consistent with the best interests of our national economy, at the lowest cost to the taxpayers.

We are aware of the inequitable distribution of Government traffic in the various parts of the country. It is our desire to remedy this situation. Mr. Hyde, who attended the meeting in Senator SALTONSTALL'S office, has been directed to coordinate the activities of those directly engaged in this work. In order to accomplish this we shall need your cooperation.

We are now ready to discuss with you the clarification or revision of Public Law 152 in connection with the present exemptions. The general counsel has been directed to make his staff available at your convenience.

Messrs. Elliott, Kennedy, Hyde and Denniston will keep in touch with you. We are hopeful that revision of the law may be accomplished during this session of the Congress. Thanks for your help and interest.

Cordially yours,

EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator.

Vesting in the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis Sufficient Quantities of Salk Vaccine to Inoculate Free All Children in the United States Under the Age of 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as I announced to the House today, I have introduced a bill which has been in preparation for more than a month which would authorize the purchase by the United States of sufficient quantities of anti-poliomyelitis vaccine to inoculate

every child in the country, without charge. The actual allocation and distribution of the vaccine under my bill would be in the hands of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

I suggested this approach on May 13, when Dr. Leonard Scheele, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, was testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee. While he voiced no official policy on that suggestion, he said he personally could see no objection to turning the whole thing over to the Polio Foundation. I then attempted to obtain the views of the Foundation itself, but was unable to do so until just recently, when Mr. Basil O'Connor testified before the Senate Labor Committee. His testimony—in answer to persistent questioning—finally gave me the information I felt I needed before I introduced any legislation on the subject. In other words, we now have the word of the Foundation that it can do this job; we also have the information from them as to how they would prefer to handle it in case it was thrust upon them.

I think they should have the responsibility. They do not ask for it. But they can handle it. And no other organization in the country, including no Government agency, could handle it as well, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I have issued a press release which gives the full details on my bill, and I include it, and also a copy of my bill, as follows:

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN TO INTRODUCE BILL TO TURN OVER TO NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INFANTILE PARALYSIS ENOUGH SALK VACCINE TO INOCULATE FREE ALL CHILDREN UNDER 20 YEARS OF AGE

Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, plans tomorrow (Monday) to introduce a bill which would have the Government purchase and turn over to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis sufficient supplies of the Salk antipoliomyelitis vaccine to immunize all children in the United States under the age of 20. The inoculations would be free.

Mrs. SULLIVAN first broached this idea on May 13 during a hearing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency while she was questioning Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Dr. Scheele said that, speaking personally, he could see no objection to turning such a mass immunization program over to the National Foundation.

The Congresswoman, 3 days later, on May 16, wired Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, asking if he thought her proposal "would be a practical approach and if the foundation would be willing to undertake the burden of the work. I can think of no better way of assuring fair distribution of the vaccine. Would you give me your views?" She said she would introduce such a bill if the foundation agreed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN received no direct answer from the foundation. Mr. O'Connor asked for time to think over her suggestion. Failing in a subsequent effort to get a definite statement of views on this matter from Mr. O'Connor, Mrs. SULLIVAN waited until the foundation head testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Education when, under persistent questioning, he finally, reluctantly, acknowledged that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis had the competency to inoculate all children in the country if the vaccine were supplied.

The National Foundation, which financed Dr. Salk's research leading to the development of the vaccine, and also the field tests involving nearly a million children in 1953 and 1954, is now in the process of providing free inoculations for all first- and second-grade children.

In his testimony before the Senate committee, Mr. O'Connor said the foundation would be reluctant to take Government money in carrying out a mass inoculation program. "We would follow the policies that the Red Cross has always followed of not accepting Government funds. If that was officially presented to us, we would prefer that the Government buy the vaccine and give us the vaccine and vest it in us as we did in foreign civilian relief in the Red Cross."

After reading this testimony, Mrs. SULLIVAN decided to go ahead with the idea she had put forward on May 13 of having the Federal Government, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, purchase the vaccine from the manufacturers, and then turn over the entire program of allocation and distribution of the vaccine for all children under 20 to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, without regard to the ability of individual families to pay for the inoculations.

The Congresswoman declared:

"The confusion which arose because of the Government's original failure to have any practical program for allocation or distribution of the vaccine, or to assure that every child in the country would receive the vaccine regardless of ability to pay started this whole thing off on the wrong foot. The administration fumbled the thing terribly. Its present proposal for the free inoculation of indigent children puts too much of a charity connotation on this program. It is not charity. All the people of the United States have paid for the development of this vaccine through their dimes and dollars to the National Foundation.

"The Foundation pioneered the vaccine. It has paid for its development. It has pledged $9 million it does not even have to carry out the school inoculation program for first and second graders. It has been engaged in this work for 20 years. It knows the priorities and the needs, both by age groups, geographically, and so on. You would have no question of blackmarketing or of anything of that nature, for no one, no matter how much money he had, could possibly corrupt the Foundation or argue with its decisions on who should get the vaccine and in what order.

"My bill provides for the inoculation of all children under 20 by the end of 1956 with vaccine supplied by the Federal Government. I understand it will take until about then to make sure we have the 160 million separate shots of the vaccine needed to immunize the 59 million children under 20, giving 3 shots to each, including a third shot for the children who have already been covered.

"Once this mass inoculation program is complete, then of course the antipolio immunization program could be carried on in routine fashion through normal channels as any other vaccination program is regularly handled. But there is nothing normal about the demand for this vaccine, and the problem it creates in assuring fair treatment for all, particularly in such an emotional area as this where the health of children is involved."

Mrs. SULLIVAN said her bill differs from the one introduced by all seven Democratic members of the Senate Labor Committee, which also provides for free inoculation of all children under 20 in that S. 2147, the Senate bill, provides for grants of money to the States to purchase and distribute the vaccine, whereas her bill has the Federal Government buying the vaccine directly, but authorizing the National Foundation, under the general supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to have complete control of allocation, distribution, and regulation of the use of the vaccine.

The Sullivan bill is attached, as follows:

"H. R. 7026

"A bill to provide for the purchase by the United States, and the distribution by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, of a sufficient supply of poliomyelitis vaccine to immunize all children in the United States under 20 years of age against paralytic poliomyelitis

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the standard of health for all children of the United States, and institute the most effective and equitable plan for the eventual elimination of the scourge of paralytic poliomyelitis among the American people through mass immunization of all children under 20 years of age on a priority basis, without regard to their ability to pay for the vaccine, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall purchase a supply of poliomyelitis vaccine sufficient to carry out such an immunization program as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 2. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, under the general supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is hereby authorized to—

"(1) develop a program for the allocation and distribution of all poliomyelitis vaccine purchased by such Secretary,

"(2) establish priorities by age group and geographical location for the allocation and distribution of such vaccine in such a manner as to make the vaccine available to all children in the United States under 20 years of age, and

"(3) regulate the use of such vaccine, under the provisions of this act, in such a manner that will assure its most effective and equitable use in combating the spread of paralytic poliomelitis in the United States.

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act the term 'United States' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. This act shall terminate not later than December 31, 1956."

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the Florida irrigation project in Colorado.

The Florida project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Florida project would be $2,200 an acre.

The project would produce agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains and dairy products.

The Doctor Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the time is well past due for the discriminatory draft of doctors to end. To continue conscripting physicians and dentists up to the age of 46 is not only unrealistic but contributes to a basic condition which is sadly in need of proper adjustment. The provision of an adequate career medical officer procurement program is the true solution to the problem. The extension of the doctor draft beyond June 30 can only be considered as a mechanism for replacing career medical officers who are leaving the service in great numbers. It means the Defense Department is avoiding again the establishment of an effective career medical officer procurement program and needed adjustments to make career service more attractive.

A report of the Hoover Commission reveals an enormous increase in medical care given to dependents in recent years. Much dissension centers around this feature of the Armed Forces medical program wherein civilian physicians are drafted, then required to devote a large percent of their time and services while in uniform to the care of civilian dependents and civilian employees of the Federal Government. This exists largely in areas where the services of qualified civilian physicians can be readily obtained. There are nearly 3 million such dependents and retired military personnel plus in excess of 1 million civilian employees, who, under current law, are entitled to receive all or part of their medical care from the Armed Forces. If medical service is to be supplied free to dependents and other civilians, why would it not be feasible for the Defense Department to contract directly with local hospitals and doctors, or pay the premiums for health insurance to cover the costs? The extent of the dependent medical care program is reflected directly in the medical manpower requirements of the Armed Forces.

If our Nation were at war, the drafting of doctors up to the age of 46 could be better understood. Or it could be excused if there were no other ways of meeting the medical needs of our Armed Forces. Actually, there is no incentive for young doctors to enter a career service in the Armed Forces because of the salaries which are below civilian levels. Further, they are repelled from a job which requires them to spend much time in duties not connected with their profession, and which keeps most of them at work on patients who are not members of the Armed Forces.

Certainly, there is no question about the necessity for having enough physicians and dentists to care for the needs of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and the dependents of servicemen stationed in foreign countries. The point is clear that these needs could be supplied by career officers if the career service were made slightly more attractive and by the new medical school graduates who, like all other young men, are subject to conscription under the general draft law. It is hard to go along with the policy of drafting older doctors; many of whom have already had a tour of duty in the Armed Forces.

We might bear in mind that the Government does not draft plumbers or bricklayers or carpenters to work at below union pay scales in the homes of military men and their dependents, nor has it seized factories to produce free goods for dependents and civilians. The extension of the doctor draft would mark the first time any segment of our citizens have been chosen for conscription in peacetime because of their professional training and skill.

There are plenty of doctors and dentists who could do the job if some judgment was used in their placement; for instance, in 1 department of the Government, there are 850 dentists doing research work and these are all young men just graduated, and they do not have to report to the draft board. When they take this job, they are automatically deferred by the Army. There are many more—dentists who fail to pass the physical examination because of the loss of a finger or toe—a disability that does not prevent them from doing a good job, who could be employed instead of these young students who could be released to serve in the Armed Forces.

I expect to have a great deal more to say about this in the next session of Congress.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pike's Peak." They are typical of the unfounded attacks on the Colorado River storage project, and I submit that they would have been more accurately entitled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

The States of the upper Colorado River Basin—the States of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming—are all public land States. In this entire area, more than half of the land is in Federal ownership. This imposes a real hardship on these States.

Under terms of the United States reclamation law, 52½ percent of the revenue on these public lands from oil, gas, mineral, and other leases, and 95 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands, is put into a reclamation fund, for the construction of reclamation projects.

In 1954, this revenue from our four States amounted to $21,525,000.

The average balance on the construction costs over the 50-year repayment period of all the reclamation features of the Colorado River storage project would be $144,796,000. Opponents of the project have made much of the fact that money used for the reclamation features of the project is—under standard United States law—interest free. They talk about a hidden interest subsidy which the taxpayers must pay.

At the standard rate of 2½ percent, annual interest on this investment would be $3,619,000. From these figures, it is clear that the revenue put into the reclamation fund each year by our own 4 States is nearly 7 times the total of theoretical interest charges on the reclamation features of the Colorado River storage project.

Let us have no more applesauce on Capitol Hill about the nonexistent hidden interest burden. Let us rather look to the immense values of a sound investment in the future of our Nation.

The Late Amon G. Carter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly great Americans of our time has passed from the temporal scene. Amon G. Carter died in Fort Worth last Thursday night.

