

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1956

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, who hast delivered me from the hands of the Nazi and Communist tyrants and hast brought me to these blessed shores, I lead Thy children in prayer for our land, the haven for the homeless, the refuge for the oppressed, the beacon of hope and faith for all the enslaved in the world.

O Lord, bestow Thy blessings of plenty upon our precious homeland. Protect her against the furor of nature's disasters and the onslaught of her enemies. May she remain the wonder garden of Thy creation where we, Thy children, dwell together in peace and brotherhood.

O Father, bless the men of this sanctuary of deliberations. Give them and their families health of body and soul, peace of mind, and happiness. May their dedicated service, zeal, and enthusiasm earn the faith and confidence of the people they represent so that they may continue to labor in Thy vineyard for peace and security on this troubled earth and the preservation of our American heritage. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 9, 1956:

H. R. 6162. An act to provide for longer terms of office for the Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii;

H. R. 6227. An act to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests;

H. R. 6573. An act to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States;

H. R. 6703. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska;

H. R. 8334. An act to permit the importation, free of duty, of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic games;

H. R. 8942. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8959. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9078. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers and members;

H. R. 10754. An act to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines;

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

On May 10, 1956:

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Justin G. Maile and Theodore R. Hilbig;

H. R. 1500. An act for the relief of Charles F. Brickell;

H. R. 2465. An act for the relief of Bernard L. Denn;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of the F. Delizia Co., Inc.;

H. R. 4118. An act to amend section 606 (5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the computation of the 10-year recapture period;

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4865. An act for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander P. Anderson; and

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Nathan L. Garner.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel;

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force;

H. R. 5495. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo;

H. R. 6395. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others;

H. R. 6622. An act for the relief of certain rural carriers;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 6769. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H. R. 7114. An act for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock;

H. R. 8187. An act for the relief of Wright H. Huntley;

H. R. 8306. An act for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reeves, and Jackson L. Hardy;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn;

H. R. 8308. An act for the relief of Arthur O. Hulse, Jr.;

H. R. 8310. An act for the relief of CWO George C. Carter;

H. R. 8311. An act for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.;

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.," and

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti;

H. R. 2057. An act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton;

H. R. 2284. An act for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer;

H. R. 2893. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3366. An act for the relief of Mary J. McDougal;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 4026. An act for the relief of James C. Hayes;

H. R. 4162. An act for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris;

H. R. 4640. An act for the relief of James M. Wilson;

H. R. 5237. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden;

H. R. 5535. An act for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H. Prather, Jr.;

H. R. 6137. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman Floyd Williams and Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Segers;

H. R. 6143. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson;

H. R. 7164. An act for the relief of Lt. Michael Cullen; and

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

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

S. 422. An act for the relief of William C. Irvine, chief warrant officer, United States Air Force;

S. 742. An act to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 764. An act for the relief of Robert Garntenberg;

S. 832. An act for the relief of Jonas Dercautan;

S. 1358. An act to authorize modification of the flood-control project for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513-512-R, Richardson County, Nebr.;

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended;

S. 1938. An act for the relief of Hildegard L. McNabb;

S. 2507. An act for the relief of Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung);

S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended;

S. 2750. An act for the relief of Frank Sevcik, Jr., also known as Frantisek or Francesco Sevcik;

S. 2785. An act for the relief of Elsa Eme-lina Rosado y Rodriguez de Brower;

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Brigitte Lechner Wagner;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 2838. An act for the relief of Antonia Soullis;

S. 2840. An act for the relief of Anniemae M. Swanson and Armylee V. Swanson;

S. 2843. An act for the relief of Dr. Shou Soon Kwong;

S. 2874. An act for the relief of Ethel Kal-lins;

S. 2883. An act for the relief of Dr. Yong Whan Kim;

S. 2888. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Dummer;

S. 2931. An act for the relief of Oksanna Oztemel;

S. 2941. An act for the relief of Lottie Windschild;

S. 2944. An act for the relief of William Jeffrey Jonas;

S. 2953. An act for the relief of Maria Cedrone De Rubels;

S. 3073. An act to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) entitled "Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. MALONE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed the Senator from Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, as conferee on the bill (H. R. 7030) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, vice the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. MARTIN.

## ADMISSION OF ELDERLY PERSONS TO FEDERALLY ASSISTED LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which, if enacted, would authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of elderly persons to federally assisted low-rent housing projects.

My interest in such legislation came to my attention rather forcibly through a letter I received from an elderly lady in St. Louis who wrote me recently asking for my assistance in helping her to obtain housing.

Under the present law, elderly persons cannot be admitted to low-rent housing projects unless there is a blood relation to share it. The lady who wrote me is 69 years of age, has no relatives, and is partially disabled and unable financially to pay high rent.

I contacted the Public Housing Administration and was advised that under existing law, only families of low income shall be admitted. Under the terms of my bill, in an effort to alleviate this serious situation, elderly persons 65 years of age or over may be admitted to such low-rent housing projects with priority, of course, to families with children. I have written the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Congressman WOLCOTT, which committee has charge of housing legislation, asking that consideration be given my bill, and I hope that you, my colleagues, will give serious thought to it when it comes before you.

Below quoted are certain excerpts from the letter I received:

Called every housing project and the same bad news from them all. No elderly women admitted alone—wonder why. What are we poor souls going to do or where can we go? Wonder who made such a ruling and was so inconsiderate of people like me. They all tell me when I phone that they cannot do anything about it and for me to write my Senator or Congressman or President Eisenhower himself. I am writing you and truly hope you will do something about this all-important matter. . . .

Cannot get into any old folks home until the age of 70 and the waiting lists are very long, besides there has to be quite a sum of money assured in most of them and all personal effects must be signed over, so that is that. Please try and do something soon about this as I probably will be evicted if I cannot pay present rent on what I get. Still would like to know why old women alone are not admitted to cheaper rent projects. We would not harm anyone. A sin and a shame to bar us.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Ashley	Fascell	Moulder
Barden	Gamble	Nelson
Belcher	Gavin	O'Hara, Minn.
Bentley	Gray	Polk
Blitch	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Boykin	Gubser	Preston
Brooks, La.	Gwinn	Prouty
Brown, Ohio	Harrison, Nebr.	Radwan
Burdick	Hayworth	Sadiak
Carlyle	Hoffman, Ill.	Short
Carnahan	Hoffman, Mich.	Sieminski
Chatham	James	Staggers
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Taylor
Crumacker	Kearns	Teague, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Thompson, La.
Deane	Lane	Tollefson
Diggs	McCarthy	Velde
Dondero	McConnell	Watts
Donovan	McDowell	Williams, N. J.
Eberharter	Mollohan	Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10986, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday general debate will continue for not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is the most important bill of the session. It deals with the most vital and most important issue before the American people today. It carries inevitable, imperative, and inescapable allocations and it appropriates vastly more money than all the rest of the appropriation bills that have been passed or that will be passed by this Congress. It provides the money for national defense. It carries funds for the preservation of free government around the globe. It is the last hope of civilization. If it fails, if America fails, there is no other people, no other government left to take up the torch stricken from our hands.

So we have little option, little latitude in the drafting of this bill. It is merely a matter of how much money can be used effectively by our technicians,

our masters of strategy, and our agencies of production. So the committee is going along, largely, with the budget. We are accepting in general the decisions of the President and the Pentagon as to amounts and allocations, although there are some of us on both sides of the aisle who must reserve judgment on some items.

We are reaching a critical period in a time of our greatest national danger. The situation demands sane and constructive thinking divorced from political interest or partisan influence. We must have the facts. The stakes are entirely too high for us to take a chance on the slightest uncertainty.

The principal editorial in the Washington Post of this morning says:

The military structure ought to be scrutinized from top to bottom.

Then it continues:

A study by independent men of stature could help to bring to bear by appropriation time next year some of the fresh thinking everyone talks about and seemingly no one does.

That is a rather drastic castigation of this budget, but it is the considered opinion of one of the great newspapers of the Nation. The duty of such scrutiny and such thinking devolves upon this House and for the time being no one else can discharge that responsibility. It has been in the hands of the committee since January, and we now submit it to you for your adjudication.

Let us look at the fundamentals.

First, can we avoid war? Will we ever be called on to use the armaments for which we are spending this \$33 billion or \$35 billion? Of course, all of us are by nature optimists. We prefer to believe that there will never be occasion to defend our families, our cities, our Nation, against predatory murder and rapine, against the Tamerlanes, the Genghis Khans, the Stalins in Russia, the Mao Tse-tungs in China, the Ho Chi Minhs in Vietnam, or the Kim Il Sung in North Korea.

We hope we shall never have to defend our Nation against these barbarians who torture body and soul as in the case of General Dean and Cardinal Mindszenty and thousands of others who have suffered unspeakable martyrdom, a martyrdom which they threaten to inflict on every American in the United States.

We are a peace loving, peace prospering people. All our interests lie along the paths of peace and international amity. We have endeavored in every way possible for the past 10 years to reach an honest and honorable agreement with Russia. We have humiliated ourselves in numerous conferences, and all without avail. Just a little more than a month ago, the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee with representatives from France, Canada, Britain, and the United States resumed discussions in London with that in view. All were agreeable except Russia. Russia alone dissented. Russia alone insisted upon maintaining the present status and continuing the race of armaments which is disturbing the whole world. The Kremlin offered

only lip service and in the meantime Russia has continued to manufacture more arms; has made more progress in scientific warfare than any previous year in the history of that nation or any other nation in the world in like time.

There can be no cause for apprehension on the part of Russia. The United States by its long and consistent course of honorable associations with other nations of the world has shown itself to be a friend under all circumstances. We established the Cuban Republic when that fertile island was thrown in our lap, and we could have had it for the asking. Instead of appropriating and exploiting it as a dependency, we preferred to make it an independent nation. In the Philippines we spent billions of dollars rebuilding the war-torn islands and rehabilitating the people and establishing schools, roads, and commerce and self-government to such an extent that everyone there today is our friend. We could have taken the Philippines over, without opposition, had we entertained any disposition toward colonization. Instead we made them a free and independent people in the family of nations.

In our relations with our sister Republic, Mexico, on all occasions we have accorded her the most deferential and amicable treatment, leaving no doubt in anyone's mind of the peaceful and friendly attitude of the United States toward all the peoples of the world. We entertained the same friendship for Russia and the Russian people. We saved her in her war with Germany. But for American ships, American planes, American arms, and American food she could not possibly have survived. But no sooner was the danger past and peace assured than the Soviet Government, seizing every adjacent nation, announced her policy of extending Russian communism and Russian rule throughout the world. In pursuit of that policy she closed down the Iron Curtain and prepared to subjugate the globe by force. And from 1945 down to the present day, the factories and laboratories of Russia producing war materials have been running on 3 shifts, 24 hours a day, in the feverish effort to prepare themselves to take us over, as they have taken over Poland, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, Albania and adjacent territories. One by one their inhabitants were subjected to selective massacre and their property carried to Russia and all are today abjectly under the heel of the Russian tyrants.

When they have so often and so emphatically expressed their hatred for us, our form of government, our religion, and our way of life, what reason have we to believe that, once they have enough long-range bombers, America and Americans would receive any different treatment?

In this continuous preparation for war throughout the last decade the Soviets could have no other possible purpose than the subjugation of America, the wholesale destruction of the majority of our people, and the looting and confiscation of everything we possess to such extent that the miserable remnant of

the American people would be decimated as completely as the famine-stricken Kulacks of Russia, who were starved and exterminated by the millions in the purges instituted by Stalin to establish his dictatorship.

But even if we could secure a covenant with the Soviets, it would not warrant a slackening of our preparations for defense. The Soviets have never kept a single international agreement they have ever made. That is a sweeping statement, but wholly justified by the facts.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, now ranking minority member of that committee, called attention to this situation when he reminded us in January that the Reds have consistently broken the Korean truce in order to build up their airpower. They realized that airpower is critical and supreme. They solemnly agreed when they signed the truce that they would not increase their forces or their war facilities. At that time they had 12 airfields. Today they have 39. When the armistice was signed, they did not have a single Mig plane. They now have 350. On the night of July 27, 1953, the day the armistice was signed, planes were detected entering North Korea from Manchuria. If they broke their word the very day the treaty was signed, what can we expect in the future?

They have all these years publicly proclaimed their hatred of us and their determination to destroy us and they have never retracted or deviated from that purpose.

But now there are alarming developments. We have always believed that our superior Air Force rendered us immune to attack. It has never occurred to us that any nation, much less backward Russia, could develop intercontinental bombers or nuclear bombs which could be used against us. Now, within the last few months it has become increasingly evident that we are losing our battle with communism. Those in a position to know have testified before House and Senate committees that Russia is attaining a frightful lead over the United States in long-range bombers and guided missiles.

Although in 1945 the United States had the most powerful Army, the greatest Navy, and the most effective Air Fleet in the world, top-ranking military officers now inform us that the Soviets have a numerical advantage in long-range bombers and the rate of production of nuclear aircraft.

With a continuation of the present trends they will have a greater striking power than we in 1958 or 1960, if not before.

General LeMay testified that even today the Soviets have more Bisons and Bears—that is the equivalent of our B-52's—in their armory than we have B-52's; and that statement is not disputed. And the ominous feature of it is that we are told by our military authorities that the United States Air Force does not now plan to increase the rate of production of the B-52's, even to equal to the combined production of the Russians

in modern-type bombers. They are producing more rapidly, and we agree they are producing more rapidly, yet we have no plans whereby we propose to remedy that situation.

To further impair American defense, Russia has just announced they will soon have an intercontinental missile with a hydrogen warhead they can place anywhere in the world. There is no known defense against a ballistic missile.

Already Russia claims to be on the way to production of a missile with a practical range of 1,500 miles. That would bring within range all our European allies.

Air Force Secretary Quarles said on April 24 that in view of our past experience with Russian claims there is little room to doubt her announcement of an intercontinental missile. For example, he said Molotov boasted in 1948 that Russia had the secret of the atomic bomb. At that time we were certain nobody but the United States had the secret, but that very year they exploded their first bomb 4 years in advance of the shortest time we had reason to expect they could possibly develop it.

Again in June of 1953 Malenkov announced they had the secret of the hydrogen bomb which we considered unknown to anyone outside the United States, and the following August they fired their first hydrogen bomb.

The Russians in the past have made good on their claims, said Secretary Quarles, and there is no reason to disbelieve them now.

In this connection, while we have had reason to believe we have the most advanced scientists in the world, we are now warned by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who certainly should know what he is talking about, that the Russians are surpassing this country in the training of technicians of all kinds. They have today more young men studying in approved scientific schools than we have and they are turning out more than twice as many as the United States is training. According to estimates by the Engineers' Joint Council of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, our minimum need for engineers from our graduating classes is 40,000 each year for the next 10 years. Last year we graduated only 23,000. I have just spoken to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] here, who has been long a member of the Committee on Armed Services and also a ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and he tells me he is thoroughly familiar with that situation and fully agrees with the estimate.

Mr. Chairman, here is something of which we should take particular note. You remember very well when we used to laugh at the idea of the Russians knowing anything about mechanics. We were told that when we delivered an automobile over there it was shortly out of commission and nobody could repair it. We thought they were just inept, incapable of mechanical training. As in everything else we underrated them. But we have discovered that frequently they are out-matching our own scientists and mechanics.

Mr. Chairman, America won the First World War and the Second World War by outproducing our enemies. What is the situation today? We are falling down on the job. Our factories have shown themselves to be remarkably deficient. Hundreds of our jet planes will not fly in battle. Out of every 100 bombers delivered, 30 do not fly. You cannot get 30 of them off the ground. And out of the remaining 70, an average of 15 always turn back before they reach the target.

That is the fault of the plants. It is inefficient production. It is inefficient supervision of our production facilities. Up to this time our plants have delivered to our military authorities only 78 B-52's, when they are the heart and life of national defense. It is the one and only weapon with which we can reach the heart of the enemy. In the coming war we must strike Moscow and the production plants of Siberia. We must drive straight to the center of Russia. Yet there is at this time only 78 planes that can deliver bombs on those targets. Out of the 78 B-52's that have been delivered only 47 have been accepted. What is the matter with our factories? What is the matter with the supervision of production in this country? What is the matter with the strategic command that temporizes with this tragic situation? We must have B-52's. Nothing else will fill the bill; still we have only had 78 delivered and out of those 78 only 47 can fly.

In February, March, and April of this year, down to May 1, our factories have delivered only 17 B-52's, while the Russian factories are in full production. Out of the 17 B-52 planes delivered to us only 2 were accepted in more than 3 months—2 of these vital planes in 3 months, and in the moment of America's greatest danger. Think of it. When only a show of strength will keep us out of war, how can we hope to avoid attack when the B-52 is the only weapon Russia fears?

These defects and these delays may have been the responsibility of the manufacturers. But what about the responsibility of the Department? Fifty-six planes were ordered by the Navy Department at a cost of \$1,350,000 each. They were delivered at intervals, one by one, over a period of a year and a half. All delivered and all paid for. And not a one of them would fly. They could not even get them off the ground. The first plane was delivered and the Navy paid for it. It would not fly. The second was delivered and again the Navy paid for it. It would not fly. And so over a year and a half the remainder of the 56 planes were delivered and paid for. Who was asleep at the switch in this critical period while Russia was taking the lead in airpower?

Secretary Wilson, who comes to us from one of the most efficient production plants in the world, seems to be somewhat confused as to why or whether Russia is ahead. During the inquiry when he was before the committee, I asked him about our relative production and he declined to commit himself. I tried to get him to say "Yes" and he would not say "Yes." I tried to get him to say "No" and he would not say "No." But when he was pressed for informa-

tion by the newspapers, he gave them information he would not give the committee. He said both "Yes" and "No," and at the same time. On May 2 he told the reporters, and I quote what he said:

The best information I have is that Russia is currently building at a somewhat higher rate than we are.

But on May 9, as reported in the Washington Post of that date, he flatly denied that Russia is, and I quote again: "far outstripping the United States in terms of airpower."

I am certain that when you consider the phraseology the two statements can be harmonized.

But, again on May 8 Secretary Wilson said:

The production schedule of B-52 bombers, which has been 6 per month against the planned rate of 17 per month, will be stepped up to 20 a month.

And only 2 out of the 17 were accepted. From January 1 to May 1, 1956, only 6 of these planes have been accepted. That is less than two a month. Is it any wonder that Russia is forging ahead of us in terms of production?

So, the newspaper men, despairing of securing detailed information from the Secretary, appealed to the President. President Eisenhower told them that the fact that Russia was ahead of us was nothing to worry about.

Nothing to worry about.

In that respect the President differs from every magazine and, so far as I am informed, from every newspaper in the United States which has referred in its news or editorial columns to Russian superiority in rate of aircraft production. The Reader's Digest, for example, with the largest circulation of any periodical in the world, and the Saturday Evening Post, with the largest circulation in the United States, have carried for the last 2 years comprehensive and emphatic articles by eminent authorities in which they predict the most ominous results unless something is done to step up our production of long-range planes. Many other periodicals have carried similar articles, a number of which have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Articles and editorials in this week's papers, notably the Washington Post, carry instructions from the civil defense authorities, who after more than 3 years study of the situation, advise all citizens to prepare food and work out a route over designated highways and at the first signal to evacuate the cities in such haste as not to wait for members of the family in other parts of the city. Gen. Earl Partridge, head of the Continental Command, told a congressional committee he could not defend this country against even a small atomic attack.

After more than a century and a half during which America has never been invaded, Americans do not take kindly to the idea of a second-best Strategic Air Command.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. President, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I shall condense as much as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the President, for whom I have the warmest personal regard, and whom I have followed implicitly in all defense recommendations, did not deny that Russia is outstripping us in rate of production. He did not deny that Russia now has more effective long-distance bombers than we have. He did not comment on the claim that Russia has better planes than we have.

He said:

We have the most powerful Navy in the world and it features one thing—air power.

Then he said:

We have bases around the world established for the particular purpose of using the medium bomber.

The medium bomber is the B-47 which must be based abroad or be refueled in the air. As was pointed out in the hearings we are short on tankers and we especially lack long-distance tankers. And tankers which supply bombers in midair are particularly, almost fatally vulnerable. A high-ranking officer asked significantly what chance a tanker, or a B-47 in need of fuel, would have with a pursuer on its tail.

"The strongest navy in the world" will not be a factor in the next world war. The President was talking in terms of 50 years ago—in terms at least prior to the last war. The submarine and the airplane have relegated the navy as a fighting factor to the limbo of the past. Germany had only 58 of the old-fashioned submarines, which had to surface to recharge their batteries, in the last war. But they drove our shipping from the Atlantic and all but froze New England for lack of oil. Russia has 426 modern snorkel submarines which can stay under for weeks. And airplanes flying so high and so fast they can neither be heard or seen would complete the work. But granting the navy could stay afloat, why would Russia bother to fight the Navy when her planes can fly overland all the way?

The committee report quotes:

In time of war, the great oceans become a giant, interconnected battlefield. \* \* \* He who has command of the seas can, in his own time, assemble and motivate these vast human and material resources against the land of his enemy. \* \* \* Once control of the seas is lost, he can do little more than postpone the inevitable defeat which he faces.

Could anything be more ridiculous? What attention would a B-52 or a Bison en route to bomb Detroit or Moscow pay to a thousand ships or 10,000 ships?

Again, the committee report quotes:

The aircraft carrier today represents one of the most important parts of our overall security program. It makes possible the location of air power in areas into which we might not otherwise be able to put United States air power. \* \* \* The carrier introduces an element of uncertainty on the part of the other fellow. He cannot always know where they are.

General Twining said in testifying only this morning before a congressional committee that the ability of the Navy to strike telling nuclear blows in a strategic air war with Russia was out of the question. He said the contribution of Navy carrier-based planes in such an attack would be small. He also noted

that the range of carrier aircraft is relatively short compared with land-based craft.

You cannot defeat Russia by nibbling around the edges and no carrier-based plane could ever reach Moscow or touch the war factories in Siberia.

General Vandenberg said more than 2 years ago that with his Air Force he could sink every carrier afloat regardless of any defense that could be provided.

And General LeMay said here the other day he could sink every carrier at sea in 2 hours.

So far as the element of uncertainty is concerned, even if the carrier were no larger than the traditional mustard seed, Russia's incomparable espionage system, which stole the atomic bomb and ran rings around our own secret service, would know where it was every minute in the 24 hours. And when in fact a carrier, with its auxiliaries and protecting escort covers miles of sea, it would be as impossible to conceal it as it would be to hide the moon. No carrier could live a day in the Atlantic much less in the Mediterranean or the North Sea.

The Navy carrier is the greatest handicap to national defense. The cost of a carrier fully equipped with its full complement of planes and auxiliaries and its defense fleet is close to a billion dollars. But the cost is its least obstructive impediment. Its construction consumes the largest amount of rare and strategic material, and employs the greatest amount of technical and skilled labor of any mechanism ever built. The Air Force now limits use of tungsten and columbite tantalite in jet engines because our supplies are short. Russia uses considerably more in her jets. But Russia is not wasting a major part of her strategic stockpiles on carriers. The extent to which this scarcity applies is shown by the fact that only this week, the week of May 7, the Air Force turned down pleas of three leading aircraft manufacturers for permission to use more tungsten. As Chairman MAHON has frequently said the reason we cannot use more money in the building of B-52's is that we do not have the plants and facilities and specialized labor to build them. The largest allocations of material, labor, and engineering is consumed in building carriers, none of which could survive a day at sea after war started. For this reason we do not have the needed material, men, and manufacturing plants to build more B-52s, the only weapon that can defend us when war starts.

But the most significant development in our defense program is one about which less has been said than any other. In order to get a practical demonstration of the place of airpower in modern warfare, the Department staged a tremendous campaign covering 12 States simulating as nearly as possible actual wartime conditions. An equal number of planes was assigned to each side, one representing the enemy and the other the defenders. The enemy attacked and the defenders used every means to protect the homeland.

Although months were consumed in planning and arranging the test it was over in a few minutes. The defenders

were protected by the usual radar screens the counterpart of those actually protecting America from attacks from abroad, but the enemy planes, by flying too low for the screens to register, took the defense by surprise. Within 17 minutes after the warning signal the enemy bombers were in contact with the defenders and in 23 minutes, as reported in the local papers, had destroyed 80 percent of the home airbases, knocked out half the defender striking force, and taken complete control of the air. The decisive phase of the war was over in 40 minutes and the United States had lost.

We come now to the inevitable aftermath. Russia is developing a mighty war machine. We have faltered while Russia forged ahead. It is becoming increasingly apparent to our allies that we cannot protect them if the present gap between Russian planes and American planes continues to widen. Already our allies are falling away. They have little option in the matter. If they are to be under Russian's bombs and missiles, they must make their peace as best they can and they are inviting visits from the Russian leaders and Churchill is inviting the Russians to join NATO. NATO was one of the most brilliant achievements in the history of American diplomacy and it was impregnable as long as we controlled the air. And Russia used every means to destroy it. But now that there is a very definite prospect that Russia may dominate the air, our allies have no choice but to seek cover.

We are confronted by an aggressive and triumphant communistic empire reaching from the Elbe in Germany to and including a large section of Indochina. It has been victorious in the field and at the conference table. It has defeated and exterminated the finest troops France could mobilize at Dien Bien Phu, and it won everything at Geneva.

General Twining said in a speech at Boston last August that an air attack "could pour out of the Soviet Union engulfing and overwhelming not only our cities and States but our entire Nation."

And Nikita Khrushchev, who visited London smiling and left with a bitter scowl on his face, said between his teeth, "Don't shake your fist at a Russian. If anyone believes our smiles involve abandonment of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, he deceives himself poorly."

Time works against us. Based on programs already in existence, the strategic air strength of the United States will decline in relation to that of the Soviet Union until in 1960, or sooner, when without allies and without dominant air power we face the inevitable.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us is one of unusual importance. The uncertain condition that exists throughout the world makes it highly imperative that the greatest care be observed in providing adequate military security. That this bill does do this is made certain by the approval that

has been given to it by President Eisenhower.

While there may be criticisms expressed by some as to its effectiveness in certain particulars, yet I am convinced that the military knowledge of President Eisenhower far outweighs and sets to naught the claims of dissenting critics. In my opinion there is no one in all the world more competent, more able, or possessing more knowledge of the military needs of the present day than President Eisenhower. And, when he is satisfied that to me is sufficient. I think we are fortunate at this time to have as President a man so eminently qualified in military matters to lead us in determining what is adequate as means of defense in the matter of the armament necessary to protect our national security.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the chairman of our committee who preceded me with a considerable amount of interest and with a greater amount of concern. I do not know where he got some of the information, purportedly factual that he presented to you. I can tell you that he did not get much of that information from the hearings which we held in the last 3 months. Some of the things which were given to you, purporting to be facts, if they were facts, in some cases were given in a classified manner, are not printed in the hearings, and if they are facts, were not properly submitted to you on the floor of the House here today. That is a serious charge, and I would not say it, if I did not feel very strongly about it. The things that were said here taken together, and if taken seriously, and I suppose they will be taken seriously because of the high position in the House which the gentleman from Missouri holds, represent a damning indictment of this 84th Congress; they represent a damning indictment of the Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill and presented it to you for your consideration here this week. If you are to believe the things you have been told by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, then I submit that in good conscience the only thing this House could do is to recommit this bill to the committee from which it came and ask the members thereof to revise this entire appropriation on the basis of those things which were presented to you as the truth by the speaker who just preceded me. I cannot refrain from saying that I think such statements, presented under these circumstances, are harmful to the defense of this country and represent a disservice to the country that everyone of us is here to serve in the consideration of this measure.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I might say to the gentleman I certainly have heard in committee meetings from responsible authorities of our Military Establishment every word that the gentleman from Missouri has spoken.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Then, they were in a different committee.

Mr. PRICE. They certainly were from responsible authorities, and I concur fully in what the gentleman from Missouri has said here this afternoon.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Then I think the gentleman from Illinois should take the responsibility of presenting that information to the House because it is information, if true, in some respects that is in conflict with that which was presented to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman from Illinois on many occasions has, and I think other Members of the Congress have, presented such information to the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman should take the responsibility for that in presenting it to the House.

But there are still some things I would like to say.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Only within the past few weeks a high ranking officer who told me something privately on a prior occasion in testifying before the subcommittee said something of a different nature. I said to him, "How come? You told me this and I understand you are testifying differently." He said, "I am under orders."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Then I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has the responsibility to reveal those inconsistencies to the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is talking about responsibility. The orders come from the administration. The responsibility rests with the administration to let those men come before committees and testify to their honest views.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman does a great disservice to the members of the committee which held the hearings on this bill in making that kind of statement, because those people who appeared before the committee were given every opportunity to express their personal opinions on these things that are before us. I would think that it does a great disservice to those men in high responsibility in and out of uniform of the Defense Establishment of this Nation if you are to infer that they did not tell the truth before the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman talks about disservice, as if everything he says is absolutely correct and nobody can have any different opinion.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON, is a voice in the wilderness, warning the American people not to be influenced by the mask of a smile, and that we had better keep our guard up. Whether you agree with everything he said, or not, the basic argument he made was a great argument and he was rendering a great service to the country.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion. I did not say whether I agreed with what he said. I am saying there is a conflict in what he said and what was presented

to our committee in the course of the hearings.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Might it not be well for that voice in the wilderness to point out who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and President of the United States when this contract was made?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Well, I think the record will bear out that the contract was made when the White House and the Appropriations Committee chairmanship were both occupied by Missourians.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support this bill as presented to the committee by the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the single exception of section 633. I shall vote to strike that section from the bill. Otherwise I am in complete accord with what has been recommended here.

Every appropriation bill—and certainly it is true of this one—represents to a great extent a matter of judgment. We can never be sure that we are exactly right. If we get into world difficulties, then whatever we may appropriate will not be enough. If we have a year with no difficulties at all, then we shall always have the feeling, I suppose, that we could have spared the American people some of the great burden that the appropriations here involved represent. This bill as it is before you represents the composite judgment of responsible men who have the right and responsibility to presents the results of their judgment to you. It represents the judgment of the top people in the Armed Forces, both in and out of uniform. It represents the judgment of the President of the United States. It represents the judgment of the subcommittee which has the responsibility for conducting the hearings and presenting it through the full committee to you today. That is true because the pattern, in spite of minor variations, has remained constant throughout all the steps in making those recommendations.

I suppose that one would feel more sure and more self satisfied about a measure of this kind if he did not sit through all of the 3 months of hearings to which we were subjected; if we were not required to acquire some knowledge of the destructive force of modern weapons, both in the hands of a potential enemy or in the hands of the Armed Forces of our own country. No one can go through that kind of experience without feeling some kind of mental and emotional peaks and valleys that come from acquiring such knowledge. Just as I suspect that some of you have felt futility and frustration as you have listened to this discussion; and then a feeling of supreme confidence as you hear of the weapons in our own arsenals.

In a sense this particular defense program and all defense programs must to some extent be a compromise and a reconciliation of various views among the people who are responsible for our defense. There are some people, and some of these views have been widely heralded in the press, who feel that if

we simply had enough B-52 bombers that that is the only thing we need to worry about, that the defense of this country would be safe. There are others who conceive the defense of this country as being in a huge central information center where you could simply push buttons to release a number of guided missiles anywhere in the world, and that that is the only way to secure the complete defense of the country. There are others who envision our defense as being centered in a group of huge super-carriers roaming the seas; and I suspect there are some other people who feel that if we would just build the Marine Corps to about 10 times its normal size that we would never have anything more to worry about. So it goes. If those views were to be followed we would not have air defense, for instance, a group of fighter interceptor bases to ring our country as a means of defense. Had we listened to all these suggestions most probably we would not have a great Army because there would be the feeling that ground forces were outdated and we do not need them. So we come down to the attempt to arrive at a reasoned judgment and a balanced program of defense for our Nation, and I believe that this appropriation bill does provide that kind of defense.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman care to tell the House at this time how much money has been provided in this bill for research and development over all?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am a little in doubt about the overall figure. It would depend on the inclusion of items collateral to research and development funds.

Mr. TABER. It would be more than 5½ billions of dollars, would it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I was going to say that you could go as high as \$6 billion. If that is not correct, would the gentleman from Massachusetts correct me?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the record indicates that in the Department of Defense there will be over \$5½ billion available for research and development and supporting activities, and that there will, of course, be funds available for other agencies.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Funds that could be transferred.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Not transferable but available for research and development in the field of national defense.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. My few remarks outside of general references will be confined principally to my work with the Air Force panel. As many of you know, this subcommittee of 15 held about a month of hearings to attempt to get the overall picture of the armed services; then we divided into panels of 5 each. It happened to be my responsibility to work with the Air Force panel. I suppose in a sense this necessary division is unfortunate in that perhaps it leads to what you might call provincialism, but the sheer bulk of the job and

the details that we had to inquire into made it necessary and I suppose that will be true so long as our defense problems remain as complex as they are today.

There are three major problems that caused some controversy and a certain amount of discussion in connection with the Air Force. One of them is the importance of the procurement and production which is handled in a separate report that dealt with the procurement policies of the Air Force, and a considerable amount of inquiry was made along that line.

Whenever you have Government officials with authority to place contracts amounting to billions of dollars every year it will always be necessary to watch those appropriations and those contract lettings very carefully; but I think it is fair to say that the procurement policies and programs of the Air Force show a meritorious improvement in the course of the past year, since we last had a chance to examine them. I would say they are better in terms of overall policy. The record will show a greater percentage of the procurement has been based on competitive bidding and a lesser percentage on the cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. There has been a greater percentage that has gone to small business, and that, too, appears to be in accordance with desirable policy.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. On page 47 of the committee report, in discussing financial management, the statement is made:

The Air Force responded to this criticism most admirably. The hearings this year, from the standpoint of information made available and presented to the committee, have been very satisfactory.

I presume it is along those lines the gentleman is discussing the matter. Would he say that in his opinion the information now supplied to the committee this year is adequate in order for us to form an intelligent judgment in regard to the appropriation bill before us?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say generally the answer to the gentleman's question is yes. I would say the presentation and the format of that presentation were much improved. I would say, further, that the people who appeared before our committee were very well informed on the programs which they sought to present to us.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as I said, there can never be complacency in a program of the size of this procurement program, and when you are dealing with that amount of the people's money there must be the greatest vigilance. I think, too, as a corollary to that, we have a responsibility as Members of Congress, not simply to be beating the

armed services over the head from year to year about their procurement policies. Collectively and individually we as Members of Congress have a responsibility to help them in improving their procurement programs. We have been guilty of something less than crystal clarity in providing the guidelines for their procurements. In theory I think we will all say that purchasing ought to be done on a competitive basis and on a bidding basis, the contract should be let to the man who submits the lowest bid to the Government; but I think as a practical matter we all recognize, first of all, that there is a great deal of our procurement that does not lend itself to competitive bidding. Secondly, we do believe in the necessity of alternate sources of some of our critical defense weapons. We believe also in the necessity for the dispersal of production facilities. And, also, from time to time there has been a feeling expressed here that certain areas of the country should be recognized as hardship areas and some of this procurement should be let in those areas. All of those things have come into play in lesser or greater degree to modify this general overall theory that we are to let all procurement bids to the lowest bidder. I say again we owe it to the Defense Establishment to give them understanding, constructive assistance in working with the problems which they have to deal with.

The second important matter of controversy was with respect to the B-52 procurement. That has been mentioned often enough—especially by my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]—to require little more. It should be pointed out again that the B-52 is a complex war machine. We cannot say "presto" and put a lot of B-52's on the production line simply by saying that that shall be so. The question will always arise in matters of this kind as to whether we have to buy large numbers of this particular weapon or whether we shall buy a moderate amount, keeping in mind that one particular weapon may be outdated by the time complete deliveries under procurement contracts could be made.

The third important matter for discussion within our subcommittee was our guided-missile program. I think this should be kept in mind: Most of our research and development is in the field of guided missiles and most of our money spent for guided missiles is in the field of research and development. So, when we are talking in the Air Force about research and development, we are talking mostly about guided missiles, and when we are talking about guided missiles, we are talking mostly about research and development. Certainly this is the most awesome, dramatic, and fearsome instrument of warfare in our arsenal. We have so much to learn about it. The possibilities are so great that we cannot afford to be second best in this field. But, I think this should be pointed out, and the record of our hearings will bear this out, that there is no development in the field of guided missiles that will be delayed by lack of money. The testimony of Secretary Quarles, in two separate instances, makes it very clear that there

shall be all needed money made available. If it becomes necessary to use more money than is provided specifically in this bill, there is transferability on the one hand; on the other hand, Congress will be here after the first of the year to make those necessary funds available if necessary. I think most of us will buy that kind of a policy, and we feel that is the proper way it should be handled; that if there are significant breakthroughs the Congress should be informed and the Congress should have an opportunity to exercise its judgment in making these huge amounts of money available if the necessity for that does arise.

Secretary Quarles' pertinent statements were:

#### BALLISTIC MISSILES PROGRAM

Secretary QUARLES. Mr. Chairman, just to be sure that I am not misunderstood I might add that this restudy also developed the fact that we had considerable uncertainties in our ballistic missiles program which is developing so rapidly and the restudy made it seem likely that the present funding for the ballistic missiles research and development program would not meet the full situation as the year 1957 developed. However, there are such great unknowns in that whole area that we felt we could not at this time properly revise our budget request. We just do not see ahead clearly enough to do that. I am merely mentioning it in order to indicate that this is the one uncertainty in the 1957 picture that we are leaving unsolved at the time we make this supplemental request that you now have before you.

Mr. MAHON. When do you think that issue may crystallize to the point where you would know whether or not you would need additional funds?

Secretary QUARLES. I do not believe we can tell until along toward the end of this calendar year because it all depends on how fast we find it possible to move ahead in some of these technical areas. If things break against us, we will have enough money because we cannot move fast enough. If we get the breaks and can push ahead as fast as we would like to, we may very well have to come before you for a supplemental appropriation in order to meet that specific situation.

Mr. MAHON. Do you believe that is the best way to meet the situation?

Secretary QUARLES. It seems so to me, because any other way would be guessing at this time.

Mr. MAHON. I do not like to be in the position of begging the executive branch of the Government or the Department of Defense to spend more and more money. We want more and better defense, but we do not want to be in the attitude of beating you people over the head and trying to get you to spend or take more money from Congress which is in effect taking money from the taxpayers, but we do want to make sure that we are getting the type of defense program that we ought to have.

I think that should be obvious to you.

Secretary QUARLES. Mr. Chairman, you realize that it would be easier in administering a program of this kind to be sort of high, wide, and handsome about it, and spend everything that you might need. That is easier than making judgments that you can soundly spend less and do the job. These are human judgments, we recognize, and all I can say is that we are making them to the best of our ability and believe that if we execute the program that has been presented to you with the best economy and to the best of our ability, it is a

sound program and a sound course of action for us.

So, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me repeat, as I said in the beginning, that it is always easy to be scared to death and attempt to scare other people to death in relation to our appropriation for our national defense. The responsible thing is frequently not the dramatic thing, and I submit that this subcommittee has presented the responsible thing to this House for its action here this week.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, before discussing some of the Army portion of this appropriation bill, I feel it my responsibility to make several comments concerning the subcommittee of which I am a member, the staff, and the Army personnel that appeared before our group. The hearings this year under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] were very ably conducted and most constructive. In addition it has been a great pleasure and a very real privilege for me to serve with the other members of our Army panel: the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], and my good friend, the other Republican on this panel, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER]. We were most adequately and effectively aided and assisted in our deliberations during the 3- or 4-month period that we operated by our Army panel clerk, Earl Silsby. This has been my 4th year on the Army panel. It seems to me that each year the Army presentation becomes progressively better. I thought we had good witnesses. They gave us all the information that we sought. And the action taken by the Army panel in reference to the budget this year, I think, reflects their presentation.

The President recommended to the Congress for the Army new obligatory authority for the fiscal year 1957 totaling \$7,761,425,000. The Army panel recommended to the full committee and now to the House new obligatory authority for the fiscal year 1957 totaling \$7,497,582,000. This appears to be a dollar reduction of \$263,843,000. Actually the reduction in money is somewhat less than that inasmuch as \$228,944,000 of that proposed reduction involves what we call deutschmark support. Since the end of World War II, our Armed Forces in Germany have received considerable financial and manpower aid and assistance from the German economy. Last May the United States concluded an agreement with the West German Government providing that the deutschmark issue should be fully determined within the next year. It may be that Germany will substantially reduce this deutschmark support but as yet no conclusive decision has been reached.

Our subcommittee felt that since these negotiations were still in process, we should strike from the bill all of the deutschmark support which, as I indicated, totals slightly over \$228 million for the Army. When negotiations are

completed by the State Department and we know precisely where we stand then the other body can make certain necessary dollar modifications.

The actual dollar reduction as far as the Army is concerned totals \$34,899,000. This is a very minor reduction when you consider the fact that the total made available in new obligatory authority is \$7.4 billion. In reality, however, the \$7.4 billion obligatory authority for the Army is not the full picture inasmuch as the Army has had since the end of the Korean war a substantial amount of procurement and production money which has not been used. So to get the full picture of the Army obligatory authority for fiscal 1957 you have to take the \$7.4 billion new money and add to it \$1.3 billion approximately which they are authorized to use in the procurement and production field. The net figure then becomes for Army obligatory authority about \$9.4 billion in fiscal 1957.

It should be pointed out that the Army has on hand in depots, posts, camps, and stations, a total inventory of over \$20 billion plus over \$4 billion worth of inventory in the hands of troops. So that the Army supplies on hand dollarwise total almost \$25 billion.

This availability of this inventory, all or most of it at the present time of conventional type weapons, ammunition and equipment, has permitted the Army in fiscal 1957 to plan for a different type of procurement program. Our Army has in its inventory a certain mobilization reserve of their conventional or old-type weapons. They have that mobilization reserve up to what they feel is a safe level for any Korean-type engagement and reasonably good for an all-out war. So the Army plans in the next fiscal year to change its equipment procurement program.

It was well pointed out by General Magruder, an outstanding witness before the committee, as Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, that the Army will expend most of its procurement and production money for new weapons, those which will greatly increase the firepower and the effectiveness of our Army.

I think that is probably the most significant change, in my opinion, in the Army program for fiscal 1957. It would be wise, in my opinion, if each of you would take the Army hearings and read what General Magruder had to say on page 1448. It is very worth while, and points out precisely what the Army had in mind.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I note on page 20 of the committee report that there will be a projected drop in Army personnel by June 30 of 1956 of approximately 65,000 men. It will then go back up to where it will be only 58,000 men below the present on June 30, 1957. My question is: In what categories or groups is this 65,000 being reduced?

Mr. FORD. Let me make a somewhat different answer to the gentleman's question. If he will turn to the Department of Defense hearings, the last hearings we held, he will find on page 95 the

actual Army strength beginning with July 31, 1955 and what they estimate the figure to be on June 30, 1956. It indicates that from a high on July 31, 1955 of 1,119,000 they will gradually drop down, not down to a valley and then up to a peak but rather a gradual drop down, to 1,040,250.

In other words, there has been some slight revision in the Army strength figures within the last several months because of the DEW line operations of the Army, the SCARWAF obligations of the Army, and the Reserve forces obligations of the Army, so that instead of going down and then back up they are gradually going to fall off to 1,040,250. Most of those reductions that have been made are in the support-type activities and in the training activities. That results from the fact that the Army reenlistment rate has gone up extremely well in the last year or year and a half. The net result is that you are having more people with experience staying on in the Army, which means you can cut down your training load. For every 4 men you train in the Army you have to have 1 experienced man as a trainer. As we build up our supply of trained men we get more experienced men and we increase our combat ratio. So that when we reduce our personnel it is not out of combat efficiency but out of support-type activities.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to hear that. Sixty-five thousand men would be equal to approximately three divisions of men fully equipped. Is it the opinion of the gentleman from the testimony that has been rendered that this reduction is not going to appreciably affect our combat effectiveness?

Mr. FORD. It is my honest personal opinion that this reduction in personnel will have no appreciable effect on the combat effectiveness of our Army. In fact, our Army in fiscal year 1957, overall, will be a better Army, a stronger Army than in past or previous fiscal years.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is one further question: There have been quite a few articles here recently, and this has been with reference to the Air Force, as to the number of men who were not reenlisted. I notice in your report that the number of 6-year enlistments has risen during the past 2-year period, including 1956. Is the 6-year enlistment the only classification the Army has?

Mr. FORD. No; the Army has a reenlistment program of, I think, 4 years and possibly 3 years, plus an indefinite reenlistment term.

Mr. SPRINGER. On the 3-year and 4-year classifications, have those reenlistment rates been going up or down?

Mr. FORD. I cannot honestly break it down to that extent. All I can say is that the Army's reenlistment rate has gone up from around 20 percent as of several years ago to 68 percent at the present time. That is the regular Army reenlistment rate.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask this one further question which, perhaps, the gentleman may be able to answer. Can the gentleman give us any reason why the reenlistment rate in the Air Force should be so bad and the reen-

listment rate in the Army appears to be at the present time on the increase, and projected ahead is estimated to be on the increase?

Mr. FORD. I am not qualified to comment on the situation in the Air Force. I can only say for the Army that they have made a very great effort to convince young men that the Army is a good career. As a consequence, they have been getting results. Perhaps it would be wise for the gentlemen to speak to the gentlemen on the Air Force panel in reference to that specific problem.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Another significant point in this budget is that in the fiscal year 1957 we are finally going to conclude the cataloging, standardization and identification work for the Department of the Army. About 6 years ago, I think it was, Congress passed this legislation which required the services to standardize and to catalog. It was estimated at that time that substantial dollar saving would be the result. Last year we were told by the Army witnesses that they were 64 percent through this tremendous job. At the present time, they are about 85 percent through. By September 30, 1956, they anticipate to have the job done insofar as identification and stock numbers are concerned. That is a tremendous job. It might interest you to know that it cost about \$21 million for this current year and it will cost about \$27 million in the next fiscal year, to finally conclude this vital job.

You might be interested in certain similarities in this year's budget as compared to the fiscal 1957 program. Dollarwise, under direct obligations in fiscal 1955 the Army had \$10.7 billion. In the current fiscal year, 1956, the Army will have direct obligations of about \$9.5 billion. In fiscal year 1957 direct obligations will total approximately \$9.4 billion. In other words, the Army has about leveled off. From a point of view of net expenditures in fiscal 1955, the Army had net expenditures totaling \$8.9 billion. In fiscal 1956, they estimated it will be \$8.5 billion. In 1957, \$8.6 billion.

In other words, the Army's funds are about on a level plane and that, in my judgment, has produced results. From the point of view of personnel, as I have brought out in colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois, the Army personnel will get down in June this year to the figure, which I believe, will carry on for a considerable period of time—about 1,040,250. Included with the uniformed personnel for the Army, the Army has approximately 435,000 employed civilians. So the total Army personnel picture is about 1,500,000, when you include both uniformed personnel and civilians.

The Army has continued during fiscal 1956 and they expect more or less to finish in fiscal 1957 their financial management program. They have carried on with their integrated accounting, their financial inventory account, their industrial funds, their stock funds, their consumer funds and their internal auditing. All of these programs which have been pushed ahead in the last several years will pay big dividends dollarwise and otherwise.

Now, if I could turn to some of the differences between fiscal 1957 and fiscal 1956; first, procurement and production. The big change there is in missile procurement. If you will turn to page 425 of the defense hearings, you will find that the Secretary of the Army says that 55 percent of Army procurement in fiscal 1957 will be for missiles. That includes Nike, Honest John, and Corporal, missiles which the Army actually has with its troops. If you will turn to pages 1448 and 1450 of the Army hearings, you will find a statement by General Magruder, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, indicating that in 1955 the Army spent \$403 million for missiles. It was originally planned for missiles, procurement, and production, for fiscal 1956, to spend \$406 million. That program has been revised upward so that in fiscal 1956 the Army will spend for missiles \$489 million.

In fiscal 1957 you will find that the Army will spend for missiles, in procurement, and production, \$861 million. Let me emphasize that this money is for Nike, Honest John, and Corporal, all of which are operational. In other words, the Army's program is aimed at these newer weapons. Almost 60 percent of the Army procurement funds will be in this category.

Now let us turn to another significant difference between fiscal 1956 and fiscal 1957. Under research and development we have almost the same situation. Greater emphasis is on missile research. In fiscal 1955 the Army spent on this kind of research \$68 million. In fiscal 1956 they expect to spend \$107 million on missile research. In fiscal 1957 they expect to spend \$113 million on missile research. That is almost twice as much as was spent on this research in fiscal 1955. Actually it is better than 25 percent of the Army research and development fund.

In addition to this kind of money which is programmed for fiscal 1957, if there is any further need for missile research for the Army, the Secretary of Defense has in a little kitty in his office \$85 million in direct obligation authority, and authority to transfer an additional \$50 million. So the Army is going to have the money they need, the total which they get is \$407 million, \$77 million more than for the present fiscal year, and they have authority to go to the Secretary of Defense and say "For a special project can we have some of this additional money which the Secretary of Defense has available for all three branches of the service for vital research and development projects?"

There is another significant change between fiscal 1957 and fiscal 1956. Last November the Army and the Air Force conducted Operation Sagebrush. That was a major exercise jointly conducted by the two services. You might be interested in the comments made on that exercise by General Taylor. If you will turn to page 435 of the Defense Department hearings, you can see his thinking.

The net result is that the Army is going to change their divisional structure. That is necessary because of the problems involved with atomic warfare. I think that those changes in divisional

organization will be coming along rather rapidly now. I understand the Army has pretty well firmed up its views in this area at the present time.

You might also be interested that in fiscal 1957 the Army will put together the first completely air-transportable airborne division. It will probably be the beginning of many divisions in that category.

Another significant change, 1957 to 1956, is the full impact of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. The legislative committee carried that legislation through the House and Senate last year. The services started the program in October 1955. The Army hopes to have around 88,000 young men trained under this 6-months' training program during fiscal 1957. They got off to a slow start, but they are building up very rapidly. Our committee wholeheartedly endorses this program, and if they need more money I am sure we would be most willing to make it available. Where you have this Reserve program building up as a result of the 6-months' training program you have to provide new facilities for the Reserve units. There is money in this budget for the construction of 180 new Reserve armories for the Army. Incidentally, that is going to cost about \$35 million.

There is also a very significant change comparing this fiscal year with next, and that is the combat effectiveness of our Army. In 1953 the ratio of noncombat forces to total forces was not very good. Your combat ratio actually as 59 percent; today it is up slightly over 70 percent. I think it is the kind of Army we want and it is the kind of Army that our leaders have been able to get for the country. It may be difficult to go better than that, but they deserve commendation for that accomplishment.

I would now like to make a comment or two about the personnel in the Army. General Taylor made some very significant comments before our subcommittee, and if you will turn to page 442 of the Defense Department hearings you will see this statement. He was answering a question propounded to him by the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. General Taylor made this statement:

The increasing professional character of the Army, as I said in my testimony, really gives me 30,000 more troops. The 1,025,000 really has 30,000 more effective troops in it for 1957 than it had the previous year, and there are other assets of that nature.

In other words, because your reenlistment rate has gone up, because you have increased the effectiveness of your training, the Army today even though the total numbers are slightly less, has, General Taylor says, 30,000 more effective combat troops.

I would ask you now to turn to page 535 of the same hearings where General Taylor had this to say. I was interrogating him. I will read you a portion of the colloquy:

Mr. FORD. In other words, divisionwise we have shown a decided improvement?

General TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. FORD. In some of the other units we have made some small decreases?

General TAYLOR. Now, your question, Where are these 30,000 men? If we had not had the increase in our enlistments, the increase in professional percentage, 30,000 of our present men would have to be recruits receiving training by a certain number of people. Of the total 30,000, about 25,000 of that number would be recruits and 5,000 trainers and overhead. Instead, these people are in tactical units performing useful military work.

In other words, even though the numbers in our Army this next fiscal year will be about what we have at the present time, the net result is that our Army will be infinitely more effective.

Now let us turn to another part of the manpower situation and I refer to the Army Reserves. The Army Reserves in fiscal 1956 show a total on a yearly average of about 190,000. In fiscal 1957 they expect that yearly average to be 256,000. In other words we go from an average of 100,000 in fiscal 1956 to 256,000 in fiscal 1957. I believe in the prepared statement that the Secretary of the Army submitted to our committee he estimated the increase in the Army Reserve personnelwise would be about 35 percent.

The average strength of the National Guard for fiscal 1956 will be 376,000. In fiscal 1957 it is anticipated their average strength will be 407,000. In other words, numberwise your Army Reserves and your National Guard will be substantially stronger comparing this fiscal year with the next.

The next question is, Will they be any better trained? Will they be more adequate to do the job? I refer to General Taylor's testimony on page 536 of the Defense Department hearings. At that point I asked this question:

Based on your observations within the last 6 months since you have become Chief of Staff, how would you rate the potency of our National Guard and the Army Reserve?

General TAYLOR. I visited some of the guard training last summer and I was impressed by the general improvement in the quality of the training I saw. Certainly the guard is stronger in experienced officers than at any time I have had an acquaintance with it; also its strength is quite good.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, pursuing that particular point further, when General Lindeman, who is in charge of the Army Reserve program, was before the committee, I asked this question:

General Lindeman, will you give for the record your estimate of the quality of the Army Reserves at this time compared with a year ago? I would appreciate your full and frank analysis of the readiness of the Army Reserves, comparing the current situation to the circumstances in 1955.

General LINDEMAN. I feel that the quality of the Army Reserves has improved over last year.

He goes on to make certain other comments, but that is the net result of his testimony.

When General McGowan of the Army National Guard was before the committee, I propounded several questions to

him. The gentleman from South Carolina, in addition, pursued this line of questioning. Mr. Riley asked:

Do you have a proficiency rating of the National Guard?

Colonel Taylor, who was then testifying, said, "Yes."

Mr. Riley asked this question:

Could you give us a little of your estimate of the proficiency of the National Guard?

General MCGOWAN. I can say it is at its highest point in history.

I think the gentleman has in mind perhaps mobilization readiness.

On page 1324 of the hearings General McGowan, in response to a question, said, in effect, the same thing. I asked this question:

Earlier in the hearing this afternoon Mr. Riley was asking you about the efficiency or quality in the guard today, and you explained means and methods by which that is evaluated?

General MCGOWAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORD. If you were asked the categorical question, Is the National Guard today better trained than it was a year ago, what would you answer?

General MCGOWAN. I would say each year I have continued to be amazed at the evident increased efficiency of the units I have been associated with.

In other words, our Regular Army and our Reserve forces are today, according to the testimony of General Taylor and the responsible officials for the Reserves and the National Guard, are in the best shape in their history.

Now, we may have an amendment subsequently proposed today which would seek to increase the strength of the Army by one division. I would like to point out why I think that amendment is unnecessary. General Taylor was asked in the hearings, if he had an opportunity to get more money, what would he use that money for, and on page 466 of the hearings General Taylor replied as follows:

Before asking for more manpower I would feel I needed more money for this particular Army.

Mr. SIKES. What would that money be spent for?

General TAYLOR. It would be spent in part for equipment. It would be spent for deferred maintenance. It would really go across the board, but the emphasis would be first on equipment.

Mr. SIKES. What type of equipment?

General TAYLOR. I will get my "shopping list" out.

Incidentally, he pulled out a shopping list, and he enumerated the kind of equipment that he would want if he had some additional money. He did not ask for a single additional soldier.

Now, he further emphasized that on page 439 in response to a question propounded by our chairman:

Mr. MAHON. If you were going to have a sizable slice of additional money, how do you think it could be best applied? How would you want to apply it?

General TAYLOR. I always have a priority list of Army needs. If you gave me another dollar, I could tell you how to spend it. I could use more money for equipment up to a certain point, then I would look at the Army force structure and see if I wanted to get more people.

Then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] asked this question:

So your first few millions would probably be spent for equipment?

General TAYLOR. Yes; I would say so. In fact, the first 200 or 300 million.

Mr. MAHON. What kind of equipment?

General TAYLOR. Do you want my list?

And, he pulled out the shopping list. Now, never once in his testimony—and he was interrogated by some able, experienced people—did he ask for an additional soldier. He said if he was to get more money, he would spend it on equipment. Now, he did say that if he could ignore all other considerations and if he could just pick the optimum size Army, he would ask for an Army the size of 1.5 million. "But," he said, "under the current circumstances, if I got any additional money, it would be spent for equipment first."

Now, that brings up the final point. If we are to give them more money for equipment—and that is what General Taylor says he wants first—we do not have to appropriate another dime. The hearings brought out that the Army has in unobligated authority at the beginning of fiscal 1957 more money than they expect to obligate in fiscal 1957 under procurement and production. In fact, they will end fiscal 1957 with an unobligated balance of about \$700 million plus reimbursements, which is almost three times what General Taylor says he would need if he was to buy additional equipment. So, we do not have to appropriate one dime in additional money to meet the most urgent needs that General Taylor says he has. The money is there for equipment. He says he does not need any more personnel. So, I say under the current circumstances the Army has ample funds; they have ample personnel; they are a well run, well led Army. They have got the best combat ratio I have ever seen. They have the best firepower, mobility, and communications in the history of the Army. They have the best Reserve program the Army has ever had, both Army Reserve and National Guard, and they have the support of some potent, formidable allied forces.

Mr. Chairman, I think the recommendations of this committee are sound. I fully and totally subscribe to them.

In conclusion may I say this. Sometimes we fail to appreciate how much money we are spending in toto for our national defense. I do not begrudge a dime of it. But do you realize, if this program goes into effect that in the fiscal year 1957 we will spend for the 3 services in the Department of Defense almost \$3 billion a month, almost \$100 million a day? It is well over 50 percent of the tax revenue which we extract from our citizens.

Because I feel that our Armed Forces overall are well led, well trained and ready to defend our country, even though the cost is great, I wholeheartedly subscribe to making this money available.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I could not fail today to express my own

strong conviction that section 633 should be removed from this bill. This section would simply perpetuate the roadblock placed by section 638 of the 1956 Defense Appropriations Act against the progress of the Department of Defense in eliminating and turning over to private enterprise its unnecessary business and industrial-type activities.

I am sure that this Congress knows of my own keen interest in securing ample consideration of all the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission and of my even keener hope that this Congress, even in its closing days, will accomplish the implementation of such of the recommendations as will produce the Government economy and efficiency, so patently necessary. It was my belief in such necessity for action that has led me, during this 84th Congress, to introduce 77 bills drawn up to implement the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission. One of these bills, H. R. 7316, seeks to establish a Defense Supply and Service Administration within the Department of Defense, and actually contains a provision that the Secretary of Defense shall report semiannually to the Congress on the progress being made in "the reduction or elimination of facilities and business enterprises that can be handled by private industry."

In the study that led to the introduction of this bill, I became increasingly aware of conditions which vitally call for the elimination of section 633 of this present bill. At the time of its careful investigation, the Hoover Commission estimated that there were 2,500 tax-supported Government-run businesses or industrial-type activities carried on by the Department of Defense; and what is more significant, it further stated that at least 1,000 of these could be eliminated and turned over to private enterprise without bringing any harm whatsoever to our national security or welfare.

The Hoover Commission endorsed the policy of the executive branch that "the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels," and recommended that the commercial-type bakeries, meat-cutting plants, clothing manufacturing plants, laundries, and dry-cleaning plants operated by the Department of Defense be closed, except in isolated and overseas locations.

The final recommendation of the Commission was that Congress review all public laws which permit the armed services to engage in business operations which can be performed by private industry.

It is to the great credit of Secretary Wilson that, starting last June 1955, he moved vigorously to close some 46 of the estimated 1,000 business-type enterprises—enterprises which compete needlessly, I would remind you, with tax-paying enterprises. These include such things as bakeries, laundries, machine shops, and even ice cream factories. In the midst of the worthy efforts of Secretary Wilson to end such unnecessary commercial activities, this Congress, over the strong opposition of many of us,

voted into the 1956 Defense Appropriations Act, section 638. President Eisenhower himself promptly made strong protest against this section, as a clearly unconstitutional invasion of the authority of the executive branch. The Comptroller General sided with Congress—and from that time on, the Department of Defense has been hampered in its efforts to decrease its unnecessary commercial activity.

Repeal of section 638, or removal of section 633 in this current legislation, would open the way for the Department of Defense to resume, without hampering on the part of the Congress, its de-competition effort.

I would like to point out to the Congress that this interest in the elimination of competition with private enterprise by departments of the Government is not new. As far back as 1932, the 72d Congress appointed a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Government competition with private enterprise. After extensive hearings, that committee made strong recommendations to counter this dangerous trend. In the 82d Congress, when I was then serving on the House Committee on Expenditures of the Executive Department—later re-named the Committee on Government Operations—the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee spent months in careful study of the various aspects of Federal supply management. The subcommittee, in drawing up its sixth intermediate report indicated the commercial-type operations in the military departments; and stated that, except in isolated areas and in emergency, such operations were to be questioned, and that private enterprise should be given an opportunity to replace them. The same subcommittee, in the 83d Congress, went even deeper into the problem and recommended in its seventh intermediate report that "a permanent vigorous preventive and corrective program be inaugurated"; and stated further that the only justifiable guides to be used are, essentially, of service and economy. It further went on to say that even economy should not be accepted as a reason for Government operation, where competitive industry could provide the establishment of a fair price. In that same 83d Congress, H. R. 9835 passed the House and was under consideration in the Senate when Congress adjourned. Public Law 108 was actually enacted, however, in this 83d Congress, establishing a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch and declaring the policy of Congress to include, first, the abolishment of services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government; and second, the elimination of nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprises.

Finally, this current Congress has produced in Senate Report No. 129 from the Senate Select Committee on Small Business the strongest condemnation of Government competition with private business. This report points out over 100 areas of business activity in which the military departments compete with private firms and states that the net result

of such competition is proving a serious threat to the economic future of the Nation. In its closing statement, the committee unequivocally takes the position that "the time has come when we need a straightforward, aggressive attack upon a steadily growing cancer in our economy."

This congressional interest, so long expressed by words, led the Department of Defense to undertake a forthright and initially successful attack upon the problem, until blocked by the passage of section 638 of the 1956 Defense Appropriations Act.

The Department of Defense, itself, is opposed to section 638 of the 1956 Defense Appropriations Act and the inclusion of section 633 in the 1957 Defense Appropriations Act now under consideration. As Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—Thomas P. Pike said in his testimony yesterday before the Committee on Armed Services, in support of section 27 of H. R. 7992:

It is the basic policy of the Department of Defense not to engage in the operation of commercial and industrial type facilities unless it is militarily necessary or the product or service cannot be obtained from private sources at a reasonable price due to the lack of competition or for any other reason.

The Department of Defense has given assurance that full consideration in the reduction of their commercial and industrial activities will be given to the protection of the national security and economy. DOD Directive 4100.15 specifically states:

No commercial and industrial type facilities of the Department of Defense will be terminated where:

1. The military demand for the product or service cannot be met by private industry at all times, including a period of mobilization without delay; or
2. The facility is required for the training of personnel for operation in a zone of action or advance base or overseas operations where commercial facilities will not be available; or
3. There would be a danger of compromising security information which would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States; or
4. It is ascertained that the product or service cannot be obtained from private sources at a reasonable price, whether by reason of lack of competition or for any other reason.

The program of reduction begun by Secretary Wilson deals principally with activities of a small-business nature, which were started only because of the circumstances of war and emergency. Such operations, like others in government, have perpetuated themselves long after the emergency is over and have, in fact, been part of a trend toward an increase in military, commercial and industrial type activities. Such a trend must be reversed and would be reversed if section 633 could be stricken from this current bill. A policy must be laid down by the Congress to encourage, not discourage, the Department of Defense in its reduction of operation of commercial and industrial type facilities. Not only would such action further economy of operation, it would, in addition, release military personnel for actual military service. Such a step, with subsequent

reduction of government competition with free enterprise, would be merely a restatement and reimplementation of what has come to be known the world over as the American system.

The responsibility, in fact, the question of whether or not further reduction of nonmilitary operation will be carried on, rests at this moment not with the Department of Defense—which has proved its good intent—but with this Congress. I cannot believe that any Member, faced with the moral as well as the economic implications of this decision, will for any reason whatsoever, personal or political, fail to meet this challenge of his faith in government economy and in the American principles of free enterprise.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after I have utilized these few minutes, I hope we can proceed to the reading of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Many statements have been made in Congress and in the newspapers and periodicals in regard to our defense program. To the American people I think these statements must be most confusing. It is my opinion that if we had the time to read all these statements and all the fine print the picture would probably be reasonably clear.

The defense picture is so big and complex that if one chooses his words and facts carefully he can leave almost any impression he wants to and still be accurate.

The Secretary of Defense was criticized yesterday for the use of the word "fearmongers." I think a better choice of words could have been made. However, the Secretary has a very fine sense of understanding of some of our problems. We do not always agree with him. The Secretary is chafing, in my judgment, under a situation that troubles everybody who thinks deeply on this problem of national defense. The Secretary, being an industrialist, knows that more difficult days are ahead than the present days. He has pointed out in these hearings that Russia is just entering the industrial revolution in a big way. We went through the industrial revolution a long time ago.

We know something of the terrific power that Germany had in World War II. She was relatively small as a nation, particularly in numbers of people, but we know something of the power Germany had. In my judgment, the Secretary feels that Russia is coming toward a period when she will develop terrific industrial power and she has one-fifth of the surface of the globe within her borders, that is, of the habitable surface of the globe. Her population is of course much larger than our own.

There is no indication that there is any lack of petroleum or lack of oil or other such important resources. There is no indication there is any lack of steel potential. So while the American people want to see all nations do well—we have a point 4 program to help raise the standards of all peoples insofar as we can, the only thing is that we do not want the resources of the Soviet Union

to be developed and channeled almost exclusively into military production. As I say, nobody understands this particular matter any better than Secretary Wilson. In the testimony on the bill in response to a question, let me show you how he understands this—and I do not believe the American people yet understand it. They will understand it in a few years:

Mr. CANNON. Inasmuch as we are preparing for defense against Russia, as you say, and you are asking to increase the budget, it is evident you think Russia is making some progress in armaments?

Mr. WILSON. That is correct. Well, they have been ever since World War II instead of demobilizing and reducing their military program and military expenditures like we did in our country, they kept on and on—

That is not the point I am particularly referring to, but here is what I want to emphasize:

Also, Russia itself has come late—

Come late—

into what is often described as the industrial revolution.

That is the thing that Mr. Wilson has pointed out:

But they did have the advantage of the knowledge of all the other things that other people have done.

The point he is making is that they can pass through the industrial revolution much faster than we did because they have the advantage of all the development by the other countries in the industrial revolution of the past. I quote:

But they did have the advantage of the knowledge of all the things other people have done so what seems like a rather disturbing progress is what you could expect of people who had that opportunity.

From the Library of Congress, I quote these figures which point up what Mr. Wilson is saying.

In 1955, steel production in Soviet Russia was 45 million tons. Prior to World War II or about 1938, our production was 47 million tons. In other words, in steel production they are just about where we were when World War II started. Now, how long will it take the Soviet Union to produce as much steel as we do—I do not know. It is that kind of thing on the horizon which, in my judgment, is more significant than any paragraph in this defense bill.

Quoting the Secretary again:

The Japanese made the same kind of progress 50 years sooner. If you go back 100 years, Japan was a feudal type country, but after they started to open it up and got the idea of technical progress and the use of mechanical horsepower and so forth, they made great strides in their industrial development.

I could continue to quote but I shall not take the time of the House. I would like to refer to the testimony of Secretary Quarles on page 155 of the hearings on the supplemental defense budget.

His testimony points up the fact that this situation in which we find ourselves now in all probability will worsen. It points up what I referred to yesterday that probably Secretary Quarles is correct when he talks about our going into this period of mutual deterrence—with

terrific power on both sides. It points up further the utter futility of hoping that by the mere expenditure of billions of dollars—and there are \$33½ billion in this bill—we can settle the problems of our world.

It points up very much the urgent necessity that some method be found to settle the problems which have plagued our world. They cannot be settled by military might alone. Certainly we hope that our leadership, and I do not mean either Republican or Democrat, but I speak of the leadership of the free world, we hope that our leadership somehow will find some other approach than money.

If we just continue to rely on the power of American industry and money alone, we are going to lose this battle for peace just as surely as I am standing on the floor of this House today. And we will probably live to see it. We must have a more effective, bold program for peace if we are going to succeed. That is where the greatest challenge to the free world is today—not in the armament race.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Office of Public Affairs*

For salaries and expenses necessary for the Office of Public Affairs, \$450,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the members of the committee a few questions, beginning with this title L.

I note on page 2, under "Salaries and expenses" there is \$60,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for emergency and extraordinary expenses. Then on page 3 there is \$32,500,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses. On page 4 there is appropriated \$50 million to be used upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such funds can be wisely and profitably and practically used. It seems to me that those funds can all be spent on the account of the Secretary of Defense and ought to be lumped together. Perhaps they are needed, but why are they listed separately?

Mr. MAHON. These funds, the first \$60,000, have to do with the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Actually this is a legislative provision which would make available these funds for extraordinary things, such as the meeting which it held at Quantico each year under the direction of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. I am not so much interested in what they are being spent for because I suspect at least some of the spending is of a classified nature. You have \$82 million spread out here for apparently the same purpose.

Mr. MAHON. It is for extraordinary purposes in one field—in the Office of the Secretary. Contingencies is a different situation, having to do with our intelligence operations and otherwise. When the Defense Department officials come

before the committee on these confidential matters, they give the committee a list of the purposes for which the funds will be expended and they break it down in detail, and they are required to follow, in the expenditure of the funds, the pattern which they have laid out in their request for the funds. These items are in no way associated with each other.

Mr. GROSS. Then what might the \$50 million be spent for, apparently and solely on the account of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. MAHON. That is in the field of research and development, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. It is on line 2, page 4.

Mr. MAHON. That is the same. It is for research and development. In other words, if you give the services all they want for research and development, there would hardly be a limit. We have tried to limit it to what can be justified and then we tell officials that if they break through faster on the intercontinental-missile program or some other developmental work they have under way and this happens at a time when Congress is not in session and they feel they must have more money they can go to the Secretary of Defense, who has some funds which would be available.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is this the only money in the bill for research and development, this \$50 million?

Mr. MAHON. No. The services are allotted in separate chapters in the bill funds for research and development projects. For example, the Air Force people have \$610 million, which should be enough to carry them through on their research and development unless they have some breakthrough; and if that occurs, as I have previously stated, and they needed additional funds and make a proper showing, they can get some of the additional money which is placed in the hands of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. As I see the language of this section it does not say that this money shall be used for the purpose stated by the gentleman if there is a breakthrough. It uses this language:

That such funds can be wisely, profitably, and practically used in the interest of national defense.

It does not say that \$50 million shall be used for research and development if there is a breakthrough; but I do not want to pursue the point. I just think this is a tremendous amount of money to give the Secretary of Defense to be spent largely as he desires and some of it without any accounting provision whatsoever. I think it is a tremendous amount of money, \$82 million, for this purpose.

Mr. MAHON. The Air Force indicated at a pretty high level that it could well use \$200 million more.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that.

Mr. MAHON. We denied the suggested funds, but this is one of the answers to it; and on page 3, under the title "Emergency funds," we say under the Department of Defense:

Available for research and development, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time

period as the appropriations to which transferred—

And so forth.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas and I regret to spend so much time upon this proposition. There is another matter to which I wish to refer.

A little while ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORN] spoke of the reserve training program. When the bill was before the House of Representatives with respect to the 6 months' training program I believe I asked a question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], concerning the necessity for expanding training facilities for the Reserves and asked whether that program would require the spending of substantial sums of money for facilities, and the answer I got back I am sure was that it would not require substantial expansion of facilities; yet I understand that it is proposed to construct a large number of buildings and perhaps other facilities.

Mr. MAHON. The situation is that there has been an estimate made as to the number of people who would be in this Reserve training program and funds were provided for the training program. The funds for installations and for construction generally except for National Guard armories and the Reserves are not included in this bill. Funds of that type will be included in the military public works bill which should be on the floor within about 3 or 4 weeks, but as I understand no additional funds will be requested for facilities, but I will yield to a member of the subcommittee who may have more current information.

Mr. SIKES. There is no money in here whatever for the training facilities for the 6 months' trainees. There is money here for the regular National Guard armory program and the Reserve armory program in continuation of the program we have had for a number of years.

Mr. GROSS. Then are the reservists using the same facilities?

Mr. SIKES. After completing the 6 months' training they go back home to the Reserve unit, and they will use the armories there.

Mr. GROSS. Does not that get to the point that if the 6 months' training program is expanded that because of such expansion additional facilities will be needed? They may not have been expanded so far, but that will be the reason for expanding existing facilities.

Mr. SIKES. Of course, if you are going to train the 6 months' trainees and then send them back home and do not give them facilities in which they can drill and keep on training you will not get much good from the expanded program.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman, Is there any more money authorized under this bill for an increase in Army personnel to train the 6-months reservists?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, a slight increase.

Mr. GROSS. Yet we were told on the floor of the House it would not require

an increase in personnel to take care of that matter, that it would be done without increasing the Regular establishment.

Mr. SIKES. I am not familiar with that, but there is a slight increase in Army personnel for the 6-months' training program.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has no responsibility for that, I know, but I believe I begin to see some light. What we were told when the 6-months' training bill went through may not be exactly correct from the standpoint of expansion of facilities and the use of Armed Services personnel.

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday, May 2, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] extended his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the heading "Twelve Small Business Organizations Adopt Resolution to Support H. R. 9067." This extension appears on pages 7362 and 7363.

I have been forwarded copies of letters from Mr. John Marschalk, executive director, Small Defense Industries Association, 3780 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles 5, Calif., to Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL, under date of May 8; and to Mr. Robert I. Black, Independent and Small Business Coordinating Committee, 1317 F. Street, Washington 4, D. C., under date of May 7.

The tenor and content of these letters is to deny any participation described in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in a meeting which was said to have been held in Washington, D. C., a few days before May 2, 1956, and which meeting apparently adopted a resolution in support of our chairman's tax bill. There was a list of not only association representatives but also individuals who were allegedly in attendance at the meeting in question. Mr. Marschalk states in the attached letters that apparently the report of Mr. Robert I. Black, acting secretary of the Independent and Small Business Coordinating Committee, to the chairman of the Small Business Committee, was in error, since no representative of the Small Defense Industries Association attended this meeting nor endorsed H. R. 9067.

Evidently Mr. Marschalk has done considerable checking on the attendance at the meeting where the resolution allegedly was drawn. In his letter to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], under date of May 8, Mr. Marschalk says:

First, the resolution by the committee for which Mr. Black was acting does not represent an action by the several associations who had representatives in attendance. The membership of each association must decide whether it wishes to join in support of the committee resolution. Thus, it is an error to state that 12 associations have joined in endorsing H. R. 9067.

Second, it appears that at least four of the listed associations, including ourselves, did not, in fact, have any representative present at the meeting of the committee. At least 12 of the persons shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as having been present at the committee meeting did not attend.

The letters which follow make it very clear that the Small Defense Industries Association is supporting my bill, H. R. 9851, which provides new corporate tax rates for the specific purpose of aiding small business. However, H. R. 9851 in no way penalizes larger businesses. Mr. Marschalk also states in his letter to Mr. HILL that—

Since the presentation of committee action misstates the views of this association, we feel it is highly probable that similar misstatement has been made with respect to others who did not attend. We cannot speak for the others absent, but feel sure they would want an opportunity to have the record corrected.

We believe it is beyond question that all the associations—with representatives present or absent—do favor early congressional action to provide tax relief for small corporations, but we know of none who wish to impose inequities on any group of other corporations to accomplish this purpose.

It is also pointed out in these letters "that rates above 55 percent approach the levels of confiscation and hence pose a threat to the entire economy." The letters also state that "the greatest need exists among the smallest corporations and that any approach to corrective tax legislation should afford maximum relief to the smallest concerns." These assertions have my hearty concurrence.

In making this statement and including these letters, I want it understood beyond peradventure of doubt that I do not and shall not question the motives of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in placing the report from Mr. Robert I. Black in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because, I believe, he acted in good faith in so doing. I know there are a great many of us on both sides of the aisle who sincerely and honestly desire to bring about tax relief for small and independent business. Personally, I have come to the conclusion, after long study and analysis, that the most effective aid which we can offer in support of our free enterprise system and the small and independent business institutions of this country is to speedily enact tax measures which will contribute to the health and prosperity of the entire small business community.

The letters follow with certain unimportant deletions in the opening paragraph as indicated from the letter to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]:

SMALL DEFENSE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,  
Los Angeles, Calif., May 8, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is addressed to you \* \* \* as the \* \* \* ranking minority member \* \* \* of the House Select Committee on Small Business. Our purpose is to bring about the correction of serious errors which we are aware \* \* \* you \* \* \* will (not) wish to leave uncorrected, once the facts are known.

On May 2, Mr. Robert Black, signing himself as Acting Secretary of the Independent and Small Business Coordinating Committee addressed Representative PATMAN and forwarded to him a copy of a resolution purportedly endorsed unanimously by the representatives of twelve small-business associations.

On May 7, this association addressed Representative PATMAN, calling his attention to

what we believed to be an unintentional error in Mr. Black's material. Mr. Black had indicated that Mr. William Brown of the Small Defense Industries Association was present at the meeting of his committee. This same material also indicated that Mr. Hampden Wentworth, president of this association, though not present in person, had an authorized representative at the meeting.

The facts are: Mr. Brown was not present; Mr. Wentworth was not present; nor was there any representative from the Small Defense Industries Association in attendance. The Small Defense Industries Association does not endorse H. R. 9067.

Today, we have received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 2. We find, on pages 6599 and 6600, that Mr. Black's error regarding the Small Defense Industries Association has been picked up and made a part of Representative PATMAN's remarks. As the only national association representing the smaller firms which specialize in defense production, SDIA is anxious that the viewpoint of our membership be known and that the record be set straight.

It is also deemed important to call attention to other errors which undoubtedly resulted from misinterpretation of the material furnished by Mr. Black to Representative PATMAN.

First, the resolution by the committee for which Mr. Black was acting does not represent an action by the several associations who had representatives in attendance. The membership of each association must decide whether it wishes to join in support of the committee resolution. Thus, it is an error to state that 12 associations have joined in endorsing H. R. 9067.

Second, it appears that at least four of the listed associations, including ourselves, did not, in fact, have any representative present at the meeting of the committee. At least 12 of the persons shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as having been present at the committee meeting did not attend. According to the record of the committee meeting, the following were present:

Julius Hoffman, president, and C. R. Green, assistant to the president, United Businessmen's Association of Philadelphia. (We know of no representative of this group who was in attendance at the meeting.)

S. S. Parsons, president, Parsons Engineering Corp., past president, Smaller Business of America, Inc.

Jules Schweig, president, Security Fire Door Co., and president, St. Louis Small Business Council.

Joseph D. Henderson, national managing director, American Association of Small Business, New Orleans, La. (We know of no representative of this association who attended.)

William I. Shuman, builder and developer, representing the Maryland Small Business Council, Baltimore. (We know of no representative for this group who attended.)

Robert Grant, South Bend, Ind., former Member of Congress.

Walter Ploeser, president, Mississippi Valley Association and former Member of Congress.

T. K. Quinn, president, T. K. Quinn Co. Dewey Anderson, executive director, Public Affairs Institute.

Hampden Wentworth, president, Longren Aircraft Co.

William H. Brown, president, Aluminum Taper Milling Co.

Since the presentation of committee action misstates the views of this association, we feel it is highly probable that similar misstatement has been made with respect to others who did not attend. We cannot speak for the others absent, but feel sure they would want an opportunity to have the record corrected.

We believe it is beyond question that all the associations—with representatives present or absent—do favor early congressional

action to provide tax relief for small corporations, but we know of none who wish to impose inequities on any group of other corporations to accomplish this purpose.

In conclusion, we feel it proper to state the views of this association as endorsed by a large majority of its membership and in accordance with the official action of its board of directors:

1. Our association endorses H. R. 9851, the Seely-Brown bill, and is hopeful that it will receive bipartisan support.

2. In the quest for any compromise legislation, we feel that no graduated tax bill should embrace rates in excess of 55 percent on any corporation of any size. We believe that rates above 55 percent approach the levels of confiscation and hence pose a threat to the entire economy.

3. We feel the greatest need exists among the smallest corporations and believe that any approach to corrective tax legislation should afford maximum relief to the smallest concerns.

4. At this time, we believe any proposed legislation should maintain present levels of Federal revenue.

Our association will be deeply grateful for your courtesy in making a correction of the RECORD and for bringing this correction to the attention of those who may have been misinformed as to our position.

Most respectfully yours,

JOHN MARSCHALK,  
Executive Director.

(Copy to Robert Black; associations at interest.)

#### SMALL DEFENSE

INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,  
Los Angeles, Calif., May 7, 1956.

Mr. ROBERT I. BLACK,  
Independent and Small Business Coordinating Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB BLACK: Thank you very much for the copy of the material issued by you after the meeting of the Independent and Small Business Coordinating Committee on April 30.

Referring to my phone call, Bob, there is no question whatsoever about your integrity—Nor any question as to the integrity or sincerity of purpose of what you are doing.

What has disturbed us is whether outsiders will recognize this integrity, whether everyone will feel that there is no reason to be suspicious.

You will recall that one of the early rumors circulated about the proposed Institute of Independent Business was that it was inspired by certain Democratic Members of Congress in order to create a favorable sounding board for party proposals in behalf of small business.

When we first met in Washington nearly a year ago, you assured me this idea was quite false and pointed to the balance among Republicans and Democrats who were taking part. This was good enough for me and it was impressive to our SDIA members who have made it clear that it will never be the policy of our association to take political sides.

You will also recall it was our suggestion that an early subject of interest to all small business would be the matter of graduated taxes. In fact, I believe you said during our May 3 telephone conversation that it was my initiation of this topic which lead you to pursue it avidly.

All of your work, I'm sure, has been activity on a strictly nonpartisan basis. It is only the way a series of events took place which may lead some people to be skeptical. I've done my best to reassure those who have questioned me, but I realize there may be many more people who react this way, and I know you will want to be able to make a clear case that will reassure all. Here is the

sequence of events which has caused the raised eyebrows:

1. On February 29, SDIA directors approved recommending a graduated tax scale designed to give relief to small and medium corporations—most relief to the smallest—a very slight increase (2 percent to those over \$700,000), to about 1 percent of all corporations—and current revenues maintained at present levels. This proposal was described in our February bulletin with copies sent simultaneously to Republican and Democratic Members of Congress as well as the rest of our mailing list.

2. On March 8 \* \* \* Congressman HORACE SEELY-BROWN introduced H. R. 9851 which proposed the same scale recommended by this association.

3. On this same day, I talked with you in Washington and we discussed a meeting of various representatives of small and independent business to be held during the week of April 9. You felt this date would be workable and I made plans accordingly. It was our thought that with several tax proposals in the hopper—the Seely-Brown bill, the Patman bill and the Fulbright bill—we could get together and work out a scale and other provisions which would represent a compromise among the beliefs and desires of diverse representatives of small business.

4. You and I had two more telephone conversations during March, the last on March 28. In each case, you commented on the high interest in the Seely-Brown scale and mentioned a number of persons who seemed favorably inclined toward it—among them, as I recall, Miles Pennybacker, Walter Ploeser, and S. S. Parsons. I pointed out that our group wasn't concerned with pride of authorship, that we were anxious to work on a compromise proposal, that the one point we were set on was opposition to any bill that would impose a near confiscatory rate on very large companies. (For example, the 75 percent top rate in the Patman bill).

5. During our March 28 conversation, you again indicated that a meeting for the week of April 9 was all set. As a result, I scheduled my trip to cover the period from April 4 through April 23 to be able to attend.

6. Not until I was in Washington and reached you on April 5, did you indicate that the proposed meeting would not be held; that it was postponed to April 30. Let me emphasize, Bob, that I am personally sure that you had been working up to that moment to try and get everyone lined up to attend on the original date. But now, in view of what happened at the April 30 meeting, others need more convincing.

7. An April 30, a committee of four drafted a resolution which the group adopted—a resolution in support of the Patman bill. Two members of this committee were from the Smaller Business Association of New England. Of the entire group, nine were from the New England association, almost half of the total persons at the meeting.

Again, Bob, there is no thought that the committee was loaded, intentionally or otherwise. Nor have we any argument with the New England group. What we are having to answer is the question of whether this preponderance of New England representatives (which is where the Patman bill is understood to have been originated) had more than ordinary influence in bringing about the unexpected action.

These events are recited in sequence to make them easier to review. Many people think they need a lot of explanation, that there is a serious danger here which threatens any future hope of bringing small-business organizations together to achieve mutual strength.

So, Bob, how can we explain this series of events to the satisfaction of all—to remove all doubts and questions? How can we explain that a meeting which was called to

work out a compromise among several measures wound up by endorsing a Democratic measure? How can we provide a clear answer to those people who have contended all along that the disguised purpose of the Independent and Small Business Coordinating Committee was to provide backing for Democratic Party legislation?

Most of all, how can we justify to our members the fact that the new committee has endorsed a measure which embraces near-confiscatory rates on the largest firms? Many want to know, if a 75-percent rate can be justified by expedience today, what is to prevent adoption of a 99-percent rate tomorrow?

Those people with whom I've talked are confident that not a single member of the committee would approve confiscation of any segment of business. But in what way can we demonstrate that the committee did not consider very-big business as expendable? Didn't anyone, in my absence, take opposition to this phase of the bill?

Best personal wishes,

JOHN MARSCHALK,  
Executive Director.

P. S.—You know the views of our board of directors—that any compromise scale will be acceptable providing it fulfills basic requirements: (1) maintaining present Federal revenue; (2) no punitive rates (over 55 percent) on any corporation of any size; (3) maximum relief to the smallest companies. At this writing, the Small Defense Industries Association cannot be listed as taking part in the resolution of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, recently General Twining, in his appearance before the Armed Services Committee, gave what I believe to be the finest, clearest and most honest analysis of the military problems facing the United States.

In summing up his testimony, General Twining made the following observation:

In the situation we face, we cannot afford to be complacent. It looks like the Communists could catch up. If they continue their rapid pace, it may be necessary for us to speed up.

The program I have outlined and the budget for fiscal year 1957 is austere. It meets only our most essential needs on a minimum basis. To keep this minimum program going and to reach and support 137 wings, will require an increased budget in 1958. On this basis, I urge support of this year's program.

Mr. Chairman, we are told by the administration that it is committed to the 137-wing program.

But you will notice that General Twining claims we will require increased funds in fiscal year 1958 "to reach and support 137 wings."

Does all this mean that the Department of Defense and the administration is again deferring necessary defense expenditures purely because of political expediency?

The fact of the matter is that the 137-wing program—less than the one the previous administration or the Joint Chiefs of Staff considered to be the minimum requirement—is in jeopardy. The

truth is that the administration for politically expedient purposes has not requested the funds necessary to achieve the current goal.

It appears that the administration budget cutters have ignored many national security requirements.

All of this, Mr. Chairman, has occurred despite known Soviet developments.

During the past few years, the Kremlin has devoted considerable attention to neutralizing the one weapon that this country has in avoiding surprise attack and worldwide conflict. As General White, the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, has so cogently pointed out, the U. S. S. R. has, during the past several years "expended great effort to make Soviet airpower equal or superior to our own."

In all types of aircraft, with the exception of medium-range bombers, the Soviets have now reached the point where they exceed the capabilities of the United States Air Force quantitatively.

Up until recent times, this country has been content to depend upon the quality of its weapons system. We have sacrificed the need for great numbers of aircraft and have instead concentrated on the improvements in weapons quality.

But, as General Twining has so clearly pointed out in his statement to the Armed Services Committee, the Soviets are even now closing the quality gap. "This," says General Twining, "concerns us much more than comparison of numbers."

General Twining's concern is prompted solely because of money, or rather, the lack of it. As he has indicated "planned readiness may not be possible" because of proposed limitations in operating and maintenance funds.

Lacking these funds, the experience and combat-crew proficiency that has given the Air Force that extra qualitative "oomph" will be lost. We must maintain these skills in old crews and support all efforts to create it in replacement crews. Additional funds must be given to the Air Force to finance more effective levels of readiness.

Mr. Chairman, the one-weapon system which provides the principal deterrent to potential Soviet aggression is the B-52. This one weapon, capable of near sonic speeds, can range throughout the length and breadth of the world. It could represent a naked sword hanging over the necks of the misguided leaders within the Kremlin. It could serve as a visible reminder to them that any aggressive attempts on their part would result in immediate retaliation and devastating destruction.

Instead of speeding up production of this weapon of retaliation, we can only be led to believe that the procurement of this aircraft and other vitally needed aircraft and their supporting elements is to be stretched out. We have already been given the shocking information that the actual rate of B-52 production does not now exceed four per month.

This administration proposes a \$5.8 billion aircraft-procurement program for fiscal year 1957. This is \$700 million less than what the Air Force requested. Of this amount, only \$4.4 billion is to be

used for the procurement of aircraft. The remaining amount is earmarked for the procurement of missiles systems. In the current fiscal year, on the other hand, \$6.3 billion was devoted to aircraft procurements, with only \$605 million being devoted to the procurement of missiles systems.

Now, I heartily endorse the expansion in the missile-procurement program, but to do so at the expense of procuring manned aircraft is foolhardy.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that General Twining claims that the combat readiness of the Air Force is still a goal and not a reality? As long as the Department of Defense proposes budgets such as it has these past 3 years and for the next fiscal year the Air Force program will always be only a goal. It will never become a reality.

General Twining has said that achievement of this goal is dependent on two things—men and money.

This administration has given neither to the Air Force.

This administration's budget juggling act has created an impossible manpower situation as far as the Air Force is concerned. For instance, in 1953 the Air Force had 106 wings supported by 977,000 military personnel. In 1957, the Air Force is supposed to have 137 wings. To operate and maintain this force, the Air Force is expected to do so with 936,000 military personnel. Even a man like Houdini could not overcome an impossible situation such as this.

Mr. Chairman, money will make the difference between an effective and an ineffective combat force. The lack of funds these past 3 years not only reduced aircraft procurements but has seriously jeopardized the base expansion program of the Air Force. For instance, in 1950 the Air Force had 47 wings and 122 bases in the United States. By 1955, the number of wings had increased 160 percent, the number of bases only 40 percent. General Twining's warning could be no more pointed than when he said:

Our present deficiency of facilities not only endangers our striking force, it slows our build-up.

This efficiency, Mr. Chairman, endangers the striking power of the Air Force. It has cut its combat capability. The Air Force has simply outgrown its base system. The lack of adequate facilities and the crowded conditions at installations that I have personally seen may well jeopardize our survival in war.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and as Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Acquisitions and Disposals, I have been shocked to learn firsthand the utter unconcern that the Department of Defense has displayed toward the recommendations and requirements of the Air Force. I have witnessed the gradual retrogression of our Air Force's effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, what the proposed fiscal year 1957 budget means is that the 137 wing Air Force program is dead, as dead as the 143 wing program. The life blood of both of these programs has been

drained away by the scalpel of the Administration's fiscal surgeons.

All of this is most disturbing. This is especially so when the predominance of our airpower is seriously questioned by military leaders such as General Twining and General White. There was a time when we could enjoy the peace of mind that our technical superiority once gave us. Today, our margin of advantage is no longer so great that we can afford to continue with our complacent attitude.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend and give my urgent support to any consideration to an increase in the Air Force budget. This will insure the necessary build-up of this deterrent weapon dedicated to the maintenance of peace. By the addition of a minimum of \$1.5 billion to the proposed Air Force budget for fiscal year 1957, a substantial contribution could be made to change the downward trend in the effectiveness of the Air Force.

It will permit the increased procurement of aircraft, the expansion of base support facilities, a stepped-up research and development program, and provide the necessary operating funds to achieve the desired and required state of readiness.