His memory will endure as long as there is a Fort Worth. The city and the west Texas region it serves are stamped with the indelible imprint of his personality.

Everywhere in this kingdom of oil and cattle, booming industry and thriving culture are the monuments to his restless vision, his daring spirit and his driving energy.

For Amon Carter was one of those rare people who achieved real greatness by doing. He was a doer of deeds. Contemptuous of obstacles and impatient of delay, he walked with steady tread into the whirlwind of history and forged an empire.

His life was a true saga of the West. From an inauspicious beginning, he proved once more the boundless opportunity which exists in this free land for one with the imagination and the force of character to capture it.

He founded a great newspaper which is a part of daily living throughout a domain that spans a thousand miles. Yet his consuming ambition was not to build a newspaper but to build a region, and the newspaper served as his personal vehicle to this end.

He became wealthy, but wealth was not his passion. He seemed to amass it for the purpose of giving it away. The extent of his beneficences is probably impossible of exact calculation. It is known that Texas Christian University, the YMCA, and 3 hospital endowments have been enriched by more than $3 million through his lavish generosity.

His largess was bestowed with the unselfconscious ease of the natural host. He wanted anyone visiting Fort Worth to be at home and took personal affront if his city was slighted. Many of the world's great came to know his unstinting hospitality and to count him a friend.

Amon Carter was known as "Mr. West Texas" because he embodied in larger measure than any other person the characteristics of spectacular success, gregarious generosity, and extreme extroversion for which the region is noted. In a land of giants, he dwarfed them all.

Fort Worth was his city, and he wanted it to have the best. There was something appealingly gallant in his unashamed partisanship. There was nothing ever halfway about his fierce allegiance. He was for Fort Worth, Tex., and the United States. He wanted the world to know it, and the world did know it.

It was never my privilege to know Mr. Carter personally. But I was intensely proud as a college student to work for his newspaper. Nobody growing up in his town could fail to feel the force of his personality or the inspiration of his achievements.

His passing leaves a void which cannot be easily filled. Yet the region and the Nation he loved with his whole heart and unrestrained enthusiasm are fortunate that the forces he set in motion will continue to live. Most of the responsibilities he bore are now assumed by Amon Carter, Jr., whose qualities of unfeigned modesty and something akin to humility will in time do ample justice to the tradition of which he is the heir.

Lesser men may discuss, as I do today, the attributes of the great, dominant personalities. We may philosophize and analyze and interpret. But society's progress owes primarily to the enterprise, the resourcefulness, and courage of the very few in each generation who are the prime movers, the builders, the doers of deeds. Amon Carter was one of these. He was one of the greatest of these.

Address at Dedication of a Monument in Honor of 90 Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 29, 1955, a monument was unveiled in my district in memory of 90 gallant young men who lost their lives during World War II. On that solemn occasion I delivered the following address:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO AT DEDICATION OF MONUMENT MAY 29, 1955

I deem it a great privilege to join with the citizens of our fine community in dedicating this monument today. This is an occasion which takes on added significance. It is our effort, in a humble way, to honor the memory of our dead heroes and the defenders of our Nation's honor. Today, we pay homage to these gallant men who have made the supreme sacrifice in the defense of our country and for the most precious heritage of the American people—our freedom and democracy.

We are gathered here today, not in a spirit of glorification of our victory in World War II but to dedicate a monument and to lay a symbolic rose on this monument in the loving memory of those 90 brave men who came from our midst, who grew up to adulthood in our community, and lived among us as neighbors. We are gathered here today—families, friends, neighbors, people from all walks of life—to collectively rededicate ourselves, to reconsecrate our hearts, and to reaffirm our beliefs in the solemn purpose for which they have died.

The one great hallmark of a civilized society is that it always shows and expresses its appreciation of the sacrifices made in its defense and the services rendered for its preservation. Yet, our capacity for thanks to those who have done so much for us is limited—a shrine, a monument, a stone marker over a grave, an account of their heroism in a book or newspaper, a memorial gathering such as this—and that is about all.

We feel it is not enough. We know it is not enough. We know that in our hearts these men and their deeds will live forever. Of the multitude of fine virtues planted in our hearts and minds, perhaps none is so widely shared by all of us as the feeling of gratitude for good deeds performed on our behalf. We generally express that feeling by commemorating the bravery of our heroes and we speak kind words of their heroism.

The words of praise that we utter here and the monument we dedicate today in their memory is only a small way in which we can express our feeling of gratitude. Their heroic deeds and their sacrifices must not and shall not ever be forgotten or in any way diminished, irrespective of the passing of countless years. Our words of praise and our recitation of their sacrifices can add but little to their greatness. They have erected for themselves a monument of greatness that speaks louder and more forcefully than anything we can ever say. This great monument that they and others like them have helped to erect is our own country, our beloved United States, democratic, peace-loving, powerful, and dedicated to the principles that all men are created equal, with certain inalienable rights.

This occasion is not one of brief pause when we merely recall those whose mortal remains have turned to dust. It has lasting meaning for us and for generations to come. Today we enshrine the memory of those who gave their lives in defense of certain sacred principles and beliefs, which are the very essence and which form the sinews of our spiritual lives as free men. The 90 brave youths whose memory we honor on this solemn occasion gallantly fought and sacrificed themselves for that sacred cause. They have given their lives on the battlegrounds of liberty, in order that their fellow men in this country and all over the world might live in peace and freedom.

The fact that these 90 men represented several of the racial strains and diverse religious elements of our community is significant. Among them were Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews, Italians, Poles, and men of other national origins which make up the people of this community and of America as a whole. Without distinction as to race or creed, they all sacrificed themselves in World War II, for they were, above all else, true, faithful, loyal, and patriotic Americans.

And so today men of all faiths honor these brave heroes—a Joe Fileccia, charitable of heart and mind and dedicated to his fellow men; a supreme court justice, the Honorable Charles Beckinella, who as a legislator and a learned judge has always tempered mercy with justice; and still another justice of the city court, the Honorable John E. Cone, whose crusade in the fight to build a better youth will never be forgotten.

Those we all honor today were destined by fate to have their lives cut short just as they had reached maturity, but in their short lives they have taught us a lesson which we must never forget—the lesson to defend and, if necessary, to die for the ideas and ideals that are dear to us all. Having learned that lesson, it is our duty to teach it to succeeding generations.

It is an equally noble and sublime duty for us to pay homage to the memory of these gallant men who, unflinchingly and dauntlessly, fought for a sacred cause and who in that fight made the supreme sacrifice for God and country. It is for us, the living, to solemnly vow to keep faith with our immortal heroes.

The great American poet, Edwin Markham, once eulogized a friend in the following words:

"And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a kingly cedar—green with boughs—
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome space against the sky."

The young men we eulogize today also went down in a whirlwind—a whirlwind not of their own making—and they left a lonesome space, not against the sky, but right here deep in our hearts. We shall always bear this lonesome, vacant spot in our hearts for the rest of our lives.

Tribute to Helen Keller on the Occasion of Her 75th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, today the world celebrates the birthday of a great, noble lady. Peoples everywhere will pause on this June 27 to pay tribute to Helen Keller on her 75th birthday, to commemorate the courageous and glorious attainments of a human being who has transcended the limits of physical disabilities.

In this time of relentless world strife and increasing pressures on the capacity of man to successfully meet his daily challenges, I know of no person who serves to inspire us to greater and greater attainments in the face of seeming insurmountable obstacles as this great lady from Tuscumbia, Ala. Although her first and foremost interest has been devoted to the handicapped throughout the world, her inspiration has been claimed by millions of people in all walks of life, by those who live in a still and dark world as well as those who are sound and secure in body. She has been acclaimed far and wide by kings, ministers, and presidents in all lands for her untiring and heroic endeavors on behalf of mankind.

Harvard University recently selected Miss Keller as the first woman in the university's 313-year history to receive

an honorary degree. In awarding this singular honor, Harvard University noted: "From a still dark work she has brought us light and sound; our lives are richer for her faith and her example." This tribute echoes throughout the world on many tongues and joyful faces.

Since Miss Keller graduated with honors from Radcliffe College in 1904, she has dedicated her rich life to the cause of the deaf and blind. And as she begins her 76th year she affirms her continued effort and service in every way to help provide a better chance in life for the handicapped. In a recent interview she stated that she disliked the very word "retirement," that she intended to work as long as she possibly could for those who live in a world of darkness and stillness. To know that this brave woman will continue her writing, her travels, and her every little endeavor to cheer the lives of all men everywhere surely gladdens the hearts and souls of man universal.

Miss Keller, who now resides with her companion, Miss Polly Thomson, in a rambling colonial home about 50 miles from New York City, recently returned from a 40,000-mile tour of the Orient where I am sure she instilled in those she met the finest aspects of American character. The annals of human history will certainly record this lady as one of America's most beloved and effective envoys, as the person who more than any other has reached the comman man with universal love, understanding, and hope. As a case in point, an Indian newspaper a few months ago editorialized that Miss Keller is the "finest gift which America has yet given to India." To be sure this magnificent individual has bestowed upon the human race the fruits of a devoted and selfless life, those attributes which defy measure in terms of cost and profit.

On this day, which has been proclaimed by the acting mayor of New York City as Helen Keller Day and which marks the beginning of a week which has been declared by the Governor of Alabama as "Helen Keller Week," we contemplate an individual and her monumental works with the profound hope that her fellow man will overcome the obstructions to world peace and encompass the light and sound which she has found although she cannot hear or see. We must find renewed courage and hope in the example of this intrepid lady who has given so much to so many. We must take heart and use those faculties of body and mind given us by the Creator lest we return to abysmal darkness.

A voice from the darkness has shown the way.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak." They are typical of the unfounded attacks on the Colorado River storage project, and I submit that they would have been more accurately entitled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

In her desperation somehow—anyhow—to head off development of the upper Colorado River Basin, southern California has even gone to the extreme of charging that the Colorado River storage project would imperil her own share of Colorado River water. No one who has made even a superficial examination of the project can avoid seeing how utterly ridiculous is such a charge. The initial phase of the storage project, for which we are now asking authorization, would bring consumptive use of water in the upper basin to less than half the total allocated to us under the compact; and the basic purpose of the storage project is to regulate the upper river and so guarantee continuous delivery of the share of the lower basin—including southern California.

The reason for southern California's frantic action is equally clear. Southern California has water problems like the rest of the semiarid West. Particularly, she foresees critical water shortages in the future. But I submit that southern California has the means to solve her own problems, without crippling development of the upper Colorado River Basin. Let us look at a few facts:

More than 50 million acre-feet of good, fresh water are wasting into the Pacific Ocean from the State of California each year. That is more than 4 times the total allocation of Colorado River water to all 4 upper basin States.

A fabulous amount of Colorado River water is wasting annually into the Salton Sea in southern California, in one of the most glaring examples of bad irrigation practices on record.

An article in the current Saturday Evening Post tells of the tremendous advance made in the technique of desalting sea water to make it usable for irrigation and culinary purposes. Before southern California's need becomes critical, the water of the Pacific Ocean may well have become a usable source of supply.

Let southern California cease worrying about bananas on Pikes Peak, or about generating applesauce on Capitol Hill. Let her solve her own water problems by means readily at hand, and not try to steal our water—the only water available to the States of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project. The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage. Development costs would be from $60 to $100 an acre for such land. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States as follows:

	Acres
Alabama	683,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

Conservationists and the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of those opposed to construction of Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. I voted against this proposed structure in committee, and would do so again if it were to come on the floor of the House.