This additional amount is approximately the amount that the administration cut out of the Air Force's initial request.

The responsibility of the Congress is to give to the Nation an Air Force that will guarantee peace, or if peace is broken, survival.

I intend to live up to my responsibilities.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to speak very briefly about an amendment I intend to offer a little later. I will say at the start that this amendment has been adopted by the House on two different occasions. I shall offer the amendment not so much for the purpose of saving the money, although it would save a considerable amount of money, but in proportion a very small amount of the total in this bill. It has to do with the recruiting services.

One reason why I am going to offer the amendment is as a matter of principle and of policy. The armed services as we know spend money at times recklessly, without much consideration for economy. A year ago I offered an amendment which would have limited the amount of money to be spent for recruiting to 50 percent of what was spent the previous year. The amendment also would cut out the renting of space for recruiting service.

I am not interested in doing away with recruiting, but I am interested in trying to put a little common sense into it. At the time, that amendment was adopted in this body by a vote of almost 2 to 1 and I think everyone recognized that there was a problem that every person could understand. Many of us do not know how much money it should cost to build a guided missile. We do not know how much money it should cost to build a carrier or a B-52, although we are told that it costs several million dollars. We do not know how many of these we need.

But we know from our own knowledge and observation what is going on in the recruiting service throughout the country.

At the present time we have approximately 10,000 people, which would be equivalent to a division of men, in that service.

After the amendment adopted here last year was knocked out in the other body and was not restored in conference, I took the matter up with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. Through his courtesy we had directed a letter to the Department to get some direct information on the amount of money being spent for recruiting. That letter was sent under cover of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. We asked for the location, including the street addresses, in each city and town in which the Government is paying rent on buildings, rooms, office space, and other facilities, and so forth. A reply came back, directed to the chairman, which furnished certain information, but listed only 271 places throughout the country for which rent was being paid for recruiting facilities. It was apparent that that information which was given in response to that letter was erroneous and was a direct evasion of the committee's request.

We now find that the reason they did not give us the correct information is that in approximately 1,000 different places that were being used for recruiting services, the rent was being paid by the General Services Administration, so that instead of a few thousand dollars which they said in their letter was being spent—and may I say that they went to great lengths to get up this information, even had it duplicated, made many copies of it—they are paying a rental of \$825,000 for 71 main recruiting places, and \$278,000 as rent on small recruiting places; but of that amount something over \$850,000 was being paid by the General Services Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you that that is a good example of how the Department of Defense and the people who are in the military are trying to keep information from the public. There is nothing classified about this information. We know that we are assigning 10,000 people to the recruiting service. We are assigning to those individuals over 4,000 vehicles which are operated at a cost of over \$2 million a year. They base that cost, for one thing, on a basis of getting 15 miles to the gallon, to operate those vehicles. Anybody who has ever operated a truck or even his own automobile knows that on these short trips you cannot average 15 miles to the gallon. I merely point this out so that when the amendment is offered, Members will understand the situation and support the amendment. The amendment will be offered at the proper place in the bill. Also I want to say that in offering this amendment, it is not intended as an effort to cut out all recruiting. It is an effort to cut out the wastefulness in there and to put the manpower to the best use. General Hershey pointed out to this committee and at other places

that last year the report showed we appropriated something over \$44 million for recruiting. Actually, with the Selective Service working, we can get all of the manpower necessary.

I take this time simply to give advance notice that this same amendment will be offered again, and I hope that I can have the same support I had a year ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the maintenance and operation of the Army, including administration; medical and dental care of personnel entitled thereto by law or regulation (including charges of private facilities for care of military personnel on duty or leave, except elective private treatment), and other measures necessary to protect the health of the Army; care of the dead; chaplains' activities; awards and medals; welfare and recreation; information and educational services for the Armed Forces; recruiting expenses; subsistence of prisoners at disciplinary barracks, and of civilian employees as authorized by law; expenses of apprehension and delivery of prisoners escaped from disciplinary barracks, including payment of rewards not exceeding \$25 in any one case, and expenses of confinement of such prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in a disciplinary barracks; military courts, boards, and commissions; authorized issues of articles for use of applicants for enlistment and persons in military custody; civilian clothing, not to exceed \$30 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from confinement in an Army or contract prison and to each soldier discharged for unsuitability, inaptitude, or otherwise than honorably, or sentenced by a civil court to confinement in a civil prison, or interned or discharged as an alien enemy; transportation services; communications services, including construction of communication systems; maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys and engineering planning; contracts for maintenance of reserve tools and facilities for 12 months beginning at any time during the current fiscal year; alteration, extension, and repair of structures and property; acquisition of lands (not exceeding \$5,000 for any one parcel), easements, rights-of-way, and similar interests in land; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U. S. C. 1346), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; purchase of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles; tuition and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; field exercises and maneuvers, including payments in advance for rentals or options to rent land; expenses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and other units at educational institutions, as authorized by law; exchange fees, and losses in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents in accordance with law; expenses of inter-American cooperation, as authorized for the Navy by law (5 U. S. C. 421f) for Latin American cooperation; not to exceed \$4,681,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; \$2,954,581,000: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year 1957 the maintenance, operation, and availability of the Army-Navy Hospital at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and the Murphy General Hospital in Boston, Mass., to meet re-

quirements of the military and naval forces shall be continued.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a question of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], but first I want to say that I appreciate very much his consideration as chairman of this panel, and also the consideration of the other members of the panel. I think you have done a marvelous job. I believe the Army will carry out the wishes of this committee.

May I ask this question: What amount of money will be available for use at the Army-Navy Hospital in case the order is carried out?

Mr. SIKES. May I say to my distinguished friend from Arkansas that there is in the fiscal 1957 budget for the operation of the Army-Navy Hospital at Hot Springs \$1,367,000.

While I am on that subject, may I say for the benefit of those who are interested in Murphy General Hospital that there is in the budget \$1,894,000 for the operation of that facility. That includes medical care and logistic support as well as the military personnel that would be required.

If my good friend will bear with me just a little longer, I must point out also that this is a considerable reduction from the amount of money that was required for the operation of those facilities in prior years. For instance, in fiscal 1953, which was the last time the facilities of the Army-Navy Hospital at Hot Springs were utilized to their capacity, and that was immediately following the Korean war, the total cost was \$3,676,490.

I think I should point out to the House that we are seeing what we consider a deliberate attempt on the part of the Department of Defense to phase out one of the best hospitals the military services now own. As a matter of fact, testimony indicates that the only hospital in our military establishment which is superior to this one in facilities and equipment is the hospital in Hawaii. The Army-Navy General is the only general hospital that is sufficiently far removed from the coastal areas of this country to be free from an attack if an attack were made on the coastal areas by guided missiles from submarines or by aircraft or missiles from hostile shores.

It is the only hospital located in the area utilized for the great Sage Brush exercise last fall. This important exercise taught us a great deal that we need to know about military operations under atomic conditions.

I want to take this opportunity to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] for his interest in the Army-Navy General Hospital, and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], who is interested in Murphy General Hospital, and the others among our colleagues who have worked with our committee in helping to keep these two important facilities in operation.

I trust the Department will recognize and respect the need for these facilities and the fact that they are superior to those that would have to be substituted

if the committee were not to insist on their continued operation.

Mr. NORRELL. May I again say thank you for your wonderful cooperation. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recorded wholeheartedly in favor of H. R. 10986.

My particular interest in asking for this time is to express my concern of the Murphy Army General Hospital, located within my congressional district, and your approval of funds to continue its operation and services through the fiscal year 1957. This hospital is the only Army general hospital within the New England region and has been serving the population of that whole area; the next such general hospital to the New England area would be the one located at Valley Forge, Pa.

The permanent-type building construction and the most modern medical services available at Murphy Hospital make it the equal of any other such hospital in the United States. As evidence of the appreciation of its superior services and popular recognition of them, may I at this time introduce a statistical breakdown of the services rendered at the hospital during the period from January 1, 1953, through April 9, 1954—these being at the time when the Department of Defense was previously advocating the closing of the hospital as an unnecessary military medical unit.

PERIOD FROM JANUARY 1, 1953, THROUGH APRIL 9, 1954

Admissions:

Admitted 5,313 patients, 2,258 military and 3,055 civilians.

Delivered 913 babies.

Admitted direct from overseas, 537.

Dispositions:

Discharged 5,412 patients from the hospital, 2,347 military and 3,065 civilians.

Returned to duty 69 percent of all military patients.

Occupancy:

Average daily patient census..... 437

Average number of beds occupied... 320

Occupied by military patients..... 264

Occupied by civilian patients..... 56

Average number of bassinets occupied... 17

1. Outpatient service, 59,705 visits.

2. Dental service, 16,999 sittings.

3. X-ray service, 14,442 patients examined.

4. Laboratory service, 143,908 procedures performed.

5. Occupational therapy section, 12,891 patient visits.

6. Physical therapy section, 15,436 patient visits.

7. Physical reconditioning section, 15,758 patient visits.

8. Pharmacy section, 40,358 prescriptions filled.

9. Psychological tests administered to 581 patients.

10. Anesthetics administered, 1,453.

11. Operations performed, 2,061.

As some of you Members here will recall, the Defense Department last year

did not request funds to continue the operation of Murphy Hospital, but this committee wisely decided that their reluctance was impractical and approved funds in the Defense Department Appropriation Act of 1956 with express direction to the Army to keep the Murphy Hospital in continuing operation for the fiscal year. Currently, the Defense Department is again persisting in their long attempt to close the hospital and have announced their intention of discontinuing this medical facility for all of New England unless your committee again approves funds for and directs the continuing operation of the hospital.

However, in this most recent pursuit of their determined objective, they have attempted to inject a bit of a more practical appeal than heretofore by stating that they need the hospital space to accommodate the housing of the offices of the New England Division of the Army Corps of Engineers, certain Air Force personnel, and the conduct of an electronics research project. Now this they try to tell us with the apparent thought that no one in Massachusetts or New England is aware of a military facility called the Boston Army Base, which embraces a total area of approximately 1,440,000 square feet of space. Some of this space is unquestionably being used, but I myself have been unable to obtain official advice on exactly how much of that space is actually being used. Their nearest approach to any true revelation is the vague information that most of it is being used or has been committed; I call your attention to that word committed, since no one in the Defense Department has yet told us how much space has been committed and to what or for what it has been committed.

On the other hand and in contradiction thereto, advice reaching me from sources associated with the Boston Army Base indicates that there is over 400,000 square feet of space at the Boston Army Base that could be used by the Army Corps of Engineers at a cost of approximately 35 cents per square foot for maintenance, whereas the Murphy Army Hospital maintenance cost of occupancy by the Corps of Engineers would approximate and might exceed as much as \$1 per square foot. It would seem, then, that the Defense Department wishes to avoid any clear revelation of the factual space conditions at the Boston Army Base in order to use the excuse of space necessity for other military units in their clouded appeal for your influence.

Another factor undoubtedly bearing on this particular phase of the matter is the Defense Department officials' unhappy consciousness that the Members here will recall their economic fiasco of closing the hospital just 2 months prior to the Korean war, when they were forced to reopen it at an unnecessary cost to the American taxpayer of more than a quarter of a million dollars. Recalling their unfortunate and impractical action at that time, I think it is quite pertinent, on behalf of the many thousands of service personnel and their dependents in the New England area, to question whether their judgment can be any better now than it was then.

Daily we read about the mounting tensions and the increasingly threatening war dangers in the Middle East, around Formosa, and the many other trouble spots in our confused world of today. You and I know that the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and all the Members of Congress are vitally concerned about the frightening possibility of open warfare breaking out at any one of the several tinderboxes now smoldering in response to the slow-match burning technique of Communist intrigue and propaganda incitement.

I submit to you that no member of the Defense Department can or will step forward to assure us, under these conditions, that the prospect of war is declining and the goal of peace in the world is just over the horizon. Nevertheless, it seems that these same officials still persist in wanting to make the same mistake that they did just before the Korean outbreak when there was much less evidence generally of war possibility than there is today. I earnestly believe that it is the high responsibility of this committee to insure that such an impractical gamble does not occur again at a time when no one can foresee the dangers of tomorrow, not even the Defense Department itself.

Let me please, at this time, further emphasize to you that while the Defense Department is attempting to tell us they do not need Murphy Hospital, they yet cannot or will not get us any estimate of the impact upon military hospital units of our area that unquestionably will arise from enactment into law of H. R. 9429, which was recently passed by the House and now is under consideration by the Senate. This bill, as you well know, the so-called Military Dependents Medical Assistance Act, is designed to provide medical care for all the dependents of members of the uniformed services, and I think you will agree that we can state with reasonable certainty that the measure will be enacted into law before this session of Congress ends.

On this score, may I in passing direct your attention to the letter of April 10, 1956, forwarded to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, in which the Commander in Chief endorses and recommends early passage by the Senate of H. R. 9429. May I further quote the sentiments expressed on this subject by the Defense Secretary himself. He says:

Medical care for dependents is one of the strongest inducements for servicemen to continue in a military career. Yet, today approximately 40 percent of our military dependents cannot be given medical care through service facilities. This is one of the major obstacles in our efforts to enhance the attractiveness of military service because it affects the wives and children of servicemen directly.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not have to emphasize to you that despite possession of the most advanced weapons, the only true measure of the fighting efficiency and determination of any military unit is the height of their morale. In my judgment, the duty of the Congress is to exercise every possible effort to insure the maintenance and continuation of the highest morale among our uniformed services personnel, and it is im-

possible for me to understand how we can meet that duty if we cooperate in a military gamble of impractical limitation of the hospital treatment and medical attention to which the members of the Armed Forces and their wives and children from the New England area are rightfully and legally entitled.

In a weak attempt of acknowledgment, acceptance, and planned correction of the startling authoritative evidence that 40 percent of our military dependents cannot now be accorded adequate military medical treatment, and it seems in avoidance of dutiful comment upon the further impact on the presently limited military medical services that will be made by passage of H. R. 9429, some of the Defense Department representatives have tried to tell us that a good part of the patient load can be taken care of at private hospitals on a fee basis. I think that you and I will dismiss this inadequate response rather summarily because we all know, and particularly those Members who have served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee emphatically know, that the Veterans' Administration tried this same scheme, and the projected cost was astronomical and economically disastrous.

While we are speaking of the difference between wise and false economy, let us consider the military's exaggerated claim of tremendous savings that might accompany their planned closing of Murphy General Hospital. Realizing that the permanent-type buildings are already standing there, wards, laboratories, and operating rooms are already established there, and the medical instruments, or whatever you want to call them, such as X-ray machines, whirlpool baths, and so forth, are now there, then let us forcefully appreciate that the largest single operating cost item by far is military pay. It is obvious, of course, that military salaries must be paid wherever the personnel are, so there can be no savings on that item. If the hospital were to be closed or used for other purposes, there can be no question of accelerated depreciation of the hospital value of grounds and buildings which would be an actual financial loss. People of hospital experience tell me that the moving of permanently installed medical machinery is tremendously costly and extremely precarious because it is very seldom that such movement does not disastrously affect the sensitivity of these delicate recording instruments of modern medical science. It is, then, reasonable to say that such attempted movement would be inevitably accompanied by great cost and substantial losses which certainly cannot be interpreted as an economy action or a financial saving.

Please keep in mind that this proclaimed military savings attempt is in a field of uniformed services morale affecting the lives and safety of their wives and children. I think it is quite fair to ask if the Defense Department has been demonstrating as much anxiety to effect savings in other less vital fields of their responsibility.

Now, this committee itself has been concerned with the wasteful and extravagant operations of the Defense Department, but perhaps more recently the

House Military Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense has been looking into this subject. As recently as last March 23 in a 96-page report issued by that subcommittee, the military establishment was charged with glaring errors in procurement and chaotic conditions in inventory that were costing the taxpayers untold millions of dollars. Among the documented accusations were excessive profits in many defense orders, tons of military equipment lost in the mud, planes out of commission for lack of 25-cent parts, instances where certain items were declared to be surplus on the one hand while the military was out buying the same items on the other, and so on. The Defense Secretary when asked about these deplorable happenings in appearance before the subcommittee on February 21, last, stated that he was "sad and mad" about the whole problem.

I do not excuse these kinds of things if they are true—

He said.

There is some explanation of it, probably, because people do not purposely do such sloppy things.

Now I am inclined to agree with our Defense Secretary that military people do not purposely do such sloppy things. I do not, for instance, for 1 minute think that certain Defense Department officials are purposefully trying to weaken the morale of a great number of our armed services personnel by attempting to greatly restrict the military hospitalization and medical treatment available to themselves and their dependents, but what I certainly do question is their balance of judgment. The continuing operation of Murphy Army Hospital for the next fiscal year would more actually and more truly cost in the neighborhood of less than a million dollars. It would then appear from the facts of the record that overlooking the certain savings to the taxpayers to be gained by scrupulous correction of admittedly existing waste and extravagance of untold millions, they are more intent upon gambling with military morale and military career incentives for the sake of an attempted savings of something less than a million dollars, and this at a time when the war clouds are increasingly darkening the horizon.

Now, I personally do not want this committee to recommend the expenditure of one unnecessary or unprofitable cent of the American taxpayers' money, but I most seriously question the practical wisdom and the economic truthness of any comparatively small savings gamble that takes a chance on destroying the high morale essential to the effectiveness of our fighting forces by not fully and completely providing military hospitalization and military medical treatment for them and their family dependents. To me, that is the moral, the patriotic, and the economic question involved in this matter, and on that question I pray your conscientious judgment and recommendation of funds to keep Murphy Army Hospital and other military hospitals open and operating, at least until the prospects of peace are

less gloomy, foreboding, and threatening than they admittedly are today.

In summary, may I emphasize that Murphy Army General Hospital in Waltham, Mass., is designed to serve the whole New England area. It is admittedly ideally accessible by train, plane, and automobile. The New England area is among the very highest, if not the highest, potential military recruitment sections of the country in time of peace and in time of war. Lying adjacent to the city of Boston, Mass., it is advantageously located, for consultation services, next to one of the greatest and most renowned medical centers of the world. The expansion of military bases at Limestone, Maine, at Otis and Bedford Airfields, with accompanying military housing construction at these and other military units, is constantly bringing an ever-increasing military population to our area, thus projecting an ever-higher potential of military medical requirements and needs for the service people and their dependents.

The President himself has expressed his concern over the vital necessity of improving military career incentives to prevent the large military turnover involving staggering training costs for short service enlistments. The Secretary of Defense himself has declared medical care for dependents is one of the strongest inducements for servicemen to continue in a military career. Yet, in spite of and in the face of these pronouncements by the two highest officials of national defense, certain of the Department officials appear to be unwittingly determined to disastrously weaken the currently declining incentives to pursue a military career by further elimination and deprivation of the New England section of the country of the full opportunity of hospitalization and medical treatment to military dependents.

Mr. Chairman, this great Nation has granted, in Christian generosity, untold billions of needed financial aid to desperate people in foreign lands and as a Christian country we can be modestly proud of such action. In reasonable amount, it is, at the very least, a gamble on the side of God and peace. However, our own American willing and patriotic taxpayers have a prior and predominant claim on the resources of this Government, and I think that they are more and more beginning to feel that this Congress should evidence more concern about their welfare. Investments in foreign lands to promote world freedom and national security may well be wise financial actions, but I believe the American taxpayers desire us to extend a comparable consideration to them and a calculated investment return to them of their own money. On all the facts that I know of this hospital situation, which remain contradicted, I am impelled to believe that a moderate investment here at home to protect against chance by trying to provide adequate military medical services to those entitled to them and thus insuring a higher military morale and greater military career incentive is a wise and sound investment.

I am confident that this committee will fully explore this problem and give this matter the same conscientious and

patriotic attention they did last year when you approved the funds for the continuing operation of the Murphy Army General Hospital.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the last of the seven volumes of these committee hearings was released recently, press articles appeared quoting certain parts of the RECORD in which I had made suggestions regarding the merging of the Veterinary Corps with the Army and Air Force Medical Corps. Headlines and quotations, some of them out of context, gave some readers the impression that I was casting aspersions on the very fine traditions and upon the officers and men of the Veterinary Corps with the result that many communications, some of them rather hot, were received. So let me hasten to make the record clear. I have a high regard for the officers and men of the Veterinary Corps both past and present. They have performed gallant service for our Nation over the years. Through my own experience in two wars, I have observed some of them. I remember in World War I, in the regiment in which I served, the veterinary surgeon not only cared for our animals but he gave heroic and skillful attention to the human casualties at the battalion front line aid stations. In World War II, I well remember a veterinary colonel who served not only in his professional capacity, but also as G-2 in an important headquarters out in CBI. The devotion of these officers and men and their capabilities has always been great. However, I do feel the time has come when this service should be merged with the Medical Corps of the Army and Air Force. You can read these figures in the hearings. The Defense Department has in all nearly 2 veterinary officers and some 5 enlisted men for each horse or mule which is owned by the Department of Defense. The figures are rather interesting. In the present Veterinary Corps in the 2 branches mentioned, there are 2 generals, 34 colonels, 738 other officers, and 2,200 enlisted men. On the other hand, the Department of Defense has 167 horses, 43 of them in the Navy, and 314 mules. We do not have the figures for the very fine dogs who are also in the armed services, and they are among our most gallant defenders, but I doubt if they amount to more than 100 or 200 in the Department of Defense. Be that as it may, it seems ridiculous that we would maintain in these days and times of the atomic age a Veterinary Corps as such. The meat inspecting responsibility is a very essential one, but no one, I think, would say that it could not be performed just as well in the Medical Corps and that the fine personnel of the Veterinary Corps could be merged with the overall medical group. Incidentally, there it would probably be in better focus and better opportunities for advancement and promotion would be provided for the personnel.

The suggestion that our committee was considering had no reflection on the personnel involved, it was just a question of regrouping. I think it might well be looked into to see if the Medical Corps

should absorb in both the Army and the Air Force the fine men and officers who are serving in the veterinary establishments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express the gratitude of my community to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] and his Army panel for the very effective manner in which they handled a problem that was giving much concern to Springfield, Mass.

The devastating floods of August 1955 weakened a dam owned by the Department of Defense resulting in a decision by the Department to declare surplus the dam and pond backed up by the dam. The area covered by the pond and known as Watershops Pond is some 220 acres. This pond had been in use for over 100 years and was widely known for its beauty and recreational value. Hundreds of homes had been built along the water's edge. Real estate developments had sprung up in the immediate area. The pond has always been a real asset to Springfield College.

This committee extended the courtesy of a hearing to Senators Saltonstall, Kennedy, Mayor Brunton, Dr. Stone, of Springfield College, and myself. It was impressed with the equity of our request. As a result of that hearing and the evolved testimony, the committee requested the Secretary of the Army to restore the dam and preserve the lake. Secretary Brucker cooperated wholeheartedly and work is now underway to effect the necessary repairs.

Mr. Chairman, this action by this congressional committee and the Department of the Army clearly demonstrates that this, indeed, is a Government with a sense of its moral obligations.

For the way in which it met and solved a purely local matter, I again express the thanks of my community.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

##### Army Industrial Fund

The amount available in the Army Industrial Fund is hereby reduced by \$110 million, such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 11, after line 22, add a new section, to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be used for recruiting purposes; and no part of any appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 50 percent of the amount expended for such purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as I said previously, this is not offered for the purpose of cutting out recruiting activity. It is offered for the purpose of saving several million dollars both in the rent paid on facilities in towns and cities where free facilities are available and could be used.

Also repeating, I will say that this amendment has been adopted twice in

the House. I think that this is an operation that all of us would be acquainted with and know something about by seeing the number of recruiting offices that are kept open over the country.

After this amendment had been knocked out last year—and to me it was in direct defiance of what the House had indicated was its desire—the Defense Department on July 1 last year made further commitments, and where they had been operating recruiting offices that were occupied by both the Army and the Air Force they instead rented two buildings in the same town. In many towns you will find four services operating recruiting, with each one of them maintaining a vehicle. Last year, at the request of our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the Department of Defense did furnish this information which purported to show the number of people engaged in recruiting, and by adding that up we come to the figure of 9,216. That has since been increased.

We also find in those same figures there were 271 locations which were supposed to be used for recruiting. I wish to read from this letter to Mr. MAHON:

It is noted for your information that the list of facilities noted in the above paragraph does not include the Armed Forces examination and induction stations, as these facilities handle all types of inductees and would be necessary regardless of the status of the recruiting program. The list of personnel and vehicles includes those persons whose primary duty is recruiting, but, of course, does not include those persons who perform minor recruiting functions which are incidental to their other duties.

So we have no way of knowing how many installations there are on which the Government is paying rent. We have no way of knowing the total number of personnel who are engaged. I have secured from the committee these figures which show, according to the hearings conducted this year, that they propose to spend \$62,577,000 for recruiting; but the clerk of the committee told me it was his understanding that that was for operations only. That being the case, that is an increase of \$18 million over the \$44 million which was in the bill last year. So instead of trying to cut this down they are raising it instead. We also know that with the selective service there is ample opportunity to get all of the manpower necessary.

Last year before the committee General Hershey made a statement in which he said that he could supply all the men and could save at least \$40 million in recruiting expense.

I think this amendment will have a good effect on showing the Department of Defense that we want to provide all of the money that is necessary for carrying on the defenses of this Nation, but that we are unalterably opposed to wasting money and not utilizing the free locations which could be used for recruiting and without paying all of that money.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a favorable vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, 7 or 8 years ago when I first came to the House I had views

that coincided with those expressed by the gentleman from Missouri. Since serving on this particular subcommittee I have had an opportunity to see a different point of view, and as a result I rise to oppose his recommendations. It is true that you could cut down the number of personnel, the number of recruiting offices and seemingly save money, but when you add up the financial benefits which accrue to all three branches of the service and specifically to the Army through longer term enlistments, you find that you save substantial money by having recruiting programs.

It is true that General Hershey if we stopped all recruiting, through Selective Service could get for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all of the 2-year men that are required. But if you will analyze the situation you will find that that 2-year enlistment program is a very expensive operation, referring to General LeMay's testimony over in the other body just a few days ago. His big problem today in keeping his Air Force efficient is the fact that he is losing people who have been trained over the years.

A man in the military is relatively useless from a combat point of view or a maintenance point of view until he has had almost a year's training. The net result is that under a 2-year enlistment or a 2-year induction he has only 1 year of productive service. Consequently, it seems to me that if we can get people into the service on a 4-year hitch, a 6-year hitch, or longer, we can save tremendous sums of money and we can increase the combat effectiveness of our Army, Navy, and Air Force infinitely.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. In addition to that will the gentleman not agree with me that it is far better to build up our military strength through a recruiting program than through the Selective Service? Every man the recruiting service gets into the establishment is one less man who has to be drafted. Is that not true?

Mr. FORD. That is absolutely correct. The figures presented to our subcommittee for the Army indicate that the reenlistment rate among 2-year inductees is very low; something like 3 or 4 percent. This means that hardly any of your inductees intend to make the Army a career. So we have a very considerable turnover among those who serve just 2 years by compulsion.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORD. In just a minute, please.

Among those who in the first instance have been recruited you find a much better reenlistment rate, and as a result we not only save money but we also increase our combat effectiveness.

One further point: This Congress passed last year the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. That program is almost entirely dependent upon the job that is done through your recruiting offices. There is no compulsion in that act. In fact, the Congress specifically said there should be no compulsion. The only way you can make that legislation work is to have good recruiters out selling our young

men between 17 and 18½ years of age on the program. If you want to sabotage, if you want to ruin your Reserve Forces Act of 1955, you should approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. If you want to make that legislation effective and give us for the first time a high-class Reserve program, you should vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Maryland), the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Is it not a fact the testimony has shown that the anticipated inductions in the Army for fiscal 1957 are only 153,000, whereas, for instance, in 1955 there were 215,000 and in 1953 there were 563,000? Does that not show the recruiting, however it may be handled at the moment, is getting results and it would be unwise to alter it while it is making good progress?

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Maryland has made an excellent point. Let me remind you that in fiscal 1957 they will induct 153,000. In fiscal 1955 they inducted 215,000. In other words, our recruiting program has substantially reduced the burden under Selective Service. When you sign up somebody by recruiting they intend to make the service a career. That is where we save dollars and increase our combat effectiveness.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like the gentleman to tell me how many people he thinks they are recruiting who would not be drafted, who are not coming in there before they come in from Selective Service? The gentleman has not touched on the point why it is necessary to have 3 separate buildings in a town for 1 man to occupy and each 1 of those men have an automobile.

Mr. FORD. Let me answer the first question first. I think it is immaterial how many are recruited who otherwise would have been inducted. The point is, we get people for longer terms of service, and they are the kind who reenlist. So we get people with previous training and we end up with a far more effective military service.

Secondly, I do not condone the three separate or duplicating offices.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman does not condone it, let us adopt my amendment and we will cut it out.

Mr. FORD. I do not think the gentleman's amendment necessarily ends that kind of expense and operation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would end renting buildings everywhere and make them use the courthouses, the Federal buildings, the post offices, and other buildings that are available without paying that rent of over a million dollars a year.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman's amendment does not necessarily end the situation. What the amendment does, in my opinion, is this: It restricts, it hinders, a recruiting program which, according to the statistics we have seen, saves dollars and increases the military effectiveness of our personnel in the Army, Air Force, the Navy, and Marine Corps.

For the reasons stated I most emphatically urge disapproval of the pending amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, recruiting is a selling activity. It is selling the American people on the advantages of military service; it is advertising; something that has to go on and on. The big companies do not stop advertising and say, when sales are good, "We can ride through next year on the advertising we have done this year." They keep on advertising. That is what the services are doing in their recruiting programs. They are selling the advantage of military service to the American people, some of whom are already in the service, admittedly. The program is directed primarily at getting long-term recruits and reenlistments. They are the nucleus, the hard core of any well-organized military force that must be able to move out tomorrow and do a job for defense.

The Navy and the Marine Corps expect to obtain in the next fiscal year, under the terms of this bill, 145,000 recruits and reenlistments through its recruiting program. The Army expects to obtain 144,000, and the Air Force 142,000. Now, if these people are not obtained by voluntary enlistment, what do you fall back on? The only people you can possibly fall back on, if we are to fill the gaps so that we can have personnel necessary for a functioning military establishment, are the 2-year inductees. And the 2-year inductees are the most costly kind of trainees. They spend the greater part of the first 6 months in basic training. Most of the time he is in the service, the chances are, he wants out. Certainly that is true if he did not want to be inducted into the service in the first place. In that case he wants to get out as soon as he can. That man gets little if any advanced training. There simply isn't time. Yet detailed and intricate training is essential for the personnel of our military services today. It costs considerably more to train and maintain a 2-year inductee, than a career man.

Under the terms of this amendment, no money could be used for rental. You could have no recruiting offices unless you could have free space. Where are you going to get free space? We have had no public building construction for years in this country. Most of the post offices and the Federal buildings are crammed full of activities and space cannot be relinquished. There would be little likelihood of obtaining free space. Under general law, many of the facilities now in use are paid for by GSA. This amendment would not touch that situation at all. Fifty percent of the current expenditures for recruiting would also have to be eliminated under the terms of the amendment before you.

On the surface it would appear to save money but only on the surface, because in operation you would be falling back on the 2-year inductee, the man who only has basic training, and you would have a military organization with lower morale, lower efficiency, lower effectiveness, and with higher operating costs.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Of course I yield. And may I say now with respect to my distinguished friend, I know he is fully sincere and I respect him for his objectives, but I do not think his amendment should be accepted.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman does not understand that I am trying to cut out recruiting by this amendment, does he?

Mr. SIKES. It could have the effect of cutting out a very effective part of recruiting. As the gentleman from Michigan well said, the 6-month training program is just now beginning to work. The recruiting services are doing an excellent job in acquainting the Nation with the value of the program. If the recruiting programs were cut at this time, it could cripple the 6-month training program.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Can the gentleman justify the use of 3 buildings and also the use of a post office in a town of 10,000 population?

Mr. SIKES. I think the gentleman from Michigan has agreed, and I agree, that there should be as little duplication as possible, and I would like to see all duplication eliminated. However, I do not think there is as much duplication as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I can show the gentleman—and I showed it to the chairman last night—that immediately after the beginning of the last fiscal year and in spite of the fact that this House adopted this amendment, the forces went out and rented additional buildings and separated the Army and the Air Force in various towns.

Mr. SIKES. The program was expanded in preparation for the 6-month training program, and for greater emphasis on career men, and, as a result, the facilities had to be expanded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman who has offered this amendment has made his presentation on what he considers to be facts, however, I am very much concerned with the end result as it pertains to the Navy. I do not have the same information as to the other branches of our military service. I should like to present for the consideration of the Members of the House the following cost appraisals and other data relating to the pending amendment.

First, the cost comparison of 4-year voluntary enlistment versus a 2-year inductee. In the Navy, there is a difference in cost per year of service in operating forces for a recruit as compared with that of an inductee of \$943.81. For the Marine Corps that difference is \$868.88.

The estimated savings in fiscal year 1957 program as a result of using volunteer recruits instead of inductees is a total, for the Navy and the Marine Corps of \$133,313,980.

The recruit provides the Navy with 3½ years of service in the operating forces, while the inductee provides the Navy with 1½ years of similar service. Both of these enlisted personnel require a half year training.

For the total 4-year cycle, the increased cost to the Navy Department in utilizing only inductees would be approximately \$443,093,000.

The cost to the Government of procuring an inductee through Selective Service is comparable to the cost of recruiting a volunteer. Hence, there would appear to be no net savings to the Government.

In order for the Navy Department to realize a net savings of about \$24 million, which is the approximate cost of the recruiting program, the Selective Service law would have to be revised to be revised to authorize induction for a minimum of 4 years.

It takes seven 2-year inductees to provide as many hours of service in the operating forces as three 4-year volunteer enlistees.

To maintain the same size operating forces in the Navy with inductees as maintained with 4-year volunteers would require increased manpower ceilings as the training load would approximately double.

Motivation of a volunteer 4-year enlistee and the quality of performance allied thereto are an intangible benefit to the Government which cannot be measured in terms of dollars. However, the probability of a volunteer, 4-year enlistee reenlisting is much greater than that of a 2-year inductee. Every reenlistment after 4 years' service would result in an additional savings of about \$3,200 which is not included in the savings mentioned previously.

In summary, volunteer enlistments enable the services to maintain a higher state of readiness as well as substantially reducing requests for appropriated dollars for military personnel activities.

Directing the balance of my comments to the rental aspect of the matter, I had a very exhaustive examination made so that I could make this presentation of facts.

There are approximately 435 Navy recruiting stations and substations. Of this number 325 are joint facilities, used in cooperation with the other services. There are only 68 locations where the Navy and all of the other services occupy separate facilities in the same town. Of these, only 5 are in Navy-leased space. Annual cost of this leased space is only about \$20,000.

In accordance with established policies of the Department of Defense and Navy Department, the Navy recruiting facilities are invariably operated jointly wherever practical.

Under the circumstances I have just recited, there is nothing that I can do insofar as the Navy aspect of the recruiting program is concerned but, very definitely, ask you to vote with me against the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the gentleman know how many personnel are used by the Navy in that recruiting program?

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the moment I do not have the figure, but I can get it for the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. As of July 1, last year, it was 3,690.

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the time that was true. I will even go so far as to give you the benefit of the breaks and say it is 7,000. I have given you the facts with reference to the savings involved in any recruits instead of inductees, that is what we are interested in.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are now about at the end of the Army section of the bill. In committee I introduced an amendment to raise the Army one more division to give its manpower 20 divisions. In the cut last year, which I opposed, with the cuts in the Marines and the Navy, we found ourselves with 18 divisions. Combining certain regimental combat teams we brought that up to 19 combat divisions.

I wanted and intended to introduce an amendment today to raise that strength to 20 combat divisions, which would entail the expenditure of about \$117 million and less than 22,000 men. I thought best, in view of the statements made by witnesses before the committee, not to pursue that today.

However, let me tell you this: General Taylor, a grand soldier and the Chief of Staff of the Army, before this committee of ours when I examined him and asked him how many men he thought he needed this coming year to do the best job that, under all the circumstances, he as Chief of Staff of the Army thought should be done, told me 1,300,000 men. This budget provides for 1,045,000. You will be over 200,000 men short of what the Chief of Staff of the Army told this committee in his best judgment the circumstances demanded and required.

I know what he said about "the first dollars you give me I will use for munitions and equipment." I heard all of that, too. But I heard General Ridgway before this same committee last year and, when I asked General Ridgway what he should do, he replied to my questions, and it cost him his head. He was fired for telling us the truth.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say these words for the Army. I do not recognize the Army as low man on the totem pole at the Pentagon. I see the Army as an equal partner in a tridimensional defense organization for the security of this Na-

tion, not the stepchild of the "fly boys" and the Navy brass under any circumstances. The importance of the Army cannot be denied despite snide remarks that may be so intended. Let me say to you the Army has a great mission. For one thing, its existence as a strong fighting power is a deterrent to war—an advice to the enemy that the Army stands ready and it is ready. It is the great antiaircraft arm of your national defense, and only the Army for the past year has operating in the field the Nike antiaircraft installations defending the great cities of America. Only the Army is in the field with guided missile and antiaircraft and has been for a year and will develop a greater family of such ack-ack defense. That is the Army. It is your Army that is training the indigent forces of our allied and other nations who are supporting us. It is the Army in the field which is facing the potential enemy nations in Europe. It is the Army in the field in Korea two miles behind the front line facing enemy troops and in Germany and all across Europe. Keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the Army undoubtedly is the queen of battle. They will go in and take ground and hold it, and not the long-haired, flat-heeled scientists and the laboratory technicians of the world—they will not hit a line and take the mud and stay there. That is the Army—and that is the queen of battle—the infantry in all countries in this war and in all wars.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SHIPS AND FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for design, maintenance, operation, and alteration of vessels; maintenance and operation of facilities; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; procurement of equipment, supplies, special clothing and services; installation, maintenance, and removal of ships' ordnance; lease of facilities and docks; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; industrial mobilization; and departmental salaries; \$766,040,000, of which \$16,240,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Coast Guard operating expenses, 1957" for the operation of ocean stations; *Provided*, That notwithstanding the availability of the trust fund "Naval reservation, Olongapo civic fund," this appropriation shall be available for such support of the town of Olongapo as may be authorized by law.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question concerning the language on page 17, which reads:

*Provided*, That notwithstanding the availability of the trust fund "Naval reservation, Olongapo civic funds."

What is the meaning of this civic fund? Are we now in the business of financing cities and towns?

Mr. SHEPPARD. This particular municipality is a part of a military operation and there are certain provisions in our agreements that we have to abide by. The expenditures which have taken

place there and to which the gentleman presently is addressing himself, have to do with the protection of the entire military force within the reservation because of a lack of proper facilities—sanitation and various and sundry things of that character. It is a definitely established obligation which we have to take care of because of the circumstances which prevail there.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask one other question of the gentleman. Do we make this kind of a contribution anywhere else in the world?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Insofar as the Navy is concerned—not to my knowledge because we have no other situation of a comparable character.

Mr. GROSS. This does constitute an unusual and a very necessary situation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Definitely.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish the gentleman from Iowa would yield to the gentleman from California to tell us how you pronounce Olongapo? Is it Olongapo or Olangapo with the accent on the last syllable? What is the pronunciation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not being a specialist in languages, as the gentleman knows, I will say from common use, let your vocal abilities function and you will have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE V

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

#### Aircraft and related procurement

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land without regard to section 1136, Revised Statutes, as amended, for the foregoing and other purposes, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; reserve plant and equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation of things; \$6,048,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood: On page 23, line 17, strike out "\$6,048,500,000" and insert "\$7,048,500,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment, I take for granted by this time, is clear. The purpose of my amendment is to provide \$1 billion additional for the purpose of purchasing B-52 long-range intercon-

tinental heavy bombers to transport, if and when necessary, A-bombs and H-bombs any place in the world that it is necessary so to do.

I have in mind the startling news stories of 2 years ago this month when there came from Moscow the announcement that a great new bomber had flown across Red Square. At the next meeting of this committee I asked the Secretary of Defense about that and he said to me in effect, "Do not worry about that. That is a hand-made, experimental job. It is a fake and does not mean a thing." That is what the Secretary of Defense said 2 years ago this month.

One year later the same military observers in the same Red Square counted 20 big intercontinental heavy Russian bombers flying across the square in Moscow. That was 1 year ago this month.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to burden this House longer with the pros and cons of this highly controversial problem. Yesterday in general debate I stated these as the questions involved in my amendment:

They are two: Has this administration decided that supremacy in the air is too costly and must yield to the balancing of the budget?

Secondly, has there been a top level decision that it is not necessary to stay ahead of Russia, that maintenance of a striking, yet not superior, long-range bomber force would be sufficient?

Those are the questions, Mr. Chairman, in this amendment.

I am aware because of my service during the years that I have sat on this defense subcommittee, I know all about the Navy air arm; I know about carriers. I went through all of that vote and that fight on this floor and in the Appropriations Committee several years ago. When the vote came to a tie in the Appropriations Committee to build the Forrestal carrier at the joint Senate-House conference I was the last man to vote, and I voted for the carrier. You got it by one vote, and you have built several since.

I know about carriers, and the air arm of the Navy. I know about the National Guard air arm and the Reserve air arm; of those things this committee and I are aware; but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the people of the United States knowing all about the Navy air arm, and the Army air arm, and the National Guard and Reserve air arms, under no circumstances will the people of the United States of America accept this policy of this administration that regardless of our air strength and regardless of our airpower we will not permit any nation to surpass us in the number and the quality of long-range intercontinental bombers, under no circumstance.

Now, that is the issue. Once the American people know the fact they would vote for this amendment to a man.

They are concerned about balancing the budget; so am I and you; but I say please do not balance the budget even in an election year before parity at least with Soviet Russia on B-52 bombers. I do not want to get elected to anything that much; no, Mr. Chairman.

There is word that we have 1,500 B-47 medium bombers. We do; they are great bombers; it is a great fleet. Where are they based? They must be based at airbases that are on the perimeter and periphery of potential enemy nations, everyone of them. In case of war every one of them will be based on foreign territory under the jurisdiction of a foreign sovereign nation, ally, quasi-ally, and neutral—pick your own word—but not on American soil. That is where your B-47 bombers will be.

Let me direct your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the political instability of all of those nations of which we speak; and how secure are your bomber bases for B-47's? You know and have heard that Soviet Russia has perfected or is about to perfect any day an intermediate range ballistic missile—1,500 miles. Every one of your air bases on foreign soil from which our B-47's must take off is a direct target today, tomorrow, within a year for Russian guided missiles; and they will destroy your bases and your bombers just like snapping your fingers.

I am not going to debate what an atom bomb or bombers will do to a fleet of carriers. We went through that. You decide. Suffice it to say it is highly debatable.

Mr. Chairman, in this business in the world today there is no margin for error, none. I say to you that with the new wings at 60 planes a wing, this amendment of mine, with the money already provided, will substantially increase the number of B-52 planes. We have about 50 of those planes today ready and available. We have been building them for nearly 2 years about 2 a month. You know the story in General LeMay's B-52 bomber testimony about what is good and what is bad. I am not going to talk about that. This is a good aircraft. It does not have the bugs of the B-36. It is a good plane. There are some bugs in it, there are some communication bugs in it that will be straightened out. But do not worry about the aircraft itself. It is a good one and we do not have anything to take its place. We are not building anything to take its place. Any plans for any substitute for B-52 will take years to produce. The B-58 is a substitute for the 47. The B-58 is not a substitute for the 52. This is what you have, this is all you have for the next 5 years, and Mr. Chairman, you better buy it now.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. Chairman, I, too, have been a member of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee for a number of years, more years than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania; yet I do not claim I know all there is to know about the Army, the Navy or the Air Force. If we did have all this knowledge we would not need to hold hearings. But we do not have this knowledge. That is one of the reasons we have men come up to us who do know their job, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs

of Staff, to tell us what the problems and programs are and give us the benefit of their experience and knowledge based on that experience.

It should be clear to all who will look and listen that you do not fight bombers with bombers. You fight bombers with fighters. You were told by no less an eminent authority than the President himself that it is not a matter of matching the number of bombers against bombers. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Twining, said the same thing. I assume that in his position as Chief of Staff of the Air Force he knows what he is talking about from many years of military experience.

In addition to that, as relates to incoming bombers we have been spending billions of dollars upon many things, including radar screens, the finest fighters in the air any place, including Russia, for guided missiles, both the Nike and the other ground-to-air missiles that will soon be in effect, together with guided missiles on the very planes themselves.

The B-52 program has been stepped up. This plane is being procured at a higher rate. They are being procured now on the basis of buying a few of them, flying the guts out of them, finding out what is wrong and then going into production as the last word. Already underway are plans for a better, a larger, a longer range, and a faster long-range bomber to succeed this one. If you desire to have a modern Air Force it is unwise to pile up a supply of expensive planes costing \$8 million each which each day become obsolescent until finally they become obsolete. The present program keeps the Air Force modern. As a matter of fact, in recent months it has been possible for the Air Force to greatly increase the altitude, the speed, and the range of the B-36 which, though obsolescent, still can do a magnificent job and which General Twining and General LeMay say can get to chosen targets at any time they are called upon to do it.

Now, as far as planes are concerned, General Twining told us they were getting new planes and especially the B-52's as fast as the Air Force can absorb them, train the crews, train the specialists, and provide adequate bases. It does not do any good to have them if you do not have the men to fly and maintain them. And, if you read the testimony carefully, we need not worry about the production of planes. We can outproduce Russia any time we need to. But, it does take time to train these men to maintain these very complex new planes that we have which are filled clear up from end to end with more complex electronic and other gadgets. It is amazing. And, without these planes being in operation, there is no use having them around, with bugs in them, on the runways waiting for modification. I am sure we can trust the good judgment of the men now in charge of our Air Force to tell us, when the time comes, that they need and can use and will be able to absorb more of these bombers. When they do tell us, they will get the money based on their testimony, not upon some story printed in some newspaper or magazine.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, all of us are interested in the defense of our country and naturally look with favor upon any proposal which gives promise of being essential to the defense of the country.