However, this dam has been eliminated from the Colorado River storage project in H. R. 3383. Because of that elimination, I support the bill and hope that you will, too. I also hope that other conservationists will step forward now and give this bill their backing.

The conservationists opposed H. R. 3383 for one reason, Echo Park Dam. They won when the dam came out of the bill. But some of them have shifted their ground and now oppose the bill because of the possibility—actually it is an impossibility—that Echo Park will be put back into the bill.

These people excuse their opposition on the grounds that proponents of Echo

Park Dam will "sneak" it back into the project somehow. As a person interested in conservation, I assure you that I will ever be alert to any such procedure, although frankly it is impossible to add anything to the bill without approval of this esteemed body.

It would seem logical to me that conservationists now should support this project, conditioning that support with a statement reiterating their opposition to Echo Park Dam. That would be the honest and direct way to approach this problem and one that would draw support from all of us interested in conservation.

There seems to be some fear that Echo Park will be restored in conference committee. The Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, recently told the Rules Committee that he will let the entire project die in conference committee rather than have Echo Park inserted. The Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, chairman of the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation, backed up Mr. ENGLE on that point. Both will be members of the conference committee. How can anyone sincerely express fear that Echo will be reinserted with such assurances from these men?

The Washington Post and Times Herald described this project as it stands now as "a conservation measure in the largest sense of the word." That, I believe, is a correct analysis of the project as set forth in H. R. 3383.

I say to conservationists, put your fears to rest and support the revised Colorado River storage project.

A Tribute to Fighting Bob La Follette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth, I want to pay my tribute to the memory of one of Wisconsin's outstanding sons, the late Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

Although three decades have elapsed since death removed him irrevocably from the arena of American politics, his personality and his principles are still among the living forces in our national life.

The passage of time has failed to cover them with the dust of obscurity, or to dim the luster of his imposing record of public service.

Both in the State of Wisconsin, and in the Halls of Congress, Fighting Bob La Follette earned for himself the esteem and the affection of the American people.

"The Wisconsin idea," which he fashioned during his three terms as Governor of our State, became the inspiration for students of government the world over. He gave Wisconsin perhaps the best educational system in the country, a number of well-adjusted laws regulating public-service companies, and a series of constructive statutes intended to promote better living and working conditions for the people.

James Bryce, the historian, called La Follette's Wisconsin the "model State of the Union," and other observers have shared this view.

While a Member of the United States Senate, La Follette was the leading champion of virtually every measure intended to promote a better order of human life, and enacted during his lengthy tenure in office.

He was called "Fighting Bob," for he seldom divorced his dynamic and explosive personality from his principles and his actions. He fought the people's battles with every bit of energy at his disposal, refusing to yield from his position, and sparing no one who stood in his way.

Because of this, Robert M. La Follette, Sr. was perhaps the loneliest political leader of his generation, constantly exposed to bitter criticism from many sides.

His ideas were frequently ridiculed and denounced. His proposal to curb the authority and power of the Supreme Court of the United States, and other controversial suggestions, were roundly condemned and lost him many friends and supporters.

Nevertheless, the record of his personal achievements remains impressive. Further, many of the principles which he championed have withstood the test of time, and continue to play an important part in the life of our Nation.

The memory of Fighting Bob La Follette will live long in the hearts of the people of our State, and of our Nation.

Surprising Four Trustees Voted To Sustain Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the House Un-American Activities Committee performed another great service to this Nation by holding hearings in Newark, N. J., on the subject of communism in education and labor. Three teachers hid behind the fifth amendment when quizzed about their relations with the Communist consipracy. The Newark Board of Education, after statements by Representative WALTER, voted 5 to 4 to dismiss the teachers as useless.

Thereafter, the Newark Star Ledger reports that the counsel for the teachers "planned to broaden the scope of the appeal to include two sections of the Federal Criminal Code dealing with protection of constitutional rights and privileges to citizens." This announcement is tantamount to a threat against those members of the board of education who voted to fire the teachers under investigation. I am surprised that members of the bar, who have every right to defend their clients, would go beyond matters of defense and attempt to terrorize and frighten public officials in the exercise of their duty. They say, in effect, you vote for us or we will bring a criminal complaint against you. That comes dangerously close to intimidation. It should be deplored.

It has been revealed later, however, that Adrian M. Unger, counsel for 1 of the 3 dismissed teachers, said they had no intention of filing criminal charges against the school board but would cite the United States Criminal Code in arguing their appeal in order to illustrate that "it is the public policy of the United States that no one's constitutional rights should be interfered with." While it is gratifying to know that complaints against the five members of the board of education who voted for dismissal are not planned, there still is the implication and warning that public officials who vote against fifth amendment lovers may be violating the Federal law. Such a position seems hardly necessary to perfect the defense of the teachers but seems more likely to be an offensive tactic to cow the board of education members. Such a position undoubtedly will be cheered in those circles where the comrades meet to discuss legal maneuvers.

The Hudson Dispatch editorial of Saturday, June 25, has pertinent comments in regard to this case which are enclosed hereafter.

The people of New Jersey owe a debt of gratitude to the House Un-American Activities Committee and in particular to Congressman WALTER who has been so outspoken in defense of America and true academic freedom.

The article follows:

SURPRISING FOUR TRUSTEES VOTED TO SUSTAIN TEACHERS

When teachers in the public schools hide behind the fifth amendment to keep from telling their connections with the Communist Party or other subversive organizations, they forfeit their right to take taxpayers' money. They also prove themselves to be unfit to teach the coming generations, in our opinion.

The most surprising part of the trial of 3 teachers, who had refused to answer questions before House of Representatives Un-American Activities Subcommittee during the probers' sessions last month in Newark, is that 4 of the 9 members of that city's board of education Thursday night voted against firing them.

Yesterday, lawyers for the teachers, who were dismissed by the five-member majority of the board, appealed the verdict to State Commissioner of Education Frederick Raubinger. Naturally, the defendants will use every legal recourse to upset the board's decision.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, for the week of June

27. This column, which might be entitled "A Happy World for Everyone," follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

She was 9, and as she finished her nightly prayer she added a new concluding thought before the "Amen." It was: "and please make this a happy world for everyone."

Her parents were surprised, almost startled—both by the unexpectedness of the injected thought in a prayer which usually varied little, and also by its truly eloquent simplicity. In 9 words, this 9-year-old had summed up fully and accurately the hopes of all of us—the dream of mankind.

Noting the momentary surprise on the faces of her elders as she looked up, the child asked "Was that all right to say?" Instantly and emphatically assured that it was, indeed, "all right" to pray for "a happy world for everyone," the little girl settled back contentedly in her bed and soon was fast asleep.

The idea that their surprise at the child's improvisation had raised a doubt as to whether it was acceptable to pray for a happy world for everyone bothered the adults a bit. For they remembered that there have been times—or, at least so it seems in retrospect—when it appeared unacceptable either socially or politically to be concerned about the happiness of any except ourselves and our own group or countrymen.

What we prayed for in the privacy of our own meditations was, of course, our own business. But the views that we expressed publicly about world brotherhood, about the common aspirations of man, about the necessity for freedom for all if our own freedom was to be safe and secure—these were sometimes regarded by self-appointed overseers of our political morality, it seems, almost as subversive thoughts at worst, or "excessive do-goodism," at best.

To some, the formation of the United Nations just 10 years ago was a sign of such foolishness. While the U. N. has certainly not succeeded in bringing about the realization of the 9-year-old's prayer to "make this a happy world for everyone", it is a hopeful signpost and significant milestone on the road to a decent world.

The President emphasized this in his speech to the representatives of the 60 assembled U. N. nations at San Francisco last week when he said:

"For this Nation, I pay respectful tribute to you whose faith, and patience, and courage, and wisdom have brought it through 10 tumultuous, frequently discouraging, sometimes terrifying—but often rewarding—years. That there have been failures in attempts to solve international difficulties by the principles of the charter, none can deny. That there have been victories, only the willfully blind can fail to see. But clear it is that without the United Nations the failures would still have been written as failures into history. And, certainly, without this organization the victories could not have been achieved; instead, they might well have been recorded as human disasters. These, the world has been spared."

The President spoke from the vantage point of having personally just participated in the Operation Alert civil defense test which required him and all of his top officials to flee from Washington. His plea to the U. N. for a basis for a just world peace followed, therefore, his first-hand observation of the extent of America's horrible unpreparedness for hydrogen warfare as demonstrated in this rather fumbling civil defense exercise.

Significantly, just a few hours before the President spoke at San Francisco of the need for world understanding to achieve peace, the House of Representatives unanimously passed a resolution authorizing the use of a cancellation stamp in the post offices bearing the admonition "Pray for peace."

What better prayer than the simple one of the 9-year-old, "Please make this a happy world for everyone"? It would, if granted, certainly assure peace, would it not? It is devoutly to be wished.

Secretary Hobby and the Salk Vaccine Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the smear artists are moving out into the open again hot after a new victim. You can tell a smear artist in a very simple way. Is the attack against specific things done or against the alleged motives of the person doing the things?

I am inserting into the RECORD after my remarks a news item appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Letter to Ike: ADA Urges Ouster of Mrs. Hobby." Also the letter referred to. Notice the use of adjectives and adverbs, participles and phrases. All begging the question, all stating the most general of unproven conclusions, leading toward the basic conclusions sought to be drawn, i. e. "a crude attempt to escape public disfavor," "the inefficiency is only equaled by its inhumanity," "(in Mrs. Hobby's place) the country needs someone who lives in the real world where people seek compassionate and imaginative aid in their quest for health, education, and welfare."

Now what has Mrs. Hobby done or not done which brings about their vicious attack on her personal integrity, her compassion and her humanity for her fellow beings? A very simple answer—she has not followed the particular program that these smear artists happen to be advocating. So, instead of bringing forward honest facts and honest argument in favor of the program they advocate, they seek to win the battle without even engaging in it by trying to make the public believe that Mrs. Hobby is not interested in the health, education, and welfare of our people.

Let us take a few of the issues up one by one, because the pointed attack of the ADA letter is only part of a concerted attack that has been going on for some time by these vicious people who will brook no honest differences of opinion.

First. The "fantastic fumbling of the Salk vaccine program." Well, what is the issue? Has there indeed been fumbling or has there been a deliberate attempt to make a political issue out of the uncertainties and problems attendant to the application of any new laboratory technique to a Nation of 160 million people? In my judgment the basic error committed was the Hollywood treatment given the wonderful discovery of the Salk vaccine; this publicity program created a very false and dangerous public attitude toward the scientific problems of getting a new vaccine out of the laboratory and out to the public. What errors have been committed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I think there have been some, are just the reverse of what smear artists insinuate. The basic error committed was not to immediately call to the attention of the people the scientific and other problems that still needed to be overcome to make the mass innoculation a reality. It was to be hoped that no scientific problem would arise, but the odds that some might arise was quite real to any true scientific mind. Actually, the problems that did arise would not have been so bothersome if the Hollywood presentation had not created the unhealthy atmosphere of haste and cocksureness.

Regardless of all this, the matter is not one involving partisan politics. The persons who have interjected the issue into partisan politics are the very ones who falsely accuse Mrs. Hobby of putting the matter into partisan politics. It is the old game of the thief mingling in the crowd and yelling "Catch the thief" in the loudest voice.