In seeking to solve the problems of our Nation we keep coming back to this business of seeming to think that all we need to do to answer the problem which confronts us is to provide money and more money. You will not at this time improve the defense posture of the United States, in my judgment, by appropriating an additional billion dollars for B-52's. Let us reflect just a moment. We are the fiscal agents of our people. When we pass this appropriation bill, do you know how much money will be available to the Department of Defense for expenditure come July 1? Sixty-nine billion dollars. That is more than the President estimates will be spent by the Government for all purposes in the coming fiscal year. Why make a gesture of fiscal irresponsibility and provide an additional billion dollars when the funds could not be properly used at this time? Next year the funds, no doubt, will be required. The available funds for the Air Force alone—and I am not speaking of the Navy but the unobligated available funds for the Air Force alone—on July 1, if this bill becomes law, for the procurement of aircraft and related items, will be \$10.5 billion; \$10.5 billion that the taxpayer must dig down in his pocket and provide to the Department of Defense. Not only will this be available for obligation, but if you couple that with funds obligated but unspent which the Air Force already has for the procurement of aircraft and related procurement, you find that the Air Force will have more than \$18 billion for aircraft and related procurement. So, it just would not make good sense to provide the additional billion.

If we could snap our fingers and bring into being today 1,000 additional B-52's, we would not necessarily be a great deal better off. We would not have the men to man them, the mechanics and technicians. We need enough planes, but more is involved than just planes. It takes time to integrate a new plane. If we had the 1,000 B-52's now, they would be outmoded to some extent next year and the year after that. One thing that we desperately need to strengthen our Air Force is more trained personnel. That is where the weakness is; it is in trained personnel to handle our new aircraft that are being produced. We have the most modern jet fighters on the runways today that we cannot adequately use because we do not have the trained personnel for this new, highly efficient fighter that we have been able to produce. What we need is more technicians, more trained personnel, more experience. Of course, when these new planes come in, it just takes time to train the men. We always have that problem to some extent. It has been pointed out in this debate, I believe, that many of the B-52's that have already been produced are not being used because they have certain imperfections. It takes time to perfect a big new intercontinental bomber. That is typical of

all new aircraft. So it seems to me wiser to go along with the funds already provided for the B-52. And do you know how much we have provided for the B-52? Five and three-quarter billion dollars, including the funds in this bill, will have been provided for the B-52. So it seems to me that the increase in funds is unwise. Moreover, the Department could speed up the production of the bomber without the additional funds.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I think the gentleman has made a very factual and conclusive statement which impresses me.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. We are providing for 11 heavy bomber wings. We have got to have the bases, the different types of runways, the different types of ground-handling equipment, the trained personnel for these 11 wings of B-52's, and there will be 45 in a wing. That will mean over 500 planes. For several years we have been providing funds for these purposes. And in this bill we have provided an additional \$248 million for the B-52 in addition to the amount included in the President's original budget.

This question arose in our hearings and we urged the Air Force to go back and take a second look; "Don't be short on funds for the B-52. We will give you every dollar you ask for if you convince us you need it."

They required an additional \$248 million and those funds are included in this bill for the B-52.

In my remarks yesterday I discussed the B-52 program in some detail.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Now I would like to say that these B-47's, 1,500 of them, referred to in the debate, are not over on the periphery between the free world and Soviet Russia. These planes are based, insofar as I know, without exception, on bases in continental United States. We have not been so foolish as to base this great striking power right at the front door of the potential enemy. We do rotate every month some of these planes to England and to North Africa. But they do not remain over there in a vulnerable position. That would be impractical and unwise.

Mr. Chairman, I think that just about covers the situation. I think the Members of this House want more and better planes. We are providing the funds for them. It is up to the people of the Department of Defense, our scientists, our technicians, labor and industry, to provide these planes. The B-52, while it has a lot of bugs in it now, is a great airplane. Probably when we have had a little more experience with it, we will find that it is going to be the finest

plane that has ever been produced. It is a great plane. That is the reason we are putting so much money in it for additional procurement, in this bill, nearly \$2 billion.

So let us go along in an orderly way and next year let us decide whether or not we need additional billions for the B-52.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

It is difficult to disagree with such an able committee as that which has brought this military appropriations bill to the floor this afternoon. Almost every member has long service on the committee and has dealt with the military appropriations problems for many years.

I can get little comfort from the fact that we have an adequate force of intermediate bombers, the B-47, for instance, that can be refueled in midair. I personally would not want to conduct a war depending on the type of bombers it was necessary to refuel in the air either on the way to the target or returning from the target. I can well imagine would happen with the pursuing enemy aircraft on their tail.

We know that under the prodding, the criticism from Members of this Congress, the administration civilian leaders in the Pentagon have month by month changed positions in regard to this matter of the B-52, the long-range bomber. We know that under prodding they have announced at least 1 and maybe 2 step-ups in the production of the B-52. So I am not going to accept the statement here this afternoon that we cannot again step up this program, although I recognize the fact that we do not have adequate manpower to keep our bombers in the air.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct in saying that this program could be stepped up. Boeing is working three shifts but only to a very limited degree. Without an additional dollar, if we wanted to produce the B-52 faster, with the \$5 billion contained in this and previous bills for the B-52 a step-up in production could be provided.

Mr. PRICE. I appreciate the statement made by the able chairman of this committee. As I say, I am almost in agreement with him. I recognize his responsibility. He has a very difficult task. When an executive department brings down an appropriation and says, "This is adequate to meet our needs," it is a little difficult for him or any other member of the committee to refute those statements.

I am not expressing my own opinion here this afternoon. I serve on two committees, the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and this service brings me into contact with most of our military leaders, sometimes not in committee meetings. Sometimes you learn a lot more outside of committee meetings than you learn in them.

The fears I express this afternoon have been expressed to me continuously and

over the period of the last couple of years by our military leaders, who fear we are falling behind in our manpower and in equipment. They are concerned about another nation's having leadership over us in numbers. We have to fear that. We are not only falling behind in numbers of aircraft, we are falling behind in manpower, in trained manpower, in scientific and technically trained manpower, and in the production of engineers. We are falling behind in many ways, and it behooves us to show a little fear and to do something about it. We have an opportunity at least to show that we want to do something about it, and I think one way to show it is by supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania here this afternoon. We are not only cutting back our Air Force dollar-wise, we have already cut it back in personnel.

The gentleman from Texas yesterday made a profound statement in explaining one of the reasons why he felt you could not put too many more B-52's in operation at the present time. He said this:

If we had 1,000 new B-52's tomorrow we would not have the crews to maintain and man them and the airfields to operate them from.

I agree with that 100 percent, but is it not time that we do something about it? Is it not time that we provided adequate funds to do something about it? We should have the trained crews and we should have the manpower. We should have the bases to house the planes that we need. Of course, you do not fight bombers with bombers, but it is better to have the bombers than not have them because they are the offensive weapon that we will need in world war III.

Recently, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report made its findings on the President's 1956 Economic Report. Based upon its studies, the Joint Committee concluded that this administration is not meeting its responsibilities in insuring a strong military posture.

I wish to quote the most significant conclusion reached by the Joint Committee:

Our defense preparedness appears to have been limited by considerations of "economy" and by basing decisions as to requirements on what we have done so far rather than on what other nations are now accomplishing. We are not critical of efforts to obtain the greatest efficiency in our military spending and applaud efforts to provide greater strength at lower cost. The American economy, however, can support a substantially greater defense effort if needed.

Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly charged this administration with shortsightedness and false budgeteering. The Pentagon, by its actions, is permitting this country's Air Force, our principal deterrent against Soviet aggression, to degenerate to a shocking state of impotency.

This Nation's Air Force is being starved for lack of funds, coordinated into feebleness by a bewildering variety of bureaucratic devices within the Defense Department and is being throttled by middle-of-the-road and wishy-washy philosophies.

In its proposed budget for fiscal year 1957, the Pentagon claims that the amount of money requested for the Air Force is designed to continue the buildup to a 137-wing Air Force. We are also told that this budget will insure the Air Force modernization with the latest and most advanced types of aircraft.

These two assertions are still further examples of the type of doubletalk that this country has been fed by this administration and the Pentagon.

Back in 1953, the present Secretary of Defense, completely disregarding the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, threw overboard the previous administration's 143 wing Air Force program which was scheduled to be achieved by 1955. In its place, the present administration arbitrarily reduced this force goal to 137 wings. This new program was scheduled for completion by June 1957.

The Pentagon told us that the 143 wing program was unrealistic and could not be achieved by the scheduled year of 1955. To make certain of this, the Pentagon budgeteers cut \$5 billion out of the 1954 Air Force budget, reduced the flow of new aircraft to a trickle, and have turned a deaf ear to the budget requests submitted by the Air Force since 1954. They reduced the Air Force's initial request for 1957 by \$2.3 billion.

Cutbacks of the Air Force program have not been limited to dollars. Equally serious have been the unrealistic personnel ceilings that have been imposed.

The previous administration estimated that the Air Force would require at least 1.2 million men to operate, maintain, and administer the Air Force.

This administration, in cutting fat, has been more successful in cutting muscle. It has reduced Air Force manpower levels to the point where aircraft today are being grounded because of the lack of trained personnel. Over the past 3 years, the critical personnel situation within the Air Force has been made even more serious by budget bungling within the Pentagon and the Bureau of the Budget. Their ridiculous approach is evident when we note that in 1953 the Air Force had 106 wings supported by 977,000 military personnel. On June 1957, the Air Force has been told to support 137 wings within a ceiling of 975,000 officers and airmen.

By virtue of these cuts, the Air Force has suffered. The modernizing program has been set back. The rate of production and procurement of new aircraft has been sharply curtailed. The rate of new aircraft procurements for the period 1954-57 are but one-third the obsolescence and attrition rate.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 3 years, every responsible Air Force representative has spoken out against the Pentagon's highhandedness. Despite and in the face of ever-increasing censorship by this administration, these Air Force officials have in honest and unmistakable terms given their warnings of the tremendous progress made in Soviet airpower.

This new Soviet Air Force poses one of the greatest challenges ever faced by this Nation.

Despite warnings by the Air Force, this administration, for reasons of political expediency, has determined to limit the Air Force program to an arbitrarily imposed budget ceiling. The Pentagon refuses to recognize the implications resulting from the many Soviet achievements in their development of a mighty Red air fleet.

If the 1957 budget proposed for the Air Force is approved by this Congress as submitted by the Defense Department, the Air Force will fail to achieve the goal that this administration had set for itself back in 1954. It will serve notice to the Communists that our airpower will continue in a state of decline; that our policy of peace through strength is based on bluff alone.

The proposed budget simply continues the limitations that this administration has placed on Air Force base construction, personnel strength, recommended and required Air Force levels, and expenditures for modern aircraft and funds to maintain and operate them.

Both Secretary Quarles and General Twining have admitted that if this budget is approved it will necessitate a request for a greatly increased amount of funds in 1958 and even a greater amount in later years. This, in effect, is an indication that the administration is again postponing the buildup of the Air Force.

The administration's budget reduces funding for new aircraft procurements by \$1.2 billion. It will purchase 600 less aircraft than are being bought in the current fiscal year.

It will result in the neglect of a dynamic research and development program, not only in the field of guided missiles, but also revolutionary advances in manned aircraft.

The pathetic support given by the Pentagon toward the development of missiles is already well known. In 1953, the Air Force devoted 25 percent of its research money toward the development of missiles. In 1957, it has been proposed to spend only 7 percent on this vital program.

There has been a similar watering down in the research and development of manned aircraft, new electronics equipment, and weapons. These and other projects are starving for lack of money to stimulate and exploit technological breakthroughs.

The budget contains a deficit of between \$300 million and \$400 million in critically needed maintenance and operations funds. This deficit will have an immediate effect on the combat capability of the Air Force.

And finally, proposed Air Force funding for fiscal year 1957 will further limit the necessary expansion of the Air Force's base support construction program. The lack of adequate air base facilities has led to a dangerous and impossible strategic situation. For the period 1950 to 1955, Air Force strength increased by 160 percent. The number of bases, on the other hand, increased only 40 percent. This has caused a serious overcrowding and, according to General Twining, has endangered our striking force.

Mr. Chairman, approval by this Congress of the proposed Air Force budget for the next year will result in that service's inability to reach its required state of readiness and modernity at any time in the near future. The pressures being exerted by the administration to reduce military expenditures purely on the basis of political expediency is self-deception in its most brazen form.

It is no secret that this country is already woefully behind the Soviets in those categories of combat aircraft that can cause us the most harm.

This budget will only widen the gap.

This administration has completely failed to devote adequate attention to the air defense needs of this country. It has ignored the problem; it has disregarded the real nature of the threat.

Mr. Chairman, matching Soviet capabilities and strength must not be delayed any longer. We must not fail to permit at least the present tempo of Air Force buildup. To do otherwise can only lead to national disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 608. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*, (1) That, notwithstanding the provision in the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in the above-mentioned position to citizens of the United States from and after the date of approval of said act, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions; (2) that at no time shall the number of Panamanian citizens employed in the above-mentioned positions exceed the number of citizens of the United States so employed, if United States citizens are available in continental United States or on the Canal Zone; (3) that nothing in this act shall prohibit the continued employment of any person who shall have rendered 15 or more years of faithful and honorable service on the Canal Zone; (4) that in the selection of personnel for skilled, technical, administrative, clerical, supervisory, or executive positions the controlling factors in filling these positions shall be efficiency, experience, training, and education; (5) that all citizens of Panama and the United States rendering skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory service on the Canal Zone under the terms of this act (a) shall normally be employed not more than forty hours per week, (b) may receive as compensation equal rates of pay based upon rates paid for similar employment in continental United States plus 25 percent; (6) this entire section shall apply only to persons employed in skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory positions on the Canal Zone directly or indirectly by any branch of the United States Government or by any corporation or company whose stock is owned wholly or in part by the United States Government: *Provided, further*, That the President may

suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.

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

I would like to ask the chairman a question concerning the provision to be found on page 35, line 19:

*Provided further, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.*

Is that not a tremendous amount of authority to give any President with respect to the working conditions compensation paid the people working in the Panama Canal Zone? What is the reason for it, if I may ask the gentleman?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman refers to the language in the last part of section 608:

*Provided further, That the President may suspend from time to time in whole or in part compliance with this section if he should deem such course to be in the public interest.*

The Panama Canal Zone is, of course, in a very vulnerable area. In the event of an emergency, it would be imperative that the President should have full authority, regardless of who the President might be, to suspend any regulations or provisions which might hamper the control of the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. GROSS. Has this same language been carried in other appropriation bills?

Mr. MAHON. This is an old provision. It has been in this bill, I believe, since the gentleman from Iowa and I have been Members of the Congress. At any rate it has been in the bill for several years.

Mr. GROSS. I must confess I have never seen it before. But, if this provision can be included in a bill with respect to the Panama Canal Zone, would it not be possible to apply the same language to any part of this country or to any other area over which we have any control?

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that it shakes my faith somewhat when the gentleman from Iowa says that he has not seen this provision before because, I believe, the gentleman goes over these bills and scrutinizes them very carefully. I do not say this in any disparaging sense because I think the gentleman from Iowa performs a good service in scrutinizing legislation. I feel that it is desirable that all Members undertake to familiarize themselves with all the bills which come before us.

Now, in case of an all-out emergency or war, of course, the Congress would quickly take action with respect to legislation involving the Nation itself. But the Panama Canal Zone is in a very vulnerable position. This language has always been there a long time. Certainly I would not want to withdraw it from this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I think it is a tremendous grant of power to any President over any area or territory. I would like to ask one other question. Am I cor-

rectly informed that the Federal Government pays property taxes in the State of Michigan, and perhaps other States? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. MAHON. I believe that in many instances the Government makes payment in lieu of taxes in order to help support the local communities. There is no provision in this bill with respect to that matter, however.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I read in the hearings a reference to the Federal Government paying property taxes to the State of Michigan. I found no explanation and that is the reason I raised the question.

Mr. MAHON. The Federal Government has much property all over the United States, and there is a great campaign about reducing the amount of land and property held by the Federal Government unnecessarily. In some areas the Federal Government owns so much that it is hard for the local communities to pay the costs of operation of the community government. There are payments in lieu of taxes.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I think what the gentleman is speaking of is taxes paid by the Federal Government on a standby plant which is not the property of the Government. Plants held in a standby status under certain contractual arrangements worked out with the local authorities are in that situation.

Mr. GROSS. Is that done in all States where we may have standby properties?

Mr. SIKES. I think this type situation is the exception. I do not think it is a general thing, although special legislation, I believe, was enacted last year to cover a situation in Missouri involving the Navy.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 609. Insofar as practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated under this act by making available or causing to be made available to suppliers in the United States, and particularly to small independent enterprises, information, as far in advance as possible, with respect to purchases proposed to be financed with funds appropriated under this act, and by making available or causing to be made available to purchasing and contracting agencies of the Department of Defense information as to commodities and services produced and furnished by small independent enterprises in the United States, and by otherwise helping to give small business an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated by this act.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: On page 36, line 13, section 609 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following language:

"The expenditures of all appropriations contained in this act effected by this section shall be made in accordance with the policies and provisions of Public Law 413, 80th Congress, section 2 (b) and Public Law 163, 83d Congress, section 203."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman reserving his point of order, because I recognize the propriety of the point of order. I have offered this amendment in recognition of the fact that this bill carries \$34½ billion of appropriations, a large part of which, although of course not the majority of it, would I hope be made available to the small business of this country. The committee very obviously recognized this in writing into the proposed legislation section 609. However, I think it is important also for me to say that in this amendment there is no criticism implied or intended of the committee or of the administration or anybody else. It is simply that we may call attention again to the importance to our national economy of small business.

Probably no group deserves more credit for the winning of World War II than our small-business enterprises. It is important, therefore, that in any legislation we keep emphasizing this fact in order that it not be overlooked. Therefore, I have simply by this legislation renewed and called attention to legislation which already exists in order that the Defense Department may again have it called to its attention.

There is no restriction on the Department of Defense, no curbing of funds, there is no new legislation, there is no additional expense; it does stress existing laws written because Congress has recognized that the great importance of small independently owned business to the national defense must be emphasized at all times.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment, as I understand, is to emphasize existing law and to emphasize the will and purpose of Congress that small business be utilized in every reasonable and proper way under the enacted laws of the country.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is quite right, Mr. Chairman; and I do so because section 609 seemed to emphasize mostly information for small business to the exclusion of other things. I desire to place emphasis on all the aspects of helping small business. I sincerely hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will see fit to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] was good enough to give me in advance a copy of his proposed amendment, and I have submitted it to a number of my committee colleagues. We are all very much in favor of helping small business. The bill as written is designed to that end. Because of the views entertained by those with whom I have conferred; however, I feel constrained to insist on the point of order.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, executive order, or regulation, no part of the appropriations in this act shall be available for any expenses of operating aircraft under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces for the purpose of proficiency flying except in accordance with the regulations issued by the Secretaries of the Departments concerned and approved by the Secretary of Defense which shall establish proficiency standards and maximum and minimum flying hours for this purpose: *Provided*, That without regard to any provision of law or executive order prescribing minimum flight requirements, such regulations may provide for the payment of flight pay at the rates prescribed in section 204 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 802) to certain members of the Armed Forces otherwise entitled to receive flight pay during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 (1) who have held aeronautical ratings or designations for not less than 20 years, or (2) whose particular assignment outside the United States makes it impractical to participate in regular aerial flights.

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

Mr. Chairman, many of us, many years ago when we were younger in school, remember an old poem which had something to say about "cannons to the right of them, cannons to the left of them, volleyed and thundered." The gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, usually is quite moderate in his remarks, but I feel that he did not measure his words quite as carefully today as he usually does when he charged—and these are the words as carried on the teletype:

The President was talking in terms of 50 years ago, CANNON asserted; and if that is all the defense we have, God help us.

What he was talking about was the comment that President Eisenhower had made in which he pointed out the importance to our defense structure of our magnificent United States Navy and its naval air power. I was surprised when the chairman made that statement because my recollection is he became chairman of the Appropriations Committee about 15 years ago and during all of those years he has always supported all appropriations for the Navy. Certainly, if we have nothing of value in our Navy he must share some of the blame.

When he so referred to the President, who is Commander in Chief and under whose guidance, wisdom, judgment, and leadership we came to victory in the greatest war this world has ever known, I feel, again, that he did not measure his words well because all of us know the magnificent military mind of our President and the military achievements which he has attained. Certainly, we could go back and say, if the President is talking in terms of 50 years ago, that nevertheless the President did a magnificent job in World War II and we

can depend on his military judgment to keep us secure at this time.

I would also point out that a careful study of some of the comments made some time ago by certain of the Soviet leaders will not bear out statements made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I read those statements carefully. The Russians did not say they have a 1,500-mile missile. They said they will soon have it and it will carry a hydrogen warhead. So will we and so will ours. When they were talking about their development of the H-bomb their remarks were not comparing our progress but were related to England.

It seems to me a travesty to think all of this Pandora box of the troubles aroused by the Russian threats had the key put in to open it back in 1933 when the United States recognized Russia which was then a tenth-rate power. With the very aid and assistance we have given them through the years, up to and including World War II, we have built them up to what we now face.

I trust that when the chairman reads his remarks before he sends them to the printer tonight for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he will modify them and use the moderate language which he usually and customarily does use. I hope when he does that he will point some dates. You will recall I tried to get him to yield to inquire about the dates of the contract for the planes which did not fly and upon which we spent so many millions of dollars. I trust he will revise his remarks and put in the RECORD the dates so that we may be fully advised as to that situation, and be informed as to whose administration that occurred.

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure the gentleman knows quite well the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II was Franklin D. Roosevelt, also Harry S. Truman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, yes, I know that but did not think that I had even mentioned them. But mentioning them have raised some other points that could well be referred to. The gentleman will probably take Mr. Truman's word against mine. One of the things Mr. Truman tried to emphasize in his articles in LIFE is the situation with which we are now faced, where we have had to publicly state the numbers of planes and things like that, which we have always held in security. Mr. Truman said that all that was necessary for an enemy of this country to do was to work up a congressional investigation and our enemies could get all of the information furnished them without the cost, by reading the papers. And further, it should be recalled that it was Mr. Truman who froze funds Congress voted to provide a 70-wing Air Force.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 629. During the current fiscal year, appropriations of the Department of Defense shall be available for reimbursement to the Post Office Department for payment of costs of commercial air transportation of military mail between the United States and foreign countries.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise only for the purpose of asking my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], a question or two about the language in section 629. Now, that language on the surface seems to be wholly innocent. It says that:

During the current fiscal year, appropriations of the Department of Defense shall be available for reimbursement to the Post Office Department for payment of costs of commercial air transportation of military mail between the United States and foreign countries.

I confess without hesitation that I have not looked into this thing personally and with any great care, but the question has been raised with me that section 629 in effect, despite the innocence of its language, actually gives in excess of \$12 million a year of business in flying Army mail to 2 or 3 of the favored and very large commercial air carriers. Can the gentleman give me any comment on that situation?

Mr. MAHON. Under our system, the Post Office Department itself is supposed to handle the mail, and the Post Office Department handles this overseas mail for the services. Now, if the Armed Forces should negotiate directly with the carriers and the Armed Forces should take over the handling of the mail, which has been the traditional function of the Post Office Department, it may be that some funds could be saved, at least temporarily. This mail is handled under the regulations of the Post Office Department and the CAB.

Mr. HAND. If I may interrupt, I understand that \$8,000 or \$9,000 a day might be saved by direct negotiations.

Mr. MAHON. It is claimed that some funds could be saved if we would change the basic law and permit the Armed Forces to take over the handling of this mail; at least for a time the carriers wanting to get into this field probably would carry it for less than the carriers who are now carrying the mail.

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

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This language is similar to language that has been in the bill previously, and first arose in June 1954 in the conference report, and it became necessary at that time because of the action taken separating the subsidization of the mail. And, if you will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, page 8838, you will see where the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] and I discussed this very language concerning which you are now raising a question. In that colloquy I made these remarks:

Mr. SCRIVNER. This section became necessary due to the action which we have taken in separating subsidies for mail. When that arose there was no provision for the carrying of the airmail to and from the servicemen scattered throughout the world.

This is merely authorization to the Defense Department to use available funds for that purpose under agreements with the Post Office Department; and of course, we expect the Post Office Department to get this

mail carried in the most expeditious manner and at the lowest possible rate of pay.

Mr. HAND. Would the gentleman comment on the question which has been raised that this mail is actually all concentrated in the hands of 2 or 3 companies and they carry it at a much greater cost than may be the case if other companies were permitted their share of the business?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am not familiar with the operations of the Post Office Department in making these contracts, but I assume that they give the contracts to the best and lowest bidder.

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

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to read here a statement prepared by the Defense Department with respect to this section.

Basic law—title 39, United States Code, section 654 C—provides that mail transported between the United States and its naval and military forces and between the forces shall be paid for "out of the appropriation for the transportation of foreign mail." Deletion of this provision would require the inclusion of funds in the Post Office Department appropriation for such payments.

We have the funds here in this bill for making these payments. Otherwise they would be in the bill for the Post Office Department. The rates are not fixed by the Department of Defense but properly fixed I think by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Post Office Department.

At this point I insert the following statement on this problem:

Under existing law (49 U. S. C. 486) rates for the transportation of mail are fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board also determines which airlines are eligible to carry mail.

The Department of Defense has no authority to enter into a contract for the transportation of military mail at rates not approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board. As a matter of fact, in a decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board of November 19, 1954, the Board specifically held that military mail was not cargo and was required to be carried by eligible carriers at rates fixed by the Board.

Even if contracts could be entered into directly with carriers and at cheaper rates, the result would be a diversion of traffic from the carriers certified to carry mail. This loss of revenue to the certified carriers would merely result in increased subsidy to them by the Federal Government.

Mr. HAND. I want to say to the gentleman that I am, of course, reluctant to offer an amendment to a good bill which comes from my own committee, but I do hope that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], will help, if it is necessary, in saving a little money that can be saved and also in seeing to it that all companies get a good crack at this mail delivery instead of just 2 or 3.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman that we had quite an extensive hearing in regard to the Military Air Transport Service—MATS—and this matter was discussed in considerable detail. It is true that a few airlines have the lion's share of this busi-

ness, as I understand it. I share the gentleman's hope that it can be spread out as much as possible and handled by as many carriers as reasonably possible.

Mr. HAND. I shall address myself to the gentleman on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to comment further on the inquiry made of our distinguished committee chairman, by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], concerning unnecessarily high expenditures by the defense for commercial air shipment by Army Post Office mail between the United States and foreign countries. I should like to make it clear that I am in entire sympathy with the natural desire to cut down on unnecessary expenditures and I believe that the desirable savings can be accomplished.

I want to be very clear in my explanation of the matter so there can be no misunderstanding as to the position of our Committee on Appropriations. Our distinguished subcommittee chairman [Mr. MAHON] referred to the hearings on the Military Air Transport Service. As the chairman knows, I urged those hearings on MATS be held and the record indicates my position that MATS has gotten out of hand.

It is no longer just my position. It is the position of the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense Appropriations and with the adoption by the full Committee on Appropriations of the subcommittee report this became the position of the full Committee on Appropriations.

With the adoption today by the House of Representatives of this bill and House Report No. 2104, this becomes the intent of the House of Representatives.

We quoted the President's Air Coordinating Committee recommendation, page 46, of our report House Report No. 2104:

The Government should, to the greatest extent practicable, adjust its use of air transportation so as to use existing unutilized capacity of United States air carriers.

I invite attention to the following statement:

The committee strongly endorses that statement.

There has thus been a statement of policy made that the Congress intends that the Government should adjust its air transportation policies so as to use the unutilized capacity of United States air carriers.

I point out to the gentleman from New Jersey that we are not just saying to the Pentagon: "Make more use of one airline."

We are saying to the Pentagon: "Make use of the unutilized capacity of all responsible United States air carriers."

Now, in encouraging the growth of a civil airlift reserve by transferring mili-

tary air traffic, and by the word "traffic" I mean what the General Accounting Office says: "Military mail, cargo, and passengers," from the Government-owned airline to commercial airlines, we want to make sure that this transfer, this adjustment in policy, is made without unreasonable expense to the Department of Defense.

At present the Department of Defense is able to secure commercial air transportation for passengers and cargo at around 25 cents to 30 cents a ton-mile.

But, we find the Defense Department is spending about twice as much, or a rate of 53 cents a ton-mile for the shipment of sacks of APO mail.

There is no sense to such an arrangement.

Our committee does not sanction the use of soldier mail as a device to subsidize airlines by having the Defense Department pay unnecessarily high rates.

The Defense Department makes direct payments to ocean shipping lines when sacks of APO mail are sent by ocean vessel and there is nothing in section 629 which can possibly be interpreted as preventing the Defense Department from doing the same thing with commercial airlines.

Reference has been made here in today's discussion to title 39 United States Code 654 (c) and it was read here a few minutes ago. But that provision of law does not prevent the Pentagon from dealing directly with commercial airlines. That section of the code was cited by the Pentagon in its letter to former Senator Ferguson which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 6, page 8446 after what the Pentagon admitted themselves in that letter was "a quick review of the situation." At that time it was Senate amendment No. 35 of the appropriations bill and it is exactly the same language as section 629 before us now.

But there is nothing in this cited provision of the code which prevents the Defense Department from paying for the transportation directly. How does the Defense Department explain how they can pay the shipping lines directly? How do they explain loading APO mail on chartered commercial planes in the Pacific?

Of course, title 39, section 654 (c) of the United States Code is no impediment to the Pentagon from dealing directly with the airlines, nor is there any impediment in section 629, as it was numbered in the bill reported by our committee. My interpretation of section 629, which is the same as the old Senate amendment 35, is exactly in accordance with that expressed by the Postmaster General in his letter of July 9, 1954, to the Secretary of Defense:

I would like to point out that the Post Office Department does not interpret the reimbursement amendment No. 35 as restricting your existing authority in any way, or precluding your Department from making direct arrangements with commercial air carriers for the transportation of such mail, or from moving it on the Military Air Transport Service.

The Civil Aeronautics Board establishes the rates, and selects the carriers,

which the Post Office Department—which really is, as they have frequently complained, a captive customer—shall pay for transportation of mail, although the Civil Aeronautics Board has no such authority over Defense Department traffic.

What has been happening is that the Defense Department has been taking a restrictive interpretation of what is numbered in the committee bill now before us as section 629 and as a result has been making payments to cover the cost of commercial air transportation of Army Post Office mail only by the method of reimbursing the Post Office Department which in turn is forced to pay at the very high rate, set by the Civil Aeronautics Board, of 53 cents a ton-mile, which rate therefore has to be reimbursed, by Defense. Therefore the Defense Department is paying 53 cents per ton-mile for service which they could obtain directly from commercial air lines at rates as low as 25 cents per ton-mile, thus bringing about a saving of over 50%.

Instead, with Section 629, the Defense Department could perfectly well permit the Army Post Office to move APO mail on commercial airlines at the low freight rates of approximately 25 cents per ton-mile, and doing so would be in accord with the recommendation of the General Accounting Office on page 66 of its report of April 9, 1956, which states:

We believe that the airlines should be able to carry mail at rates and yields that are closely related to those of freight.

This would encourage the Defense Department to carry out, at the lowest charge obtainable by the Army Post Office, at least the military mail part of the recommendation on page 30 of the General Accounting Office report of April 9, 1956, which reads:

We believe it important that the Congress direct the Department of Defense to transfer, wherever possible, military mail, cargo, and passengers to United States certificated air carriers.

According to page 877 of the Federal Budget, the Defense Department, if restricted solely to this reimbursement method, is expected to have to spend \$12,700,000 in 1957. The amount involved is, therefore, sufficiently large to warrant action by the Secretary of Defense in the interest of economy.

There is nothing in section 629 nor in our committee's report to prevent the Secretary of Defense from obtaining commercial air service for Army Post Office mail at charges below those set by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] estimated—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 24, 1954—that liberating the Defense Department to deal directly with commercial airlines whenever charges lower than those set by the CAB (for which reimbursement to the Post Office is required) were obtainable, as my proposed amendment would do, would save the Defense Department approximately \$8,000 per day on the European channel alone.

Why does not Secretary Wilson do it? Why does not Secretary Wilson save \$8,000 on tomorrow morning's shipment? The answer is that he can make this sav-

ing, and our committee intends for him to do it. It should be remembered that approximately 2 years ago the Congress expressed its intent that responsibility for payments for commercial air carriage of Army Post Office mail between the United States and foreign countries should rest with the Department of Defense and not the Post Office Department.

Reference-statements of intent by Senator BRIDGES, floor manager of the Post Office appropriation and Senator KENNEDY—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 5, page 6538—and the same statement of intent on the part of the House by Congressman CANFIELD, who was managing the bill for the House Committee on Appropriations and Congressman HESELTON—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 5, page 6840.

Still later there was a case before the Civil Aeronautics Board in docket 6489 holding that APO mail is not property within the meaning of the Civil Aeronautics Act and that therefore the property tariffs filed by two companies to carry this traffic at 25 cents per ton-mile had to be rejected.

Nevertheless, I am advised that a number of methods exist which, if properly pushed by the Department of Defense, could surmount any legal difficulties, which may be imagined to exist, to the transportation of APO traffic at rates below those set by the CAB. I have been advised, for example, that it would be possible for the CAB to set special rates for APO mail which are lower than those for United States mail and that the result would obviously be reduction in the expenditures of the Army post office on this item. A number of justifications for a lower rate have been suggested, among them the fact that APO traffic represents two-way loads for the airline carrying it, whereas United States international airmail is largely one-way traffic with the return loads being given to foreign-flag airlines by foreign postal administrations. It has also been pointed out that contract or charter agreements could be devised for the sake of lower rates for APO traffic. There have been additional suggestions that exemption orders such as have been issued in the past for military traffic, or special authorizations for the carriage of APO traffic could be secured, if the Defense Department pushed the case at the CAB and elsewhere.

I am not going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, what particular method should be used to secure a lower price on commercial air transportation of APO mail, but I do want to make it clear that the House intends the Defense Department to explore all possible methods and to make use of them. The Congress has provided that, for example, a letter from a girl in Texas to her soldier boyfriend stationed in Frankfurt, Germany, can be addressed to APO 858, care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y. This letter bears only 6 cents domestic air-mail stamp instead of the normal United States-international air-mail postage stamp of 15 cents, so that when the Post Office has flown this letter from Texas to New York and delivered it to the postmaster, the 6 cents has been used up. The postmaster in New

York then turns the letter over to the Postal Concentration Center run by the Army. What happens then is up to the Army.

The Post Office Department delivers mail to the various APO offices in our country such as New York and San Francisco, and the responsibility from there on rests with the Defense Establishment. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, 1954, quoting Congressman CANFIELD as floor manager for the Committee on Appropriations).

If the Army ships that letter by boat, the Army pays the shipping line directly. If the Army chooses to have that letter flown, it is the view of the Post Office Department that air delivery is a fringe benefit of the soldier, and the Army must pay the bill. If the Army chooses, it can fly that letter on MATS. If the Army wants to turn the letter over to the custody of the Post Office Department, the Army will have to reimburse the Post Office Department at the high CAB rate of 53 cents per ton-mile. There are other additional methods, however, which the Defense Department can employ to secure lower charges than this 53 cents for flying this letter from the airlines who are now flying this traffic or from other United States flag commercial airlines. We want the Defense Department to use all possible methods to secure lower commercial charges.

It is fair to say that on most APO channels—example: only 1,600 pounds a month, channel 8 to Brazil—it is not worthwhile for the Army to make special arrangements and they are probably better off turning their few APO sacks over to the custody of the Post Office Department and reimbursing the Post Office through section 629 of this bill for the commercial air trip to Rio.

But on channel 30 to Europe, for example, the volume of APO mail is some 450,000 pounds a month, and on channel 34 to Japan and Korea, the volume is as much or more. The huge return loads, back to the States from these areas are all sorted, sacked, and loaded onto commercial planes entirely by the Army.

The Post Office Department does not even see this return-haul APO mail, coming from soldiers stationed overseas to their families and friends in the States until after it has arrived in this country. The Post Office never has custody of it. The Army handles the whole thing. So why payment for this return haul APO mail should be made by Army via Post Office at an artificially high rate is something no one has explained yet. Here are two places where special arrangements such as contracts, charters, or special CAB exemptions for certificated freight lines, and so forth, for such large loads can be made, and should be in the interests of economy.

For example, suppose the APO loads to Frankfurt and back for 1 month totalled 450,000 pounds. At present the Army is paying 53 cents per ton-mile—which is equal to \$1.06 per pound, New York City to Frankfurt, Germany—or a total of \$477,000—to commercial airlines via reimbursing the Post Office—for that 1 month.

But is, instead of using the Post Office reimbursement methods, the Army pushed special arrangements to pay the

airlines directly, and if the Army had to pay for APO traffic no more than they are paying for passengers and cargo, around 25 cents per ton-mile; which is equal to 50 cents per pound to Frankfurt, their airline bill for the month would be only \$175,000.

The saving in the Army expenditures on this 1 channel for this 1 month would thus be \$225,000, or \$8,400 per day.

Additional savings are possible on the large volume now moving to the Far East.

This is enough of a saving to warrant Secretary Wilson's attention; and therefore I say he should take the handcuffs off his own Department and push them into making this saving.

I do not believe there is any impediment in the availability of this appropriation for direct payment, as well as for reimbursement.

We have expressed ourselves clearly. Now it is up to the Secretary of Defense.

What is there to prevent his making a special arrangement for his Army Post Office to tender tomorrow morning's shipment out of Frankfurt bound for the States directly to a United States commercial airline at a freight rate? Nothing. Nothing at all. He can save his Department \$8,000 a day, beginning tomorrow.

There isn't a commercial airline flying the United States flag across the ocean that wouldn't jump at a chance to carry APO mail at half the price the Defense Department is paying now. The airlines who are now carrying it—at twice a reasonable price would still be glad to take it at half the present price. And, as the GAO report to the Congress recommends, there are other United States certificated airlines, flying several trips a day across the Atlantic between the United States and Frankfurt, where most of this APO traffic moves, who are ready and able to provide the service for the Army Post Office, who could do it tomorrow morning, and who have actually offered to do so at rates of less than half what the Secretary of Defense is paying now. Their unused space should be used for this traffic, as our committee report obviously intends. There are other lines certificated by CAB across the Atlantic. Our report says the others are included too.

The distinguished gentlemen from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] and Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] have done a real public service in pointing up this place where money can be saved.

As a member of our Committee on Appropriations, who has been intimately bound up for weeks and weeks, in just this air-transport problem, on both the defense subcommittee and also on the Civil Aeronautics Board subcommittee, I assure the House that our committee intends that this potential \$8,000 a day saving shall be made by the Defense Department.

#### PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF MAY 14

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

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he would advise us of the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this bill is disposed of today, we shall go over until Monday.

Monday is District day. The following bills are to be called up:

H. R. 2603, increase area, for residing.

H. R. 6732, regulation, sale of goods.

H. R. 7804, apply, uniform, simultaneous death act.

H. R. 10060, pay periods, police and firemen.

H. R. 10375, enlarge awards, police and firemen.

H. R. 10768, increase annuities, District of Columbia teachers and school employees.

The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1957 will be the next order of business. If not disposed of on Monday, it will go over until Tuesday.

Tuesday is a primary day in Nebraska and Friday is a primary day in Oregon.

The usual procedure will be followed in case of any rollcalls on Tuesday and Friday, if a session, since they are primary days. If the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is disposed of on Monday, there is no program for Tuesday.

On Wednesday we shall take up the District of Columbia transportation bill, H. R. 8901.

Any further program will be announced later. Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] asked me if the gentleman could give us further information about the sugar bill conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman did talk with me. Of course, the bill has been over 20 days in conference. I am sorry I cannot give any direct information on it at this time. I do not know if any member of the Committee on Agriculture who is a member of the conference committee is present and may be able to advise us.

Mr. ARENDS. Perhaps the gentleman can make further inquiry and give us light on that a bit later.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can say this with reservations. The best information I have is that it is the intention of the conferees to go into conference after the Agriculture bill is disposed of in the other body. It is thought that the conference report would come in the latter part of May. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] in talking with me indicated that the bill has been in conference such a period of time that a preferential motion might be made. He did not say he was going to do that, but he indicated he had it in mind.

I make that announcement so that the House conferees may be aware of the fact that such a motion may be made. Like the gentleman from Nebraska, I hope the conferees will get together as quickly as possible and bring in a report as soon as possible. The gentleman from Nebraska has talked with me, and I thought his position was very fair. I do not know what he intends to do, but I am alerting the House conferees to the fact that he may make that motion. Of course the logical thing for them to do would be to meet to forestall any such motion being made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 633. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work that has been for a period of 3 years or more performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless justified to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, at least 90 days in advance of such disposal or transfer, that its discontinuance is economically sound and the work is capable of performance by a contractor without danger to the national security: *Provided*, That no such disposal or transfer shall be made if disapproved by either committee within the 90-day period by written notice to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: On page 46, strike out all of section 633, beginning in line 21 and extending through line 7 on page 47.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this subject the other day so I do not expect to consume my 5 minutes.

On the question before this House now, we can all ask ourselves this question: Are we who speak so much for private industry, and we all have spoken in behalf of private industry, for it, or are we for the Government's keeping on with governmental enterprises when those charged with the responsibility of operating them do not want them and say they do not need them? Still, this section would force the Department of Defense to operate and supervise certain governmental enterprises despite the fact that that Department says they do not need them, they do not want them, and that certain of those enterprises are inefficient and unprofitable.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wish to thank the gentleman for introducing this most valuable and necessary amendment. As the gentleman knows, I had planned to introduce this amendment myself, but deferred with great pleasure to his seniority and great wisdom. I have spoken at length on this amendment, and certainly commend it and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman. I think I am correct in saying that there is not a Member in this body who has not, at some time or other, said that they were in favor of private enterprise, that they wanted private enterprise and would do all within their power to keep the Government out of business. I do not think there is a Member in this body who does not know that private enterprise cannot compete with governmental enterprises because of taxation, for one thing. Private corporations pay a 52-percent tax. There are real estate taxes. On the other hand, the Government does not have to pay such taxes and does not have the overhead expenses that private enterprise has. It seems inconceivable to me and unimaginable for us here in the Congress to force the Department

of Defense to operate certain plants which they claim, after the most careful consideration and study, that they do not need and they do not want. If I can give you an example which, perhaps might be considered a little on the ridiculous side, it would be the same situation if today when the cavalry is obsolete as a component of our Armed Forces, we were to insist that the Department of Defense keep open certain governmental enterprises for making saddles.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McVEY. I want to associate myself with those who are in favor of striking section 633 from this bill. I think the striking out of this provision would be the exercise of the necessary restraining influence on the disposition on the part of various governmental departments to compete with private enterprise. I am very much in favor of striking this language from the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am very happy to join the gentleman in his remarks. I would like to make a further observation and see if the gentleman does not agree that not only is this in the interest of private enterprise, but the private enterprise that we are mainly talking of is small business. There is a good deal of talk about people being for small business, but it is in this area of small business that our military is mainly competing such as laundries and little garages and the 101 various activities that compete with small business. It is in that area that we who are interested in private enterprise and small business will all get behind this amendment, and I commend the gentleman for introducing the amendment.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to join the gentleman in his remarks. I am going to vote to strike this section from the bill.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. POFF. I join with the gentleman in his remarks. Is it not true that this section would have been subject to a point of order under a straight rule?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I agree with what the gentleman has said. I offered a similar motion in committee, and I shall gladly support the gentleman's amendment at this time. In addition to what the gentleman says, I am very much convinced that this section is an unconstitutional invasion of the executive authority. I think we should be jealous when the executive branch invades our authority—the authority of the legislative branch, and we should be equally careful not to invade the authority of the executive. The President announced himself last

year as being opposed to this invasion of the authority of the President.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, section 633 which was carried in the last defense appropriation bill as section 638 is quite well known to the House by this time. The best test of any piece of legislation is in its operation. Objectives, operation, and results are what you measure legislation by; not by the telegrams which attempt to influence your stand. The language of section 633 has been in operation for a year and we know how it works. I assure you that Congress has not created a monster in this section. Congress has created a safeguard, a simple and workable safeguard to protect the tax money of the people of the United States and to protect needed activities in the national defense establishment. I state categorically that section 633 has not resulted in any additional costs to the Government. Certainly it is reasonable to assume that before the Department of Defense decides to contract out to private industry an activity previously carried on within the Department, it would determine the economics of such a step. It would not be in the public interest to make such decisions blindly, without prior investigation.

Having determined the economy of such an action, it is only one step more for the Department of Defense to send to the Congress the figures showing why it is advisable to terminate that activity or dispose of it through private contract. It has worked no hardship whatsoever.

Now let us look at the actual operation of this section. The Department has sent to the Congress a list of 112 activities that it wanted to discontinue or contract out to private industry. What happened? The Congress gave its assent in all but nine cases. In only 9 cases out of 112 did the Congress say "We think you should not terminate or contract this activity." In most of those nine cases there was disagreement within the Department as to whether the work could be done more economically within the Department than it could under contract. In some of them there were important research aspects which would have been lost.

In 1 or 2 there simply was no private facility capable of doing the work, construction of facilities by private industry for such an operation at considerable cost—to be deducted from taxes of course—simply does not sound like good economy to me. In one operation it would have been necessary for the contractor to subcontract back to the Government for the operation to be carried on. There was nothing to indicate a saving.

Perhaps there were some more flagrant examples of activities scheduled for contracting to industry that the Government did not bother to send to the Congress because it was known there was no justification for a change.

Big business objects to this simple language which obviously is intended

to protect the taxpayer. Why? It has shown by actual operation that there is nothing wrong with the section. It gives the people who appropriate the money for the operation of a specific activity an opportunity to look before the activity is contracted or given away and closed down, with possible injury to the Defense Establishment.

Do not forget there is a human side to this problem. There is know-how and skill accumulated through faithful service to the Government by the workers who carry on these activities. Are they to be turned out without a word and without consideration because big business smells a profit in what they are doing? The skill of these workers will be invaluable in time of emergency. Where will you turn for know-how or facilities at that time?

Let me say this: Some of the drive to eliminate this section seems to have come from recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I remember many instances when the recommendations of the Hoover Commission have not been considered sacrosanct. As a matter of fact, I think most of them have had to be tempered down quite a little bit before we found them practical, workable, or acceptable. Secretary Wilson said that this is working no hardship. He showed no disposition, on being questioned by me, to have this section eliminated. I submit it is a good section.

If you want the final measure on this, the House Committee on Armed Services has prepared a bill, and will present it shortly, which carries on this same operation. It is in different language, yes, but it will carry on the same activity that we proposed a year ago and which was adopted a year ago, and which has proved itself in operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has expired.

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

This is a wonderful time in the consideration of this bill for us to beat our breasts and talk about how much we love free enterprise. Most Members are on the floor and I do not see a man before me on either side of the aisle who is not devoted to free enterprise and willing to fight for it on any and all occasions. We are now fighting for the cause of free enterprise and economy and good management. But there is some degree of shadow boxing in this demonstration. One would think that the administration is just about ready to get the Government out of business. The Defense Department, headed by Secretary Wilson, is employing at this time about 1,170,000 civilians. About one-half of these people are directly or indirectly engaged in business-type or semibusiness-type operations. One would think that except for Congress Secretary Wilson would turn all these business-type operations over to private business. Please do not be misled; these are not the facts.

Under this section of the law all the Secretary has to do is to tell the Congress that he wants to discontinue a certain operation and we have 90 days in which to veto it. If we take no action, the Secretary is free to act. He sent up 112 sug-

gestions and we agreed with him in all but 9. I have a list of the 112 here. The list is far from being impressive. Here it is: Officials wanted to close up coffee roasting shops in Atlanta, Auburn, Oakland, and in New York, and a few other places. The shops were using 191 people. We told them to go ahead. They could have done this 3 years ago. No one was stopping them. Not even this section of the bill was in effect until less than a year ago.

Then there is a ropewalk in Boston. They wanted to close that up. There are 78 people involved there. Out of this 1,170,000 civilians employed by the Department of Defense, there were 78 employed at the ropewalk. They wanted to close up the ropewalk, and under section 633 they cannot close it up over congressional objections but they can reduce it to one man, can reduce operations to the very minimum and let much of the work out to private enterprise. The ropewalk is, in a measure, a research and development project.

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

Mr. MAHON. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This ropewalk the Navy wants to close up received notice last June that they were going to be closed up, but due to a little political manipulation it still keeps open.

I would, however, like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we have a cordage company in Plymouth where the first people in the United States landed with the exception of the Virginia colony. What about their business? What about the Government going in competition with the Plymouth Cordage Co. or the New Bedford Cordage Co.? Is there anything in the Constitution that gives them that right?

Mr. MAHON. I believe this ropewalk is not manufacturing any rope at this time. It is mostly experimental. In time of war it does engage in considerable production.

I suggest that the gentleman discuss the problem with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Wigglesworth].

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

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

Mr. McCormack. That ropewalk has only been in existence since 1837.

Mr. MAHON. And here they have 51 people at a paint shop in Norfolk and some in Mare Island; and here is a bakery in Camp Kilmer with 9 people, and here is a cobbler shop. We are getting the Government out of business in a big way. Is this not wonderful? A cobbler shop in Gary Air Force Base in Texas, one man. We are getting the Government out of business. This is mostly administration propaganda.

And here is a cobbler shop at another Air Force base. We surely are getting the Government out of business in a big way—one part-time employee, that is all at this particular base.

This is so laughable. And over here in Fort Francis E. Warren, in Wyoming,

they want to do away with the cobbler shop there and displace one cobbler. We agreed to all this but please do not think that this indicates that the Defense Department is really getting the Government out of business.

Go through this list. None of the projects amount to anything much compared to the total number of civilians employed by the Defense Department. The Defense Department is not getting out of business; the Defense Department has a half million people in commercial-type activities, and they come in here with this chickenfeed, this gesture which is apparently meant to impress people.

In the Department of Defense there are hundreds of thousands of people employed in arsenals, navy yards, repair depots and places of that sort. Do not be deceived by the discontinuance of a few cobbler shops, bakeries and minor operations where only a handful of people are normally employed. The Defense Department is making practically no progress in getting the Government out of business. The window dressing is not impressive if you take a good look at it.

I would be interested in knowing if the Defense Department wants to get out of business in a substantial way, removing thousands of civilians from Government payrolls, making a substantial reduction in the 1,170,000 civilians on the Defense payrolls. No such suggestion has been made by this Administration. I would be glad to agree to vast reductions if the cause of economy and defense can thereby be served.

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

(By unanimous consent Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. MAHON. I want to continue speaking about the importance of the Government getting out of business. Yes, I yield to the gentleman briefly, to my friend.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If all this is chickenfeed why not throw it all out and just forget about it?

Mr. MAHON. It is regrettable that the Government is not doing a better job of getting out of business. I have not heard from responsible officials any real substantial recommendation that the Government get out of business, particularly the Defense Department.

Secretary Wilson has a good sense of humor and he takes all this with a twinkle in his eye and a large grain of salt. On page 101 of the hearings on defense appropriations, Mr. Sikes said:

I take it that this section has not caused you any material difficulty in its operation.

Secretary Wilson replied:

I do not think so. It is just one of the added ones, you know, around your neck. We can carry that load.

If you knock the section out of the bill—that is a matter for you to decide—please do not think that free enterprise, which we all represent, has won a signal victory, because it will be pretty empty, just a few cobblers, bakers, candlestick makers and a small number of others.

They are the only ones involved and unfortunately the Government seems to find it necessary to remain in business-type activity in a big way.

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

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

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if the gentleman has not found that some of these eliminations are somewhat of an ideological spur which the Defense Department has given. I know of cases in my Navy Yard where it would increase greatly the expense to the Defense Department if certain activities were eliminated.

Mr. MAHON. There is one forge in the world capable of making the chain for the *Forrestal* carrier. It is in the Navy Yard. The committee was told that in order to make a showing on private enterprise, officials tried to give private enterprise the contract, then they found they would have to lease the forge to private enterprise to make this chain for the *Forrestal* carrier. How ridiculous can you get?

Mr. PELLY. I support the gentleman's position.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Is it not true, speaking of the chain for the *Forrestal* carrier, which was made at the Boston Shipyard, the contract had originally been let out to a private contractor to make the chain, but he came back to the Government saying he did not have the proper dies to make the chain and he returned the contract to the shipyard so that the shipyard might make the chain?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. We do not want the Government competing with private enterprise but there are instances, like in connection with the making of the chain for this big carrier, that it would seem utterly ridiculous to change the present procedure.

Let me make this point clear. Congress gave the Defense Department the money to set up the forging plant to make the big chain for the *Forrestal* carrier. Under section 633 it is provided that before the Defense Department can discontinue the operation, Congress must be consulted and given an opportunity to take affirmative action in opposition. If no affirmative action in opposition is taken, the Defense Department is free to abandon the enterprise. Why should not Congress keep its fingers on the purse strings and try to see to it that an increasingly better job is done when Government funds are involved. Business-type operations in the Government came into being through congressional appropriations. Congress should have some say-so in what is done with these activities. Expensive Government machinery should not be abandoned and heavy losses to the taxpayers incurred without Congress having an opportunity to take action.

As stated before, the Defense Department has suggested the closing of 112 business-type operations such as cobbler shops, et cetera. Congress has concurred in the closing of 103 of these installations. I feel confident that Secretary of

Defense Wilson feels that he is maintaining a wonderful batting average, and I do not believe that he is too unhappy about the situation.

I voted against this amendment when it was presented to the Appropriations Committee last year. I am about to decide that it is not such a bad amendment after all. I trust that we shall have an opportunity to concur in the closing of a much larger number of business-type Government-operated facilities. I certainly favor such action if such action is in the interest of national defense and economy.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is mighty easy for us to get exercised over issues here in the House, particularly where it is represented as being pro or anti private enterprise. Understand, there are about \$34 billion in this bill and our activities are spread throughout the world. Back through the years there have been many services, many things in our Military Establishment and many times those things had to be made by the Military Establishment itself. The Congress has made appropriations for these activities and for these workings in the Military Department. Now, due to the fact we are not actually at war, with time we have found that many of these activities could well be stopped by the Military Department and placed with private business even though the Congress has provided funds for these particular activities for years.

What has the Congress done in this section? It has said that we recognize that with changed conditions many of these activities could well be done away with but since we have given the money for these activities for years and since it may be essential to continue some of them, we direct that the military report to the Congress these activities which they have been carrying on for all of these years which have served the needs of the Service, but which the Department of Defense now wishes to close. We say, "Tell us about them before closure." There were only 9 out of 112 submissions where the committee has said the military should carry on. Why? Much of the work to support a big Military Establishment is research in its nature. You have to determine the type of rope and how the rope will stand up under trying conditions. You have to determine what kind of paint will stand up under the conditions of warfare. The Government is going to have to do much of that research.

Is it not sound to manufacture at least some quantity of the product on which you are doing experimental research so that in the use the military can minimize the cost of your research, or is it better to stick to less and invite somebody to go into business to produce something that the Government knows all about where the Government has to provide all of the initial expenses? There have been 9 times where we have said that since you have to carry on this research to serve the needs of the military department, we think you should produce enough of this product that you

will have a sufficient quantity to really try out the results of your research.

My friends, it is one thing to favor private enterprise, and we should; it is quite another thing to set up a new private enterprise at increased cost of research carried on by your Government and give a handout to somebody that wants to move in on the Government. We need Government out of business, but we need some business in Government. Here again the Congress has told the military through the years, by giving them appropriations and approving their activities that "We support these many, many activities that you do; we give you the money for it; it is working well. Now we have agreed that much of it should quit." But, in order to be on sound ground, we have said, "Tell the Congress about it so Congress can at least tell the public what is going on, so it will be the real McCoy." Now, the rope factory, the chain factory, and the 8 or 9 other instances that have been outlined, you will find that the service affected, the service which knew about it, the service which we depend on, has been in accord with the Congress. It is the national Defense Department which has issued orders to the particular service, because somewhere somebody started this drive: Let us get the Government out of private business, even if we do it at tremendous cost to the taxpayers. I say you go too far when you overlook the last statement that I made.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time just simply to serve notice on the House and on the Committee that there will be no more extensions of time, because I shall object.

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

Mr. Chairman, like my colleague from Illinois, I, too, in the past have proposed an amendment to strike this section from the bill. Let me say to my good friend from Texas, whom I admire, that Secretary Wilson may have said that he could live with this, but it is just like living with the measles. When we have them, we have to live with them, but you would be lots better off without them. So, I think we could get along without this.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge that section 633, which is a proposed reenactment of section 638 embodied in the Defense Department appropriation bill last year, be stricken from the pending defense appropriation bill. It precludes the Secretary of Defense from disposing of any of the innumerable business enterprises in which our vast Defense Establishment has been engaged without first having the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

In the first place, this provision has no rightful place in an appropriation bill. It is not a limitation on an appropriation. It is legislation, pure and simple, over which the Committee on Appropriations, in my opinion, has no jurisdiction whatsoever. In this instance, and in altogether too many instances, the Appropriations Committee has arbitrarily arrogated to itself legislative powers that

belong exclusively to our Committee on Armed Services.

Day in and day out our Armed Services Committee reviews the various aspects and countless operations of our Military Establishment. No real estate is acquired or disposed of by the Defense Department without the proposition being first reviewed by our committee. Members of our committee have an intimate, firsthand knowledge of every phase of our defense needs, functions, and operations, both at home and abroad. I think it is fair to say, and I do so with all due respect to the Appropriations Committee, that the Armed Services Committee is much more familiar with defense operations than the Appropriations Committee could possibly be. That is part of our job, so to speak.

Whether the Secretary of Defense should or should not discontinue any of the specific business-type enterprises in which our Military Establishment has been engaged is something for the Armed Services Committee to decide. There is no reason whatever why the Appropriations Committee should have the right to make such decisions. For that reason, if for no other, this section, giving the Appropriations Committee the right of review that belongs to the Armed Services Committee, should be stricken from the bill.

But there are other reasons, Mr. Chairman, why this provision should be eliminated. It retards, delays, and obstructs the splendid job our Secretary of Defense has been doing in taking the Government out of business in competition with private enterprise. And, in my judgment, taking the Federal Government out of those enterprises and activities that rightfully belong to private enterprise is one of the major undertakings of the present administration. I can see no reason for this provision except to obstruct the program and to protect certain bureaucratic vested interests.

At the last session of the Congress the Hoover Commission submitted its report on business enterprises in which the Federal Government is engaged. The magnitude and diversity of such operations is almost beyond imagination. To say the least, it is shocking and alarming. It has constituted a threat to our system of private, competitive enterprise, as well as an unnecessary burden on American taxpayers.

The Hoover Commission reported that in the Defense Department alone the total number of Government commercial and industrial type facilities probably exceeds 2,500, in which the capital investment probably exceeds \$15 billion, involving 47 different categories of activities, such as coffee roasting plants, ice cream plants, cement mixing, jewelry repair shops, and even tree and garden nurseries.

To be sure, some of the business enterprise activities are essential to the Defense Establishment, such as when private enterprise itself cannot provide the service or possibly because of geographic isolation. But, at the very least, half of the defense facilities of this character could be eliminated without injury to our national defense or any essential governmental function.

In accordance with the Hoover Commission recommendations our able Secretary of Defense undertook to eliminate the unessential, and he has made excellent progress in that regard. He has been endeavoring to dispose of those facilities which have been in competition with private enterprise, where the capital invested could be recovered and where unnecessary expenditure and losses could be eliminated.

To this worthy undertaking on the part of the Secretary of Defense resistance developed. Personnel of the agencies operating the facilities protested. They did not want to lose their jobs. Citizens in the communities where the facilities were located protested. They did not want to lose this special benefit to their area. These vested interests, regardless of the public interest, seem to have been sufficiently loud and strong in their selfish protests to cause the Congress to write into the appropriation bill at the last session this wholly unnecessary restriction on the Secretary of Defense.

Except in a very few instances, Government business-type enterprises pay no taxes, little or no interest on the capital invested and generally the directing personnel is on the Government payroll. All this comes out of the taxpayer's pocket. Not only that, with the Government operating the business instead of private enterprise the Government is deprived of taxes that it would get from a private operation.

Section 633 of this bill brings into sharp focus the basic issue: shall we serve the public interest or shall we yield to the vested interests? If we want to serve the public interest, if we are really interested in getting the Government out of competition with private enterprise, we will vote to remove this provision from the bill.

The Hoover Commission made an exhaustive study of our governmental organization and operations. It was a monumental undertaking, with its findings and recommendations filling 38 volumes of ways and means to make our Government more efficient and to eliminate waste and duplication. It has outlined the way by which over \$7 billion a year could be saved.

And yet this Congress has done nothing by way of legislation to carry out even a part of these recommendations. On the contrary, it is proposed by this provision to restrict the Secretary of Defense in his efforts to do what he can by administrative action for accomplishing what the Hoover Commission recommended for his Department.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask if that means that Members who are not standing may claim time under that agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will note the Members standing and allocate the time among them.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object, unless I may have 4 minutes.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Section 633 of the Defense appropriations bill is not discriminatory against private business. It does not prohibit the transfer of an activity now performed by the Government to private industry. All that it does is to safeguard the interests of the Nation by assuring that any proposed transfers are proper and for the good of the entire country.

I think the best refutation of the arguments being presented here this afternoon for the elimination of section 633 is to be found in the report which accompanied last year's appropriation bill. That report stated:

Attention of the committee has, on a number of occasions, been directed toward plans within the Department of Defense for the disposal or transfer of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Defense Department. The committee recognizes that there may be circumstances which make a contract operation more desirable than continuations of work by civilian personnel. In some instances, however, this represents a radical departure from established customs and it is conceivable that contract operations could, if carried to extremes, result in a loss of trained personnel and know-how within the departments with the dispersal of tools and facilities and result in an actually greater cost to the Government over the years. Particularly would this be true in the event of a sudden emergency which would require rapid expansion of on-base activities. In view of the Government's own great investment in its shops and facilities and the know-how of its civilian personnel and because of the committee's responsibility in the matter of appropriations it is felt that a justification of transfers before the appropriate committees of Congress is proper before the transfers take place.

All of us here know that the most peculiar rules of conduct in all the world are the rules applied by executive agencies in the interpretation of congressional intent. I have sat in on committee hearings on all manner of things from vocational rehabilitation to control of Indian lands—and listened to administrators of executive agencies tell Congressmen what Congress meant when it enacted a specific piece of legislation. I can recall very vividly the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor protesting that the United States Office of Education was not interpreting the law on vocational education in the manner in which the chairman had intended it should be interpreted when he helped to write the law. I can recall that

the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] then told the United States Office of Education that he knew what he had in mind when the law was written. The executive agency officials did not agree with him and there was little if anything that the cosponsor of that legislation could do about it.

I am talking from experience. I do not want to have that situation repeated.

I am quite willing to agree that the Defense Department should have some leeway in the awarding of contracts for the production of goods and services required by Military Establishments. However, I want it made clear right now that I cannot bring myself to the point where I am a party to granting to the Defense Establishment—or any other executive agency—what amounts to carte blanche authority to determine the areas within which the military establishments of our country shall take care of their own needs. You permit them to have this authority by your action today and you will live to regret the manner in which they will interpret that grant of power.

Far more than dollars and cents is involved here. Homes and families are of much greater concern than would appear whenever an executive agency official points to what he claims is a help to the national budget.

If the attitude of the Defense Department, as it is presently being demonstrated, is permitted to go unchallenged, it is my opinion that without doubt such conduct will be encouraged in all other Federal agencies. There are many, many thousands of Federal employees who will be threatened with the possibility of sacrificing years of faithful service to the whim of some official who encourages the demands of private corporations who seek first, last, and always their own preferred position in the economic life of the country.

I am fearful that the exercise of this authority to curtail and eliminate Federal activities which now employ hundreds of thousands of people, under the guise of helping private industry, actually will result in depriving those hundreds of thousands of the means of earning a living, paying for their homes, educating their children and contributing their share to the growth of a healthy economy. In all honesty, I say this autocratic authority in the hands of Federal officials—and I sincerely fear its spread beyond the ranks of the Defense Establishment—can have a most damaging effect upon the proper functioning of all Federal activities.

All I ask is that this Congress, made up of men and women elected by the people of the country, be afforded the honorable and honest privilege of taking a second look at the curtailment of any Federal activity which employs those who in the last analysis are the heads of America's families.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, years ago it used to be possible for the Committee on Appropriations to go over these Government industries and analyze them and do what it could to get

rid of those that were not desirable. Today it cannot be done. There is no report made of all these operations and what they are doing, all these activities that infringe upon private industry. Let us adopt this amendment and fix it so that the Department of Defense can do what it believes ought to be done to get rid of them. It is time we did something along that line and stopped interfering with proper efforts on the part of the Department. Whatever happens, I am going to try next year to see that the Department of Defense comes forward not only with the 8 or 10 that they want to get rid of but the 400 or 500 that I believe they really should get rid of right away.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Allen amendment to strike section 633 from the bill.

All of us will recognize that this section is contrary to our general philosophy. All of us will agree with the theory that the Government should relinquish as many industrial and commercial activities as possible.

Perhaps it is natural for a congressional committee, such as the Committee on Appropriations, to desire to keep whatever authority may be placed in its hands. However, the existence of section 633 is harmful for the Appropriations Committee and harmful for the Department of Defense because it is an open invitation to backscratching among members of the Appropriations Committee.

It has been suggested that this section does no harm, that section 633 in the current year's Defense Department appropriations bill has worked out satisfactorily. Such proponents have cited the language of Secretary of Defense Wilson to the effect that the Department of Defense has not had much trouble with section 633. Does it not seem rather strange that the same people who now rely on Secretary Wilson's single sentence are for the most part the same people who delight in taking Secretary Wilson's statements out of context for the purpose of criticism and ridicule?

In fact, this section does more harm than shows on the surface. Certainly, people in the Department of Defense are aware that some very important Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are interested in specific industrial and commercial activities now being conducted by the Department of Defense. Certainly, they are aware that influential members of the committee which passes on defense appropriations are personally concerned and interested in certain such industrial and commercial activities. I think it is logical to believe that the hullabaloo which has been raised over such items as a ropewalk and a telephone exchange has prevented the Department from submitting other discontinuances for approval.

I can hardly follow the logic of the chairman of our subcommittee, Mr. MAHON, of Texas, when he stated in effect that the way to encourage the Department of Defense to get out of busi-

ness was to continue this roadblock in the way of doing just that.

Does it not appear incongruous that here we are today appropriating \$33.7 billion to the Department of Defense under terms which permit great latitude and discretion and yet we will not permit the Secretary of Defense to exercise his judgment on the question of an operation of a ropewalk or telephone exchange?

In our subcommittee markup session I offered an amendment to strike section 633. In the full committee, Mr. HAND, of New Jersey, offered an amendment to strike that section. Both efforts were defeated. I hope the House will reverse those previous decisions by adopting the Allen amendment here today.

One further suggestion. If the House does not see fit to strike out section 633, I hope it will permit it to remain as is. In other words, I think the choice should be between the present language and the complete deletion of that language. I believe any so-called attempt to write compromise language can only be confusing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman. There will be no transfers of time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support section 633. It was interesting to note in the discussions here that there are only nine industries presently active in the navy yards, as I understand, and two in the Boston Naval Shipyard located in my district.

It is interesting that it was in the 20th Congress, in 1828, that the ropewalk was first established. For about 125 years now there have been certain people who have been trying to close this ropewalk over the objection of the Navy itself. Now, the Department of Defense wants to close the ropewalk over the objections of the Navy. Rope is a strategic material. It is one of the most important things used by the Navy. It is an integral part of the Navy. Actually, how much rope is manufactured in the ropewalk? The figures show that 1½ percent of the rope manufactured in the United States is manufactured in the Navy ropewalk. They make rope for the Navy. During the Korean conflict in 1952, the Federal Government bought for defense purposes 11½ billion pounds of rope. Three and one-half billion pounds of rope was manufactured in the ropewalk itself. We have heard all these bleeding hearts for small business, but I want to point out that there are only 15 manufacturers of rope and cordage in the United States. When it comes to the kind of rope that is manufactured at the Boston Naval Shipyard ropewalk, there are only four manufacturers of rope in America who are able to compete and bid. This is not small business.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we had this fight last year and on a roll-

call vote we kept the Sikes provision in. There will be another rollcall vote if the Committee of the Whole adopts it. The Sikes amendment is commonsense. I hope the Allen amendment to strike it out is defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. I thank my colleague. At the present time, there are only 33 employees in this ropewalk in Boston. There were about 50 employees in the chain shop. We have heard about the controversy in the colloquy which was had with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. Actually, a contract was awarded to a company to build a die link chain for the *Forrestal*. They returned that part of the contract saying that they did not have dies sufficiently large enough to make the chain. So actually the chain had to be made in the Boston shipyard. Of the 112 businesses that were in the navy yards there are only 9 at the present time in operation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has mentioned the number of employees. It is just a paltry few. We need these businesses that we have in the shipyards at the present time. We need them for the defense of the Nation. That is the reason. In 1939, when the draft act went through, and when we needed rope and cordage for tents, these 15 cordage plants could not supply it. If it had not been for the naval shipyard ropewalk, we would not have had enough material to supply our Armed Forces. In 1952, if it had not been for the fact that we had the ropewalk at the navy yard, the ships of the United States Navy and the soldiers who were in Korea would not have had sufficient rope. This ropewalk is needed in the event of a national emergency.

The Federal Government and the taxpayers of the United States have over \$2 million invested in this activity. Do you want to shut down that plant? What about the taxpayers' investments? What about the welfare of these employees who have given a lifetime of service to their country?

The real issue is what is in the best interest of the national defense.

Those who best answer this are the Navy themselves. They are for the retaining of these plants.

I hope the Sikes—section 633—amendment remains in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, there is concern upon my part because of the effort that certain Members of great influence in the House insist that an amendment of the bill be made to strike out section 633, which reads as follows:

SEC. 633. No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work that has been for a period of 3 years or more performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless justified to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, at least 90 days in advance of such disposal or transfer, that its discontinuance is economically sound and the work is capable of performance by a

contractor without danger to the national security: *Provided*, That no such disposal or transfer shall be made if disapproved by either committee within the 90-day period by written notice to the Secretary of Defense.

The above section is placed in the bill to prevent the closing down of any military installations unless and until the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, or either of them, either approve or fail to express dissent within the 90-day period.

This section has been included in the bill because too often there is an apparent desire upon the part of the Defense Department to close down facilities that have been built up through a period of years and have rendered, and still are rendering, valuable service to the Government. There is a prevalent thought in some quarters that private enterprise should take over all facilities that are capable of operation by it regardless of the efficiency of the operation that is being conducted by Government agencies.

There are many reasons that could be urged in opposition to such a course, among which are the following:

First. The effect on the employees that are now, and in some cases have been for many years, employed by the Government in these facilities would be most unfortunate. These employees have as high a degree of efficiency as exists in private industry. They have continued with the agency for many years. They are anxious to make it their career. They have gained seniority rights that could not be gained if suddenly placed in private industry.

Second. Many of these employees have made a career of their work with the Government. In many instances they have given years of faithful service. Thus, their age would prevent them going into private industry, and certainly it would be impossible for them to gain the status and security rights they now possess. All of this would be destroyed as they entered private employment. Their seniority and civil service security rights would be a thing of the past. Furthermore, most of them, as they applied for jobs in private industry, would be met by the age barrier that so frequently prevents them from gaining employment after reaching 45 years of age. These difficulties are real and substantial and should be recognized by those in the higher echelons. Unfortunately, such is not always the case. Too frequently the desire to eliminate Government work, that can be done in private industry, overlooks the human element, namely the effect on the worker and his family when dismissed from a Government job. The dollar and cent argument is given precedence over the human welfare argument. This should not be the case.

Third. But even if the dollar and cent viewpoint is given consideration, then it might be examined from the standpoint that many Government facilities are, in effect, pilot plants. They do not do enough work to disturb private industry or make it worth while for private industry to reach out and take it over. But the part that is done by a Govern-

ment facility, small in amount though it may be, is nevertheless sufficient to fix and determine proper specifications and fair price. Thus, Government facilities are justified as a check on improper specifications, type and character of work done, and most important to make certain that the price is right. The work done under Government operation thus pays for itself many times over in making sure that the Government gets what it is entitled to and at a proper price.

Fourth. It has also been shown that the cost to the Government in maintaining these services and facilities has shown that Government operation is not any more expensive than private operation. Thus, even on a dollar-and-cent theory there is no real or practical reason for destroying Government facilities that by their very nature have and still are protecting the Government from overcharges or improper workmanship that could easily result if such Government activity did not exist.

Fifth. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that these Government facilities also provide a skeleton force that can be quickly and effectively used in the case of emergency. This phase of the situation cannot be overestimated. Innumerable examples could be given where private industry was not in a position to immediately take up production and make delivery without disturbing the work they were doing as private concerns. The Government, time and again, has had to call on its facilities to do what private industry was not in a position to do. This in itself, in my opinion, is sufficient to justify the existence of Government facilities.

There are many additional reasons that could be offered of a substantial character in opposition to the removal of the slight protection to workers and the Government that is given by section 633 of the bill. This section should remain. In fact, it is my opinion that it could with great advantage be even increased in strength as a protection to workers and the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, section 633 of the Defense Appropriations Act for 1957 is highly undesirable. The Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in its report on Government business enterprises found that there were at least 2,500 separate business enterprises in the Department of Defense. The Hoover Commission, which was charged by Congress with the task of recommending the termination of unnecessary business enterprises of the Government, found that at least 1,000 of these business enterprises ought to be eliminated. It made specific recommendations for the elimination of many types of these activities.

Section 633 is an unnecessary barrier to the Department of Defense in the elimination of unnecessary business enterprises. In the first place, the section slows up the process because the Department must give to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses at least

90 days notice of its intention to close any such activity.

Second, because this provision gives to each of the two Appropriations Committees a veto on such closings, it constitutes an unnecessary hurdle to the closing of undesirable business enterprises of the Government. Although, out of some 112 enterprises that have been submitted by the Secretary of Defense, only 9 have been rejected by an Appropriations Committee. I am afraid that when it comes to closing significant enterprises, the record will not be as good. Many of the enterprises that have been submitted since last August have been very small and insignificant. The only really significant ones that have been submitted have been rejected; that is, the paint factories at Norfolk and Mare Island Navy Yards, and the ropewalk and chain factory at the Boston Navy Yard.

Third, this provision implies that the Appropriations Committees have a better understanding of what is necessary for the defense of the country than the Secretary of Defense because it confers upon either committee the right to veto purely administrative action.

Fourth, this provision is an unconstitutional intrusion of Congress into the executive sphere of the Government. President Eisenhower, a year ago when he signed the 1956 Appropriations Act, made clear his strong opposition to the inclusion of a comparable section at that time. His opposition was based upon the ground that this was an improper intrusion by Congress into the executive sphere.

The Attorney General in a statement of July 14, 1955, indicated that he considered this section to be unconstitutional. He said in part:

The practical effect of these provisions is to vest the power to administer the particular program jointly in the Secretary of Defense and the members of the Appropriations Committees, with the overriding right to forbid action reserved to the two committees. This, I believe, engrafts executive functions upon legislative members and thus overreaches the permitted sweep of legislative authority. At the same time, it serves to usurp power conferred to the executive branch. The result, therefore, is violative of the fundamental constitutional principle of separation of powers prescribed in articles I and II of the Constitution which places the legislative power in the Congress and the executive power in the executive branch.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the inclusion of section 633 in the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offered during general debate this morning what I hoped were cogent reasons for passing this amendment. I now rise, being persistent, merely to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SYKES] the question for which he did not have time to yield to me a little earlier.

What are the nine enterprises which the Defense Department wished to terminate and for the termination of which the Appropriations Committee refused permission?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentlewoman will yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. They are a paint shop at Mare Island, with 52 people employed. The ropewalk in Boston, with 78 employees. The chain forge plant in Boston. A micrometer shop employing about 12 people in Norfolk, and other small facilities.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman would place the rest of the list in the RECORD, because of the limitation on my time.

Mr. MAHON. Certainly. I shall gladly do so.

There have been two reports submitted by the committee which explain our action on the Department proposals, parts of which I insert at this point. To these inserts I have added the numbers of employees involved.

#### REPORT OF JANUARY 13, 1956

In compliance with provisions of the above, the Department of Defense has by letters of August 8, 1955, November 3, 1955, November 17, 1955, and January 4, 1956, advised the committee of its intent to discontinue a total of 56 commercial and industrial type operations and facilities at various Army, Navy, and Air Force installations. Although, with respect to the activities contained in the Department's letter of August 8, the 90-day period expired November 7, the committee requested and the Department agreed to withhold action until the reconvening of Congress in order that full and proper consideration could be given the Department's proposals.

The hearings on these facilities disclosed considerable doubt as to the advisability of closing the following facilities and which, accordingly, are disapproved by the committee. These are as follows:

	Number of employees
Ropewalk, Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.-----	78
Chain manufacturing, Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.-----	42
Paint manufacturing, Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif.-----	52
Paint manufacturing, Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va.-----	51

The committee is of the belief that the ropewalk should be continued in operation to the extent necessary to provide the Navy with adequate research and development and testing facilities. Obviously a certain amount of rope will have to continue to be manufactured for this purpose, and it would seem that production adequate to an economical operation should be planned.

It was testified that the chain manufacturing shop is the only such shop where chains for the *Forrestal*-type carriers can be manufactured. This type production is planned to be continued by the Navy. However, as in the case of the ropewalk, sufficient output of other chains should be planned if necessary to insure economical operation. When and if requirements for the *Forrestal*-type carriers are fulfilled, another review of the chain manufacturing facility will be in order.

With respect to the paint manufacturing plants at Norfolk and Mare Island, the committee is convinced that it is premature to close these plants at this time. Information received indicates that the industry is not quite prepared to assume production of certain special-type paints now being manufactured. Many of the Navy ships are required to remain at sea for long periods of time and a special type paint, which has been developed by the Navy, and which is presently being used for this purpose, is not readily available from private industry. The

Navy requested bids of 47 paint manufacturing companies some time ago for certain types of required paint, and only one qualified offer was received. Under all the circumstances, the committee feels that it would not be in the best interest of national defense or the Government for the paint shops at Norfolk and Mare Island to be discontinued. However, the committee would be glad to give further consideration to the matter at some future time if the situation is changed.

#### REPORT OF MAY 3, 1956

In compliance with provisions of the above, the Department of Defense has by letters of March 6 and 17, 1956, advised the committee of its intent to discontinue a total of 56 commercial and industrial-type operations and facilities at various Army, Navy, and Air Force installations, covering 9 types of activities. These are in addition to the 56 installations previously submitted and on which the committee has already acted.

Justifications for the closing of these facilities and testimony by other than departmental witnesses were carefully reviewed by the committee. It would appear that sufficient doubt exists as to the advisability of closing the photographic equipment and supply facilities and the watch, clock, and jewelry repair shops which, accordingly, are disapproved by the committee. These facilities are as follows:

	Number of employees
Photographic equipment and supplies:	
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.-----	1
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.-----	2
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.-----	2
Watch, clock, and jewelry repair:	
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va.-----	12
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.-----	9

As to the first category, information received by the committee indicates that Government production of sensitized blueprint paper, the function of these facilities, results in a total annual saving of \$57,846 when compared to costs under private contract at reasonable competitive prices. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) responsible for the administration of section 638 was requested on April 16 to supply the committee with cost data for use in its consideration of the item. This information was not received in time to be of value.

With respect to the second category, above, it should be stated that the heading, as submitted by the Department of Defense, is somewhat misleading. It was testified by employees engaged in this activity at the Norfolk shipyard that these shops are primarily chronometer repair facilities and only a portion of the work is on clocks or watches. The shops have nothing to do with jewelry.

The present facilities were established in 1950 at the time this work was discontinued at the Naval Observatory in Washington, D. C., with one chronometer repair shop on each coast. In proposing discontinuance, the Department in its justifications stated, " \* \* \* it has been determined appropriate to negotiate a one-year trial contract with commercial firms for a portion of the chronometer repair work prior to making a final determination on the future operation of these two facilities. In other words, the Department itself does not know whether or not this work can be performed satisfactorily under private contract. In the meantime it would be risking the loss of the experts it now employs for this purpose. It was also testified, and with considerable logic, that even if the repair and testing of

chronometers were done under contract, the chronometers, because of the high degree of accuracy and extremely limited performance tolerances required, would have to be retested before placement on ships on account of possible damage resulting from shipment and handling. It does not appear that the proposal to discontinue these facilities has been given very thoughtful consideration.

The committee is dissatisfied with the manner in which this provision of law has been administered and with the poor judgment shown in certain of the proposals for discontinuing activities made to the Congress thus far. Provisions of the section are recommended for inclusion in the Department of Defense Appropriation bill for 1957. Additional comments of the committee on this provision are found in the report accompanying that bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sure of that. I would like to say this, that we fought over this matter last year. There are many of us who might be affected by accepting this amendment. We are not unaware, further, of the human values involved, to which consideration should be given, and will be given, by those making the decisions.

Yet surely those decisions can and should be left to the Defense Department—and Congress should remove this unconstitutional roadblock to its serious attempts at efficiency and economy.

Some time ago in the other body a notable young Senator wrote a stirring book called *Profiles in Courage*. I think that we need that kind of courage here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. We are considering here an appropriation bill for the national defense, for military departments, and facilities upon which our Nation must depend for its safety. Our prime purpose here then is to see to it that our national defense is equipped with all of the facilities to do the job required to adequately and completely protect this Nation.

In various areas of the Nation are located these facilities—the arsenals and navy yards on which the Army, Navy, and Air Force must depend for the production of certain types and kinds of tools and equipment needed by these military services.

Under the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, the manufacture, the production, of these military equipment necessities would be channeled into private business and taken from the arsenals and navy yards. To do this is an erroneous step for this Nation to take, and, very briefly, this is the reason it is wrong. Private business operates for profit and private gain. The arsenals and navy yards do not. They operate for the benefit of the military services. In the arsenals and navy yards there are thousands of highly skilled workers of many years experience. If the work is taken away from the arsenals and navy yards in favor of private business these facilities must close down much of their operation. This means the skilled workers must go. They must

sell their homes, uproot their families, and go wherever they can get employment. The important fact is they are lost to the navy yards and arsenals for good.

Now if this country should find itself in an emergency facing war or actually in war as we did on December 7, 1941, the military services are going to need the arsenals and navy yards in full capacity. Where would they obtain skilled workers? The older ones would be gone and there would be none in the process of training. Great manufacturing processes and operations cannot be built overnight. In any future war however, 24 hours will be a long time and very vital to the safety of our country.

This appropriation bill is for \$32 billion. It is extremely foolish to throw away manufacturing processes and operations and organizations that have taken many years to perfect and billions of the taxpayers money to develop into the efficient facilities they are at this moment.

Our national defense is too vital, too precious, too well organized to be wrecked by political considerations bordering on the selfish. These political pressures to chip away the work so ably done, so efficiently performed by our arsenals and navy yards are resulting in a great disservice, and a great mistake.

There is enough needs of various types in this great Nation for private business. There is no need whatsoever to destroy the work of the arsenals and navy yards on the political grounds this work is needed by private business. To play politics with the national defense is to play with ultimate disaster. The manufacture of munitions, parts for guns, parts for ships, parts for airplanes is a very important operation. Upon the performance of these parts depends the lives of the military men using them and countless others. They must be made perfectly. On a number of occasions, it has been found, private business failed to measure up and men have lost their lives. There is, also, always the possibility of sabotage. Private business cannot be screened as closely and efficiently as can the military services, the arsenals and the navy yards. This was proved during the last war.

It seems to me there is enough required by this country together with the world responsibility it has assumed, particularly with our allies, for private business to have all that it can handle without taking the work away from the arsenals and navy yards, the work they perform so well and on which so much and so many depend.

These, then, are some of the reasons why I am opposed to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is recognized.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the experience of this past year with the operation of this particular provision, it seems to me, points up very clearly the need for the continuation of this or a similar provision. We talk about small business. Once it was proposed to close the chronometer shop at Norfolk because the watch industry of this country was sick, yet there was a total of only

11 people employed in the chronometer shop. How silly can we get?

I completely agree that there are many of these things that should be closed but they should be done on the basis of practical commonsense.

I will agree also that perhaps consideration of specific proposals should be referred to the Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, but until we have the authority under which that committee can take these matters up we must retain this section 633.

I would like to mention just one specific proposal that was recently under consideration by the Department of Defense. That was a proposition to prohibit the manufacture of acetylene gas in the shipyard in Portsmouth in my district. Prominent business people in the shipbuilding and repair business tell me that the navy yard could not operate efficiently without producing and controlling the supply of acetylene. We must maintain our shipyards and we must permit and provide those essential subordinate activities which operating efficiency and effectiveness require.

I could cite other proposals which like this shows how far these crusaders would go if we let them. Congress must maintain a check on disposal as well as inauguration of business-type activities. Until new legislation is provided from the Armed Services Committee this section should be retained.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] is recognized.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing from distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee of the insignificant size of the commercial type operations involved in section 633. "An 11-man operation, a 31-man operation, a 50-man operation," they say. Their very testimony points out that this is truly small business which they are discussing; the very type of small business I am striving to protect from the competition of big government. The more they talk the more sure I am of the insidious qualities of section 633 which will be removed from this bill by the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

There are several vital issues which must be discussed this afternoon before we vote. Is this section of the bill constitutional? Is it proper and legal to direct the President to beg of the Congress permission to remove the Defense Department from areas of operations which are not its normal concern? Are we to allow log-rolling to rise above the welfare of our constituents?

When you vote on this amendment, today, remember President Eisenhower's message last year when he signed this same appropriation bill reluctantly and said, forcefully:

This section violates the constitutional principles that the three branches of the Government are separate and coequal. The Congress has the right and power to grant or to deny an appropriation, but once the appropriation is made the appropriation must, under the Constitution be administered by the executive branch of the Government alone, and the Congress has no right to confer upon its committees the

power to veto executive action or to prevent executive action from becoming effective.

Editorial comment from responsible publishers has been almost universally favorable to the elimination of this stumbling block in the path of Federal efficiency. In my own district the Indianapolis Star, the Indianapolis News, and the Indianapolis Times have expressed themselves in favor of the elimination of section 633 in the interest of economy, efficiency, and constitutional government. Only today, the Scripps-Howard publication in Washington, the Daily News, stated editorially, and I quote briefly:

Members of the House Appropriations Committee still are insisting on veto power over the Defense Department's program for the disposal of commercial and industrial facilities the Department doesn't need.

The Department was operating some 2,500 such businesses—from clothing factories and ice cream plants to cobbler shops and jewelry repair shops.

The Hoover Commission last year reported the Department could dispense with at least a thousand of these operations—to the large benefit of the taxpayers. But the Appropriations Committee stuck a rider on the money bill saying the Department had to get committee O. K. before dropping any of these enterprises.

Out of 112 proposals by the Department, the committee vetoed 9. And the Department went along with these vetoes—despite President Eisenhower's rebuke to the committee and his avowed intention to ignore the committee orders.

In the new Defense Department appropriation bill, on which the House was due to vote today, the veto "gimmick" is riding high. If the House doesn't kick it out, the Senate should. And if it stays in, the administration has a legal and moral obligation to disregard it.

The duty of Congress is to make policy. The duty of the executive department is to administer law.

My constituents are writing me daily in increasing numbers. They are clamoring and demanding economy and efficiency in Government to pave the way for tax reductions. They ask me, "What have you done to effectuate the recommendations of the Hoover Commission?" If this amendment goes to a record vote as the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, has suggested, my answer will be plain for all to see. This is the time the chips are down. Those who favor economy can clearly establish their position on this vote today. Only yesterday, the Honorable Thomas P. Pike, Assistant Secretary of Defense, stated in his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee that:

The Department of Defense is opposed to section 638 of the Defense Appropriations Act for 1956 and inclusion of section 633 contained in the Department of Defense appropriations bill for 1957 as reported out of committee.

A previous speaker has referred to those of us who believe that private enterprise can shoulder the responsibility for production for defense as being bleeding hearts. If this be so, I plead guilty, because I have heard few arguments today which establish to my satisfaction the necessity for placing in the path of the Secretary of Defense this legalistic hurdle. Back in 1951 the Bonner subcommittee, of which I was proud to be a

member, established the fact that the armed services were engaging unnecessarily and unprofitably in civilian-type enterprises. Wartimes must not be used as a peacetime excuse for the expansion of big government in competition with its small businesses.

The issue today is clear. When you vote for the Allen amendment to take out this section you vote in behalf of every small-business man in your district; you vote with every taxpayer who seeks economy and efficiency in Government; you support the Hoover Commission; and you vote against big government encroachment in the field of the small machine shop, the local carpenter, the local laundry and the small rubber stamp manufacturer. This is your chance, if you are for the small-business man. He is looking at you today. Stand up and be counted. He can share in our victory when this amendment is carried and the socialistic section 633 is finally removed from the Defense Department appropriation bill. You can share in his gratitude next November.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot more in this than just closing up a ropewalk. The Government in my day has gotten down to the proposition now of trying to run every city and town, trying to take over all the laws and their execution that have been passed through the last three centuries; and I think it is about time that the Government did what the Constitution says it should do. There is nothing in the Constitution that gives the Government the right to go into business. There are a hundred and one other things that the Government has assumed. It is about time that most of us should wake up here and get this Government where we had it. We have been making rope down in Plymouth for over 100 years.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that today we will start turning back this country to the State and to the people themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I support the Allen amendment and oppose the Sikes provision in the appropriation bill for two reasons. First, I think the Sikes provision is unconstitutional. Second, I think it is socialistic.

No one has had a greater desire than I to see the prerogatives of the Congress preserved. I have frequently complained that Congress has permitted the executive branch of the Government to invade the policymaking, legislative functions of the Congress and I have urged the Congress to take steps to recapture its policymaking power under the Constitution.

By the same token, I do not believe the Congress should attempt to engage in ministerial and executive activities, including day-to-day decisions of the character here involved. In fact, our attempt to invade executive functions and to assume them makes it less likely that we can recapture the policymaking authority which we have lost, because our

time is limited and there is just so much we can do.

Let us stick to policymaking and not attempt to invade the executive branch, and let us see that the Executive does not take any more power away from us.

The Sikes provision, while the magnitude of industrial operations it affects may not be great, expresses an underlying philosophy favoring Government performance of industrial and commercial operations instead of Government buying what it needs from the free-enterprise system under which our country has flourished.

This could go on. They start making boxes, then engage in scrap-metal processing, then coffee roasting, paint manufacturing and other manufacturing activities. Where is the end of it? You can justify all kinds of industrial activities such as making aircraft or tanks or ships under the philosophy of the Sikes amendment. Government in business is socialism.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I am for the Sikes amendment and against the Allen amendment, because the Sikes provision is constitutional and it is not socialistic.

The Constitution says that Congress shall provide the Army and Navy; and the President shall be Commander in Chief.

Why should we not inquire into our creature? We created the Army and Navy. Why should we not ask the Defense Department: We have given you that money, what are you doing with it? The Sikes amendment is abundantly sensible and predominantly constitutional. It is ridiculous to say it is not. Everybody knows that.

There is a lot of talk about some of these other things, such as the Hoover Commission. Reference has been made to the Hoover Commission. But they had someone in the Hoover Commission who had an ax to grind for some ship operating company. They came and got the Hoover Commission to say: Let us abolish the Military Sea Transport. If we had abolished the Military Sea Transport where would we have been in Korea when Harry Bridges closed up all the docks? Constitutional? Of course this is constitutional.

Let me tell you something else. We are going to take this thing up in the Committee on the Armed Services. We fought this thing out and we won. We are going to take this thing up in our committee, and that is where it belongs.