Second. In the education field the ADA accuses Mrs. Hobby's proposal an unworkable plan of Federal aid for school construction. What the smear artists mean is she proposed a plan which did not coincide with the one they wanted. Now let us get down to the specifics. The ADA wants, and have wanted, for some time to get the Federal Government to move more fully and completely into the field of education. Others who are just as interested as the ADA in the field of education of our people, and more so, in my opinion, because they do not falsely throw the matter into partisan politics, believe that in the long run the education of our people is best served through the local communities and the States with the Federal Government playing only an ancillary role. Now there is ample room for fair debate on this subject. But the issue is not as the ADA would have it, who is the most interested in the education of our people, but what proposals are most likely to produce the best education for our people. Once we stick to the issues and get away from attacking the motives, the public debate can be fruitful.

Third. In welfare Mr. Rauh, the chairman of ADA, said Mrs. Hobby "vigorously opposed" adequate increases in social-security benefits. Now, this particular accusation approaches outright lying—the only word in that statement which saves it from such a charge is the adjective "adequate." Indeed, the adjective "adequate" is the entire issue. But let Mr. Rauh come forward to state what he believes are "adequate" increases in social-security benefits and why. Of course, he cannot do this in public hearings because his partisan allies have voted to hold no public hearings on the proposed increases in social-security benefits. Having the votes 15 to 10, these illiberal procedures are being followed right now in the House Ways and Means Committee deliberations on social-security extension. On this point

again, let Mr. Rauh and his partisans direct their attention to discussing the issue rather than accusing their opponents of being in favor of sin and opposed to Christian humanity.

Finally, I would say to Mr. Rauh and his partisans, if they would seek to deserve the adjective "liberal" which they so loosely apply to themselves and their endeavors, let them at least eschew procedures and techniques of debate that are illiberal. I am satisfied if once the debate gets on the issues and away from the motives of opponents, we will find that the results of Mr. Rauh's and the ADA's proposals in the field of health, education, and welfare would actually produce less health, education, and welfare and certainly would shackle rather than free our people in reaching these ends. But that, of course, is the issue—what proposals are indeed most likely to get the maximum of health, education and welfare for our people.

Now, a word about Mrs. Hobby's resignation. I hope Mrs. Hobby will not resign. I think she has been doing an excellent job overall, in very trying circumstances. Whoever is the head of HEW is apt to be subjected to the same kind of attacks that Mrs. Hobby has been subjected to. It is in the HEW field that the socialists are the most active, and I regard most of the proposals of the ADA in this field as socialistic. Incidentally, I am using the term "socialistic" not as an epithet, but as a definitive term set forth in any English dictionary. I believe that more direct Federal governmental action in these fields will produce, over all, less, not more, adequate health, education, and welfare for the American people. I believe the Federal Government has an important role to play. Much needs to be done, but what is primarily needed at this time is to get the matter back to honest public discussion of the issues of how we are to get the job done. I am certain there will be plenty of room for political differences as to how to do it without accusing one another of not being interested in the health, education, and welfare of our people.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 27, 1955]

ADA URGES OUSTER OF MRS. HOBBY

Americans for Democratic Action called on President Eisenhower yesterday to "reverse the do-nothing course" of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and dismiss Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary.

ADA Chairman Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., said in a letter to the President that Mrs. Hobby's "fantastic fumbling of the Salk vaccine program has ended her usefulness as a public servant."

"More important, it has dramatized beyond doubt the extent to which Mrs. Hobby's new Department has abdicated responsibility for public health, education, and welfare," he said.

"The inefficiency of Mrs. Hobby's administration is equaled only by its inhumanity," Rauh told the President. "Surely it is time for a change."

Mrs. Hobby's first "failure" in the vaccine program was "in failure to take responsibility," Rauh said, Then, he said Mrs. Hobby made a "crude attempt to escape public disfavor" by a "buckpassing" denial that the responsibility was hers in the first place.

In the education field, he said, Mrs. Hobby proposed an "unworkable" plan of Federal aid for school construction. In welfare, he said, Mrs. Hobby "vigorously opposed" adequate increases in social-security benefits.

Rauh urged Mr. Eisenhower "to replace Mrs. Hobby." In her place, Rauh said, "the country needs someone who lives in the real world where people seek compassionate and imaginative aid in their quest for health, education, and welfare."

JUNE 25, 1955.

To the PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Secretary Hobby's fantastic fumbling of the Salk vaccine program has ended her usefulness as a public servant. More important, it has dramatized beyond doubt the extent to which Mrs. Hobby's new Department has abdicated responsibility for public health, education, and welfare.

In your message to Congress of March 12, 1953, you staked out the new Department's purpose: "To improve the administration of the vital health, education, and social-security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental rank. Such action is demanded by the importance in magnitude of these functions which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens."

But you also said, "* * * good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their success upon efficient, responsible administration." We heartily concur.

Mrs. Hobby's regime is bare of either responsibility or efficiency. In fact her self-righteous refusal to recognize government's responsibility for the health or welfare or education of the American people appears to be a matter of private principle; in so doing she professes to be resisting what she calls "back door socialism."

The consequent chaos and confusion in the United States vaccine distribution program is especially shocking when compared to the success of the Canadian program directed by a government which even Mrs. Hobby could hardly accuse of having succumbed to state socialism.

Even more appalling is Mrs. Hobby's crude attempt to escape public disfavor by indulging in the ordinary barracks variety of buckpassing. Her first failure was in failure to take responsibility. Equally incredible is her serene denial that the responsibility and the failure were hers in the first place.

Mrs. Hobby's negligence in the Salk vaccine program is typical of a 2-year record of evasion of the tasks for which her Department was charged with responsibility.

One has only to look at the record:

Most administration proposals in the field of health, as devised or presented by Mrs. Hobby's Department, have been transparent public relations gimmicks.

The proposal for reinsurance of private health plans suggested a $25 million solution to a $9 billion problem; it proposed applying relatively untried economic backstops for programs already working well for people who could afford them; it would give no aid at all to those for whom private health plans are economically out of reach.

The proposal to revise the Hill-Burton Act to encourage the construction of homes for the chronically ill was submitted to Congress at the same time that the administration was requesting less than half of the annual appropriations already authorized under this act for hospital construction. When it was pointed out to Mrs. Hobby's Department that the Hill-Burton Act was broad enough to construct the kind of facilities sought, the Department failed to forward a request for funds to construct the very nursing homes originally proposed.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department has reluctantly requested aid to States and local communities for school construction, a request which only came after the administration had been in office for more than 2 years, and after the Democratic controlled Labor Committee began hearings on a Democratic proposal of direct Federal grants to States and local communities on a matching basis, and suggested instead an elaborate system of Federal guaranties for local and State bonds permitting local authorities to borrow money for school construction. The Hobby proposal, as presented to Congress, would undoubtedly have required a majority of States to amend their constitutions in order to benefit from it. Further, many State and local communities which are already unable to bear the burden of their school problems would be encouraged to overextend themselves further. It is hard to see how States which cannot now build schools for lack of money would be able to afford to pay the interest and service charges on the bond proposed by Mrs. Hobby.

Mrs. Hobby's Department has done nothing about the teachers' salary problem.

While the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare favored modest increases in social security benefits, it vigorously opposed increases to make social security benefits provide a really adequate standard of living. The Department opposed legislation which would have given immediate benefits to workers who have been permanently and totally disabled after they had worked long enough to gain coverage under the law.

Americans for Democratic Action respectfully urges you, as the person who must assume ultimate responsibility for the policies of your administration, to reverse the do-nothing course of your Health, Education, and Welfare Department and recognize in deeds as well as in words "the importance and magnitude" of its functions. The first step, we suggest, would be to replace Mrs. Hobby.

In her stead, the country needs someone who lives in the real world where people seek compassionate and imaginative aid in their quest for health, education, and welfare.

The inefficiency of Mrs. Hobby's administration is equaled only by its inhumanity. Surely it is time for a change.

Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
National Chairman, ADA.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak." They are typical of the unfounded exaggerations being circulated about the Colorado River storage project, and I submit they would have been more accurately entitled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

Water to be developed by the Colorado River storage project would not be used to grow bananas on Pikes Peak, or, indeed, anywhere else. But this water will be used to grow sinews and muscle for an expanding America.

The Geneva steel plant was built in my State, Mr. Speaker, during World

War II. It has continued in operation, under private ownership and management, and is now contributing substantially to the backbone of American industrial might—the output of steel.

The Geneva plant turns out 1.8 million tons of steel a year, and to achieve that production it consumes from 12 to 25 million gallons of water every day. That is a lot of water, especially in a dry country such as ours.

How, then, did the steel plant obtain the needed water? Mostly through reclamation development. Substantial quantities were purchased from a comparatively small reclamation project just being completed when the steel plant was first constructed—Deer Creek Reservoir. Other supplies were purchased wherever they could be found. But most important of all, land for the steel plant was purchased complete with appurtenant water rights. The water which for years had been used for irrigating farmland was purchased along with that farmland, and made possible this great industrial development.

The same pattern will be repeated many times in the future, as this great Nation grows and her industry expands. Water developed for use through the Colorado River storage project will, much of it, eventually be turned to the development and expansion of America's strategic industries—and repay the cost of development many times over.

Remarks of Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, on the Program Youth Wants To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 15, 1955, I participated in the program entitled "Youth Wants To Know." I ask unanimous consent that the questions asked and my responses thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The ANNOUNCER. Youth Wants To Know. The unrehearsed, spontaneous questions of today's young people.

And here is your moderator, Stephen McCormick.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Hello, I am Stephen McCormick welcoming you to another session of Youth Wants To Know, founded and produced by Theodore Granik.

Our guest today on Youth Wants To Know is Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. Senator ANDERSON is a former Secretary of Agriculture and is also a member of the Senate Committees on Agriculture and Forestry and Interior and Insular Affairs.

Senator ANDERSON, it is a pleasure to have you with us as our guest on Youth Wants To Know today.

Senator ANDERSON. I am glad to be here, Steve. I like this program.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Good.

Well, the youngsters participating in the program under the auspices of the American Legion have many questions for you.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think there should be a Secretary for Atomic Energy in the President's Cabinet?

Senator ANDERSON. No, I don't believe there should be. The atomic energy work cuts across many departments.

The Secretary of Defense is very much interested, for one, and the Secretary of Commerce, and all the various Government agencies have a part in it. I think it is better to have the program administered by a separate, independent Commission than by a Cabinet officer.

Question. According to the May 13, United States News & World Report, the recent atomic blast had been postponed for several days until the winds that had blown radioactive clouds over areas that had just about all the atomic radiation that the Atomic Energy Commission would allow, had shifted themselves. Is this true?

Senator ANDERSON. I don't blame the AEC for being cautious. It was a little more cautious than I would have been.

Question. Is that radiation reaching the danger level or is this talk we hear about the effects just Communist propaganda to slow down our weapons program?

Senator ANDERSON. It is not Communist propaganda, but it is sometimes a little overcautious. For example, I live at Albuquerque, N. Mex., and the radiation there is five times what it is in Phoenix, because we have certain industries close at hand.

Radiation is higher in Denver, which is a mile high, than at the seacoast, but the people in Denver bear up very well under it.