If you do not have an accounting of those people in the Defense Department, you do not know where you are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Allen amendment, and I want to say right off the bat that I am awfully sorry to notice that it is all Members on this side of the aisle who have risen to speak in behalf of it. I am very happy to see

the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services present.

Mr. VINSON. I have a very bad throat. I am for the Allen amendment. I only wish I could speak on it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The reason I made those remarks was because my interest in this matter came when, as a Member of the 82d Congress, I was a member of the Committee on Small Business and also of the Bonner subcommittee of the then Expenditures Committee. There we found out that there had grown up considerable competition to small business in the Military Establishment. Those committees were chaired by the Democrats, and a majority on the committees, of course, were Democrats, and I honor them for bringing this matter out. Here we have a chance to really continue on ahead with this program, and yet we find many of the people who were originally behind this program now trying to thwart it by throwing this particular Sikes amendment in the way.

There is one other aspect to the Allen amendment, and I have not much time to talk about it. It is not the United States Chamber of Commerce that is involved in this thing. I think the gentleman from Texas, listing these items as he did, clearly indicated that what I said is true, that we are talking about small business. That is the main area in which the Government is in competition. This is, indeed, a matter of private enterprise and of small business. I hope the Allen amendment will be adopted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under the privilege to extend my remarks, I want to discuss one other aspect of the defense appropriation bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee. I had wanted to bring the matter out on the floor, but the time limit on debate has precluded this. However, the purpose of calling the matter to the attention of the House and the public is served by this extension of my remarks.

The Appropriations Committee report on page 6 discusses the general problem of the reputed current scarcity of scientists and engineers. The report stated the committee "is not in position to suggest any method or plan of training and education which would foster interest and eventually increase our potential in the field." This, of course, is true for many reasons not the least of which is the fact that the Armed Services Committee is the proper committee of the House to exercise jurisdiction in this area.

This whole matter of military manpower usage requires professional and unprejudiced studies. The human resource studies being conducted at the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, is one of the most encouraging things being done along this line. Every publication this group has made to date should be familiar to the Armed Services Committees.

Yet the congressional and other governmental agency hearings and reports since World War II on subjects which directly bear on this overall and basic problem, such as universal military

training, extension of the Draft Act, the military reserve programs, military career compensation, the new code of military justice, Federal aid to vocational education, show a lack of comprehension of the basic problems involved.

As long as the Pentagon follows the blind philosophy expressed by General Hershey to the effect that the civilian skills are largely of no use to the Military Establishment and that the military in effect has to untrain and retrain the personnel it intends to utilize, we are not going to be able to cope with these problems.

Eighty percent of the skills needed and utilized by the present Military Establishment are not military—combat—skills, but rather are skills that exist and, in many instances, are highly developed in our civilian society. The supply of scientists and engineers in our society needed to fill our civilian and military requirements is dependent upon an intelligent approach to the entire problem of military manpower usage, recruitment and training.

It is slowly sinking in that the civilian distributive system, for example, should be utilized rather than duplicated by the Military Establishment. And incidentally, the issue on the Sikes amendment is to a large degree a rear-guard action on the military's part to remain in the distributive and servicing fields. I am hopeful that it will also start to sink in that it is just as important that the civilian educational and training system should be utilized rather than duplicated. This means, of course, that the military does not need to draft or enlist personnel to carry out these extensive functions, either as students or instructors. We have permitted our educational processes to be interfered with greatly by the manpower policies of the Military Establishment and we are experiencing some sad results.

I am putting in the Appendix of the daily *Record* an article recently written by James R. Killian, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, entitled "Four-Point Plan To Get Scientists" appearing in last week's *Life* magazine. This article merits last consideration.

The article interestingly enough starts off by accepting as a premise the widely publicized statements to the effect that Soviet Russia is passing us in educational output of engineers and scientists. I think it is about time there was some clarification in this matter of Soviet educational output in these fields. The recent rash of statements from high governmental officials, military leaders, Congressmen, Senators, columnists and commentators, most of which consist in quoting each other on this subject, all have their origin in a very fine study published last year. The book is entitled "Soviet Professional Manpower, Its Education, Training, and Supply," by Nicholas DeWitt, of the Russian Research Center, Howard University. This is a fine scholarly work and it is a shame that most of the statements made by public officials fail to pay attention to what is set forth in the book. Most statements are of such a nature that it is obvious that either the person making them has not read the book or has not used much

judgment in evaluating what the book sets out.

First of all the book makes it quite plain that our knowledge about Russia's educational system is quite limited. In fact, Russia's knowledge about her own system is quite limited due to a lack of accurate and meaningful statistics. Second, the educational system of Russia is full of serious flaws.

I will give 2 short references to illustrate these 2 points, but I think it is advisable that anyone who wants to discuss the subject read the book for himself.

On page 133, under the heading "Training in Scientific Fields in Soviet Higher Educational Institutes," subhead four "Comparability of Soviet Scientific-Technical Training and American Professional Education" this basic statement appears:

In other words a detailed comparative study of the quality of Soviet and American higher education is handicapped by the absence of standards essential for such comparisons. Therefore, this study perforce had to resort to generalities rather than to venture into details. Despite these shortcomings in the present survey, it seems, from the examples discussed above, that the following statements are justifiable.

On pages 146-150 under the heading "Factors Affecting Quality of Training" subhead seven, "Supply and Quality of Textbooks" the difficulties and inadequacies of the Soviet higher educational and professional training set out are such that the alarm being created among the American public about Russia's prowess in this field is incomprehensible. This is made more so when other basic features of the Soviet educational program are presented showing similar serious shortcomings.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, yesterday expressed resentment of the term "fearmongers" being applied to some of the public figures sounding the national alarm on the status of our military might in relation to that of Soviet Russia's. I agree with the gentleman to the extent that we need and will always need honest public discussion and indeed well-founded criticism of our defense problems. But it is quite within the realm of public debate to examine the statements and criticism made to determine if it is indeed based upon studies and intelligent differences of opinion or is based upon rumor, ignorance and catch words. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree with me that misstatements or half statements whether stemming from willfulness or ignorance if creating public fear is fearmongering. I am willing to examine with him some of these statements including several that have been made on the floor during this debate. Regrettably I say that they fit the term "fearmongering."

I think it is doubly important that persons who occupy high positions or through their previous positions appear to have special knowledge in the area of military strengths be extremely careful of the statements they make in this area. Because, in this present cold war the contest to a large degree rests on the impression we or Russia make on the neu-

tral countries. If Russia's game is bluff we certainly assist her in achieving her goal by overstating her prowess.

I am satisfied that much of Russia's game is bluff and I say this feeling quite strongly that it is much better to overestimate a potential enemy's power than to underestimate it. I am satisfied that some—not all by any manner of means—of the statements about Russian prowess are untrue, unsubstantiated, and are utilized to stir up the American people to a concern for their safety. I believe those who do this mean well. They see what they think is a dangerous apathy on the part of our people to the dangers in the modern world. I again say, this is a dangerous procedure when so much of the cold war is directed toward influencing other nations. Indeed, if Russia is so powerful the logical conclusion is their system cannot be as bad as we picture it to be. Well, I think their system is bad and I think their prowess, if accurately judged, bears out this statement.

I am going to close by giving an example of a half-truth that has been bandied about for some time about Russia's submarine prowess. It used to be that a strange submarine was sighted off the coast of California or in the Gulf of Mexico right around the time the military appropriation bill was up. Now the statement that Russia has 400—a couple of years ago it used to be 200—submarines is made by various military leaders and picked up by others, as our chairman of this subcommittee did yesterday in his address to the House. Well, maybe Russia has 400 submarines, but frankly I do not think it can be substantiated. But that is only part of the story.

A major restriction on the effectiveness of submarine power is the number of submarine bases Russia does not possess one ice-free open sea submarine base. Yet these facts do not discourage the irresponsible reiteration of this bit of fear mongering. These facts about the limitation of submarine warfare and Russia's particular limitation in this area is a simple matter to comprehend. It is not at all complicated and not at all classified information. The public can be given this information and the public can grasp the significance of it. So too the public can grasp the significance of other bits of fear mongering if it is pointed out to them. It is time to start separating proper public discussion and criticism in the defense areas from that which is improper, being based upon ignorance or untruths. Both political parties have a stake in accomplishing this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Allen amendment and in favor of section 633 as it stands in the bill. It seems to me, if I understand section 633, it in no way prevents the Defense Department from disposing of activities. It simply requires them to justify that the disposition is for the best interests of this country.

There is one example that occurred during the past years, in the nine cases mentioned by the committee, which seems to me to show the importance of having a check upon this. The Defense Department notified the Committee on Appropriations that it desired to close the paint manufacturing facilities at Norfolk and at Mare Island. When that matter came before the Committee on Appropriations the witnesses from the Navy Department testifying before that committee stated that they did not feel it was in the best interest of the Navy Department that these two paint manufacturing facilities be closed. The testimony before that committee showed that during World War II these particular paint-mixing facilities had developed types of bottom paints for use in our fleet that caused our vessels to be able to stay out in the ocean without coming into drydock approximately three times as long as they had ever been able to stay out before. This particular discovery in these two paint-mixing facilities saved our Government literally millions of dollars from the standpoint of bringing the ships in and getting them back as well as the importance from a defense standpoint of this discovery. In this particular instance private enterprise had an opportunity, but up to that time had never shown that they could develop this particular type of need for the Defense Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to disagree with the distinguished gentleman from California who just spoke, but there are several other aspects in addition to the small-business angle and to the executive responsibility angle that might be here stressed.

First of all, the 84th Congress instructed the Government as far as possible to get out of business competing with its taxpaying citizens. I do not think we stress that enough. We instructed them to do it, and now we have given them the orders to do it, and they are trying to do it, but the proposed section 633 could check on them and force them to bring back request for permission, permission, if you please, to discontinue one man. They have to come to the committees of Congress and wait 90 days for approval and get the approval of both Houses before they can fire 1 man or 2 or 5. The word "silly" has been used. How silly can we get to ask the mighty Defense Department that has this terrific responsibility, when they want to clean up and make this more efficient, constantly to come up here and ask permission for the discontinuation of small departments?

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the amendment will carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. ALLEN of Illinois.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 156, noes 116. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, 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. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 46, strike out all of section 633, line 21 on page 46 through line 7 on page 47.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 222, nays 156, answered "present" 1, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—222

Abbott	Cederberg	Friedel
Abernethy	Chase	Fulton
Adair	Chelf	Gary
Alexander	Chenoweth	Gathings
Alger	Church	Gavin
Allen, Ill.	Clevenger	Gentry
Andersen,	Cole	George
H. Carl	Colmer	Gray
Andersen,	Coon	Gross
August H.	Cooper	Haley
Arends	Corbett	Halleck
Auchincloss	Coudert	Hand
Avery	Cramer	Harden
Ayres	Cretella	Harrison, Va.
Baker	Cunningham	Harvey
Bass, N. H.	Curtis, Mo.	Hébert
Baumhart	Dague	Henderson
Beamer	Davis, Ga.	Heseltun
Becker	Davis, Tenn.	Hess
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Wis.	Hiestand
Berry	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Betts	Devereux	Hinshaw
Boggs	Dies	Hoeven
Bolton,	Dixon	Holt
Frances P.	Dodd	Hope
Bolton,	Dolliver	Horan
Oliver P.	Dondero	Hosmer
Bosch	Donovan	Huddleston
Bow	Dowdy	Jackson
Boyle	Durham	James
Brooks, La.	Ellsworth	Jarman
Brown, Ga.	Fallon	Jenkins
Brownson	Fenton	Jensen
Broyhill	Fino	Johansen
Budge	Fisher	Jonas
Burleson	Fjare	Jones, N. C.
Burnside	Flynt	Judd
Bush	Ford	Kean
Byrd	Forrester	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Fountain	Keating
Canfield	Frazier	Kilburn
Carrigg	Frelinghuysen	Kilgore

King, Pa.  
Knox  
Krueger  
Laird  
Landrum  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lipscomb  
Long  
Lovre  
McConnell  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McVey  
Mack, Wash.  
Martin  
Mason  
Meador  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Minshall  
Morano  
Mumma  
Murray, Tenn.  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
O'Konski  
Osmer  
Ostertag  
Patman  
Patterson

Phillips  
Pilcher  
Pillion  
Poage  
Poff  
Prouty  
Rains  
Ray  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Riehlman  
Robeson, Va.  
Rutherford  
St. George  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Scott  
Sudder  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Sheehan  
Shuford  
Siler  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Springer  
Taber

Talle  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson,  
Mich.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thomson, Wyo.  
Trimble  
Tuck  
Utt  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Velde  
Vinson  
Vorsy  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Walter  
Weaver  
Westland  
Wharton  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Williams, Mass.  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Yates  
Young  
Younger  
Zablocki

NAYS—156

Addonizio  
Albert  
Allen, Calif.  
Andrews  
Ashley  
Ashmore  
Aspinall  
Bailey  
Baldwin  
Barrett  
Bass, Tenn.  
Bates  
Bell  
Bennett, Fla.  
Blatnik  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bowler  
Bray  
Brooks, Tex.  
Burdick  
Byrne, Pa.  
Cannon  
Chiperfield  
Christopher  
Chudoff  
Clark  
Curtis, Mass.  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
Denton  
Dingell  
Dollinger  
Donohue  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dorn, S. C.  
Doyle  
Elliott  
Engle  
Evins  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Fernandez  
Flood  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Garmatz  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Grant  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.

Gregory  
Griffiths  
Gubser  
Hagen  
Hale  
Hardy  
Harris  
Hays, Ohio  
Healey  
Herlong  
Hollfield  
Holland  
Holmes  
Holtzman  
Hull  
Hyde  
Ikard  
Jennings  
Johnson, Wis.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Karsten  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Keogh  
Kilday  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Lanham  
Lankford  
Lesinski  
McCormack  
McDowell  
McMillan  
Macdonald  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Marshall  
Matthews  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder  
Murray, Ill.

Natcher  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Neill  
Passman  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Price  
Priest  
Quigley  
Rabaut  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robson, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Schwengel  
Scrivner  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sieminski  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Smith, Kans.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Steed  
Sullivan  
Teague, Calif.  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tumulty  
Udall  
Vanik  
Whitten  
Wier  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, N. J.  
Wolverton  
Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bonner

NOT VOTING—54

Anfuso  
Barden  
Belcher  
Bentley  
Blitch  
Boykin  
Brown, Ohio  
Buckley  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Celler  
Chatham

Cooley  
Crumpacker  
Davidson  
Dawson, Ill.  
Deane  
Derounian  
Diggs  
Eberharter  
Edmondson  
Gamble  
Gwinn  
Harrison, Nebr.

Hays, Ark.  
Hayworth  
Hillings  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Johnson, Calif.  
Kearns  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Klein  
Knutson  
Lane  
McCarthy

Mollohan  
Morrison  
Multer  
Nelson  
O'Hara, Minn.  
Polk

Powell  
Preston  
Radwan  
Sadlak  
Short  
Taylor

Thompson, La.  
Thompson, N. J.  
Tollefson  
Watts  
Williams, N. Y.  
Zelenko

Bolton,  
Oliver P.  
Bonner  
Bosch  
Bow  
Bowler  
Boyle  
Bray  
Brooks, La.  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Brownson  
Broyhill  
Budge  
Burdick  
Burleson  
Burnside  
Bush  
Byrd  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Canfield  
Cannon  
Carrigg  
Cederberg  
Chase  
Chelf  
Chenoweth  
Chipfield  
Christopher  
Chudoff  
Church  
Clark  
Clevenger  
Cole  
Colmer  
Coon  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Coudert  
Cramer  
Cretella  
Cunningham  
Curtis, Mass.  
Curtis, Mo.  
Dague  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Davis, Wis.  
Dawson, Utah  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
Denton  
Devereux  
Dies  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dodd  
Dollinger  
Dolliver  
Dondero  
Donohue  
Donovan  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Doyle  
Durham  
Edmondson  
Elliot  
Ellsworth  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Fascell  
Felghan  
Fenton  
Fernandez  
Fino  
Fisher  
Fjare  
Flood  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Ford  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin  
Gentry  
George  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Grant  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Gregory  
Griffiths

Gross  
Gubser  
Hagen  
Hale  
Haley  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Va.  
Harvey  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hébert  
Henderson  
Herlong  
Heseltun  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hill  
Hinshaw  
Hoeben  
Holfield  
Holland  
Holmes  
Holt  
Holtzman  
Hope  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Huddleston  
Hull  
Hyde  
Ikard  
Jackson  
James  
Jarman  
Jenkins  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johansen  
Johnson, Wis.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N. C.  
Judd  
Karsten  
Kearney  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Keogh  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
Kilgore  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Knox  
Krueger  
Laird  
Landrum  
Lanham  
Lankford  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lesinski  
Lipscomb  
Long  
Lowe  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McDowell  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McMillan  
McVey  
Macdonald  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Marshall  
Mason  
Matthews  
Meador  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mills  
Minshall  
Morano  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder

Mumma  
Murray, Ill.  
Murray, Tenn.  
Natcher  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Osmers  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patman  
Patterson  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Phillips  
Pilcher  
Pillion  
Poage  
Poff  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Quigley  
Rabaut  
Rains  
Ray  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riehlman  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robeson, Va.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Rutherford  
St. George  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Scrivner  
Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Sheehan  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Shuford  
Steminski  
Sikes  
Siler  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Sisk  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Steed  
Sullivan  
Taber  
Talle  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomas  
Thompson,  
Mich.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thomson, Wyo.  
Thornberry  
Trimble  
Tuck  
Tumulty  
Udall  
Utt  
Vanik  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Velde  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Wainwright  
Walter

Weaver  
Westland  
Wharton  
Whitten  
Wickersham  
Widnall  
Wier  
Wigglesworth

Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. J.  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Winthrow  
Wolcott  
Wolverton  
Wright  
Yates  
Young  
Younger  
Zablocki

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Hayworth against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mrs. Knutson against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Multer against.

Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Watts against.

Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Crumpacker for, with Mr. McCarthy against.

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Davidson against.

Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Polk against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. RAINS and Mr. YOUNG changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BOLAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BARDEN. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 377, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—377

Abbott  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Alexander  
Alger  
Allen, Calif.  
Allen, Ill.  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Andresen,  
August H.  
Andrews

Arends  
Ashley  
Ashmore  
Aspinall  
Auchincloss  
Avery  
Ayres  
Bailey  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett  
Bass, N. H.  
Bass, Tenn.  
Bates

Baumhart  
Beamer  
Becker  
Bell  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bennett, Mich.  
Berry  
Betts  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bolton,  
Frances P.

Bolton,  
Oliver P.  
Bonner  
Bosch  
Bow  
Bowler  
Boyle  
Bray  
Brooks, La.  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Brownson  
Broyhill  
Budge  
Burdick  
Burleson  
Burnside  
Bush  
Byrd  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Canfield  
Cannon  
Carrigg  
Cederberg  
Chase  
Chelf  
Chenoweth  
Chipfield  
Christopher  
Chudoff  
Church  
Clark  
Clevenger  
Cole  
Colmer  
Coon  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Coudert  
Cramer  
Cretella  
Cunningham  
Curtis, Mass.  
Curtis, Mo.  
Dague  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Davis, Wis.  
Dawson, Utah  
Delaney  
Dempsey  
Denton  
Devereux  
Dies  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dodd  
Dollinger  
Dolliver  
Dondero  
Donohue  
Donovan  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Doyle  
Durham  
Edmondson  
Elliot  
Ellsworth  
Engle  
Evins  
Fallon  
Fascell  
Felghan  
Fenton  
Fernandez  
Fino  
Fisher  
Fjare  
Flood  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Ford  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin  
Gentry  
George  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Grant  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Gregory  
Griffiths

Gross  
Gubser  
Hagen  
Hale  
Haley  
Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Va.  
Harvey  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Hébert  
Henderson  
Herlong  
Heseltun  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hill  
Hinshaw  
Hoeben  
Holfield  
Holland  
Holmes  
Holt  
Holtzman  
Hope  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Huddleston  
Hull  
Hyde  
Ikard  
Jackson  
James  
Jarman  
Jenkins  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johansen  
Johnson, Wis.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N. C.  
Judd  
Karsten  
Kearney  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Keogh  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
Kilgore  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Knox  
Krueger  
Laird  
Landrum  
Lanham  
Lankford  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lesinski  
Lipscomb  
Long  
Lowe  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McDowell  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McMillan  
McVey  
Macdonald  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Marshall  
Mason  
Matthews  
Meador  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mills  
Minshall  
Morano  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder

Mumma  
Murray, Ill.  
Murray, Tenn.  
Natcher  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Osmers  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patman  
Patterson  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Phillips  
Pilcher  
Pillion  
Poage  
Poff  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Quigley  
Rabaut  
Rains  
Ray  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riehlman  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robeson, Va.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Rutherford  
St. George  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Scrivner  
Scudder  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Sheehan  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Shuford  
Steminski  
Sikes  
Siler  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Sisk  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Spence  
Springer  
Staggers  
Steed  
Sullivan  
Taber  
Talle  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomas  
Thompson,  
Mich.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thomson, Wyo.  
Thornberry  
Trimble  
Tuck  
Tumulty  
Udall  
Utt  
Vanik  
Van Pelt  
Van Zandt  
Velde  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Wainwright  
Walter

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

King, Pa.

NOT VOTING—55

Anfuso  
Barden  
Belcher  
Bentley  
Blitch  
Boykin  
Brown, Ohio  
Buckley  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Celler  
Chatham  
Cooley  
Crumpacker  
Davidson  
Dawson, Ill.  
Deane  
Derounian  
Diggs

Eberharter  
Gamble  
Gwinn  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Hayworth  
Healey  
Hillings  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Johnson, Calif.  
Kearns  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Klein  
Knutson  
Lane  
McCarthy  
Martin  
Mollohan  
Morrison  
Multer  
Nelson  
O'Hara, Minn.  
Polk  
Powell  
Preston  
Radwan  
Sadlak  
Short  
Taylor  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, N. J.  
Tollefson  
Vursell  
Watts  
Williams, N. Y.  
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Hayworth with Mr. Short.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Polk with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Davidson with Mr. Crumpacker.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Belcher.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Kearns.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# CORRECTION OF SECTION NUMBERS IN DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, section 633 of the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense was stricken. I ask unanimous consent that the numbers of the remaining two sections of the bill be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill just passed may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include brief excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Defense Department appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

**COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 401)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, has set important and desirable objectives for the improvement of Federal administration and for providing more effective methods in the financing and control of Government services. Cooperative action on the part of the legislative and executive branches is required in order to bring about more rapidly the fulfillment of those objectives.

The Commission's report on Federal budgeting and accounting practices is an important contribution toward the attainment of more effective and economical governmental services. It includes significant recommendations showing how the Federal Government can bring about improvements in budgeting, accounting, and management practices generally. Because these recommendations pertain to vital responsibilities of the Chief Executive, I am especially and personally appreciative of the contribution which Mr. Hoover and his distinguished associates have made.

These recommendations of the Commission have been studied extensively by the executive branch with a view toward identifying all possible actions that can be taken to strengthen the administration of the executive agencies. I have already approved plans developed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to intensify efforts of the executive branch toward that objective. These plans include actions to accelerate the establishment and use of modern accounting methods and improved budget presentations and controls. I consider it desirable and necessary that the executive departments and agencies actively and fully participate in carrying out these plans.

The actions being taken by the executive branch to put many of the Commission's proposals into effect will require close coordination with the legislative branch and merit the support which the Congress should and can provide. I urge that the Congress seek the early enactment of appropriate legislative provisions to support the major objectives of the Commission's recommendations.

The initial recommendation of the Commission's report on budget and ac-

counting calls for the strengthening of the management review and budgeting functions of the Bureau of the Budget. This is of signal importance to the attainment of the Commission's objectives in this field. It has a direct bearing on how fast and how well the executive branch carries out the plans which I have approved. Because the resources of the Bureau of the Budget must be increased if it is to provide, on my behalf, strengthened leadership in the improvement of executive branch budgeting, accounting, and other management practices, I am proposing to the Congress a supplemental appropriation to permit an expansion of the Bureau's staff for this purpose.

Today's Government demands the use of the best and most economical methods that can be devised. To that end, we should take full advantage of the constructive proposals put forth by Mr. Hoover and his able associates.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 10, 1956.

**HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED**

Mr. McCULLOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Secretary of State, with a resolution adopted by the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

Mr. Speaker, this letter concerns our late, great colleague, the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, April 13, 1956.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit to you a copy of a special resolution concerning the late Hon. Chauncey W. Reed adopted by the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at its meeting on February 20, 1956. As you know, the late Representative Chauncey W. Reed served with honor as a member of a number of United States delegations to the sessions of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and won the respect and admiration of the council for his many helpful services.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION, FOURTH SESSION—SPECIAL RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE LATE HONORABLE CHAUNCEY W. REED (ADOPTED AT THE 30TH MEETING, FEBRUARY 20, 1956)

The Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration having learned of the untimely death in February 1956 of the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed, eminent Member of the Congress of the United States of America, distressed by the loss of his devoted services to the committee, wishing to pay tribute to his memory, a person known to all for his humanitarian principles, for his untiring efforts directed to the creation of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, for his capable and effective service as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, and

for his sympathy and understanding as a friend, resolves to request the delegation of the United States of America to convey to the Government of the United States and to his family and friends a copy of this resolution with the expression of the deep sympathy, the regret, and the homage of this Council.

RENE MITCHELL,  
Chairman of the Council.

The verbatim report of the proceedings thereon held in Geneva, Switzerland, on February 20, 1956, is as follows:

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION, FOURTH SESSION—TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE CHAUNCEY W. REED, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MADE AT THE 30TH MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ON FEBRUARY 20, 1956

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Micheli, Switzerland). Since our last session we have with great regret learned of the death of Mr. Chauncey W. Reed, a Member of the United States House of Representatives and former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, a member of the United States delegation at several sessions and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution at the sixth session of the committee in Venice. As chairman of the third session, I addressed on your behalf a telegram of condolence to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and I propose that we should stand to pay tribute to the memory of this generous man who had such a keen interest in the work of the committee. [Silence.]

I should like to submit for your approval the following draft resolution concerning the death of the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed:

"The Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration having learned of the untimely death in February 1956 of the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed, eminent Member of the Congress of the United States of America, distressed by the loss of his devoted services to the committee, wishing to pay tribute to his memory, a person known to all for his humanitarian principles, for his untiring efforts directed to the creation of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, for his capable and effective service as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, and for his sympathy and understanding as a friend, resolves to request the delegation of the United States to convey to the Government of the United States and to his family and friends a copy of this resolution with the expression of the deep sympathy, the regret and the homage of this Council."

Mr. HAVEMAN (Netherlands). Mr. Chairman, I was very sorry, as I am sure are all the members of this committee, to hear the sad news of Judge Reed. I would like to express my sympathy with the American delegation in the loss of this important member. He took a large part in drawing up our constitution and showed great interest in many ways in the life of our committee. I remember him addressing the committee several times and I am quite sure that he will live in our memory for a very long time to come. I have the honor to support the resolution submitted by you, Mr. Chairman, to this committee.

Mr. HARRY (Australia). Mr. Chairman, I am sure we shall all regret the passing of Mr. Chauncey W. Reed. For those of us who were in Venice, his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the Constitution will be an unforgettable experience. He showed then and continued to show, I believe, right up until the time of his death, a very keen interest in the growth and working of this committee, and I feel that a resolution such as you proposed would be most appropriate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CONTEMPRE (Belgium). Mr. Chairman, I welcome and should like to support the

statements just made by our Netherlands and Australian colleagues, as there is nothing for me to add to the words of praise of those speakers who have preceded me. Mr. Reed was a remarkable president of our very important session in Venice during which our committee's constitution was drawn up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPINELLI (Italy). Mr. Chairman, the Italian delegation wishes to associate itself with the acceptance of this resolution for the commemoration of Congressman Chauncey W. Reed. My country has, through the course of centuries, experienced all aspects of migration problems and had the opportunity of appreciating at its fullest the contribution which the statesman of the United States of America, recently deceased, brought to the solution of such problems. The work carried out by Congressman Reed in the drafting of what became our Constitution, which used to be referred to as the Venice Constitution from the time that the most important act of all organizations was perfected, is still present in our minds. The contribution which Congressman Reed made to the committee will not be easily forgotten by any of us and particularly by those who in my country participate in the common effort of this undertaking, trying to improve the social and economic conditions of the people.

(The resolution was adopted.)

Congressman McCULLOCH (United States). Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. On behalf of the delegation representing the United States of America, I wish to say that we are pleased, indeed, that the resolution in memory of our departed friend and colleague has been unanimously adopted by the committee. It is a fitting tribute to one who, until the very end, did so much for this committee and its great work. Those of you who have been members for a while know of his work as chairman of the subcommittee which drafted the Constitution for this committee, and likewise you know of his masterful presentation of that Constitution to the Congress of the United States, where it was unanimously approved. Our colleague, and my great friend, Chauncey W. Reed had a knowing mind and an understanding heart and if this committee has lost an able friend and adviser, which it surely has, the Congress of the United States has lost an outstanding leader in his important field. Our delegation and our country deeply appreciate and thank you for your resolution of respect and we wish you to know that a copy will be delivered to the members of his family and a copy will be spread on the official Record of the Congress of the United States of America.

#### GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Concurrent Resolution 201, approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 19.

Page 34, after line 4, insert:

"A-6967612, Chang, Chao-Kang.

"0300-447092, Li, Fei-Yu Lin.

"A-7841866, Li, Tieh Tseng."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week and the week following be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a bill and report to accompany same on the agricultural appropriation bill for 1957, and that it may be in order to bring that bill up for consideration on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

#### SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until tomorrow night, Friday, May 11, to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 10004, the second supplemental appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to rise today to call the attention of the Members to our country's longest celebrated event honoring one of our great food industries—National Raisin Week.

This important agricultural industry is centered around Fresno in my district of California, and this week marks the

47th annual observance of the importance to our economy of this product.

Each year observance of National Raisin Week includes a California-wide contest, participated in by our finest cooks and sponsored by the Central Valley Empire Association, to select the finest and most luscious raisin pie.

Today I have received the prize-winning pie, sent direct from the oven by air express, and I have had the honor, on behalf of the Central Valley Empire Association and the good people of my State, to present it to our honored Speaker. I leave it to the most agile of our Members to determine those who may share it with him.

Through the years, raisins have contributed greatly to California's economy. Since 1851 thousands of California farmers have depended on the stability and vigor of the raisin industry. Substantially all United States raisins and about one-half of the world's supply are produced and processed in the San Joaquin Valley of California.

From a 500-ton crop in 1878, production of raisins has grown to a crop of 220,000 tons with a first sale value of about \$40 million. Some 60,000 persons are directly employed in the industry. Raisins are a versatile food, with a great variety of uses to provide fine flavor and quick energy, alone or in combinations with other food products.

Our raisin industry is progressive and is quick to adopt means of helping itself. It was one of the first agricultural industries to broaden its markets by nationwide advertising, and I am sure many of you will recall from the past the pictured and printed question: "Had your iron today?" The industry stabilizes itself and seeks foreign markets under a national marketing order and has adopted the most modern methods of culture, processing and packaging. Even now, I am asking the cooperation of the Congress and the Department of Agriculture in research work to further expand the usefulness of raisins in packaged food products. This progressive and creative attitude will help solve surplus problems in this industry, and I think the same principles will work equally well in other surplus situations.

I am sure my colleagues will want to join with me and with the people of my district in our observance of National Raisin Week, honoring a great agricultural industry.

#### LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would strengthen the antitrust laws.

The antitrust laws of the United States, effectively applied, have historically provided the chief bulwark against the development of monopoly in

the United States. Today's headlines make clear that their vigorous enforcement, on a continuing basis, is essential to prevent the spread of monopolistic practices in this country.

One of the most important means of enforcement of the antitrust laws are the so-called private treble damage suits whereby one party, harmed through monopolistic practices of another, may sue under the antitrust laws and recover not only the actual damages suffered, but also an additional amount as punitive damages. It is this combination of compensatory and punitive damages working together which gives private parties the necessary incentives to institute suits under the anti-trust laws, thereby providing the Government with its most effective means of enforcement.

Unfortunately, the income-tax laws operate independently of the antitrust statutes. As recently interpreted by the Supreme Court, the punitive element in an anti-trust damage action constitutes taxable income fully taxable in the year of receipt. As a result of this decision, if a lawsuit is successfully prosecuted or settled against a violator of the anti-trust laws, all of the funds so obtained are bunched together in the same year for purposes of the Federal income tax. This produces artificially high surtax rates and causes a confiscatory tax to result. In effect, the present application of the Internal Revenue laws removes all of the private stimulus to enforcement of the anti-trust suits.

To remedy this situation, the proposed legislation would exempt from tax the punitive element in an antitrust damage action—recovered through prosecution of a suit or its settlement. This will insure that parties wronged by a violation of the statute will receive the full benefits conferred upon them by the antitrust laws without dilution by taxes. This will also produce maximum private enforcement efforts as is intended by the Congress.

The bill would make clear as to the compensatory element of the damages—that is, the portion of the recovery which redresses the injured party for damages actually suffered—that this amount can be spread back for tax purposes over the years in which the damages were actually suffered. By this approach the wronged party will be placed in precisely the same position as he would have been had the violation of the antitrust laws never occurred.

In order to make this proposed legislation fully applicable, the bill provides for its application as if it were enacted as part of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

#### RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the anniversary of Rumanian independence. But the people of Rumania are not free. After more than 10 centuries of sacrifice and struggle for democratic principles; they are once again trying to forge a national unity in order to gain their freedom and independence. Although the ruthless Russian war machine has abolished the celebration of Rumanian independence day, there is still that deep-rooted nationalism and faith in God that arises spontaneously in the hearts and minds of every man, woman, and child of Rumanian descent on May 10. This spirit of faith is the inspiration which welds the Rumanian people together in resisting the despotic rule of communism.

In the past decade, Rumania, has been sealed firmly behind the Iron Curtain. They have been denied all the basic hopes and privileges of free people. Tyrannical dictatorship is the order of the day. Purges, persecutions, and slave labor camps are the rewards of anyone that defies the Communist Government. Yet, with all these formidable punishments to keep the Rumanian people in line, there is still extensive activity by the Rumanian people to break the Communist yoke of despotism. The Rumanian people will not let their inherent consciousness of unity and independence be destroyed by brutality, lies, or stringent oppression.

The barbaric foreign rule of the Russians had not been able to uproot the Rumanian people's sacred attachment to the traditional celebration of the 10th of May. The Russians have deviously tried to alter the significance of this day by celebrating the 9th of May as the anniversary of a Soviet victory. Although flags are now raised on the 9th of May, Rumanians in their captive homeland still celebrate in their hearts and minds the day that follows.

Possibly never before in the history of Rumania has the future looked so dark. But on the other hand, never before has such a devoutly united feeling of hope and freedom arisen from a nation. No matter how dark the situation may seem, Rumania is a nation that in the past has achieved freedom and independence and will again.

We here in America are strongly aware that the Rumanian people have kept their courage and faith. Therefore, on this day representing freedom and independence, I wish to join with the American people in expressing the deepest hope that Rumania will soon be free.

#### REPORT OF THE BRADLEY COMMISSION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I find there is a very erroneous idea that the Bradley Commission is in reality not a report to the President of

the United States as it is, but is a bill that has been sent to us for action. That is, of course, not the case. It is merely a report to the President with recommendations. I hope with all my heart those recommendations to the President will not be carried out. Many of them would make great hardships—I find everywhere and I think very ill thought out. Veterans and their dependents are living in fear.

We have just passed a \$32 billion defense bill, expenditures for the men going into the national service. Certainly we want to do everything we can after they come out of the military service to protect them, and show gratitude for their sacrifices. It would be a sorry thing to pass a bill like this but not take care of the men in such matters as compensation, insurance, training, and so forth. As this bill was being debated and acted upon, I constantly thought of our men and women who have given their lives for us and of those who are so splendidly serving us. May I always help and support them in every way possible. I am mindful of the fact that much of the military service is not only trying but also fraught with great danger.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I was detained on a long distance telephone call from one of my constituents and arrived a few seconds too late for the vote on the Defense appropriation bill. Had I been here I would have made the vote unanimous by voting for the bill, because I supported it in the Committee on Appropriations and in the Committee of the Whole.

#### RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, May 10 marks a triple anniversary for all Rumanians. On this day in 1866, Prince Carol, who later became King Carol I, arrived in Rumania and the existence of the Rumanian Kingdom was proclaimed. On the same day in 1877, Rumania gained her full independence. And later, in 1917, the unification of all Rumanian provinces took place on May 10.

Thus this day is far more than the anniversary of a single event. It is a holiday on which we celebrate both the birth and growth of a nation which through the centuries has played a leading role in the cultural, political, and economic development of western civilization.

However, May 10, 1956, is not a joyous occasion for the Rumanian people and their friends around the world. All of us are aware that today the proud people of Rumania are living in tragic circumstances. All progress in that noble state has come to a halt under the crushing heel of the Communist regime.

The Communists have taken drastic steps to crush traditional Rumanian freedom of thought and expression. Because resistance within the country has been so vigorous, Red tyranny has been especially severe. The task of the gallant Rumanian people to keep alive the spark of liberty and national pride has been made that much harder, but they have not failed.

Word leaking out to us from behind the Iron Curtain indicates the degree to which Soviet domination has failed to intimidate the Rumanian people. A prominent case in point is the Rumanian farmer. Since the country is primarily built on an agricultural economy, the Russians have made great efforts to force the farmers to join together in collective farms. But the Rumanian farmers have stood solidly together, and in spite of the exorbitant taxes which have been levied on them and the fact that a large portion of their crop is confiscated by the government, they have resisted collectivization.

By decree of the government, these farmers have been reduced to virtual serfs, but this stringent measure, intended to cow them, has merely served to intensify their opposition to the Communist regime.

On this occasion we pay tribute to those loyal and sturdy patriots who stand fast in their faith for the future of Rumania and assure them that the American people have not forgotten their plight.

The men from Moscow fear Rumanian Independence Day so much that its celebration is denied behind the Iron Curtain. Nevertheless, loyal Rumanians, in their hearts and minds, continue to honor this sacred day.

Let us all hope and pray on this May 10 that the day is not too far distant when the Rumanian people will be able to celebrate openly their historic day of independence, free from Russian domination and once again a member of the family of free nations.

#### ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had introduced H. R. 11116, a bill to give postal employees a flat \$600 pay increase. I am one of the Members of the House who feels that we did not give the rank and file employees an adequate pay increase under Public Law 68 passed early in this session. Many of us tried our level best to provide a bet-

ter pay increase for the rank and file letter carrier, post office clerk, rural carrier, motor-vehicle employee, mail handler, custodial employees, and others, but our efforts were thwarted by administration opposition and vetoes. The pay of postal employees has not kept pace with the American standard of pay. According to the April 7, 1956, issue of The Nation's Business the Nation's income has increased 335.8 percent since 1941. The postal employee increase has been a mere 210 percent. We live in a dynamic economy, not a static economy. The standard of living is constantly on the move upwards; the increases we have granted to the postal employees have scarcely kept pace with the cost of living; these increases have failed to keep the postal employees in step with the standard of living prevalent in the United States today.

According to a recent study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a city worker with a wife and two children in Washington, D. C., for a "modest but adequate" standard of living, requires \$4,522 per year. The Heller budget for a wage earner with a wife and two children in the city of San Francisco requires an annual salary of \$5,465.74. Is it any wonder that in every large city in the country Civil Service Commission officials are finding few applicants for postal jobs? Is it any wonder that a postmaster in a California city was recently compelled to advertise nationwide to get men to take letter carrier jobs? After 25 years of faithful service the top pay is merely \$4,710 per year, far less than the minimum prescribed by the Heller study. The need for an increase of \$600 provided for in my bill is very great indeed and should be given favorable consideration.

#### THE HARDWOOD FORESTS OF THE SOUTH—AN IMPORTANT RESOURCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss with you for a few minutes one of our most neglected and one of our most important resources, the hardwood forests of the South. I use this term "neglected resource" advisedly because the hardwood forests of the South are truly a great resource and in comparison with the attention other kinds of forests are receiving, they are really neglected.

First, let us see how large the resource is and what it means to the country as a whole, as well as the South. The total land area of the Southern States from Virginia through Tennessee to the eastern half of Texas is about 329 million acres. Of this, 193 million acres are classed as commercial forest land, or land available to grow forest products for commerce. The hardwood forests occupy one-third of the total land area of the South—an area one-third greater than the renowned southern pine.

This vast area supports nearly 175 billion board-feet of hardwoods in trees large enough for lumber. According to

the most recent estimates, nearly 5 million feet of hardwood lumber were harvested in 1 year in the South. This cut was 60 percent of the total hardwood lumber produced in the country. So it is amply clear that the production of hardwoods occupies an extremely important part in the economy of the South and of the Nation.

One significant point to remember about hardwood lumber, much more than softwood, is that it enters into many remanufacturing processes, thus contributing more to labor and industry than the sawing of boards alone. The fabrication of hardwood lumber into furniture well illustrates this point. Through the manufacturing process the value of the wood is enhanced many times.

Manufacture of furniture is a good example of a rapidly growing southern industry dependent in large measure on southern hardwoods. The South now manufactures over 40 percent of all furniture made in the Nation. And much of the furniture made elsewhere is made from lumber from these southern hardwood forests. Hardwoods suitable for fancy veneers, paneling, and flooring are our most valuable forest trees. The place of hardwood in general construction is too well known to require comment. So again I say hardwoods are a very important resource.

But we do have problems that retard progress. The vast area of hardwood timber is something that Nature gave us and we have been cutting the best of it and letting the poorer species take over. This creaming process has left us with gradually deteriorating forests in terms of quality. Fires, disease and insects have all contributed to this situation. Fires in hardwoods are less spectacular than in pine forests but more insidious in their damage. Hardwoods have thinner bark and they do not have any pitch to heal over the fire scars. As a result the wood is exposed to decay and attack by insects. The losses from decay are enormous. Very little is known about these wood destroying diseases and insects which cause such heavy losses in hardwoods. Improved methods should be developed for detecting and combating them.

Because of these damaging agents our hardwood mills find a high percent of decay and cull in what ought to be high quality logs for furniture, flooring, and other special uses. In pine forests, after a severe fire you start over with a new stand of seedlings or a new plantation. With hardwoods you are likely to have the ground occupied by a stand of culls and sprouts and you cannot get a good forest back without investing a lot of money to get rid of worthless trees.

So the fire problem is different, and the firefighting job is different too. It calls for different equipment and methods. To get ahead, we need an active fire research program tailored to fit problems on hardwood lands.

How to achieve more intensive utilization and marketing of low-grade hardwoods is an extremely important problem. High quality hardwoods can be sold easily. The big problem is lack of sufficient markets for the poor grades. This problem is especially acute on small

holdings in the South. There are 1.8 million private owners of small forests who own three-fourths of all commercial forest land in the South, and one-fourth of all the forest lands in the Nation.

The use of hardwoods for pulpwood in the South has more than doubled during the past 5 years but that still accounts for only a fraction of the hardwood pulpwood supply available. Expanded use of hardwoods for other products such as lumber and veneer has been encouraging but inadequate. Research must develop more efficient methods of timber marketing, improved procedures for supplying timber owners and operators with market and price information, and new outlets for surplus low-grade hardwoods. Progress should be possible with a stepped-up program of research in the processing of lumber from little used species and lower grades. What is needed more, however, is utilization outlets for large volumes of wood not suitable for sawing and fabrication. Further development in the pulping of hardwoods is one distinct possibility.

A promising field for using large volumes is that of chemical conversion. Wood, and especially hardwood, can serve as a base raw material for manufacture of many needed chemical products. The pyramiding plastics industry, for example, demands each year a much greater variety and amount of organic chemicals. Acceleration of research in chemical utilization of hardwoods applicable to southern species is needed.

In much of the South hardwoods are replacing pines as the great demand for softwood timber results in removal of the pine forests. This poses two problems. First, is the land better suited for growing pines or hardwoods and, second, how can the hardwoods be removed feasibly if the land is better suited to pines? There need to be, then, studies of the soils under which the many important hardwood species will do best in comparison with the pines. Such an approach will guide timberland owners in how to manage forest land most profitably.

An extreme case of where scrub hardwood has taken over a former pine area is in my own district in west Florida. Here there are large areas where the soil is too sandy to grow good hardwoods and the scrub oaks now present do not grow to real tree size. The obvious answer is to replace the scrub oak with pine if a way can be found. As I have stated on this floor before, a way is being found by the forest research men through the use of heavy machinery and the landowners of that area are pretty happy about the progress being made. It looks like we are on the way to a solution of this particular idle land problem.

I would not want to give the impression that all hardwood production problems are concerned with poor quality hardwoods. Actually we have millions of acres where good hardwoods still occupy the land. For example, in the bottomlands and on the better upland soils very fine hardwoods can be grown. For these forests there is a general lack of information on the best way to care for and harvest the trees and keep the land

growing the more desirable kinds of hardwoods.

The hardwood forests of the South present both an opportunity and a challenge. They now support an important segment of the economy. Through an adequate research program in protection, utilization, marketing, and management they could be made to do much more.

It is with great gratification therefore that I observe that the Senate has seen fit to increase the funds for the forest-research program of the Forest Service, a substantial portion of which should be available for work on hardwoods. I sincerely hope that the House will support this increase.

#### PRESERVATION OF STATES RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, while we were a group of Thirteen Colonies struggling for the right to be independent we were warned "no free government, nor the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

Our progress as a Nation is written in our devotion to the fundamental principles of our Government. We are a Federal Republic created by a group of sovereign States. Our charter of existence as a Nation is a document wrought soundly by men with strong faith in the principles they advocated. How difficult it must have been for these men to surrender the smallest portion of their right to local self-government. Only the complete failure to establish a nation under the Articles of Confederation convinced them that some surrender was necessary.

So to a Federal Government they delegated those powers which are essential to a national government. All other rights and powers were expressly reserved to the States and the people. And these are the rights and powers of a people who fought to govern themselves locally in the light of traditions of their own creation.

In our Constitution has been written the method by which our laws shall be enacted. What has happened through the years? Have we forgotten the fundamental principles so deeply embedded in our traditions? The penetrating vision of Jefferson warned us long ago:

It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. Were this country not already divided into States, that division would have to be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself, and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. If we were directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we would soon want bread.

We are today faced with our most serious internal crisis in many years. I refer to the issue of desegregation, raised by the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954. No

other question has so greatly aroused human passions. The recent decision in the segregation case is but one of many instances of judicial legislation against the constitutional rights of our States. It is the constitutional prerogative of the Supreme Court to judge laws enacted by Congress when an issue is properly before the Court. It is not the function of any court to effectively amend a law into something more than the language of the law says it is. This practice has been disastrous to the rights of our States.

A review of recent cases of the Supreme Court clearly reveals that confusion has been created in many fields throughout the various States as a result of the Supreme Court having embarked upon a course of substituting personal concepts for the written provisions of the Constitution and of the laws enacted by the Congress. These personal concepts are set forth in recent opinions which more closely resemble essays on the establishment of a new social order than judicial decisions. In these opinions the Supreme Court acknowledges that words to them may have one meaning when written and another meaning when interpreted by the Court. In these opinions the legal precedent of judicial decisions has been abandoned, and in its interpretation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, the Supreme Court has ignored the authority of the Congress to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of the 14th amendment. In one of these opinions the Supreme Court has spoken of looking beyond the tangibles, and in another it has looked beyond the language of specific acts and construed several acts of the Congress when taken in combination to constitute a plan by the Congress to take away the rights of a State.

The segregation cases are but one example of the effect that Supreme Court decisions are having upon the States and the fundamental rights of the individual citizens. The fact that the Supreme Court stated in the segregation case that it cannot turn back the clock to 1868 when the 14th amendment under consideration was adopted cannot, of course, be confined to public education. This decision means that to the present Supreme Court the wording of the 14th amendment had one meaning when it was written into the Constitution in 1868 and another meaning today.

This new concept of the Supreme Court strikes at the very heart of judicial interpretation and constitutional government in America, for, if the Supreme Court is to be consistent, this new theory of ignoring the meaning of words when written will have equal application to all other provisions of the Constitution, as well as legislation passed by the Congress.

In a decision rendered by the Supreme Court on January 8, 1934, concerning a matter unrelated to segregation, Justice Sutherland thought that it was hardly necessary to say that a provision of the Constitution does not admit of two distinctly opposite interpretations, and that it does not mean one thing at one time and an entirely different thing at another time.

In 1856, Chief Justice Taney stated that as long as the Constitution continues to exist in its present form, it speaks not only in the same words, but with the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hands of its framers, and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. Chief Justice Taney further stated that any other rule of construction would abrogate the judicial character of the Supreme Court, and make it a mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day.

In 1824, Chief Justice Marshall stated that—

As men whose intentions require no concealment, generally employ the words which most directly and aptly express the ideas they intend to convey, the enlightened patriots who framed our Constitution, and the people who adopted it, must be understood to have employed words in the natural sense, and to have intended what they have said.

In addition to the unwillingness of the Supreme Court to agree that the 14th amendment continued to mean what it said when adopted, there appears to be the same inclination on the part of the Supreme Court with respect to whether Congress means what it has said in legislation. For, in *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* (350 U. S. 497), the Supreme Court held in a decision rendered on April 2, 1956, that the Smith Act of 1940, as amended in 1948, supersedes the enforceability of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act.

In this decision the Supreme Court stated that the Federal statutes touch a field in which the Federal interest is so dominant that the Federal system must be assumed to preclude enforcement of State laws on the same subject. This decision of the Supreme Court precluding the enforceability of a Pennsylvania State law was rendered even though the Smith Act appears in title 18 of the United States Code, which title codifies the Federal criminal laws, and even though section 3231 of that title provides that—

Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof.

In this case the Supreme Court ignored the language of the Congress in the same manner that it cast aside the language in the 14th amendment to the Constitution. I am glad that the various States have taken notice of this decision, for its restriction on the rights of the States cannot be limited to the State of Pennsylvania any more than the ill effects of the abandonment of judicial precedent in the segregation cases can be limited to one subject or to one State.

Therefore, I am supporting H. R. 3, introduced by Congressman HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, on January 5, 1955, which provides that no act of the Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of the Congress to occupy the field to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect. His bill further provides that no act of the Congress shall be construed as invalidating a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act unless there is a di-

rect and positive conflict between an express provision of such act and such provision of the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together. I urge that H. R. 3 be passed.

The hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, from April 28, 1955, to July 12, 1955, leave no doubt that the States view the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the States by means of judicial interpretation with serious concern. The attorney general of the State of Missouri stated that the Attorneys General Conference has had the matter of the preemption doctrine under discussion and were very much concerned with it because they think the States are being reduced to more or less vassals and that the Federal Government is being strengthened to an unusual degree. The attorney general of New Hampshire testified that he believed it would be helpful to the Court to have an indication from Congress that you do not want them to find this doctrine of suppression by implication unless there is a direct and positive conflict so that the two cannot stand together. The assistant attorney general of Illinois, the assistant attorney general of South Carolina, and a representative of the Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives appeared in support of legislation. A member of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board testified that this board is always faced with an attack on the power of the board to take any action. The legislative director and assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau appeared as representatives of a voluntary organization of 1,609,000 farm families and quoted from their policy resolution as follows:

In recent years a number of court decisions have seriously eroded the authority of State governments. The effect of these court decisions has been to declare that when the Federal Government has extensively legislated in a field, it has preempted this field and deprived the States of jurisdiction. Should the Federal preemption doctrine prevail, we foresee the eventual destruction of the States rights. We will actively support legislation to prevent this Federal preemption.

This restriction on States rights was extended to California in *Barrows et al. v. Jackson* (346 U. S. 249) in a decision rendered by the Supreme Court on June 15, 1953. In this case a group of citizens had entered into a covenant legally binding under the laws of the State of California, and it was alleged that respondent broke the covenant. The Supreme Court, while acknowledging the right to enter into such a covenant, construed the award of damages through a State court to be punishment of the respondent and thereby decided in favor of the breach of a covenant acknowledged to be legally binding under the laws of California.

In a case decided on May 16, 1955 (349 U. S. 1), the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan and in effect held it to be unconstitutional for a State judge to punish a contempt, previously committed before him while

acting as a one-man grand jury, after a full hearing in open court. Yet, with respect to Federal courts, rule 42 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure allows a trial judge to immediately and summarily punish for contempt, and the Federal Court rule was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in *Sacher et al. v. the United States* (343 U. S. 1) on March 10, 1952.

Of the recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court which I have mentioned, each ignores either the written language of the Constitution or the written language of an act of Congress, and each of these decisions ignores article X of the Constitution which provides that—

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The means for amending the Constitution has been provided in the Constitution, and this power was not granted to the Supreme Court. The power for enforcing by appropriate legislation the provisions of the 14th amendment are lodged with the Congress under the last of the enumerated powers set forth in the 14th amendment, and this power was not granted to the Supreme Court. In *Gibbons v. Ogden* (9 Wheat 188), Chief Justice Marshall wrote that Congress is authorized to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for this purpose.

The present Supreme Court would have us believe that "the history of the 14th amendment is inconclusive as to its intended effect on public education." Yet, in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537), the Supreme Court stated in 1896, that the most common instance of laws permitting, or even requiring, separation of the races is connected with the establishment of separate schools, and further stated that this has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored have been longest and most earnestly enforced.

It has been pointed out on the floor previously that the same Congress which proposed the 14th amendment to the Constitution provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia and that when the 14th amendment was submitted and ratified, segregation was and continued to be a matter for the determination of the States. It is an odd legal interpretation which gives less weight to the mutual understanding of the States at the time of the ratification of the 14th amendment than would apply to a contractual obligation between individuals. In *Plessy* against *Ferguson* the Supreme Court held in 1896 that the object of the 14th amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the equality of the two races before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political equality, or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. In 1896, the Supreme Court further stated that the State legislature is at liberty to act with reference to established usages, customs, and traditions of the people, and with a

view to the promotion of their comfort, and the preservation of the public peace and good order.

Under the Constitution the legislative branch of the Government was established under article I; the executive branch, under article II; and the judiciary, under article III. And I repeat, that under article X, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The Supreme Court has arrogated unto itself powers under the Constitution which were never intended, and has usurped the power of the States and of the Congress by its insistence on invading the legislative field and its refusal to confine its activities to the judiciary. I am sure that the lawyers find it most difficult to advise their clients with any degree of accuracy as to what constitutes the rule of law today, for they must look beyond the Constitution and statutes to the personal concepts of the Court. Almost every field of endeavor can now become a matter for the Supreme Court, whether it be the processing of butter; the title to land; the growing, harvesting, and processing of sugar; the shipment of processed agricultural products; the method of figuring income taxes, or any number of activities which have been interpreted by the Court to be matters for Federal regulation.

The decisions of the Supreme Court affect the daily lives of the people of all of the States. The recent decisions of the present Supreme Court strike at the very foundations of the life we have known in America based upon individual freedom and liberty.

Is it any wonder that editorials are being written which refer to the Supreme Court as a Third House, when the rights guaranteed to the States under the Constitution are being ignored; the authority of the Congress is being disregarded; judicial precedent is being cast aside; and language is being written into the Constitution by means of judicial interpretation? Is it any wonder that the decisions of the Supreme Court bring uncertainty and confusion as a substitute for the peace and good order which earlier Courts felt obligated to preserve? The Constitution of the United States has served us well for more than 160 years, the wisdom and foresight of its framers remain unequalled in history, and it is my belief that it is not less imperative that we adhere strictly to the principles of constitutional government today.

It is now time for the Supreme Court to retrace its steps to the point that its decisions are in accord with the intent and purposes of the framers of the Constitution.

Mr. LANHAM. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I commend the gentleman for the splendid statement he is making. At this point I want to emphasize the fact that it affects not only us in the South, but the very case that the gentleman discussed earlier in his remarks of *Pennsylvania v. Nelson* (350 U. S. 497) shows that the threat

is not to the South alone but to our entire country and every State in the Union. Again, I want to say how important this statement is and how thoroughly I agree with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. I compliment my distinguished friend and colleague for the statement he is making here, but beyond that I would like the RECORD to show, and I would like the people to know, that through more than 20 years of service in this Congress, PAUL BROWN has stood for the very things about which he is now talking. Had many of the people throughout these United States who have had the opportunity and the privilege of serving with him observed to the same degree and to the same depth that he has observed and is now observing the real threat that the alien philosophy in the minds of those who now occupy the Supreme Court have brought us to, we probably would not be faced with the many serious threats to the destruction of State government that we are threatened with today. I hope the Members of this body will join in supporting the Smith bill and that more of the Members will come to realize what our friend, the gentleman from Georgia, is saying here this afternoon—and that is that the Supreme Court is out to wipe out the lines of demarcation between the States and the Federal Government and destroy the sovereignty of the several States.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great appreciation to the masterful and learned address which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is delivering to the House. I agree with him in these sound sentiments and I join with him also in his support of the bill H. R. 3 and commend the gentleman most heartily for his splendid address.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my respects to the gentleman for the fine manner in which he has addressed himself to the most serious domestic issue in which our country is involved today. The gentleman is performing a great service not only to the Congress but also to the country as a whole by the scholarly discussion he is making.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

#### UNDERSTANDING THE SCHOOL DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the very able remarks of my friend—and I consider him my personal friend—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], on a matter which is of great importance to everyone in this country.

I am reminded that Prof. Paul A. Freund, the Charles Stebbins Fairchild professor of law of the Harvard Law School, who is considered one of the great constitutional authorities of this country, recently wrote two very able articles discussing the background of the unanimous Supreme Court decision in the so-called school segregation case and the decision itself, *Brown v. Board of Education, etc.* (347 U. S. 483).

I placed them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in March. Under permission to extend my remarks, I shall insert them at this point in the RECORD, for I feel they will be of great assistance to anybody who is interested in a dispassionate discussion of the issue involved here. They are:

I

Unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court are uncommon enough in ordinary cases, and especially rare in extraordinary ones. When, therefore, the unanimous decision in the school segregation cases provokes attacks on the Court for "judicial usurpation" and "naked judicial power," the lines of communication between the Court and the people have been badly tangled. The phrases just quoted are taken from the Declaration of Constitutional Principles issued by 19 Senators and 81 Representatives in the United States Congress.

This declaration (popularly known as the Southern manifesto) is only the latest and most dramatic item of evidence that we may be facing not only a crisis in race relations but—what could in the long run be even more shattering—a crisis in the role of the Supreme Court as the authoritative voice of our highest law. The latter threat, no less than the former, calls for the fullest possible measure of understanding.

One thing can surely be said of the segregation cases: They were not hastily or thoughtlessly decided. Every contention now advanced against the decision was presented to the Court in briefs, running to hundreds of pages, and in oral argument. The Court was exceptionally deliberate in its treatment of this litigation. The cases were originally set for argument in October 1952. Argument was postponed by the Court until December. In June 1953, the Court ordered the cases reargued at the following term, specifying certain questions, including historical inquiries, to be canvassed by counsel.

In December 1953 the reargument took place. The Court was assisted not only by the unusually thorough briefs of the complainants and the defendant States but by a full-scale brief submitted by Attorney General Brownell, in support of the complainants' position. On May 17, 1954, the decision was finally handed down; but even then the Court avoided precipitate action. Still another argument was ordered on the question of the form of relief.

The attorneys general of all States requiring or permitting racial discrimination in public education were invited to present their views, and the representatives of six States—Florida, North Carolina, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Maryland, and Texas—were in fact heard, in addition to the States directly involved in the cases—Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.

The judgment of the Court was announced on May 31, 1955, more than 3 years after the cases had been docketed there, and after every forewarning that a momentous decision might be forthcoming, but still with forbearance in the order for enforcement. The NAACP had asked for decrees effective not later than the opening of the next school year. The Attorney General's brief had suggested decrees requiring plans to be submitted by the States within 90 days, "for ending, as soon as possible, racial segregation of pupils in public schools."

The Court took the more moderate course of directing the lower courts to enter "such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases." The phrase "deliberate speed" is a term of legal art deriving from 18th century chancery practice, and not as certain litterateurs surmised from the haunting refrain in Francis Thompson's religious poem *The Hound of Heaven*: "Deliberate speed, majestic instancy."

The literary reference does, however, serve by contrast to underscore the judicious restraint shown by the Court. Majestic instancy would have been too heroic a demand for mortal men faced with genuine problems of school districting, allotment of facilities, transfer of teachers, grading of pupils, and similar administrative burdens. Nevertheless the opinion made it plain that delay for reasons of community nonacceptance would not be legitimate. "But it should go without saying," the opinion of Chief Justice Warren declared, "that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them."

Those who disagree with the decision on constitutional grounds argue that it is not justified by either the language or the history of the 14th amendment. The Congressmen's declaration, for example, states: "The original Constitution does not mention education. Neither does the 14th amendment nor any other amendment."

This, of course, is true. The 14th amendment provides that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person the equal protection of the laws."

But the argument from the silence of the Constitution about education proves much too much. It is the very essence of the Constitution that it speaks in generalities like "equal protection of the laws," and it is the very essence of the judicial process that it must apply the generalities to the concrete facts of experience. Nowhere does the Constitution mention agriculture; are there then literalists who would conclude that Congress is out of bounds in debating Federal price supports for agricultural commodities?

Note, too, that the argument from the silence of the Constitution would rule out any Federal standard whatever for public education, the separate-but-equal standard no less than desegregation. In this respect the declaration is not free from ambiguity, for it quotes with apparent approval the separate-but-equal doctrine as an "established legal principle almost a century old." It is not clear, that is, whether the usurpation by the Court is thought to

begin when any facilities at all are required for the public education of Negroes, or equal facilities in separate schools, or admission without regard to race.

The argument from the historical background, rather than the text, of the 14th amendment, is subtler, and it leads to some basic questions about the nature of constitutional interpretation. To quote once more the declaration of the Members of Congress: "The debates preceding the submission of the 14th amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the systems of education maintained by the States."

Here there is a further ambiguity. If the meaning is that there was no specific, calculated purpose to deal with education, the statement is undoubtedly true. If the meaning is that there was a specific, calculated purpose to exclude education, the debates are plainer to the signers of the declaration than they were to the Court or to the Attorney General. The word used by Chief Justice Warren to describe the debates is inconclusive. This is hardly surprising, in view of the relatively minor role of public education at the time, and the correspondingly fragmentary attention it received in the spacious discussions in Congress over privileges and immunities of citizens and equal protection of the laws.

Most schooling in the South was private in 1869; for Negroes it was virtually nonexistent there; and throughout the country the public-school system and compulsory education as we know it were in a rudimentary stage. The Congress which approved the 14th amendment did not foresee the development in education which has taken place and did not foreclose the participation by Negroes in that development on a plane of equality, for equal protection of the laws was adopted as a standard without exceptions or exemptions.

Even if the legislative history had shown more evidence than it did of the intention not to cover public education the interpretation of the 14th amendment would not necessarily be circumscribed by that sentiment. The Founding Fathers in the convention of 1787 voted down a proposal to authorize Congress to grant charters of incorporation. This negative vote did not later prevent such charters from being granted and upheld, under general language which the framers approved.

Very often, and very properly, the real intention of constitutional assemblies is to establish principles and to leave the hard questions of their application to be worked out in the unknown future. Thereby trouble is not borrowed for the present, and the unfolding life of the future is not straitjacketed.

The process is misunderstood if it is thought to be peculiar to the 14th amendment. The sixth amendment, for example, provides that "the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." When this was formulated in 1789, the right of an accused person even to employ counsel to assist at his trial was denied in England for many types of crimes; not until 1836 was that right fully granted in England.

With us, however, the guarantee has come to mean more than the right to have the assistance of counsel who is employed. It has come to mean, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, the right of an indigent defendant to have counsel appointed for him by the trial court. This is simply an illustration of Chief Justice Hughes' pronouncement in the famous mortgage moratorium case in 1934:

It is no answer to say that this public need was not apprehended a century ago, or to insist that what the provision of the Constitution meant to the vision of that day it must mean to the vision of our time. If by the statement that what the Constitution meant at the time of its adoption it means today, it is intended to say that the great

clauses of the Constitution must be confined to the interpretation which the framers, with the conditions and outlook of their time, would have placed upon them, the statement carries its own refutation.

## II

Is there, then, no criterion of meaning for the general guaranties of the Constitution? Must the Justices do what they are accused of doing in the Congressman's declaration, substituting personal, political, and social ideas for the established law of the land?

The answer is that as the function of a Justice is necessarily something more than to be a grammarian, it is decidedly less than to be a zealot. The Court interprets to us our own ideals implanted in the constitutional document, as they have flowered in our national life. Justice Holmes put a complex idea concisely, in speaking of the provisions of the Constitution: "Their significance is not formal; it is to be gathered not simply by taking the words and a dictionary, but by considering their origin and the line of their growth."

"The line of their growth" is a key to the understanding of the segregation cases. Whatever the purposes of the 14th amendment may serve—and it has come to serve a good many collateral ones, such as the rule of "1 thing, 1 tax" in State taxation—its basic aim concerned equality of rights for Negroes. The development of that concept is a story of successive applications of the principle to a widening variety of practices.

In 1880 the right to be included on juries was established. In 1917 racial restrictions in zoning laws were held invalid, despite the argument of the municipality that property values and public order required the discrimination.

In 1927 the all-white primary election was ruled invalid, despite the argument of the State that primaries are a private political affair. In a passage resembling some current protests, the brief of the State of Texas declared, "It must be remembered that nominating primaries were unknown at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and of the constitution of Texas in 1876. The question of parties and their regulation is a political one rather than legal."

Although the 15th amendment deals with the right of suffrage, Justice Holmes said, for the Court, "We find it unnecessary to consider the 15th amendment, because it seems to us hard to imagine a more direct and obvious infringement on the 14th."

Then in 1938 a Negro applicant was ordered admitted to the law school of the University of Missouri, despite the State's offer to pay his tuition at a nondiscriminating law school in a neighboring State. Since Missouri had no separate (and equal) law school for Negroes, the color line had to be broken in the State university. Mr. Justice McReynolds, who dissented from the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Hughes, saw clearly enough the line of growth in education, and he did not like it. He said:

"For a long time Missouri has acted upon the view that the best interest of her people demands separation of whites and Negroes in schools. Under the opinion just announced, I presume she may abandon her law school and thereby disadvantage her white citizens without impairing petitioner's opportunities for legal instruction; or she may break down the settled practice concerning separate schools and thereby, as indicated by experience, damnify both races."

All of these cases had their sequels, in which the Court turned back attempts to circumvent the decisions or to blunt their effect by differentiating them from cases coming before the courts. Much of the progress was made before World War II. Since then, in Korea and in military posts around the globe, as well as at home, we have

extended the principle of desegregation. The question before the Court in the school cases was whether the vital growth had come to an end in the educational sphere with the separate-but-equal doctrine or whether it carried through to desegregation.

The Court could have answered in any of three ways. It could have answered as it did, finding that the principle of equality was not exhausted by separate but equal facilities; that as a Nation we had moved beyond that stage in profession and to a substantial degree in practice; and that the real and painful difficulties of adjustment in certain areas would be given proper respect by allowing time for administrative changeovers.

The second possible choice for the Court would have been to leave the matter to Congress under the power to enforce the provisions of the 14th amendment. That course would have been the easiest for the Court to take, but it would not have been the most straightforward.

The advances already made in applying the principle of equality had been achieved through resort to the Court, not to Congress: zoning, primaries, university education. Congress was not in the habit of taking responsibility in this field, or indeed in any of the other ramifications of the 14th amendment as limits on the powers of the States. To have dropped the issue in the lap of Congress would have been extraordinary. Congress, on its part, could have been expected to regard the issue as a judicial one and to play an Alphonse-Gaston game.

The third possibility was to decide that education is not included in the guaranty of equal protection of the laws, or that the guaranty is satisfied by separate public schooling. This would have been a pronouncement that as a people we do not recognize fellowship in the educational process to be a minimum standard for governments to observe in our common life, that the vital growth of the principle of equality has not carried to this point.

Would we have been satisfied with this reflection of our own better nature as a people? For it is just that better nature which we mean the Court to hold up to us in interpreting the Bill of Rights. A philosopher, Alexander Meiklejohn, once described the Court's function in this way:

"That Court is commissioned to interpret to us our own purposes, our own meanings. . . . And its teaching has peculiar importance because it interprets principles of fact and of value, not merely in the abstract, but also in their bearing upon the concrete, immediate problems which are, at any given moment, puzzling and dividing us."

If the Court was wrong in the school cases it is because the Court misjudged our present-day ideal of equality in law. To judge the decision, therefore, is to judge ourselves, all of us, for the Constitution sets a common, not a sectional, standard for the country. That is why it is supremely important that we understand the meaning of the decision and the role of the Court in reaching it. That is why it is important, too, that those who believe the Court judged rightly, as well as the critics, should let their voices be heard.

I want also to refer to one of the very few valuable contributions to this subject made here on this floor or elsewhere in Congress. This was a special order by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary on March 15, beginning at page 4223 of the RECORD.

His speech merits and should receive the thoughtful and serious study of every citizen of this country who is interested in this vital problem. It should have

the widest possible distribution. I am glad to have this opportunity to call attention to it again. I urge that every group and organization now engaged in presenting the facts as to this problem to the American people should undertake to make it available to every one of its members and to all others who wish to have an understanding of this momentous and historical decision of the Supreme Court.

Our colleague's thorough and careful analysis of the history of the Brown case is by a lawyer of recognized and outstanding ability, an active member of the House Committee on the Judiciary and, for some time, the ranking minority member of that committee, who has had occasion to deal directly with this vital problem of civil rights before that influential committee. I am confident that each of his colleagues, irrespective of his or her individual opinion as to the civil rights issue, will concede that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has exercised excellent judgment and strong leadership in making it possible for a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary to recommend recently the enactment of the civil rights legislation which had been recommended by the present Attorney General of the United States.

I want to include here the final two paragraphs of that speech by our colleague from New York, as follows:

To this I would add one more brief quote, from an act done in the First Congress, from which we who are assembled here today trace our origin, in a document signed 180 years ago:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness; that, to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

I hope we shall be able to keep this great heritage in focus. I agree with my esteemed friends from Southern States that we are facing challenges akin to those which plagued our Nation in the sad days of reconstruction. But I am sure that, on reflection, none of us will wish to carry his partisanship on this matter beyond the limits of judicial reconsideration, or legislative or constitutional revision. And I hope that the wisdom and restraint of the Court's own language in these decisions will prove helpful to all of us.

I know that the great majority of this House expects and intends that it shall be given an opportunity to express its deep convictions upon these recommendations by the Committee on the Judiciary in the very near future.

I think all will admit, even though they may not approve, the undisputed fact that the executive departments have made substantial and significant contributions in implementing an excellent civil rights program.

Few would challenge the fact that progress has been made in the judicial department, and particularly by the Supreme Court of the United States and by the Federal courts, in defining and upholding the civil rights of American citizens.

Unfortunately, there has been little in the record of Congress over the years,

so far as this great issue is concerned, to commend itself. We must admit, with regret, the fact that progress by Congress would have been possible if it had not been for unfortunate delay and obstruction, primarily through such inexcusable devices as filibusters.

Now that a constructive and valuable program has been recommended by a majority of one of our outstanding committees, each of us must accept an individual responsibility for doing everything within his power to insure that the individual Members of this House will have the opportunity to express herself or himself in this field of legislation before adjournment of this Congress. It is an absolute and unequal responsibility of the House, irrespective of what may happen elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent further to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include certain extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, now that H. R. 8901, the District of Columbia transit bill, has been rescheduled for consideration next Wednesday, I want to discuss certain further points with reference to H. R. 10871, which I intend to offer as a substitute for H. R. 8901, if that becomes possible under the parliamentary situation.

I want to emphasize that it is entirely possible that the only vote by the House may well be confined to acceptance or rejection of the committee substitute. Of course, if the committee substitute should be rejected, it would be possible to seek recognition to offer H. R. 10871 as a substitute. However, I want to add that I have also asked the advice of the House Parliamentarian as to whether H. R. 10871 could be incorporated in a motion to recommit and he has advised me that this cannot be done. While I do understand that the simple motion to recommit to the committee might be offered, in view of the time element involved and of all the circumstances, personally, I do not believe that public interest would be served by such a recommitment. Consequently, I hope that it will be possible to present the single fundamental issue of whether the charter and franchise of the Capital Transit Co. which was revoked last August by the Congress shall be returned to that company, under its present control, or an interim Authority can be created to carry on the efforts of the District authorities to locate competent private operators prior to August 15, 1959. I hope it is clear by now that public ownership, as such, is not a real issue. Title III, section 301, section 303, and section 305 not only direct a continued effort toward such a sale but would terminate the existence of the interim Authority upon that sale and, most important, would require the Board of Directors of that Authority to report to Congress within 15 days of June 15, 1958, all the steps taken to bring about such a sale

and the reasons for failure to make such a sale, if none occurs by June 15, 1958. Therefore, Congress would retain full and complete authority after the receipt of such a report to pass any legislation it then considers necessary and proper. Only if Congress did not act upon such a report would the permanent Authority come into being.

At this point I want to include a brief memorandum of references I have prepared in order to reply to the inquiries I have received:

Because of the increasing number of inquiries I have been receiving with reference to this legislation I have prepared this brief memorandum of references, thinking it may be convenient for those who are interested in this legislation.

1. The minority views I filed on April 27 in report 2034, part 2.

2. The so-called interim transit bill, which I hope to be able to offer on the floor, is House Resolution 10871.

3. The following citations to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to and including May 9 may be of some interest and possible value.

(a) May 2, page 7325.

(b) May 7, page 7592.

(c) May 7, page 7646.

(d) May 9, page 7857.

4. The following citations are to references to comments as to this legislation, although there may have been other references which have not come to my attention:

(a) Congressman HAYWORTH, May 2, Appendix of the Daily RECORD, page A3510.

(b) Congressman MACDONALD, May 8, page 7712.

(c) Congressman MACDONALD, May 9, page 7836.

Several possible amendments to H. R. 10871 have been suggested to me. I have not had an opportunity yet to study them as I intend to do over this weekend. However, it seems to me that some of them are constructive and might improve H. R. 10871, if it becomes possible to offer that bill as a substitute. Therefore, I believe it would be useful to mention them briefly at this time.

The first would be an amendment to insure that, in acquiring any specific items of real or tangible personal property by eminent domain, the interim Authority could not take less than the entire interest in such items of property vested in the owner.

The second would make it clear that the interim Authority would not have the right to take by eminent domain both the assets represented by the capital stock of the Capital Transit Co. and also the capital stock itself.

The third would specify more clearly the employment rights and benefits the employees of the company would have in the event they were transferred to the interim Authority.

The fourth would provide that all present career employees of the Capital Transit Co. would have an opportunity to retain their positions under the interim Authority.

I hope to be able to discuss these, and any other amendments which may be suggested to me, on Monday or Tuesday of next week and to place in the RECORD the precise language of any such amendments as I would feel justified in offering or supporting.

## RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, all Rumanians in America and throughout the world are today commemorating May 10 as their historic day of independence.

The Kremlin, in its efforts to sovietize Rumania, has abolished and prohibited any commemoration of this national independence day. Since 1944 Rumania, a former free country, has been occupied and ruled by large Soviet military forces. The people are living under constant terror and slavery. The peace treaties with Rumania and Hungary provide that the Russian troops withdraw from Rumania and Hungary within 90 days from the conclusion of the Austrian Peace Treaty. After the signing of the Austrian Peace Treaty last year, the Russian troops should have withdrawn from the Rumanian border within 90 days, but up to now, they have not departed and evidently do not intend to do so. Our Government, the United Kingdom, and Soviet Russia are signatories for the treaty providing for this withdrawal of Communist troops from Rumania. I firmly believe that it is the obligation of our State Department to insist that the Soviets fulfill their treaty obligations and retire from the Rumanian border. Apparently it was a great mistake to conclude the peace treaty with tyrannical governments forcibly installed by Moscow, but once our State Department made these incredible concessions to the Soviets, we should at least make an effort to see that these treaties are respected. The peace treaty with Austria has been concluded and over 6 months have elapsed, but there is no sign of the Russian troops withdrawing from Rumania and Hungary. The Soviet Union is thus violating its obligations under these peace treaties. Until now, the United States and the United Kingdom have not raised the issue of the withdrawal of the Red troops, although it is their obligation to do so. A profound silence reigns over the whole situation. Moreover, the Communist governments of Rumania and Hungary which have been infringing the treaties and are subservient accomplices to this last Soviet violation, have been rewarded for their crimes by being accepted as respectable members of the United Nations. The State Department should take the necessary steps for asking for the fulfillment of these treaty provisions. Articles 38 of the Rumanian and 40 of the Hungarian peace treaties provide for the procedure to be followed in this case. Congress could raise this vital problem and ask for action on this agreement to which the signature and interests of the United States are involved. Regardless of the recent change of face and smiling visits of Bulganin and Khrushchev to free countries, it is highly necessary that the Soviet dictators be compelled to live up to their treaties and agreements. This so-called change of attitude on the part of the Kremlin is nothing more than a strategic maneuver to get time to consolidate its control over captive nations so

their economy can become stronger and in a few years continue their drive for world domination.

Rumania and the people of other captive nations, as well as the people living in free democracies, should not be misled by Soviet diplomatic maneuvers and relax in her fight for freedom and independence. If the people of the free world will continue their opposition to further Communist expansion and also expose the real facts and truth about communism, Rumania and other captive countries will again enjoy self-government and freedom. The history of the world reveals that tyrannical governments who rule by fear, slave labor camps, purges, and mass murders, cannot continue long in power. The Communist tyrant's rule over Rumania is sure to suffer defeat and extinction and we all hope that the day is not far distant.

I wish to incorporate with my remarks on this anniversary commemoration of Rumanian independence, a statement from Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Rumanians, setting out historical facts on Rumanian independence:

### THE LEAGUE OF FREE RUMANIANS—HISTORICAL NOTE ON RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE

The independence of the Rumanian people was fully reestablished by the Congress of Berlin, 1878, after almost three centuries of being under the suzerainty of the Ottoman Empire. Up to the moment of the Turkish advance into the Danube area the Rumanian lands had been ruled by national Domni (independent princes) who took an active part in the defense of Europe and of Christian civilization, through an unceasing fight against the invasions from the East. "The victories you have gained with equal wisdom and bravery over the unbelievers, our common foe, have raised your fame to the point that your name is on everyone's lips, and all agree in exalting you"—wrote Pope Sixtus IV to Stephen the Great, one of these Rumanian Domni ruling in the second half of the XVth century.

The Rumanian people, descendants of the Roman colonists of Dacia (the ancient name of the land inhabited by the Rumanians) form a strong Latin and Christian outpost at the Eastern confines of Europe. The country, numbering now 20-odd millions, has preserved its national integrity throughout centuries of vicissitudes. A deeply rooted nationalism and Christian faith are once more today the inspiration which welds the Rumanian people together in an unyielding resistance to communism.

The circumstances under which the independence of Rumania was recognized in 1878 are worth remembering.

On the eve of the war between Russia and Turkey on April 16, 1877, Mihail Kogalniceanu, Rumanian Minister for Foreign Affairs, signed a convention with Russia. The convention assured to the Russian armies free passage across Rumania, provisioning and the use of roads and railways, and pledged her to respect Rumanian laws and institutions. Article II of this convention had the following text: "In order that no inconvenience should result for Rumania from the fact of the passage of the Russian troops through her territory, the Government of His Majesty the Emperor of all Russias pledges himself to maintain and to make respected the political rights of the Rumanian State, such as derive from its internal laws and the existing treaties, as well as to maintain and defend the present integrity of Rumania."

What happened immediately after this convention was signed is typical. "Meanwhile the Russian attitude was disquieting," writes the English historian, Seton Watson. (A History of the Rumanians, Cambridge, 1934, p. 336.) "There was a tendency to override or ignore Rumanian susceptibilities and treat the country as a mere Russian dependency. Rumania's cooperation on equal terms was airily rejected by the vain and pompous Gorchakov (the Russian Chancellor): the most that he would concede was that she might join the war uninvited, but in that event there must be complete fusion and unity of command. 'Russia,' it was stated quite explicitly, 'does not need the assistance of the Rumanian army'."

But "in the second half of July the Russians suffered more than one reverse, and, finding themselves in urgent need of reinforcements, pressed the Rumanians to come to their aid. \* \* \* Prince Charles, with a fresh army of 50,000 men and 180 guns at his disposal, was this time able to lay down specific conditions for cooperation, and the Russians dismounting from their high horse, gracefully offered him the command of the united armies before Plevna. \* \* \* On September 8 the Rumanian army had its real baptism of fire in the redoubts of Grivita, before Plevna: and the foreign attachés and correspondents were unanimous in their praise of its extreme gallantry and steadiness, which contributed very materially to the final defeat of the Turks." Osman Pasha surrendered on December 9.

The reward for this cooperation came very soon. On January 29, 1878, Gen. Ion Ghica—the Rumanian representative in Moscow—was officially informed that Russia demanded the districts of southern Bessarabia, which had been returned to Rumania by the Treaty of Paris. "The plea that the territory in question had been for centuries an integral part of Moldavia and had fallen to Russia the first time only 44 years before the Treaty of Paris, seems to have made not the slightest impression upon either the Tsar or Chancellor."

The possession of Bessarabia with control of the mouths of the Danube, was cynically made by the great powers an object for bargaining, and the Berlin congress sanctioned this amputation of Rumanian territory to Russia. "In politics," remarked Lord Beaconsfield to the Rumanian Prime Minister Bratianu, "ingratitude is oftentimes the reward for the most distinguished services." It was in vain that Gladstone accused the British Government of "selling Bessarabian liberty to Russia."

A similar incident happened, when, in the autumn of 1944, Sir Winston Churchill sold Rumanian liberty to Communist Russia. But this time there was no Gladstone to protest against this political felony. Thus was the great American principle of self-determination which President Woodrow Wilson upheld and made a reality in Eastern Europe, sacrificed to placate a Communist tyrant. The fact that from September 1944 until the end of the war, the Rumanian army substantially contributed to the Allied offensive and considerably shortened the war, being considered at that time, as the London Times put it, "the fourth combative force," has not affected the cynical bargain between the great powers in 1944. The situation is remarkably similar to that of 1878; when Russia raped a province from Rumania, her ally, who had saved her from defeat.

Rumania has been blatantly subjugated by Soviet Russia on March 6, 1945; through the politically and militarily enforced ultimatum delivered to King Michael, by Andrei Vishinsky 2 weeks after the Yalta Declaration. The United States and the United Kingdom officially recognized this enslavement by signing a so-called peace treaty with the nonrepresentative Moscow installed puppet government in Paris in 1947.

Thus does history repeat itself, but this time with infinitely more tragic consequences both for Rumania and for the world.

#### AID FOR THE AMERICAN SHIP-BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention by William A. Calvin, international president of the International Brotherhood of Boiler-makers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, AFL-CIO, an article that recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal and written by Vinton McVicker.

This alert and progressive union is the bargaining agent for the employees of most of the shipyards in the United States of America and is to be complimented for the legitimate concern it evidences for a distressed and sick industry as well as for the shipyard worker. Mr. McVicker emphasizes that American firms are ordering quite a few new vessels, but that only a relatively small number of orders are being placed with American shipyards. The result is that while the general shipbuilding industry throughout the world is enjoying a high level of activity with a very reassuring backlog of firm orders, American shipyards have been desperately fighting for their very survival because of a dearth of orders for new ships in recent years.

This underutilization of our shipbuilding resources is of great significance to the Nation. First of all, shipbuilding is a highly technical operation, requiring a relatively large force of highly trained and specialized workers. The skills of these workers can be preserved only through constantly practicing their art—that of building vessels. This is possible only when the shipyards have orders for ship construction. In the absence of orders, the shipyards are forced to close down, turning loose their most irreplaceable commodity—their skilled workers.

The immediate distressing effect is to swell the unemployment ranks by the thousands. If the condition is allowed to persist for long, these skilled workers become completely dispersed and are absorbed into other industry, from whence they may never return. The ultimate ill effect would be an irreparable loss to the Nation of its shipbuilding technique. I am certain that the Nation will never permit such a major catastrophe to occur, although we came close to this prior to World War II. It would be unwise and dangerous to permit this condition to develop and to exist.

The second element of significance of the American shipbuilding industry is economic. This industry is a part of our broad economy; and so long as it remains a sick industry, it constitutes a cancerous spot in that economy. In this connection, it must be borne in mind

that the industry is an important user of steel and of many prefabricated and finished items.

The shipbuilding industry is of major importance to my district and to the State. In addition to the Navy Yard at Boston, there are the Bethlehem yard at Quincy, and various other facilities throughout the area. The depressed condition of these installations has an undesirable effect on the entire economy of the State. And we are acutely sensitive to the resulting unemployment.

But this is not just a problem for Boston, nor even for New England alone. Privately owned shipyards exist in all coastal areas. Shipbuilding is an important industry on the Pacific coast and in the gulf area, as well as on the Atlantic coast. Thus, this problem of a depressed shipbuilding industry is truly one which is national in scope.

The third element of significance is the extreme importance of the shipbuilding industry to national defense. When war strikes, we are completely dependent on our ability to build ships quickly. Certainly the lesson of two world wars is that a strong merchant marine is absolutely indispensable to our war effort. For the safety of the Nation, we simply must maintain a foundation of personnel and facilities upon which to build and expand, if the time ever comes that we again must build a wartime lifeline of ships. In this respect it has been authoritatively established that the minimum safe nucleus of skilled shipyard workers for mobilization of the industry in wartime is 36,000. At the present time, the total amounts to only 11,000. While the industry is picking up now, we are still a long way from achieving this goal. If war came tomorrow, we would have less than one-third of what has been established as the minimum shipyard labor force on which to build a war-shipping potential.

We are seriously concerned with the trend of American firms taking their orders for new ships to foreign shipbuilders. The principal reason advanced is that costs are considerably higher in the United States—30 percent higher, according to Mr. McVicker, and 40 percent higher according to other sources. Thus, they say, cost is the prime factor involved in the placing abroad of ship-construction orders.

But this is not the complete answer. If we were to apply this reasoning to all fields of production and business activity the results to our American economy would be disastrous, with unemployment and reduced purchasing power resulting therefrom.

However, every study and effort should be made to try and bring our costs as near as possible to the prevailing cost levels in foreign yards, and I am informed from reliable sources that this can be done without affecting the American standard of wages and living among our workers in America's shipbuilding plants. There is a growing conviction that this high-cost problem in shipbuilding can be tackled with great success.

This is a conviction to which I heartily subscribe because I am quite aware of the vital importance of this great industry. For many years it was accepted

without question that the American shipbuilding industry was characterized by high costs and that nothing could be done to lower those costs. This is now being questioned in reliable quarters and some very constructive suggestions have been made.

It is clearly understood that building a large ocean vessel cannot be adapted to pure production-line methods as are employed to manufacture automobiles. But there are being advocated procedures which are expected to result in definite reductions of costs. One outstanding suggestion is for the standardization of basic ship design.

An example of the advantage of standardization was described for the wartime shipbuilding industry. At a particular shipyard which was building tankers, the first round, or in other words, production of vessels on the existing ways, took 149 days. By the time the yard had turned out 10 such rounds of tankers, the time for the 10th round had been reduced to 41 days. High volume of ship orders undoubtedly played an important part in effecting some economies. However, there was definite advantage gained from advancements in methods and techniques.

More and more, as the ship was put together in sections before going on the ways, methods were found to make the production not only faster but less costly.

The Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administrator, Mr. Clarence G. Morse, has expressed himself on the subject in forthright fashion:

Break down the cost picture into its various components: a basic degree of standardization can result in greatly decreased construction costs, the ready interchangeability of ships in various trades, the ability to stockpile a minimum of spare parts, improved cargo handling gear, modern propulsion machinery—all the advantages of good basic designing plus the evolution lessons of mass production. And, in the first instance, much lower design and plan costs.

We are putting too much money into paper. I intend to lend my support to having that money spent on iron and steel and still have the best designed, best built and best operated ships of the world.

I don't think this is going to represent any aggregate loss of business to the ship designers because if we don't go along these lines of standardization, in my opinion, we won't have the total amount of shipbuilding we are all working toward. As a matter of fact, the impact of all these programs will be so great that it will be difficult to meet the normal engineering requirements. There are many and varied modifications that each operator will need for his particular trade; in each of our joint enterprises under the subsidy laws there is a constant exchange of ideas and planning with the individual operator and his design agent. And there are limitless horizons ahead for the design of new and specialized equipment and building techniques which will call for all our expert services.

I must repeat, the Government is not in favor of nonstandardized ship types. This position, I submit, is consistent with our entire economy; we must cut down on the overhead before we price our merchant marine out of business. Another thing which is often forgotten—our greatest problem today is not ship design, it is not ship operation—basically it is ship construction. We

need more work and more skilled workers in our shipyards.

The Maritime Administration has implemented its position on vessel standardization through the establishment of a proposal for seven basic ship designs. The 7 consist of 4 dry-cargo types, a tanker, a bulk carrier, and a ship designed to carry truck trailers.

The last named type of vessel represents the water carrier counterpart of the railroad operation known as trailer on flatcars. Ship-trailer operations hold some promise of helping to revitalize coastwise and intercoastal shipping. Such a development is especially significant since by law only ships built in the United States can be used in coastwise or intercoastal trade.

A related factor germane to this discussion concerns the threat of block obsolescence, or having the existing merchant marine fleet become obsolete in a relatively short period of time. The threat involved in block obsolescence is having to replace a large number of ships in a few years' time. This leads to a very unstable, feast-or-famine condition in the shipbuilding industry. The solution is to place into effect a leveling off plan for ship replacement. Such a course would lend some assurance to shipyard operators of the continuing availability of a reasonable number of orders for new construction.

After reaching an alarmingly low level in recent years, the shipbuilding industry in the United States has received some encouragement lately. Favorable congressional legislation is one factor. Ships to accommodate truck trailers, mentioned earlier, is another factor. The prospects for shipbuilding activity have decidedly improved.

Now that we are in the process of revitalizing our shipyards, I think that this is an excellent time to consider new cost-saving methods and techniques, including the proposal to standardize the basic design of ships. It is my considered judgment that now, while shipyard operators are in the process of planning for the future of the industry, the operators should sit down at the conference table with labor representatives to seek new methods and techniques, and ways of adopting them. I recognize fully that it is a wise course to permit labor to have a voice in such far-reaching proceedings. And I am confident that both management and labor will recognize my proposal as a suggestion for positive action to aid in reviving the shipbuilding industry in the United States and maintaining it at the high level at which it properly belongs.

Mr. Speaker, we in America have a proud maritime heritage which has evolved through all the years of our existence as a Nation. We have built good ships to serve our foreign commerce needs, and those of other nations. This heritage is threatened because of high costs of operation in relation to the shipbuilding industry abroad. We need to effect significant savings in shipbuilding, and I am confident that with all our technological knowledge and inventive ingenuity we can devise methods and techniques which will result in such savings. This, Mr. Speaker, is the positive,

forward-thinking approach to our shipyard problem.

The article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal follows:

**RUNAWAY SHIPS—MANY AMERICAN FIRMS BUILD MONSTER VESSELS IN FOREIGN SHIPYARDS—TANKERS IN FRANCE, JAPAN; ORE CARRIERS IN GERMANY; BANANA BOATS IN BRITAIN**

(By Vinton McVicker)

#### A CLOSE LOOK AT HAMBURG

**HAMBURG.**—To discover many of the merchant ships, great and small, which American companies are building today—and will build tomorrow—you must seek out shipyards in foreign lands.