Mr. MCCORMICK. It isn't particularly harmful to them, is it, Senator?

Senator ANDERSON. No, not unless it is higher than it has become.

I don't blame the AEC for being careful. I believe it was unduly careful in laying out a pattern that enabled them to shoot about once every 20 days, if you followed that policy exactly. I think we can afford to be a little more liberal, because the danger isn't that great.

Question. Do you think that the Federal civil-defense laws need changing, at the present time?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I don't know. I think we need to worry a lot more about civil defense than we are now doing, and I think we need to try to find out if we have come to some conclusions on civil defense that are valid. For example, I don't know whether you can evacuate a great city like New York and if that is the only type of civil defense we have, then it isn't very good.

I think there are other things we might do, probably by law, maybe better by practice.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think universal disarmament is possible in the face of the H-bomb?

Senator ANDERSON. I am afraid I don't, David. I think until we have reached a position where we are able not only to have disarmament, but able to have inspection so we can go in and see what another country is doing in the manufacture of bombs, then and only then can we have any sort of disarmament.

Now this Government made a proposal at one time to Russia. Russia wouldn't accept it because it wouldn't grant the principle of inspection. We have to know, just as Youth Wants To Know, and our Government wants to know.

Question. Is the United States in such a position now that we cannot stop developing atomic weapons without defaulting to the Russians?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I don't know how to answer that. We must not stop. That is the best answer I can give you, because we know that the Russians are pressing rapidly ahead and for the present, at least, the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb are the one great deterrent to war. Therefore we can't afford to be in a position where we can't deter a war, we can't stop somebody else from striking us. Therefore, we must keep our weapons program going.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Senator, should one conclude from your answer that possibly a Big Four meeting or a meeting in the summer would be unwise, then?

Senator ANDERSON. Oh, no, I think a meeting is wise and I think it is fine to talk about it, but until Russia will change her position and say, "We are willing not only to say we will disarm, but we will also permit constant inspection to see that we are not again building bombs," then we can't safely give up our weapons, because Russia does have a manpower that might be able to overrun Europe without something like the atomic weapon, and the atomic weapon, however, balances out this difference in manpower. Therefore, we must keep it, as long as we have that great difference in manpower.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think it is wise to sacrifice a large mass land Army in favor of an atomic-backed Air Force?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I think we have to sacrifice a large land mass army, because the fighting might take place in Europe or might take place in Asia, and we don't have an Army there, and they can't train an army in Asia very quickly and they aren't able to raise a large enough army in Europe to stand up against the present strength of the Russian Army, and therefore our atomic weapons are very, very essential.

Question. United States Intelligence recently disclosed that we have fallen behind Russia in air superiority. Do you feel this is really a desperate problem, or is there something we can do to remedy the situation?

Senator ANDERSON. I have heard the story that we have fallen behind. I don't believe our military people believe we have fallen behind and I would rather take their judgment than my own.

I think the Russians are moving ahead very rapidly in the development of aircraft and atomic weapons, and while that is true we simply cannot afford to take it easy.

Question. How are we with regard to the atomic stockpile, or the atomic element? Are we ahead of the Russians there, too?

Senator ANDERSON. The stockpile question is very, very much classified material and we don't know the score on Russia's stockpile but let me say this: We believe we are in very good shape and I have seen some figures that persuade me we are in pretty good shape. I just hope we stay in that good shape.

Question. Do you think that the present restrictions on the exchange of atomic information with our allies is hampering our atomic research program?

Senator ANDERSON. I think not. There are restrictions that have to be placed. We are developing our own research in excellent fashion. I do hope that as a result of the Geneva Conference, we will find it possible greatly to increase the scope of information being exchanged with our allies. I think it can safely be done now, but I think it has required a great deal of caution in the past and may require a substantial amount of caution in the future.

You can't tell exactly what someone else is going to do with the information once it reaches him and it's going to take a little trial and error testing before we know how safe it is to turn our secrets over to someone else.

I think we have many allies such as the Canadians with whom we can exchange any type of information without any danger whatever. How much farther it should go depends, really, upon those individuals in the State Department who are able to judge the reliability of foreign governments.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, why has the United States lagged so far behind England

in using atomic energy for industrial purposes?

Senator ANDERSON. Now, let me tell you, you must not believe all read in the papers about how far ahead of us Britain is. While Britain has done a fine job and is making a great show, I am one of those who believe we are still ahead of most of the rest of the world in the practical application of atomic energy.

I do think we need to turn our great industrial giants loose. I want to turn Westinghouse and Western Electric and General Dynamics loose in this field and let them run with the ball, and I think they will do a magnificent job.

I don't admit we are behind Britain in the slightest. We are just lacking a little in opportunity for our people to make practical application of what they already know.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You feel industry rather than Government, Senator, should take the full charge ahead?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, and they want to. We have been a little slow.

Question. Will you cooperate with them in the future?

Senator ANDERSON. I will, but it requires something more than one individual. I believe we need a policy that presses ahead in that field. I believe we are coming to it, and the recent announcement that we would allow many different firms to build reactors and start in this field was a very encouraging one. These five who are now underway will do a lot toward proving how sound our theories are, and once they are completed I think it will be pretty well established that we are not behind the rest of the world. At least, I hope so.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, Mr. Hopkins, the head of General Dynamics, said that Britain and France are almost ready to put reactors into use for electricity, today, while the United States was just beginning. Do you have any comment on this?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I heard Mr. Hopkins on that program, and I think I might agree with him, but remember that out of his own yard has come the *Nautilus*—the atomic-powered submarine. We are making some practical use of it.

The difference, I think, between Britain and the United States is that Britain has to depend upon a rather expensive coal supply for the generation of electricity. We have an enormous quantity of hydroelectric power. We have a lot of natural gas that generates electricity very cheaply. We have a lower generating cost, and therefore it is more desirable to develop energy in the high-cost areas such as Britain than in the low-cost areas like the United States. Even if atomic energy should 11 mills or 12 mills per kilowatt to generate in Britain, it is still very desirable because they want to keep their coal for another purpose. But we don't want to generate 11-mill electricity here. We want 3- and 4-mill electricity and therefore we approach it from a different economic standpoint.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, what will the U. N.'s Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva accomplish?

Senator ANDERSON. If it accomplishes nothing more than forcing the Russians to show their hand while we show ours, I think it will be a good thing, because it will tend to show how far along we are in the development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes, and they will compete with us, and maybe out of that mutual competition there will come some emphasis on what is the real purpose of atomic energy.

In the long run, the peaceful uses of atomic energy will far outweigh in importance the military applications, and we want to start moving in that direction.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You feel, then, that the peaceful application might be that one element that might bring us together?

Senator ANDERSON. It could be. It isn't indicated yet, but I say the showing at Geneva could put such an emphasis on the peacetime uses of atomic energy that we might say, "Well, let's for a while be able to see if we can agree to put wartime applications in the background and see who can lead in this new field."

I hope that might be the result.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, at the recent conference between the United States and our allies and Russia in Vienna, do you think that the Russians are really sincere there?

Senator ANDERSON. I don't believe the Russians have been very sincere in international affairs for a long time.

Question. Then what is the use of even trying to make a treaty with them if they aren't going to keep it?

Senator ANDERSON. That is why I said we have to have inspection. We don't upon their written word if we have that sort of agreement. We don't depend upon their promises to disarm and never to build another bomb. We want to be able to go in and see whether they are building them or not. That is what broke up the other conference. That is why I like this program, Youth Wants To Know. I want to know and the United States Government wants to know whether Russia is living up to its agreements.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, don't you feel we should spend more money on guided-missile research in addition to atomic-energy research?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, you don't know how much we are spending on guided-missile research, and it might be quite a little.

I do feel we should spend a great deal, I think we are spending quite a good deal. I think that satisfactory progress is being made, but it is one of those things you can't discuss until it is all over. Once we have developed a good guided missile then someone will say, "Well, they were making wonderful headway all the time." We didn't have too much to say about the possibility that the atomic submarine would be a success, although we had tried out all the essential theories before it was built and we could almost predict it would be a success. It proved to be. When our guided missiles come along, I think they will prove that we are farther along than we probably now know.

Question. Are you in favor of the President's proposed atom-powered merchant ship which would cruise the world?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, maybe I'd better say I would like to see us devote that same energy to developing a merchant ship that would be usable, rather than one that would be used for a demonstration. I am not very much interested in using atomic power to show off, and I am afraid that is how this might be construed. I say that not in a partisan fashion, because Congressman COLE who is my predecessor or chairman of the joint committee is also critical of it. We would like to see a demonstration, I believe, of a merchant ship carrying usable cargo and demonstrating the useful applications of atomic energy and not as a display.

Question. Do you think the $30 million it would take to build it and the $600,000 each year it would take to run it could be used better in other propaganda endeavors, in food and so on?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes; I do believe so. Otherwise, I wouldn't have said I would like to try some other type of merchant ship.

I think, for example, if we could get an ocean liner that was carrying merchandise to other parts of the world—perhaps carrying part of our surplus food—that they would like to see atomic energy used for that more useful purpose than just for a demonstration. After all, being tied up at a dock, the people can't see what is unusual about it, because we are not going to take them down and let them see the power plant, anymore than you can come down and see the power plant of the *Nautilus*. We can show them what a nice deck we have. I would prefer that the deck would be carrying some useful goods to another part of the world. I am not against trying to demonstrate how well we are doing our job. And the President's proposal may come down to that, eventually. He didn't amplify it. I want to believe that he has in mind only the finest demonstration of our atomic energy development, and let's see what it proves to be.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Now, Senator, before taking the next question, it is time to announce the winner of this week's 30-volume set of the Encyclopedia Americana, America's first and oldest encyclopedia. The winner this week is Marie Morrison, 1605 W. Allegheny Avenue in Philadelphia, Pa. The station of the week, WPTZ in Philadelphia. For details of the contest, listen to the announcement at the end of the program. Now let's hear the winning question. Will you read it please.

Question. Will the continued development of atomic energy result in a gradual elimination of coal and gas in the electrical industry?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, that is a very interesting question. I think my answer to it would be a flat "No." For example, I think the fossil fuels will have a place in our whole economic life until they are perhaps exhausted. We use the waterpower plants we have now built. They will not be put out of existence by atomic energy. They will go on for 40 or 50 or 60 years, because our energy requirements are building up very rapidly and the atomic energy that is developed will just supplement what we now have. It may gradually supplant it, but not until the useful life of the present plants is well worn-out and as far as gas and oil are concerned, they may be required for many other things. Our coal may be wanted for a great petro-chemical industry, but certainly for the present there is no possibility that atomic energy will supplant it.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, what do you think will be the main election issues in 1956?

Senator ANDERSON. I think they will have to develop when we have finished this session and the next session of Congress. Primarily, I think people will want to know how well the Republican Party has kept its promises. They will want to know that about the Democrats, and I assume they will want to know the same thing about the Republicans. They will want to know how well we have balanced the budget. They will want to know how well we have gone about the principal business of the world, which is the preservation of peace.

Question. Senator NEUBERGER said he thought it would be conservation. Would you like to comment on this?

Senator ANDERSON. I think that will be an issue in many States and may result in the election of Senators and Congressmen and it may change some of those States, but Senator NEUBERGER is from an area that is very conscious of conservation and waterpower. That is not so much an issue in New York State, or Maine, or Vermont. Therefore, I think, across the country, it will not be quite as important as, perhaps, how well we have gone about the business of peace.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think that Governor Shivers, along with other prominent Democrats who bolted against Stevenson in 1952, surely should not be treated as delegates to the convention in 1956?