At this moment Tide Water Associated Oil Co. is negotiating with French yards at Dunkerque and St. Nazaire to build 2 gargantuan tankers, each capable of splashing along at 17 knots, hauling 60,000 or more tons of crude oil in a single trip to its new Delaware River refinery from the neutral zone between Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. The expectation is that when delivered, in 1958, these would be the world's largest tankships, though so hot is the competitive pace of construction that no one can guarantee it. Tip one of these craft on end and it would fall just a few feet short of the RCA building in Rockefeller Center. Its total weight, loaded, would be over 80,000 tons—exceeding the *Queen Elizabeth*, world's largest liner. The price: Probably at least \$8 million apiece.

A monster almost as large, and the biggest thing of its kind now afloat, is the 55,000-ton-capacity Sinclair *Petrolore*, which arrived at Santos, Brazil, a few days ago with a cargo of crude oil from Kuwait. It is of a revolutionary design, capable of hauling not only oil but also such dry cargo as ore and coal. Built this year by Universe Tankships, Inc., of Liberia, an affiliate of National Bulk Carriers, Inc., of New York, the *Petrolore* will be taken over next month by Sinclair Oil Corp. on a long-term lease. Slated for round-the-world service, the *Petrolore* will carry oil from Kuwait to the United States and ore from Venezuela to Japan. Universe Tankships has other vessels abuilding in Japan, two of them even bigger than the *Petrolore*.

#### Ore ships, banana boats

Here in Hamburg the order books of Germany's largest shipbuilder, Deutsche Werft, have a fresh entry. Hendy International Corp. of Philadelphia has signed up for 8 big seagoing ore carriers. Designed to haul 34,500 tons each, at better than 14-knot speed, the vessels are slated to carry ore for big United States steelmakers, as well as some bauxite for aluminum companies.

In the British shipbuilding center of Birkenhead an ore carrier destined to move bauxite is being assembled at the yard of Cammel Laird & Co. This 31,000-tonner is for Pan-Ore Steamship Co., Panamanian subsidiary of Aluminum Co. of America. Three 6,000-ton banana boats are being put together near Glasgow, Scotland, by Alexander Stephens & Sons, for a subsidiary of United Fruit Co. The same yard is making, for the same customer, an 8,700-ton cargo ship which will also carry passengers.

This is the merest sampling of the American business flowing into foreign shipyards. While United States yards are operating at a fraction of capacity, West Germany's yards have enough domestic and foreign business booked right now to keep them busy for 2 or 3 years, and Britain's shipbuilders have about 4 years' work in hand.

The explanation, of course, is that United States costs run at least 30 percent higher; American yards would get almost no business except for Federal construction subsidies to shipping lines. The oil companies and others who receive no subsidies turn to a cheaper source of supply. This great group includes even some of the shipping lines. For instance, Isbrandtsen Lines of New York,

through its affiliate, Liberian Steamship Co. of 1955, Inc., has ordered a motor cargo ship of 4,550-ton capacity to be delivered late next year by Howaldtswerke Hamburg A. G., a yard owned by the German Government.

Even with a 10-percent pay increase that took effect October 1, the highly skilled craftsman in a German yard still averages only about 54 cents an hour. The parking lots at the gates hold motorcycles, motor-scooters, and bicycles, with only a sprinkling of Volkswagens and other tiny German cars. There have been no strikes and no threats of strikes.

Such competition is likely to seem unfair to United States shipbuilders, who are constantly seeking more Government aid. But the fact is that dollars spent abroad for ships all find their way back to America in the form of demand for the myriad products which can be made cheaper in the States. The foreign shipbuilding boom itself creates such direct demand for United States wares; so far this year Germany has imported about 50,000 tons of ship plates—all of it from American steel mills.

Subsidies are not unknown in shipbuilding industries abroad, of course. The French Government pours subsidies into its yards, as into most of its export industries. The principal question in Tide Water's negotiations for its two new supertankers is how large a French subsidy will be made available. Germany has spurred shipbuilding with tax incentives and loans at cheap interest.

#### Tanker building

Even a casual glance shows that the international oil companies, including those headquartered in the United States, are prime instigators of the shipbuilding boom.

The Texas Co. now has a couple of 28,000-ton tankers abuilding at the Harland & Wolff, Ltd., yard in Belfast, Ireland, and 2 more turbine tankers of about the same size at the Deutsche Werft yard here in Hamburg, which earlier this year launched an 18,300-ton motor tanker for the company's Norwegian subsidiary. The company has a 16,000-ton tanker under construction in Norway and an 18,000-ton vessel in the works in the Netherlands.

Overseas Tankship, Ltd., an affiliate of Caltex, the joint creature of Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co., has two 18,000-ton tankers going up in the United Kingdom shipyards of Hawthorn Leslie, Ltd., and Scott's Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd.

Standard Oil of New Jersey affiliates have 27 tankers on order, mostly from foreign shipyards, and in the foreseeable future expect to order 26 more. One subsidiary, Panama Transport Co., has ordered two 35,500-ton tankers from Italian yards. In the Netherlands, Jersey Standard's Dutch affiliate expects delivery next spring of a 26,650-ton tanker, the Esso Nederland. In Denmark, the company's Danish affiliate has on order a 26,225-ton tanker.

French yards have just completed one 37,000-ton tanker, the Esso France, for the French affiliate of Standard Oil of New Jersey, and another tanker, the Esso Colombia, will shortly be launched for another subsidiary, Panama Transport. A British affiliate has two large tankers on order at the Vickers-Armstrong yards at Walker-on-Tyne, three small tankers going up in Yorkshire, and a bitumen carrier in Aberdeen, Scotland.

Jersey Standard's German shipping subsidiary, Waried Tankschiff-Rederei, has just placed orders with three Bremen and Hamburg yards for six 36,000-ton tankers, to cost about \$36 million. The new order was given just as the company received the last of four smaller tankships from German yards. And the British affiliate of Esso has ordered two large tankers in Germany.

#### Britain still leads

Great Britain is still by far the world's biggest shipbuilder, with 2,147,000 gross tons under construction as of September 30, up from 2,058,000 a year earlier. But its share of the booming construction around the world was somewhat shrunken—34 percent compared with 37 percent a year before. One big reason: The postwar revival of the shattered shipbuilding industries of Japan and Germany. Germany nosed out Japan for second position last year; they are fighting it out again now. The Netherlands, France and Italy are not far behind.

Britons admit their prices are about 10 percent higher than German quotations, and delivery dates tend to be more distant. One result: Only about 24 percent of orders received in the past 12 months have been for foreign customers. In contrast, about 70 percent of Germany's total order backlog, about 2.4 million gross tons, represents foreign business. So perhaps it's worth a closer look.

German shipbuilding centers in Hamburg and in nearby Bremen, Bremerhaven, Kiel, and Lubeck—an area about the size of New Jersey. As you stroll through one of these yards—dodging trucks and steel-laden freight cars, hearing the rat-a-tat of riveters and thump of huge steel-stamping presses, seeing the sparks fly as flames cut through thick steel plates for ships' hulls, gazing upward at towering spiderwebs of girders in the shipways—it's hard to believe the ground about you was nothing more than a mess of tangled steel and rubble a few years ago.

For all today's rush of building, which keeps more than 90,000 workers busy on overtime schedules, is being handled in yards that for several years after the war lay wrecked and idle. Allied bombs had put them effectively out of service. And what little equipment was left had to be dismantled under orders from occupation forces.

Not until Allied restrictions on German shipbuilding were lifted in late 1950 and early 1951 could rebuilding start. After that, however, the cleanup and reconstruction job was swift. Today West Germany's shipyards equal the world's best in modern machinery and efficient operation. And in skilled, industrious manpower the yard managers say they can't be beaten anywhere.

#### BOATS IN BRITAIN

##### Foreign orders mount

As fast as yards were put into shape to resume work, orders poured in. They came first from German firms eager to rebuild their own merchant marine. But business from abroad grew quickly, too.

In 1951, first year of the revival, West German yards turned out 255,910 gross registered tons of ships—nearly all for German buyers. They doubled that tonnage in 1952, and more than half of that year's total was in ships to sail under foreign flags. Steadily upward has been the production curve since then, nearly 700,000 tons in 1953 and over 880,000 tons in 1954. Last year's output was worth about \$426 million.

Before World War II, the total output of all German shipyards, including some now behind the Iron Curtain, ranged about 500,000 gross tons a year. Last year's West German production alone topped that by more than 75 percent. And this year the prewar all-German output was equaled by the West German yards in 8 months.

In those 8 months, through August, 182 oceangoing ships, aggregating 553,645 gross tons, were delivered. Of that output, 61 ships of 260,658 tons, were for export, the rest for German buyers. The foreign-flag vessels run bigger than those for home delivery.

The scarcity of steel and capital now make it hard to expand German output much more.

Steel obtainable from West German plants averages about 50,000 tons a month. The

yards need more than that for full-scale production, and are resorting to imports to the extent their finances permit.

Imported steel costs more, but the yards have to use it to meet guaranteed delivery dates. They claim they can get steel from America in 2 or 3 months from date of order, while home-produced plates may keep them waiting 8 months. The shipbuilders hope German steel output will grow enough to meet their needs in the next few years. However, shortage of capital slows down steel plant growth as well as shipyard expansion.

#### Visit to Howaldtswerke

Typical of the boom atmosphere in the shipbuilding industry is the Howaldtswerke Hamburg establishment here. It has orders on hand for 30 ships with cargo capacity of 300,000 tons.

That backlog is nearly three times the yard's 1954 output, which it expects to equal this year. Delivery dates on these ships run as far ahead as 1960, and the firm's capacity is booked almost to the limit through 1957.

On this yard's slipways at the moment are four 10,000-ton cargo ships. Three are for German owners, one for a shipping line in India. Tied up alongside, other ships are getting the finishing touches that come after launching. While this year's output will be about half foreign, half domestic, Dr. Niese estimates it will run 60 to 70 percent for export in the next few years.

One reason German yards have been able to snare so many foreign orders is that they started from scratch when the worldwide boom in shipbuilding began, while their British and other European competitors were already getting up to their ears in orders. Thus, the Germans were able to promise quicker deliveries. And, even more important in many cases, they could guarantee firmer prices on these quick jobs, since they didn't have to write into their contracts escalator clauses as broad as those British builders needed for protection against rising wage rates and material prices.

That differential is tending to shrink, some German builders admit, now that the German bookings are beginning to run almost as far into the future as those of their competitors.

#### British business to Germany

As things stand now, however, some British buyers still are turning to German yards with their orders, in spite of their own country's top rank as a shipbuilder.

Of 43 tankers ordered in the last few months by the Royal Dutch-Shell group (British and Dutch controlled), 8 are to be built in German yards, 21 in Britain, and 14 in the Netherlands. The German orders, for 2 tankers of 32,000 deadweight tons and 6 at 18,000 tons, went to Howaldtswerke Kiel, A. G. Weser, and Deutsche Werft.

A few months ago the British shipping firm, Shaw Savill & Albion, a subsidiary of Furness, Withy & Co., went into the market for four fast freighters for its New Zealand and Australia runs. After shopping around, it gave the orders for three of the ships to the Bremer Vulkan yard at Bremen. Only one of the vessels was placed with a British firm, Harland & Wolff.

The German builder promised delivery dates—one ship in November 1956, the others in early 1957—which the buyer said no British shipbuilder could approach. The shipping firm also estimated the British-built ship would apparently cost about 15 percent more than those built in Germany, because of differences in the escalator clauses.

#### Cost-cutting tricks

German shipbuilders say there is little if any difference in current labor and material costs between their yards and those elsewhere in Europe. Any price shaving they are able to do in comparison with European competitors, they say, reflects the industry and skill of their workers and their cost-cutting tricks in production.

Deutsche Werft demonstrated one of those economy measures when it built its biggest tanker to date, the *Cabimas*, launched last year for an American buyer, Gulf Oil Co. That 32,467-ton ship was constructed in two pieces, each in a shipway of its own. Then, after launching, the two parts were towed into a floating dock and welded together there.

This sectional building technique is being used in other yards also to speed up the work of putting big ships together.

Similar in method was a job Howaldtswerke Hamburg did in inserting a new midship section in a tanker for Standard Vacuum Transportation Co., Ltd., a joint subsidiary of Socony-Mobil and Jersey Standard. The *James W. McGuire* was sliced in two, and the newly built section was spliced between the bow and stern in a floating dock. The result was a longer tanker, of greater carrying capacity, rechristened the *Stanvac Nairobi*.

Another speedup method in nearly all German yards is the prefabrication of parts of ships, perhaps much of a bow or stern assembly or a large section of deck on the ground in roofed shops before work starts in the huge shipways. The steel plates are fastened together there, and then the entire assembly is hoisted into the spiderweb of girders that make up the shipway, for quick insertion. This jigsaw-puzzle method keeps any one ship's time in the ways at a minimum and lets it be moved out quickly for another.

Two supertankers finished in 1953 and 1954 did much to swell Germany's export tonnage in those years. Howaldtswerke Hamburg built them for Aristotle Socrates Onassis, famed Greek-Argentine shipowner. Rated at 45,000 and 47,000 deadweight tons, they were the biggest cargo ships in the world when launched.

#### HOW HOLLYWOOD HELPS BUILD SUPER OIL TANKERS

PARIS.—Hollywood is cashing in on the boom in shipbuilding abroad.

American movie companies have no trouble earning francs in France, where the public is currently flocking to see not only such 1955 releases as *We're No Angels* and *Strategic Air Command*, but also revivals dating back to a King Vidor production of 1929. Their big trouble has been in converting those francs into American dollars; the French Government chronically blocks a large proportion of them.

But now, under a special deal, these blocked francs are being used to help build four huge tankers for Tide Water Associated Oil Co. Ordered last January, they are under construction at the Penhoet yard in St. Nazaire and the Chantiers de France yard in Dunkerque, at a total cost reportedly approaching \$20 million. As the Motion Picture Export Association feeds francs into this project in Paris, it receives 24 hours later in New York dollars supplied by the oil company.

The oil concern benefits because instead of getting the official exchange rate, 350 francs to the dollar, it is able to obtain from beleaguered movie firms an amount approaching the black-market rate. That means a bonus of perhaps 30 or 40 francs for every dollar.

#### HON. FIELDING LEWIS WRIGHT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend an event of monumental proportions in the annals and affairs of Mississippi and the Nation occurred. The Honorable Fielding Lewis Wright passed into the great unknown as a result of a sudden heart

attack. Born at Rolling Fork, Miss., on May 16, 1895, educated in the public schools of Mississippi, the Webb School at Bell Buckle, Tenn., and the University of Alabama, Fielding Wright was a great civic leader. He served his native State of Mississippi as State senator, speaker of the house of representatives, Lieutenant Governor, and twice as Governor of the great State of Mississippi. He was a devoted member of the Methodist Church and a man of high and honorable character. In addition to the countless thousands of Mississippians he is mourned by his devoted wife and a devoted son and daughter. The whole State was left shocked and appalled as a result of the untimely death of this outstanding Mississippi statesman. For, truly he was a statesman in every sense of the word. In no sense of the word was he a politician in the common application of that term to the average public officeholder.

Neither the plaudits of the public nor the glamour of high office could sway him from the path of righteous duty once he determined that course.

Serene of purpose, a man of indomitable courage yet gentle of manner, he was most personable and approachable. A man of unusual modesty, unostentatious, often mistaken for a businessman, Governor Wright made Mississippi a splendid Governor. He gave it a business administration motivated only by the desire to do the job at hand.

Outside of his native State which today mourns his passing, Fielding Wright was best known for the fact that he was the vice presidential nominee of the States' Rights Party in 1948, with characteristic modesty having refused consideration for the nomination for the Presidency on that ticket. A firm believer in the Jeffersonian principle of States rights, a conservative, an outstanding opponent of the ever-increasing tendency to centralize all of the power of government, at the expense of liberty, in Washington, it was perfectly natural that he should be in the forefront of any States rights movement. No one realized more than he that the office for which he was nominated was not to be had by him under this movement. But, motivated by a desire to raise the storm signals of the dangers ahead, he reluctantly accepted the nomination and carried the fight. He loved and respected the Democratic Party. In fact, at the time of his death he was Mississippi's Democratic committeeman—a position he had accepted with reluctance and reservation and which he had threatened to leave if those presently in charge of the party machinery persisted in their efforts to ignore the Southland for which he had a great passionate devotion. Fielding Wright was a States rights statesman. He believed in the philosophy of the Founding Fathers. He had the courage to do something about it other than render lip service.

Mr. Speaker, we of the Mississippi delegation here in the Congress today honor and respect him for his manly principles, for his outstanding public service, for his courage and for his high sense of duty and integrity. We extend

our sympathy to his splendid family and to the thousands of Mississippians who mourn the passing of this leader, this man of high integrity and devotion to duty.

A sturdy oak in the forest of men has fallen.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Frederick Sullens, editor of the Mississippi Jackson Daily News, and a long-time close associate and devoted friend of Governor Wright, paid tribute to this outstanding statesman in a timely and appropriate editorial as follows:

#### FIELDING L. WRIGHT PASSES

Rugged honesty, sincerity, unselfishness, frankness of speech and a passionate love for his native State were the outstanding traits in the life and character of Fielding L. Wright, whose notable career was brought to an abrupt close by a heart attack early Friday night. In his passing Mississippi has lost a statesman of first rank, a well-beloved citizen, and a man who played well all his appointed parts in human affairs.

Fielding Wright battled valiantly in behalf of many causes during his memorable career, and he always fought fairly. He was open and aboveboard in every thought and action. Indeed, some of his closest personal friends and supporters felt that he manifested too much kindness and courtesy in dealing with opponents but it was a trait of character for which he had no apology to offer.

Friendship was a word of much meaning for Fielding Wright. He had many thousands of devoted friends and admirers throughout the State, and for them he cherished a deep and abiding love. He bound his friends to him as with hooks of steel—the warm and devoted type of friendship that overlooks all petty faults or foibles and magnifies the good while minimizing the bad in mankind. Among those whom he counted as close friends he found nothing false or insincere, no selfish motives, no ulterior purposes. Their friendship was based on a genuine affection, a friendship that sprang from a trusting heart and became a love akin to that of David for Jonathan or Damon for Pythias.

Because of his rugged honesty, his unswerving devotion to duty and his eagerness to faithfully serve the State and its people, Fielding Wright did not accumulate a large amount of worldly goods but he did gather and jealously hold a huge fortune in friendships, and these friends meant much more to him than Midas-like wealth or the praise and applause of the multitude.

Another trait of Fielding Wright was his modesty. He was soft of speech, quiet of manner, devoid of pretense, never indulged in boasting or self-praise, and the qualities all too common among men in public life had no part in his being.

To every trust Fielding Wright was true. As a member of the lower house of the legislature, as speaker of the body, as Lieutenant Governor, and for 7 years Governor, he measured up to a high standard of faithful, fearless, and intelligent public service. It was frequently said that he was the most popular man who ever left the Governor's office; that he had more friends and fewer enemies than any man who had ever occupied that place. This was unquestionably true. Some may have differed with him concerning plans and policies, but none ever doubted his sincerity or spoke of him with lack of respect.

It can be truthfully said of Fielding Wright that he concentrated his entire life to making his beloved State a better and more prosperous State in which to live. He was always advancing, always struggling to bring about a betterment of human conditions, to carry on some much-needed reform, to develop the natural resources of the State, to help humanity to a large chance

and to put Mississippi in her proper place in the sisterhood of States. The value of the work he performed, of the things he achieved is beyond estimate. It is a subject that must be left for future historians to evaluate.

Despite his quiet, modest, unassuming manner, Fielding Wright was always at his best when fighting a battle in behalf of some worthy cause. In his inaugural message when installed as Governor for a 4-year term he sounded a clarion call to arms in behalf of the restoration of State rights—a call that culminated in the State rights movement and his own nomination as a Vice Presidential candidate. That one note in his inaugural message can rightly be called the foundation stone of the present State rights movement to which the Nation is now being awakened.

Fielding Wright was a man of mature judgment. He thought soundly on public questions and the issues of the day. He was never impractical, never blinded by passion, and always sought to improve social conditions and to promote the progress and prosperity of the State he so faithfully served.

Fielding Wright had within him the elements of greatness.

He was great because he always thought clearly and acted wisely.

He was great because he stood squarely for the highest and noblest things in life.

He was great because he was a man of courage and convictions.

He was great because he was a man of broad and sympathetic understanding.

He was great because he was honored and universally respected by the people he served.

He was great because he commanded the instant admiration and wholesome respect of all who met him.

He was great because of the genuineness and everlasting quality of his friendship.

Fielding Wright was a devoted husband and father and one of the beautiful things in his life was his love and devotion for his frail, white-haired mother. His private and home life was one of supreme joy and happiness. His mind and heart were ever centered on those who were near and dear to him by ties of kinship.

For the intimate friends of Fielding Wright the parting is hard. His death came as a rude shock. It seems well-nigh unbelievable. Apparently he was in the best of health and spirits. In the midst of their sorrow they can find solace only from "Him who doeth all things well," confident that the useful life and goodly deeds of Fielding Wright will live and be a part of the warp and woof woven into the life of our commonwealth. To his loved ones we add:

"I cannot say and I will not say  
That he is dead.

He is just away!

With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand,  
He has entered into that unknown land;  
Think of him still as the same, I say,  
He is not dead, he is just away."

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing our deep and sincere sorrow at the death of Hon. Fielding L. Wright, former Governor of Mississippi.

Governor Wright was one of the finest men, a man of sincerity, integrity and courage, one of the most outstanding public officials the State and Nation has ever known.

It was my privilege to enjoy a close personal friendship with Fielding Wright for many years. He was a man of energy and sound judgment. Possessed of even temper and splendid character, he kept

himself in position to pass temperate judgment on issues presented, however heated the debate, in legislative councils or in the public press.

With the fairness of a real judge, he always applied his experience and good judgment to sound solutions.

He made Mississippi an outstanding Governor, serving continuously longer than any other in Mississippi's history. After discharging his duties in an exemplary manner he left our State in best financial condition we have ever known.

Governor Wright was one of the first to recognize the dangers which threaten the constitutional government. He was one of the first to point out the dangers of encroachment on the rights of the States by the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the National Government. He could see the dangers in the attitude of the leaders of the two great national parties.

He was a candidate for Vice President on the States rights ticket, not for any reason of personal advancement but because he truly believed that existing conditions are destroying provisions of the Constitution and endangering our future as a Nation. Yet, as strongly as he felt, his earnest and sincere beliefs were expressed in such manner as to reflect credit to his State and the Southland, and to warrant the serious consideration of all citizens of the Nation.

Fielding Wright did not desire a multiparty system. He did know that unless the rights of the people to maintain their local differences within the respective States were continued, eventually the two-party system would be destroyed with a resulting many-party Nation, which would become ineffective as a nation on the order of France and Italy today.

Governor Wright was a good father, a fine husband and a loyal friend. We mourn his untimely passing. We take pride in his accomplishments and know that he leaves a sound and outstanding record, one which is a real challenge to all.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mississippi will long mourn the loss of Fielding Wright. I knew Fielding Wright as a very close, intimate friend, and I feel a very great personal loss in his passing.

Fielding Wright was the embodiment of the best in human virtues. He was a man of deep convictions. He was a man of integrity, a man of limitless courage, and one who had the ability to put forward his beliefs.

Perhaps Fielding Wright will best be remembered throughout the Nation as one of the standard bearers of the States' Rights Party in 1948, when he was an unsuccessful candidate for Vice President on that ticket. However, Fielding Wright will be remembered by the people of Mississippi and the South, not for having a place on that ticket, but for having the courage to permit his name to be placed on it.

I recall his inaugural address in 1948, when he made a statement that I shall never forget, one that became his polit-

ical creed and one which I have sought to adopt as mine; that "undying truths and eternal principles transcend party lines."

As far as I know Fielding Wright never made a dishonest move or committed a dishonest act. He was, indeed, a great man, and he will long be remembered and revered by Americans everywhere.

I join my distinguished dean and other Members of my delegation in mourning his tragic and untimely passing, and in extending our deepest sympathies to his family and loved ones.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to and extending sympathy to the family of the late Fielding L. Wright, one of the great men of my State.

Although Mississippi has produced many men of accomplishment, none exceeded Fielding Wright in quality or stature.

If we were to enumerate all of the qualities of this great man we would begin by referring to his sterling character. Being the possessor of such all other qualities naturally obtain. Irrespective of the accomplishments of any man, without character, good character, he cannot become nor can he be classified as one of greatness. Fielding Wright met this test with a high score.

As a defender of his country, as a lawyer, as a legislator, a governor, and just as a plain citizen with which, due to his modesty, he preferred to be associated, Fielding Wright was a leader among men. He left behind a record and a mode of life which all would do well to emulate. He led an unselfish life, always making paramount the interest and welfare of those for whom he served at great personal sacrifice. He regarded public office as a public trust. He neither sought nor expected reward. His only desire was to serve for the benefit of his fellow man.

Like our Founding Fathers, he was a staunch advocate of the individual and rights of the States. He spurned and opposed the centralization of power in the Federal Government.

In 1948 when the trend had turned toward the ideology of a government which our Founding Fathers attempted to guard against, Fielding Wright did not seek but accepted the position on the States Rights ticket for Vice President of the United States. He did so without expectation of being elected. He profoundly believed in the cause and the objective. Characteristic of his sacrificial nature, he accepted the post that he might sound the alarm and alert the country which he loved and defended as a soldier, to the dangers confronting it. The trend and events of this very hour have proven his position to be so right.

He was a man of great accomplishment. When the history of our Nation is written, historians will record as his greatest accomplishment the undying will with which he inspired the individual citizen and the States to continue their fight for constitutional government

and against the centralization of power at the Federal level.

For what greater cause, Mr. Speaker, could man devote a life of public service?

Mr. Speaker, because of the life of Fielding Wright, because of the principles in which he believed and for which he fought, because of his devotion to a great cause and because of his great ability, devotion to duty, unselfishness and unimpeachable character, our lives have been enriched and our country is a better place in which to live.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, with deep sadness I join in this memorial tribute to former Governor of Mississippi, Fielding L. Wright, who died May 5, 1956 of a heart attack. The Nation, as well as the State of Mississippi, has sustained a great loss in the passing of one of our most highly respected leaders and citizens.

Fielding Wright began his public service career as an attorney in his home town, later serving in both branches of the Mississippi Legislature. He served as Speaker of the House the last 4 years of his two terms as a member of that body. In 1944 he was elected lieutenant governor as running mate of the late Governor Thomas L. Bailey. After the death of Governor Bailey, he became Governor for the 2 years of the unexpired term. In 1947 he won the governorship over four candidates in the first primary.

Throughout his entire career, Fielding Wright was a strong advocate of constitutional government, states rights and all those principles which have made our country the greatest on earth. His dynamic leadership for the causes in which he believed made many refer to him as "one of the ablest Mississippians we ever had." Mississippi, the South and the entire Nation are poorer because Fielding Wright is gone.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], in whose congressional district the late Governor Wright resided.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of Fielding L. Wright was a great loss to the people of Mississippi and the United States. It will be hard to conceive of affairs in Mississippi without the steadying influence of his advice and counsel.

On Monday afternoon I joined the great throng of mourners who paid their last respects to Governor Wright at the Methodist Church on the banks of Deer Creek in the little town of Rolling Fork. The people of the Delta area, whom I have the honor to represent in the Congress, held Fielding Wright in the highest regard. In his campaigns for State offices, Fielding Wright always carried his native Delta by large margins, but his personal friendships extended to every county in the State. He stood for principles in public life that commanded firm respect, regardless of sectional differences within the State.

Fielding Wright began his service to Mississippi in the State legislature as senator from Sharkey and Issaquena Counties. He later moved to the house

of representatives, where his role as a leader was recognized by his election as speaker of the house during the administration of Gov. Hugh L. White.

In 1944 Mr. Wright was named lieutenant governor of Mississippi, and he succeeded to the governorship upon the death of Thomas L. Bailey in 1946, winning election to a full 4-year term by an overwhelming margin in 1947.

Governor Wright's role of leadership in the States rights struggle has sometimes obscured the many accomplishments of his administration as governor of Mississippi. I was very proud to have had a part in that administration as a State senator.

Under the Wright administration there were vast improvements made in the public school system. A State-aid road program was established to revitalize the rural road work in the counties. The State 4-year medical school was authorized, and Mississippi took the lead among the States in a program of cooperation under the Hill-Burton law to provide adequate hospitalization for every community. An oil and gas conservation law was passed that has done much to assure sound development of the mineral resources of our State. A long struggle was climaxed when a workmen's compensation law was passed for the first time, a law which then Secretary of Labor Tobin described as a model for the entire country. Important new building programs were established for virtually every State activity.

Despite the great progress achieved in virtually every responsibility of the State government, the conservative financial guidance of Governor Wright enabled Mississippi to act without burdensome additions to the tax structure. The administration of Fielding L. Wright as Governor will long rank as one of the State's great periods of progress.

Governor Wright's great dedicated purpose, of course, was to bring the people of the United States to an awareness of the dangers that were involved in extensions of Federal power without regard to the needs and differences of the individual States. Thanks to his leadership, the entire South became aroused and for the first time responsible and farsighted peoples in other parts of the country began to see that the dangers of centralized power were far from limited to legislation and administrative action in the field of race relations.

The States rights presidential ticket symbolized the extent of the revolt against this trend toward centralization. Governor Wright accepted the nomination as the vice presidential candidate, not from any desire for personal glory, but solely in order to serve the movement to which he was so completely dedicated. I have always personally felt that he should have been the choice for President on this ticket.

The protest of the States rights movement having served an effective purpose, Fielding Wright continued his fight within the Democratic Party and in every other public forum that was available to him. His last speech just a few days before his death served notice that there must be no letup in the fight.

Because of his outstanding role in helping to awaken our Nation to some of the dangers confronting our system of government, Fielding Wright deserves rank among the great political prophets of his time. His passing is not only a loss to the Mississippi Delta and the State of Mississippi, but to the entire United States. I feel a distinct personal loss in a valued friend and constituent whom I greatly admired and respected.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK], who served as Governor of Virginia while Governor Wright was serving as Governor of Mississippi.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi and others in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable Fielding L. Wright who served for more than 6 years as Governor of that great State. I had the privilege of serving as Governor of Virginia much of the time he served as Governor of Mississippi. I knew him for many years. I was closely associated with him in matters of mutual public concern. His administration of the affairs of his State were such as to enhance the already high standing of the office to which he was elected. He made a valuable contribution to the public service of his State and Nation, and set an example that should be emulated by all.

Fielding Wright was imbued with the fundamental principles upon which our Government was established. He had the intelligence, the character, the courage, the determination to adhere to these principles. He possessed admirable and sterling qualities of character and was thoroughly established in the confidence and esteem of those who knew him. He was my warm personal friend. I had unbounded confidence in him. His calmness and composure, and the straightforward manner in which he met the problems confronting him were such that he was a pillar of strength. I leaned heavily upon him for counsel and advice in hours of storm and stress.

It is regrettable that one so steeped in our American traditions should be called away from us at such a time as this, and particularly at an age when we could normally expect many more years of service and usefulness. But, "the wine of life keeps oozing drop by drop, and the leaves of life keep falling one by one." No one knows the day nor the hour when the grim messenger with inverted torch will beckon us on to that long and eternal home.

Despite the fact that in this hour we are sad and forlorn, we are nevertheless grateful that we were privileged to serve and be associated with a man of such qualities of mind and heart. I shall always appreciate the associations which I enjoyed with our late departed friend, and I shall ever cherish his memory.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sadness that I learned of the untimely passing of Governor Wright, of Mississippi. I did not have the privilege of knowing him intimately but I did have the privilege

of making his acquaintance and talking with him on more than one occasion here in Washington when he visited our Capital City. I admired him and I respected him as a man and a public official.

He possessed in great measure a quality which is becoming more and more rare in public officials, the quality of having the courage of his convictions, and the courage to stand in support of those convictions even though it might have been his lot to stand almost alone, as he did.

His passing leaves a great vacancy not only in the State of Mississippi but in our country. I join with the distinguished Members of the House who have already spoken in extending my sympathy to his family in this time of bereavement.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHEPPARD, for 20 days, to May 30, 1956, on account of official business.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. FORRESTER) for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MADDEN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BAILEY, for 15 minutes, on Monday.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS and to include an editorial.

Mr. COOPER and to include a press release issued by him.

Mr. MACHROWICZ (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. FASCELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. DURHAM.

Mr. MACDONALD.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken

from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 422. An act for the relief of William C. Irvine, chief warrant officer, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 742. An act to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 764. An act for the relief of Robert Gartenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 832. An act for the relief of Jonas Dercoutan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1358. An act to authorize modification of the flood-control project for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513-512-R, Richardson County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1938. An act for the relief of Hildegard L. McNabb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2507. An act for the relief of Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2582. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2750. An act for the relief of Frank Sevcik, Jr., also known as Frantisek or Francesco Sevcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2785. An act for the relief of Elsa Emelina Rosado y Rodriguez de Brower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Brigitte Lechner Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2838. An act for the relief of Antonia Soulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2840. An act for the relief of Annemae M. Swanson and Arnylee V. Swanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2843. An act for the relief of Dr. Shou Soon Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2874. An act for the relief of Ethel Kalins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2883. An act for the relief of Dr. Yong Whan Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2888. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Dummer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2931. An act for the relief of Oksanna Oztemel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2941. An act for the relief of Lottie Windschild; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2944. An act for the relief of William Jeffrey Jonas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2953. An act for the relief of Maria Cedrona De Rubels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3472. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to desig-

nate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Basé;

H. R. 3633. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Herman F. Gierke, Jr.;

H. R. 3975. An act for the relief of the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 6452. An act for the relief of William H. Foley;

H. R. 7583. An act for the relief of Mary Viola Jones;

H. R. 7993. An act to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval and the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

#### 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. 1488. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel;

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force;

H. R. 5495. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo;

H. R. 6395. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others;

H. R. 6622. An act for the relief of certain rural carriers;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 6769. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H. R. 7114. An act for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock;

H. R. 7513. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska;

H. R. 8187. An act for the relief of Wright H. Huntley;

H. R. 8306. An act for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn;

H. R. 8308. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr.;

H. R. 8310. An act for the relief of C. W. O. George C. Carter;

H. R. 8311. An act for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.;

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."; and

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel;

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, USAF;

H. R. 5495. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5951. An act for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo;

H. R. 6395. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others;

H. R. 6622. An act for the relief of certain rural carriers;

H. R. 6706. An act for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 6769. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H. R. 7114. An act for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock;

H. R. 7513. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within

which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska;

H. R. 8187. An act for the relief of Wright H. Huntley;

H. R. 8306. An act for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy;

H. R. 8307. An act for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn;

H. R. 8308. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr.;

H. R. 8310. An act for the relief of C. W. O. George C. Carter;

H. R. 8311. An act for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.; and

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 14, 1956, 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:

1829. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending March 31, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1830. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U. S. C. 1827) (H. Doc. No. 397); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1831. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 302 (c) (10) of Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1832. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1833. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1834. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1835. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 4, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pantego Creek and Cucklers Creek, N. C., authorized by the Flood Con-

trol Act approved June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 398); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1836. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 28, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Oceanside, Ocean Beach, Imperial Beach and Coronado, San Diego County, Calif., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 399); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

1837. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report of a violation by an employee of the Department of State under subsection (h) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, pursuant to subsection (1) (2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1838. A letter from the Administrator Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a report on property acquisitions for the quarter ending March 31, 1956, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1839. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1840. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 21st Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission covering the fiscal year 1955, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 16, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1841. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 69 of the Hawaiian Organic Act"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1842. A letter from the President, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the National Safety Council for the year 1955, pursuant to Public Law 259, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1843. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to Section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1844. A letter from the executive secretary, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit by a certified public accountant of the financial transactions of the above society and of the corporate books and records pertinent thereto, covering the year ended December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 9 of the act of September 20, 1950, to incorporate the American Society of International Law (64 Stat. 869); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1845. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of \$405,000 for the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President. (H. Doc. No. 400); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

**Mr. PRIEST:** Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3246. An act to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research, with amendment (Rept. No. 2144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. COOLEY:** Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 10108. A bill to amend section 314 and section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. ENGLE:** Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2151. An act to provide for the segregation of certain funds of the Fort Berthold Indians on the basis of a membership roll prepared for such purpose; without amendment (Rept. No. 2146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

**Mr. ZABLOCKI:** Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Special Study Mission to the Middle East and the Western Pacific; (Rept. No. 2147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

**By Mr. CHUDOFF:**

H. R. 11142. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:**

H. R. 11143. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of elderly persons to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

**By Mr. DAGUE:**

H. R. 11144. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the tax on certain cigars which do not contain reconstituted or processed tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:**

H. R. 11145. A bill to amend the definition of dependent to permit working mothers and widowers to deduct amounts paid for care of children while parent is working and to correct present inequities in this provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. METCALF:**

H. R. 11146. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for Indian tribes on the Fort Peck, Fort Belknap, and Blackfeet Reservations, and to provide that such lands shall become part of such reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**By Mr. MORANO:**

H. R. 11147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for increased deductions for employers who employ individuals who are 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. EBERHARTER:**

H. R. 11148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide relief

with respect to the tax treatment of damages in antitrust actions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. HOLMES:**

H. R. 11149. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**By Mr. PRIEST:**

H. R. 11150. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of broadcasting stations by presidential, vice presidential, and congressional candidates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

**By Mr. MACDONALD:**

H. R. 11151. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act, as amended, to provide a certain number of visas for persons of ethnic Armenian origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. TUMULTY:**

H. R. 11152. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for retirement of certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions in the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

**By Mr. ALGER:**

H. R. 11153. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to establish a procedure for making wage determinations under that act, and to provide for judicial review of such wage determinations, to the same extent as wage determinations are made and judicial review is provided under the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

**By Mr. ANFUSO:**

H. R. 11154. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); and to provide a deduction for certain expenses paid by a taxpayer for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. BAKER:**

H. R. 11155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. CRETELLA:**

H. R. 11156. A bill to provide that citizens or a free corporate union of Trieste may acquire certain surplus merchant vessels from the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

**By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:**

H. R. 11157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant nonprofit educational institutions exemptions from the excise taxes which are now applicable to public educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. HYDE (by request):**

H. R. 11158. A bill to create a Czechoslovakian Claims Fund to settle claims of certain United States nationals against Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

**By Mr. KLEIN:**

H. R. 11159. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of silk waste, noils, and partially manufactured silk fibers if not twisted or spun and for the free importation of spun silk or schappe silk yarn of numbers finer than 40 (English) count, not manufactured in United States in appreciable commercial quantities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**By Mr. LANKFORD:**

H. R. 11160. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11161. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11162. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

**By Mr. SCUDDER:**

H. R. 11163. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 58), authorizing the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

**By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:**

H. R. 11164. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a new building for the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on Public Works.

**By Mr. WHARTON:**

H. R. 11165. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

**By the SPEAKER:** Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to waive certain charges against an employer relative to unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

**By Mr. BALDWIN:**

H. R. 11166. A bill for the relief of Ilda dos Santos Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. BURDICK:**

H. R. 11167. A bill for the relief of Joseph Romero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. DONOVAN:**

H. R. 11168. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cloino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. FASCELL:**

H. R. 11169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lore Anna Rominger Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. GRANAHAHAN:**

H. R. 11170. A bill for the relief of Michael George Petrakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. HEBERT:**

H. R. 11171. A bill for the relief of Mr. Gerard Phillip Dunn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. KLEIN:**

H. R. 11172. A bill for the relief of Beniamino Rocco Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11173. A bill for the relief of Michele Pepi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. ROBERTS:**

H. R. 11174. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Moskot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**By Mr. RUTHERFORD:**

H. R. 11175. A bill for the relief of Andres Amadeo Macha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 11176. A bill for the relief of Alvise Pietro Naccari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1014. By Mr. BOW: Four petitions of Floyd Hughes Post No. 693, Inc., Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Canton, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1015. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Loyalsockville Evangelical United Brethren Sunday

School, Williamsport, Pa., urging enactment of S. 1636 and H. R. 8540, bills relative to humane slaughter methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1016. Also, petition of Eldred Grange No. 1604 urging enactment of S. 1636 and H. R. 8540, bills relative to humane slaughter methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1017. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. William Sharpe and 3,723 other residents of Columbus, Baltimore, Basin, Pickerington, Groveport, Mount Pleasant, Ragland, Dillonvale, Martin's Ferry, Adena, Harrisville, St. Clairsville, Ravenna, New Milford, Freedom Station, Steubenville, Wintersville, Russellville, Ripley, West Union, Youngstown, Amanda, Lima, Delta, Hamden, Chillicothe, Toledo, Zanesville, Lancaster, Nor-

wood, Cloverdale, Kansas, Bellville, Springfield, Clyde, Batavia, Xenia, Jackson, Van Wert, Seaman, Clarksville, Salem, Conesville, Waynesfield, and other towns and cities in Ohio, urging the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1018. By Mr. WESTLAND: Petition of Mrs. Mary Owen, of Custer, Wash., and 40 other residents of the second district of Washington, urging enactment of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Veterans of Foreign Wars

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 10, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday last I was privileged to speak to the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Oshkosh, Wis. It was Loyalty Day. On that particular occasion I was given a citation by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I ask that excerpts from the address which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES ACTION AS SYMBOL OF LOYALTY: OUTLINES IMPROVED PROGRAM FOR VETERANS: EXPRESSES SERIOUS CONCERN OVER BRADLEY COMMISSION FINDINGS

I am happy to join you in this luncheon today to celebrate Loyalty Day.

I know that you need not be reminded of the meaning of loyalty. For who, over the breadth of our great land, knows the meaning better than you V. F. W. men who have left our shores to fight and sacrifice for life and country.

Each of us is loyal in his own way in civilian life. We obey the laws; we live decent lives in our communities, doing what is requested of us.

But real, true loyalty is more than that. It is pursuing our freedom. It is helping to develop the greatness that is our land. It is inventing and producing the good things of life. It is performing our jobs the best way we know how—whatever our station is in life.

#### TRUE LOYALTY IS NOT STATIC

Loyalty is not static; it is a growing thing. Out of heartfelt loyalty, we must work toward progress, and attainment of future goals—which are now only dreams and visions.

We must accept the challenges in this atomic-jet age, and create things for a better life.

#### ACTION, NOT WORDS

Loyalty, as you know, must be demonstrated by action.

It was so demonstrated on the battlefield by you and your buddies.

It must and will be demonstrated in the Halls of Congress, in the office, factory, farm-field, and on every roadway of American life. It must be an active, living spirit of patriotism within each of us, flaming with the fiery zeal of modern-day Patrick Henrys.

Each of us, in his own way, doing a good job at that which he knows best and does best, is the kind of all-around loyalty that needs to be demonstrated.

#### LOYALTY DAY CELEBRATIONS

As we celebrate, the tramp, tramp, tramp of our marching men thrills our hearts with pride.

A tramp tramp, tramp—echoing in our hearts—is also the memory of men who have given their lives for us, who have died for our freedom, who protected our land of liberty.

To the hallowed memory of these great men of our past, and to the promise of the future, we need to rededicate our efforts to preservation and improvement of our climate of freedom.

#### FULL USE OF FREEDOM

We must make full use of our freedoms:

Freedom to live as we choose, to open a business, to enter a profession.

Freedom to travel, to be educated, to enjoy our rich heritage of music, art, and drama, and to benefit by the tremendous technological and scientific progress of our country.

Freedom to participate, freely and imaginatively, in our future progress.

#### WE MUST REBUFF COMMUNISM

We must realistically acknowledge that short of annihilative war communism is with us to stay, at least, for a while.

This major evil in the world today is not an abstract, theoretical form of Government. This is a real, ever-spreading totalitarianism that uses all the methods of deceit, terror, threat, promise, and subversion to attain its goals.

#### COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP—A FARCE

The recent declaration of a return to a collective leadership by the Soviets, of course, is a farce. This is a mere disguise under which the top-echelon Communists are struggling for power. Why? Because not one of them is yet strong enough to assume the ghostly cloak of Stalin as supreme dictator of the Kremlin.

But the specter of Stalinism hangs over the Communist leaders. All the crimes he is accused of will be perpetrated again by other dictators of this Soviet regime oppressing the populace behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

#### WITHOUT COMMUNISM WE WOULD HAVE A FREER LIFE

Without communism, we would have a freer life. We would have the opportunities to concentrate on building for a better America and a better world.

Without communism, we could apportion a greater share of our resources to feeding the hungry, sheltering the cold, and going about the tasks of enriching the earth with a better economic, cultural, and spiritual life.

As it is, we have an uneasy tension in the world. Free nations are attempting, by every possible means, to avert the capture of more innocent people by Soviet despotism, without the holocaust of a nuclear war.

Such a war, we are all aware, would destroy cities and nations. It would make the earth a wasteland in which only the mutilated escapees of atomic and hydrogen war would exist.

We must utilize every possible means, national and international, to avert such a war of human annihilation.

#### NATO

The recent proposals for achieving greater benefits from NATO, I believe, should be completely examined. We should weigh carefully the undeveloped idea of making the NATO military alliance, in fact, an economic and political force for peace.

As you know, Secretary Dulles is in Paris right now, together with the representatives of the other NATO nations to explore the possibility of utilizing NATO for the lessening of international tensions.

#### NEED OF LEADERSHIP

Our leadership, at whatever level it exists, must be constantly attuned to the progress of our times, and to the problems of our State and Nation. We must provide for the changing needs of our people and eradicate the shortcomings of existing programs.

A soldier can no longer go into battle with an old flintlock or muzzle loader; he must have modern weapons. So it is, if our country is to progress, that we must have new and modernized laws and programs to fulfill the needs of our fast-moving age.

#### ANTISUBVERSION

We must, of course, exert every effort toward meeting the external challenge of communism. This must be accompanied by a tough policy toward internal attempts at subversion.

The FBI has done an admirable job of keeping a finger on Communists and their activities.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I, too, have had the opportunity and the responsibility to legislatively assist in this effort. I have joined in many legislative proposals to strengthen our laws.

Some of the objectives of my recent legislation are:

To toughen the penalties against seditious conspiracy and advocating the violent overthrow of the Government.

To crack down by requiring registration of Communists or other foreign agents who have been trained in espionage or sabotage.