Senator ANDERSON. I think that will depend a lot on the attitude of the Democratic convention and how it is getting along on its program of trying to bring about unification.

There is an obvious indication that the present chairman of the party, Chairman

Butler, wants to bring these Democrats back into the party.

I was one of those in the Chicago convention 2½ years ago, who tried to keep the Texas delegates in the convention and Governor Shivers and I talked there many times about it. And therefore I believe that perhaps by the time we get to the 1956 convention, we will be wanting to make sure that all the Democrats are inside the Democratic Party.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, should Mrs. Hobby resign from her position, who do you think will, or should replace her?

Senator ANDERSON. That is purely the prerogative of the President of the United States, and until he asks me for some advice I am not going to give him any.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You don't think that is likely for the moment, sir?

Senator ANDERSON. No, I don't think that is likely for the moment.

Question. Senator, would you say that the United States Government under President Eisenhower has mishandled the use of the Salk vaccine, the distribution and so on?

Senator ANDERSON. I have always found it a pretty wise thing not to comment on things I know very little about. I have not been one of those in close touch with the distribution of the Salk vaccine, and I don't know. It is a pretty easy thing, after the event, to criticize. If everything had worked out very well, we would have said "Isn't it fine we didn't put any controls on?" I don't know.

Mr. MCCORMICK. One thing you do know a great deal about is nuclear power, and I have been fascinated by that little yellow rock there. I wonder if you would tell us what it is.

Senator ANDERSON. That happens to be a piece of good uranium ore. I thought these young people, impressed by success stories of prospectors, wanting to go out and look around for some, might want to know what they are looking for.

This is just a little piece of yellow stone that proves to be very valuable. It is out on the Colorado Plateau, which is a very worthwhile part of the world these days, as a source for uranium and it's indicative of the fact that we have found inside this United States, a very wonderful supply of ore.

Mr. MCCORMICK. We will keep our eyes out for rocks that look like that.

Question. Are we developing another Dust Bowl in the West?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, we aren't, but somebody is. I am afraid that the weatherman is doing a bad job out there.

Yes; a Dust Bowl seems to be developing again. I was very familiar with the Dust Bowl that we had there in 1934, because I had the responsibility of moving some of those families out of the Dust Bowl when conditions got to a point where they couldn't live there. And now, again, we seem to be developing a very dry situation, and a great deal of dust. I hope it is not going to finally develop, but at the present time it is an extremely interesting prospect and could happen to us.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, we have been talking quite extensively about the use of atomic energy in industry. How about the use of atomic energy in agriculture?

Senator ANDERSON. It is a very interesting field. I brought along a package that I think is interesting. You know when I was Secretary of Agriculture, the toughtest problem we had was what to do with all the potatoes that were thrust upon us.

Here is a potato that has been irradiated and it's smooth and firm and good and will stay that way for a couple of years without undue problems. Here is a potato that was not irradiated and in 2 weeks it starts to sprout.

We have some potatoes that have been going a month or two and they look like a hairy ape.

Now, this is a sample of the fact that agriculture may change completely. It not only applies to potatoes, it applies to meat, it applies to a great many things. Not only that, but we are finding out how fertilizer is best used. We are finding out that new substances can be fed to animals that benefit them. I would like to give you a whole lecture.

Question. How would that potato taste after you cooked it after a year or so?

Senator ANDERSON. Just the same. If potatoes are fattening to you before, they are fattening to you after they are irradiated.

Question. Why does that potato stay good by being irradiated? What is the difference between its condition and the condition of the potato on the right?

Senator ANDERSON. The processes that start the development of these sprouts are killed by the irradiation. In other words, it becomes sterile.

Question. Do you think there is any chance for Hawaii or Alaska getting into the Union in the coming months?

Senator ANDERSON. I thought once that both of them would be in and I hope that both of them do come in. I think the prospect is a little less forbidding than it once was.

Question. Are Senators and Representatives playing politics with these two areas? That looks like what is happening.

Senator ANDERSON. Well, politics has something to do with how they get elected and it is not unusual that it continues to influence their lives to some degree.

I don't think it is just that. Many of us feel Alaska should be in the Union, along with Hawaii, that if Alaska is left out, it may never get in and we would rather insist it be brought in at the present time. I don't think you can change the reactions that human beings have to that. I have supported the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii. I do today and I will when I leave the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MCCORMICK. We certainly thank you, Senator ANDERSON, for helping to provide the answers that Youth Wants To Know.

And, now, I'd like you to meet a special guest, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. WATERMAN. The United States has always been and still is the country's pioneers. Today the great unexplored areas are in the field of science. The country needs young men and women with trained minds and a sense of adventure to pioneer those fields.

Our industrial democracy depends very greatly upon basic research which seeks out the secrets of nature.

In their search for the unknown, scientists accumulate the fundamental knowledge that is applied to the needs of daily living. Scientists and engineers are essential to industry, to agriculture, to the creation of weapons for defense, to the Armed Services, to the war on disease, to the education of others. Unless an increasing number of gifted young people choose science as a career, there may be grave shortages of these essential skills in the years immediately ahead.

I do not mean, of course, that science should have more than a reasonable share of able people. For those whose aptitudes are along scientific lines, however, the career opportunities are many and the rewards great.

Scholarships and fellowships are available from many sources, for those who need assistance in acquiring an education.

The Federal Government is playing an important part through the support of research and education in the sciences. A career in science is an opportunity to serve your country.

When American young people realize there is a great need all along the frontiers of knowledge, I know that their spirit of adventure will respond.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Thank you very much, Dr. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation.

Summary of the Program of the National Historical Publications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission, I am privileged to lay before the House a brief summary of its current program:

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

A knowledge of their history is of great importance to a free people who are determined to preserve their liberties and their democratic institutions. Congress has created an agency that is charged with important responsibilities regarding the history of our country. This agency is the National Historical Publications Commission, which is composed of representatives of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government and of the historical profession. I have the great honor to represent the House of Representatives on this Commission, and I should like to report to you at this time on what it is doing.

The Commission is not engaged in writing history. Its function, rather, is to help preserve and make known by publication and otherwise, the documents that are basic to a knowledge and understanding of our national development—the raw materials from which history is written.

After extensive consultation with many persons throughout the country, the Commission has submitted to the President of the United States a report on a national program for the publication of historical documents. This outlines a comprehensive program for the preservation and the selective publication of documents that deal with the political, agricultural, industrial, scientific, technological, religious, and other important aspects of the history of the United States. All sections of our country and all periods of its history are covered, but emphasis is placed on the early years of our existence as a free and independent Nation.

One part of the proposed program would be the publication—by microfilm as well as by the printing press—of the correspondence, speeches, and other papers of individuals in the United States who have been leaders in many varied fields of activity. The Commission lists the names of more than 300 persons whose papers have been brought to its attention for possible inclusion in a publication program, and it provides some detailed information about more than 100 of these and the location of their papers. Another part of the program would deal with documents selected because of their relationship to important developments or significant events rather than to particular individuals. Such, for example, would be documents on the establishment of government under the Constitution, Indian relations, public-land policy, the westward movement of population, and the growth of a national transportation system.

The Commission feels that the program should be carried out objectively and impartially, free from partisan bias, and with-

out racial, religious, or other prejudice. It should be flexible. It should be undertaken cooperatively, participated in by many colleges and universities, historical societies, libraries, State and Federal agencies, and individuals.

Already, under various auspices, several projects for the collection and publication of papers within the broad framework of the program have been established. Among them are projects for publishing the papers of the following: John, John Quincy, and Charles Francis Adams, by the Massachusetts Historical Society, Harvard University, the Adams Manuscript Trust, and Life Magazine; Bishop Francis Asbury, by the Association of Methodists Historical Societies; Archbishop John Carroll, by the American Catholic Historical Association; John C. Calhoun, by the University of South Carolina, Clemson College, and the South Carolina Archives Department; Henry Clay, by the University of Kentucky; Benjamin Franklin, by Yale University and the American Philosophical Society; and Alexander Hamilton, by Columbia University. Plans are also well advanced for the publication of the papers of James Madison. Copies of the papers of John Marshall are being assembled by a group representing the Cincinnati Bar Association and the Law School of the University of Cincinnati. Copies of the papers of James Monroe are being assembled at the University of Virginia. The National Archives, with which the Commission is closely associated, is undertaking the microfilm publication of the official records of the Continental Congress, which was the governing body for the United States during and immediately following the American Revolution. The Commission itself is collecting papers which throw light on two of the most important events in our history—the ratification of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and the work of the First Congress under the Constitution.

A program such as that outlined in the Commission's report was envisioned by President Truman in 1950. On the occasion of the publication at Princeton University of the first volume of a comprehensive edition of the papers of Thomas Jefferson, he said that there was need also to collect and publish the papers of other persons "who have made major contributions to the development of our democracy," and he requested the National Historical Publications Commission to look into this matter and report thereon. President Eisenhower has stated that the fulfillment of the program set forth in the Commission's report would be of lasting benefit to all Americans; that it is through the publication of the source materials of our history "that we will be reminded of the real wellsprings of our national strength."

As you see, the National Historical Publications Commission is making excellent progress and deserves, I think, the continuing support of Congress, the States, and the people of our country.

Latest Cold War Weapon Widely Supported by United States Press and Democratic Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, with funds supplied by the President's emergency fund, the United States is fighting the cold war on two new fronts. Both are important. And on both the Communists have a head start on us.

In the 5 years prior to 1955 the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented. Their first shock was at Damascus last year, where they had a $500,000 exhibition. Awakening in time to what was happening, the United States was a last minute entry, presenting as one of its official exhibits the film Cinerama. The picture was the hit of the fair. It stole the entire show. The Communists protested violently, and when they heard the United States was planning a repeat performance at Bangkok they withdrew entirely. They could not take the competition.

Since that date the U. S. S. R. has withdrawn from at least five other fairs in which it was announced that the United States would exhibit, the Lyons International Fair and the Milan Sample Fair in April of this year, the Paris International Fair and the Tokyo International Fair in May, and the Canadian International Trade Fair in Toronto this month.

Under the program made possible during the current year by the President's $5 million emergency fund, the United States will have been represented at 15 fairs by July 1, 1955.

Bills to make the President's emergency fund a permanent part of the program of the United States in this cold-war period have been introduced by eight Democratic Members of the Congress. Hearings will begin on this legislation on July 5 before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. So far, this legislation does not have the sponsorship of a single Republican Member of the Congress. Yet it has the support of the Hearst newspapers and has been widely supported in other publications from coast to coast. Included here is an article from the July 1, 1955, issue of U. S. News & World Report as well as an article of mine which appears in the July–August issue of the Music Journal.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of July 1, 1955]

ART AND ENTERTAINMENT: LATEST COLD WAR WEAPON FOR UNITED STATES

People around the world are beginning to find the cold war entertaining—at least in one of its latest phases.

America and the Communist bloc are sending their finest talent—musicians, ballet dancers, actors—everywhere to build prestige among intellectuals.

Europeans and Asians are eating it up. In big cities such as Paris, hardly a week goes by without a United States or Communist show on the platform, sometimes both at the same time. It is almost like an old-fashioned band contest, with the trumpets of one side trying to drown out the horns of another.

Even places as remote as Iceland or the town of Peshawar, at the foot of the Khyber Pass in northern Pakistan, see talent from both sides as the artistic warfare warms up.

It was Russia that launched its big cultural drive first, right after Joseph Stalin's death. In the last 8 months, 500 Soviet and other Communist performers have visited France alone. And they lose no chance to build up the old idea among intellectuals abroad that America is a barbaric nation, with little or no real culture.

CAN THE UNITED STATES CATCH UP?

The United States, getting started only recently, is making up for lost time.

Congress, last autumn, gave the State Department $2.25 million to help United States artists and athletes—selected by the American National Theater and Academy and the Amateur Athletic Union—make foreign tours that could not hope to meet expenses by commercial bookings.

That program, on top of the libraries, art exhibits, and lecturers sponsored by the United States Information Agency, now gives foreigners a look at American talent of all kinds—not just the gangsters, jive artists, and millionaires they see in Hollywood films and hear about from Communists.

The musical comedy Oklahoma swept French critics off their feet in Paris. It is booked for Italy, also, and may be sent around the world.

That show is just one feature of an American cultural display in Paris, Salute to France, which is helped by the United States Government. An American art exhibit drew heavy crowds. Actress Judith Anderson, in Medea, was praised by one critic as giving one of the most remarkable performances of our generation.

UNITED STATES MUSICAL TRIUMPH

Europeans are still talking about another musical from America, Porgy and Bess, now being sent to Latin America after a triumphal tour of seven countries in Europe and the Middle East.

In Milan, stronghold of traditional European opera, Porgy and Bess sold out 4 days before it opened, and it won thunderous ovations for 8 consecutive nights at La Scala. Even the Communist press called this folk opera about life on Catfish Row one of the masterpieces of the lyric stage.

In Tel Aviv, two-thirds of those wanting to see Porgy and Bess were turned away. At one showing, a crowd of 200 Israelis crashed through a window and squatted in the aisles.

Everywhere, United States diplomats report, Porgy and Bess did much to dispel the idea of foreigners that America has little culture. And many Europeans commented that its all-Negro cast, on this official tour, was an effective reply to widespread stories of racial tension in the United States.

"RAVE" NOTICES

In Europe, too, United States art exhibits draw people by the thousands—in Germany, Spain, Britain, and other nations. The New York City Ballet, at its Paris debut, was cheered by an overflow audience long after auditorium lights went on. The 102-man Philadelphia Symphony, on tour, got packed houses and "rave" reviews.

American officials now are trying to send more performers to Asia and Africa. In that part of the world, few American artists can get commercial bookings—and anti-American feeling among Asian artists and intellectuals is especially strong.

The United States, this year, is helping send a tennis team to the all-Asian tennis tournament in India. The Martha Graham dance troupe is to make a tour of Asia. Exhibits of American paintings, arranged by the United States Information Agency, prove popular in India and elsewhere.

Big United States cultural showpiece in Asia, right now, is the Symphony of the Air. This orchestra, trained and conducted for years by Arturo Toscanini, is touring the Far East with the help of a $200,000 Government grant. It stirs even wilder enthusiasm among Asians than Porgy and Bess did in Europe.

GIFTS AND FAN MAIL

In Tokyo, people stood in line 24 hours just to get standing-room tickets to Symphony

of the Air. Musicians were besieged for autographs.

Latin America, too, is getting a slice of officially backed United States ballet and art exhibits, in addition to Porgy and Bess.

These cultural missions by no means answer all the criticism of the United States abroad. Anti-Americans in Tokyo and elsewhere point out that the Symphony of the Air seemed to find very little American music worth playing. And there are complaints that United States artists have to attend too many high official receptions, unlike Russian artists who seek out students.

Generally, however, American performers are found to be making a good impression—and causing many foreigners to revise their idea of America as backward in the arts.

American performers occasionally show up their Communist rivals. A Soviet art exhibit in Ceylon was termed inferior to a showing of United States water colors there a few weeks earlier. Japanese comment was far more favorable to the Symphony of the Air than to the recent visit of a Soviet ballet troupe.

Communists, too, suffered a propaganda reverse when three of their performers deserted to the West while touring France in the past year.

SPEEDUP FOR REDS

These setbacks are forcing the Communists—old hands in official show business—to step up their efforts.

Russia, with a full-fledged Ministry of Culture that spends tens of millions of dollars annually, has concert artists performing throughout Europe and has even sent a ballet troupe to Canada. A Soviet company of 30 entertainers, including circus performers, toured India for 6 weeks, with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's government picking up the tab. And the London appearance of Russia's leading violinist, David Oistrakh, was a big event of the musical season.

Communist China is busy, too. A Chinese entertainment troupe made a big hit in New Delhi. And the Peiping Opera Co., turning up in far-off Paris, drew huge crowds and enthusiastic reviews from critics.

United States and Communist cultural competition, already warm, is to get warmer. The administration now is asking Congress for funds to continue officially backed overseas tours by American artists next year.

America's cultural drive, officials point out, has to overcome a big head start by the Communists. But United States, judging by audience reaction, is doing very well in the world-wide battle developing between American and Communist artists.

[From The Music Journal for July-August, 1955]

ARE THE COMMUNISTS RIGHT IN CALLING US CULTURAL BARBARIANS?

(By FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.)

Making Washington the cultural center of the world would be one of the very best and most effective ways to answer the Russian lies and defeat their heavily financed effort to have communism take over the world. As my friend Jacob K. Javits put it, "if we do not want to fight the Russians with the atom bomb, then we have got to defeat their effort with two other weapons, economic and cultural, but in the cultural field we have not even touched it."

I have introduced several bills in Congress which are designed to enhance the cultural and artistic prestige of our country, for I am convinced that this is as important as any of the "guns and butter" programs which we support. One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy military allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture.

It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a Nation for our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contribution which we have to give to the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cue from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist parties in various countries and the U. S. S. R. find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

I, for one, do not propose to make it easy for the U. S. S. R. to win the minds, the hearts, and the loyalty of men and women throughout the world. I believe the time has come, and indeed is long overdue, for the United States of America to mount an important counteroffensive against the huge Soviet cultural drive which includes everything from violinists and ballerinas to athletes and chess players, and on which they are spending enormous sums. The fine arts are a unifying force, as Washington and Jefferson knew, and they are especially important to us now, when our country is assailed from within and without by divisive and undemocratic forces from the right and from the left. At no time in our history, perhaps, has it been more important than it is today for the dynamic and liberal forces to rally around the effort to place our National Capital in the vanguard of our country's cultural and artistic development, in order that the healing influence of the fine arts may become both practical and effective.

It has given me a great deal of pleasure to note that the administration has now begun to realize the importance of these matters as they were brought out last year in hearings before a committee of the House of Representatives.

In his state of the Union speech to the Congress last January, President Eisenhower said: "In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

When the Secretary of that Department, Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, presented the proposal for such a Commission to the House of Representatives, her message included the following statements: "Encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny. Throughout the great epochs of history, civilization has been importantly exemplified by masterworks of art and architecture, music and the dance, drama and literature. Achievements in these fields represent, of course, one of the enduring criteria by which history appraises any nation.

"The United States, despite its relative youth, is rich in artistic achievement. We have contributed new power of design in architecture, created new rhythms in music and developed a literature which commands worldwide attention. In the theater and film, and in the ancient form of the dance, we show a creative vitality. Our great museums, art galleries and orchestras are a source of pride for our people. Yet there are many respects in which we lag behind other nations in the general position we accord to the arts in our society. * * * There are in our Nation many persons of talent and genius, whose gifts need the encouragement and recognition which persons in other comparable fields enjoy. * * * Our National Government has not lent its encouragement and prestige to the arts to the extent that is desirable."

The sentiments expressed by President Eisenhower and Mrs. Hobby have been given legislative expression in a bill introduced by Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, Republican, New York, which would provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. While this bill does not envision as complete a program in the cultural field as those which I have introduced, it is an important step in the right direction. At the moment, details are not too important. They may be worked out during the hearings on these bills and a program established which will satisfy the groups and individuals with a direct interest in these proposals. Nor is it necessary to dig up the old clichés about mixing politics in art. Federal recognition is an absolute must in this matter and the bills I have introduced provide the necessary safeguards since all programs will be in the hands of experts and not politicians. This should insure the realization of our esthetic ideals without favoritism and with no strings attached.

It is my hope that all music lovers and culturally minded people in general will do everything possible in support of these bills, most particularly by letting their own Congressman know how they feel. In this way we will be able to prove to the rest of the world that we are sincerely concerned with the ultimate realities of truth and beauty and that we are by no means a Nation of mere "cultural barbarians."

Secretary Dulles Tells Kremlin All It Has To Do To Get Peace and Relaxation of Tensions Is To Observe Faithfully the Charter of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address given by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at the 10th anniversary meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco on June 24, 1955. If the people of our own country and those allied with us will read and heed his penetrating analysis and sound counsel, we will continue steadfastly on the course which is beginning to get results, and not be tricked by the guile and wiles of our enemies into abandoning the sound policies of firmness and strength which give hope at last of forcing the Kremlin to abandon its program of world conquest:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE UNITED NATIONS, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 24, 1955

Anniversaries can be both pleasant and useful occasions. This meeting is of that kind. We look backward and see much that was good. We look forward and see much of promise.

I

The United Nations has already shown that it is here to stay. One proof is the presence here of 37 foreign ministers who have come from all parts of the earth. Another proof is the fact that, since its founding, no member nation has sought to with-

draw; and there is a long, too long, waiting list of qualified nations which want to become members.

This esteem for the United Nations is based on solid accomplishments.

In the political field, there have been moments of triumph, as when the United Nations enabled Iran to bring about withdrawal of foreign troops from its soil. And when it helped Greece to overcome the threat of Communist subversion. And above all when it saved the Republic of Korea by organizing collective defense.

In the field of non-self-governing territories, the United Nations, working through the Trusteeship Council and otherwise, improves the lot of many dependent peoples and brings them nearer the goal of self-government or independence.

Through its Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations holds aloft a standard which will lead increasingly to respect for the individual human being and his sacred God-given rights.

Through the Economic and Social Council, much is being done to improve the economic and social conditions of the less-developed areas of the world.

We live in the atomic age. And members of the United Nations, responding to President Eisenhower's stirring proposal, are joining together to create an international agency which will harness for human welfare what was only a weapon of war.

Above and beyond concrete actions is the all-pervading moral influence which the United Nations exerts. In fulfillment of the words of Arthur H. Vandenberg—a name never to be forgotten here—our General Assembly has become a "town meeting of the world," exercising a guiding and enlightening influence on the conduct of all nations.

These achievements explain why, throughout the world, the United Nations is held in high respect. As President Eisenhower said in his opening greeting to you, the United States takes pride in its loyal support of the United Nations in all these manifold activities which benefit mankind.

II

The vision of the founders was indeed a lofty one. They met, while war still raged, determined to save mankind from the scourge of future war. But the charter they wrote does not call for peace at any price. The peace of the charter is a peace of justice; it is a peace which will assure to all nations great and small the right to be genuinely independent; it is a peace which will enable all individuals, however humble, to enjoy their God-given right to freedom.

To attain these high goals, the charter calls upon the nations to work together. Fellowship is indeed the essence of the charter. No solidarity effort could win for any nation the charter's goals. Collective effort is needed to preserve freedom. Without collective strength despotism would have free rein; the rights of nations would be trampled under foot, and human beings would be made slaves.

The founders of the United Nations endowed the charter with the flexibility needed to keep alive this concept of collective effort that these unpredictable times demand. A secure peace still eludes us. But that spirit of collective effort implicit in the charter, if practiced in good faith and with creative will, can guide us toward the ultimate goal of man—peace with freedom.

III

We all know that certain of the activities of the United Nations have been gravely hampered by the use—abuse—of veto power in the Security Council. This has prevented the Security Coucil from discharging many of its intended functions. Also, the Security Council has never brought into being the security force which it was supposed to command. The reason is that the members have not sufficiently trusted each other to make it practicable for them to unite their forces.

Happily, the framers of the charter realized the limitations under which the Security Council might operate. They did not require the members to risk their future on a rigid all-or-nothing proposition. They provided alternatives. Article 51 permits like-minded nations with common problems of defense to join together under the charter for their collective protection against aggression. This has been widely availed of by nations which trusted each other and which felt bound together by a sense of common destiny.

The first so to act were the 21 American Republics. They had been closely associated for a century and a half. They knew each other, and they trusted each other. So, in 1947, they made their Rio Pact. It recognized that an armed attack against any American state was an attack against them all.

Others followed in that way. There was the Brussels Pact of 1948; the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949; and the Manila Pact of 1954. Now, there are the London and Paris Accords of 1954, which bring about the beginning of Western European Union, a union long dreamed of by men of vision and good will, but which, until now, has eluded human grasp.

Every one of these collective security arrangements embodies the basic principle of the United Nations Charter, a principle which in turn derives from the teachings of all the great religions, that people have the right and the duty to help each other.

Every one of these arrangements also gives added security even to the nonparticipants. There is less armament, because multiplication of armament is avoided when the force that protects one is equally at the service of many. Also, the military power and facilities of a coalition tend to become distributed and not within the control of any single nation.

In international affairs, as in domestic affairs, the sharing of power is the best safeguard against abuse.

Power which is shared among a group of independent sovereign nations cannot be used effectively unless the participating countries are in accord. Such accord would be totally unattainable except for collective self-defense.

Because collective security responds to the needs and highest aspirations of mankind, it has been invoked by many nations.

The United States, which in 1914 and again in 1939, sought safety in neutrality, has now learned by that hard experience that security lies in collective action. We believe that the power which we possess ought to be made available for the protection of others, just as we desire the help of others for our own defense. So, the United States is today a party to mutual security treaties which bind us collectively with the defense of no less than 44 countries. We are proud to have these multiple ties of trust and confidence.

These systems conform to the Charter of the United Nations. They carry into effect the charter ideal of fellowship. They operate under the principles of the charter, and they are subject to the influence of this organization. They have attacked no nation; they have threatened no nation; and they thwart no nation that does not covet the land and peoples over which collective security stands guard.

IV

Out of the evolutionary process I describe, much good has come. Speakers who preceded me have referred to encouraging international developments, particularly some of recent months. Wars have been ended in Korea and Indochina; the Austrian State Treaty has been signed; relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have improved; the Soviet Union seeks diplomatic and trade relations with the German Federal Republic; and peace talks have begun between the Soviet Union and Japan.

These are indeed significant developments. But in our rejoicing, let us not forget why they have occurred, or the sequence of events that have brought us where we are. If we forget that, we will have lost the key to a future of peace and prosperity.

What has happened is because certain nations backed steadfastly the principles of the United Nations and backed them with a resolve that, if need be, carried with it blood and treasure.

Today there is no longer fighting in Korea. But why? The reason is that 16 members responded to the call of the United Nations and fought the aggressor who had struck from the Communist North and almost immediately overran South Korea. After 3 years of bitter fighting, the aggressors were back at, or behind, their point of beginning. The aggression had failed. Then, and only then, did the aggressor accept an armistice and end the killing. It is indeed strange to hear this triumph of collective security now hailed as proof of the peace-loving character of the aggressor and its supporters. If they had had their way we would today be commemorating the fifth anniversary of the demise of the United Nations.

Today there is an armistice in Indochina. It was negotiated a year ago at Geneva. But shortly prior to the Geneva meeting several members of the United Nations made clear that continuance of the fighting would carry a threat to all of Southeast Asia and require consideration of collective defense within the framework of the United Nations Charter.

Today there is an Austrian Treaty. It is a treaty which could, and should, have been signed years ago. For nearly a decade Austria was deprived of its freedom and its economy was exploited by one of the occupying powers. During this period of travail Austria's courage was sustained by the moral and material succor of friendly powers and by the backing of its hopes by the United Nations. In the long run, that combination prevailed to win a victory for justice.

Today, Yugoslavia is no longer the target of abuse. An orchestrated threat began in 1948, when Yugoslavia asserted its national independence and broke away from an alien yoke. During the next 7 years Yugoslavia was helped militarily and economically by nations which differed from its government in almost every respect except for one, namely, the right of Yugoslavia to be a truly independent, sovereign nation.

Today, the Soviet Union seeks diplomatic and economic relations with the German Federal Republic. That development comes after many years of hostility, during which the Federal Republic was given security and economic support by those who believe in the right of the Germans to have an independent existence under a government of their own choosing.

Today, there is a possibility of peace between the Soviet Union and Japan. Four years ago, in this same room, 49 nations signed the Japanese Peace Treaty, a treaty of reconciliation. I recall how, from this very platform, that peace was bitterly assailed and rejected by some. But now, as a result of the treaty of San Francisco, Japan has resumed a place of honor and dignity in the community of nations, so that some nations now seek peaceful relations which 4 years ago they spurned.

Throughout all of these events, there runs a common theme, the theme of fellowship. Those who believed in the principles of our charter have helped each other, and in so doing, they have helped themselves.

Some say that what has happened marks the beginning of an era. I believe that can be. Certainly, the United States, I pledge you, will do all that lies within its power to make it so. But we do not forget, we dare

not forget, that some of those who now hail the recent developments are precisely those who sought for years to stop them.

It is not unprecedented to see men make a virtue of necessity. Today, the necessity for virtue has been created by a stalwart thwarting of efforts to subvert our charter. If we want to see that virtue continue, I suggest that it may be prudent to continue what has produced it.

Steadfastness to principle and sacrifice for principle are the proven price of the good that we have won. It would be reckless to expect further good at any lesser price. To achieve peace with justice, peace with sovereignty for nations great and small, peace with respect for human beings without regard to class, will require sustaining the effort, the sacrifice, the solidarity which has brought us where we are today. Much has been accomplished, but more, much more, remains.

There exists the problem of German unification. For 10 years, part of Germany has been severed from the rest. That unnatural division of a great people constitutes a grave injustice. It is an evil which cannot be indefinitely prolonged without breeding more evil to plague the world.

In Eastern Europe are nations, many with long and proud record of national existence, which are in servitude. They were liberated from one despotism only to be subjected to another, in violation of solemn international undertakings.

In Asia, there is a Chinese Communist regime which became an aggressor in Korea, for which it stands condemned by the United Nations. It promoted aggression in Indochina, and has used force and the threat of force to support its ambitions in the Taiwan area. Recent developments, including the influence of the Bandung Conference, suggest that the immediate threat of war may have receded. Let us pray that this is so. But the situation in Asia remains one that cannot be regarded with equanimity.

Also, we cannot forget the existence of that apparatus known as international communism. It constitutes a world-wide conspiracy to bring into power a form of government which never in any country, at any time, was freely chosen by the people, and which destroys the reality of independence. At Caracas last year the Organization of American States found that the activities of international communism constituted alien intervention in the internal affairs of nations, and were a threat to international peace and security. This threat should end.

Finally, there is the urgent problem of limiting the crushing burden of armaments. For many years the United States and its friends have sought to find ways to carry out the mandate of the charter to reduce the diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. Nearly a decade ago, the United States made a proposal to internationalize atomic energy. This, if accepted, would have prevented the present competitive production of these weapons of awesome destructive power.

This unprecedented proposal was made at a time when the United States was sole possessor of this weapon. It was rejected.

This proposal was subsequently followed up by new proposals for the control and regulation of armaments and the establishment of an international organ to supervise an honest disarmament program. These proposals too were spurned. But the Soviet Union recently indicated that it might be prepared seriously to consider the initiative which had been taken months before by other members of the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee. Let us hope that these indications can be translated into concrete action making possible limitations of armament which are, in fact, dependable and not a fraud.

These are some of the problems that confront us as we face the future. They are problems which cannot be met if we shut our eyes to them, or if we are weak, confused, or divided. They are problems that can be met if we are faithful to the principles of our charter, if we work collectively to achieve their application, and if we are prepared to labor and sacrifice for the future as we have in the past.

The United States asks no nation to do what it is not prepared to do itself. Any nation that bases its actions and attitudes in international affairs on the principles of the charter will receive the wholehearted cooperation of the United States.

Admittedly, the problems we face are not easy to solve, and they will not be quickly solved. There is room for many honest differences of opinion. But the existence of hard, unsolved problems need not itself be a source of danger and hostility if the nations will bring to the common task the spirit of our charter.

There is one extremely simple method of bringing an end to what is called the "cold war"—observe the Charter of the United Nations; refrain from the use of force or the threat of force in international relations and from the support and direction of subversion against the institutions of other countries.

To bring the cold war to an end, seven points are not needed; this one is sufficient.

It is in that spirit that we go to Geneva, and we hope to find that spirit shared.

If so, we can find there new procedures, or at least develop a new impetus, which will help to solve some of these vast and stubborn problems that still confront us.

We shall not, at Geneva, assume to act as a world directorate with the right to determine the destinies of others. Good solutions do not come from such a mood. We shall seek to find procedures such that all nations directly concerned can fully assert whatever rights and views they have.

In other words, we shall try to carry into the Geneva Conference the spirit which has been generated by this commemorative gathering of 60 nations. The sentiments which have been here expressed can inspire new strength, new determination, and a new spirit of fidelity to the principles of the United Nations founders.

In conclusion, I can do no better than to cite the pledge made here last Monday by the President of the United States:

"We, with the rest of the world, know that a nation's vision of peace cannot be attained through any race in armaments. The munitions of peace are justice, honesty, mutual understanding, and respect for others.

"So believing and so motivated, the United States will leave no stone unturned to work for peace. We shall reject no method however novel, that holds out any hope however faint, for a just and lasting peace."

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, June 27, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rabbi David de Sola Pool, rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue in New York, N. Y., which was founded in 1654, offered the following prayer:

God of the spirit of all living, may Thy blessing rest on this assembly dedicated to serve our great land in keeping with the ideals with which Thou didst inspire its Founding Fathers.

Strengthen these Thy servants with wisdom from Thee in their ever-extending responsibilities. Through their vision and high purpose may the light of freedom and fellowship for all that was kindled in this Republic bring hope and courage to a world that shall be united in human brotherhood and good will beyond national frontiers.

Help and strengthen the Members of this powerful Government body to further Thy teachings of justice, compassion, and neighbor love, so that soon may dawn the day foretold by Thy prophet when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more, and all men, as children of Thee, the universal Father, shall dwell in peace on this earth as brothers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 27, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

FINAL REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 198)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 1582. An act to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; and

S. 1755. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr.