SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1956

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

Eternal Father in changing, troubled days, we pray for conceptions big enough and spirits strong enough to match the epic time in which we live and serve—in this age on ages telling. With our minds startled by the swift march of world-shaking events, we bow at this wayside altar of prayer. Hidden fires are flaming forth consuming the old habitations of men. We hear voices that challenge all that has been counted fixed and final and sure. Nations and men in chains are stirring with hopes that savage repression cannot kill. For social systems which have sentenced the masses to grinding poverty, for industrial theories which hold human life more cheap than merchandise, may the ax be at the root of the rotted tree—as in all the turmoil of our times Thou are sifting out the souls of men beneath Thy judgment seat. Make us eager partners of Thy eternal purpose for all Thy children when under every sky men shall stand side by side in equal worth and unfettered freedom, all toiling and all reaping, with gratitude to Thee, the source of their blessings and the Father of all mankind. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 19, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 20, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 872) for the relief of Sam Bergesen.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1956.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems submitted to me through its chairman, covering its operations from July 1 to December 31, 1955, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1956.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, should the Senate be in session on June 26, 27, 28, and 29, I ask unanimous consent to be absent in order to attend the Republican State convention in my home State of Indiana, where I am a candidate for renomination to the United States Senate.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, and the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

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

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NORTHERN SYNOD, EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Northern Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church recently adopted two resolutions at the annual synod meeting. The first urges the elimination of discriminatory provisions in our immigration and naturalization laws, and the second urges the expansion of our technical assistance programs, particularly through the United Nations.

I support both of these objectives wholeheartedly and ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolutions be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

NORTHERN SYNOD,
EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH,
June 14, 1956.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At our annual synod meeting held April 24–26 our committee for Christian social action presented the following resolutions which were unanimously adopted:

"A. That the synod affirm the obligation which rests upon the United States to eliminate from its immigration and naturalization laws all provisions which discriminate against persons on the basis of race; to provide for a more equitable quota basis and a more flexible use of quotas so that more worthy persons may enter this country from lands whose quotas are presently exhausted; and to provide for a system of fair hearings and appeals covering unjust deportation orders or refusa' of visas.

"B. That the synod urge the International Cooperation Administration, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, and the Members of Congress representing its constituency to support and expand our support of technical assistance, particularly through the channels of the United Nations, and to allot adequate sums to give such programs effectiveness and stability."

We are sure that you are in agreement with the objectives of these two resolutions and request that you do what you can to secure favorable action on them.

Sincerely yours,

H. REIFSCHNEIDER,
President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

H. R. 6029. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually, and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne (Rept. No. 2277).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 285. Resolution arranging for exhaustive studies to be made regarding foreign assistance by the United States Government (Rept. No. 2278).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 4086. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe, Hopi Tribe, and individual Indians to the area set aside by the Executive order of December 6, 1882, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 4087. A bill for the relief of Verdi Adam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 4088. A bill to provide additional visas for certain aliens of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 4089. A bill to amend Public Law 298, 84th Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 4090. A bill for the relief of Kalman Novak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL (by request):

S. 4091. A bill for the relief of Kyonghi Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 4092. A bill to provide for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State for International Cultural Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4093. A bill for the relief of Sally Ann Probert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 4094. A bill amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to reductions in certain Federal income and excess profits taxes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

PRINTING OF REVISION OF HOUSE DOCUMENT 210, ENTITLED "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. KENNEDY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 293), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the revision of the document entitled "How Our Laws Are Made" (H. Doc. No. 210, 83d Cong.), by Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, be printed as a Senate document, and that 15,000 additional copies of such document be printed for the use of the Members of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL VISAS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS OF GREEK ETHNIC ORIGIN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate numbers among his friends, as I do, hundreds of Greek-Americans who are such fine citizens of our Nation.

I am certain, also, that every Member of the Senate has watched with interest and admiration the fine work of the Order of AHEPA and the AHEPA Refugee Relief Committee.

In the State of Indiana, as in all other States, AHEPA continues its work with great vigor, but feels the need of some assistance from the Congress in furthering its valiant efforts.

I have been working with these fine folk to formulate legislation which would be helpful to their program. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which these fine people assure me will accomplish their worthy purpose.

The bill proposes to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by providing that from any special nonquota immigrant visas allotted to aliens under section 4 (a) of such act which remain unissued on January 1, 1957, there shall be made available for issuance to aliens of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece—whether or not refugees within the meaning of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953—the following: First, not more than 4,000 shall be available to aliens residing in Greece who served in the military forces of such country during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; second, not more than 2,000 shall be available to aliens residing in Greece who are the parents, brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of citizens of the United States; and third, not more than 500 shall be available to eligible orphans residing in Greece who are under 14 years of age.

The visas authorized to be issued under the provisions of the bill may be issued until December 31, 1957.

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

The bill (S. 4088) to provide additional visas for certain aliens of Greek ethnic origin residing in Greece, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred. The bill has been prepared in an effort to put into effect the recommendations of Dr. J. L. Morrill, the distinguished president of the University of Minnesota, who was employed by the Department of State to review the exchange programs. I introduce the bill to call it to the attention of the Senate. I do not expect to press for its present enactment; but I hope Senators will give it their attention and in that way perhaps an appropriate bill may be developed.

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

The bill (S. 4092) to provide for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State for International Cultural Relations, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT, RELATING TO EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to 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 following amendments, namely:

On page 47, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 634. During the fiscal year 1957 there is hereby authorized to be transferred to the Air Force Industrial Fund not to exceed $40 million from the Navy Industrial Fund and not to exceed $110 million from the Army Industrial Fund."

On page 47, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 635. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense for major procurement of aircraft and missiles shall be available for expenses of development."

Mr. CHAVEZ also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10986, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] may be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 3588) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for himself and other Senators, on April 11, 1956.

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

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

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address entitled "Our Heritage of Freedom," delivered by him at the baccalaureate service, Montana State University, Missoula, Mont., on June 3, 1956.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Senator PURTELL placing in nomination Senator BUSH, and excerpts from keynote address by Leonard W. Hall, at the Connecticut Republican State Convention on June 19, 1956.

THE PREFERENCE CLAUSE IN FEDERAL POWER LEGISLATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Watertown Times, of Watertown, N. Y., has published a series of three excellent articles written by its Washington corre-

spondent, Alan Emory, on the history of the preference clause in Federal power legislation and its importance to the Niagara power bill now pending before the House Committee on Public Works.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 7, 1956]

PREFERENCE CLAUSE LONG AT CENTER OF DISPUTE ON POWER—PROVIDES PRIORITY IN SALE OF POWER TO PUBLICLY OWNED NONPROFIT GROUPS

(Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S Niagara power bill was fought in the Senate almost entirely on the issue of the preference clause. The history of that provision, what it means, what it does, the arguments for and against it and its particular position in the Niagara power battle are discussed in a series of three articles starting today.)

(By Alan S. Emory)

I

WASHINGTON, June 7.—The most controversial word in the whole public-private power dispute is "preference."

The preference clause was at the heart of the Senate debate on Niagara power. That single provision of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S bill to let the State of New York build a huge hydroelectric plant at Niagara Falls aroused the heated opposition of the other State Senator, IRVING M. IVES.

Senator LEHMAN is a Democrat, Senator IVES a Republican, yet it was under a Republican, President Theodore Roosevelt, that the preference clause got its first real impetus.

It has been reinforced at least 13 times in congressional statutes since then.

Senator LEHMAN'S bill specifies that the New York State Power Authority, in selling Niagara energy, shall give equal preference to counties and municipalities, including their agencies or instrumentalities, New York agencies and departments, rural electric cooperatives not organized for profit and Federal defense units.

Proponents of the preference clause argue that the first crack at buying power from publicly developed projects should go to publicly owned nonprofit organizations, like local governments. Opponents argue that such arrangements constitute discrimination against customers of private utility companies who are more numerous.

According to a Library of Congress study this year by Wallace R. Vawter and Barbara Jibrin, prepared at the request of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, "there has been a continuous and consistent provision by the Congress that public agencies should have preference in the purchase of surplus power from Federal projects."

The latest expression of this policy, now 50-plus years old, came in the 1954 atomic energy law, when Congress directed that the byproduct heat and energy from atomic installations should be sold under preference provisions.

"Here, even with incidental power and in a wholly new field of energy development, the Congress has insisted on a preference clause," the study reported.

Public ownership and operation of waterpower sites along rivers existed long before the United States was established and can be traced to New Hampshire in the 1630's. There was a public preference in the disposition of surplus reclamation water back in 1877.

Twenty-six years later, President Theodore Roosevelt vetoed the Muscle Shoals, Ala., dam bill and in his message called for a survey aimed at a new power policy to "best conserve the public interest."

On April 16, 1906, the policy took form in the Reclamation Act, which authorized the Federal Government to lease surplus power with preference to municipal customers. This, the Library of Congress report said, gave evidence of "intention that the power benefits should be widespread, rather than monopolized by a private corporation."

Following this act Presidents Roosevelt and William Howard Taft vetoed a succession of bills authorizing private companies to build hydroprojects on the Tennessee, Rainey, James, White, and Coosa Rivers.

Since then the preference clause has had a long legislative history, but Congress has generally followed the principle of selling power at the generating site, or bus bar, to the first customer to show up.

A sustained attack on the preference clause coincided with the entry into office of the Eisenhower administration. Public power advocates decried the administration's "partnership" policy, which, they claimed, led to the denial of proper public benefits from natural resources projects. The main target of their attack, Douglas McKay, has resigned the Interior Secretariat and is now a candidate for the Senate from Oregon.

Between 1906 and 1956 the preference clause had this history:

The Raker Act, 1913, granted the city of San Francisco authority to use national park land in the Sierra Nevada to store water and develop power, but the water and energy could be sold only to a municipality, municipal water district, or irrigation district. The courts upheld this law.

The Federal Power Act, 1920, set up the Federal Power Commission, classed power as a natural resource owned by the public, and ordered the FPC to give preference to State and municipal applications for hydro licenses on navigable waters.

The Boulder Canyon project law of 1928 repeated this theory.

The Tennessee Valley Authority law of 1933 said surplus power should be distributed with preference to "States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens or farmers not organized or doing business for profit * * *."

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 included the preference principle in regard to loans.

The Bonneville Power Act, 1937, required the agency running the project to give public bodies and cooperatives first chance to buy project energy and stated Congress' policy that public bodies should always get such preference. Here Congress added a provision for withdrawing power committed to private companies by contract if the preference customers should eventually develop greater needs. Senator LEHMAN'S Niagara bill has this provision in it.

The Fort Peck Act, 1938, duplicated the Bonneville provisions.

The Flood Control Acts of 1938, 1944, and 1945 insisted that preference in the sale of public-project power go to public bodies and cooperatives.

An amendment to the reclamation law, 1939, authorized power contracts for periods of up to 40 years at rates approved by the Interior Department, but preference for public agencies was repeated.

The Water Conservation and Utilization Act, 1940, repeated the preference clause.

The atomic-energy law, 1954, specified that the Atomic Energy Commission "shall give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives or to privately owned utilities providing electric utility services to higher-cost areas not being served by public bodies or cooperatives." License applications from public or cooperative bodies "shall be given preferred consideration," the law said.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 8, 1956]

PREFERENCE CLAUSE SOFT-PEDALED, MORE OR LESS, UNDER IKE—SEATON MAY LOOK MORE KINDLY UPON ITS ENFORCEMENT THAN DID MCKAY

(This is the second of three articles on the preference clause.)

(By Alan S. Emory)

II

WASHINGTON, June 8.—The controversial preference clause has been more or less soft-pedaled over the years the Eisenhower administration has been in power.

Former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay was of the opinion that it ought to be revised. His successor, Fred A. Seaton, comes from Nebraska, a public power State, and may look more kindly on its enforcement.

Yet, as far back as August 18, 1953, the Interior Department made a policy statement that all Federal natural resource facilities would be operated for the benefit of the general public and particularly of domestic and rural consumers and the Department will give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives.

The difference with preceding Democratic administrations was the declaration that the Department would not try to dispose of publicly developed power directly to consumers except under existing contracts.

In 1954 the Southwest Power Administration said that after preference customers used the power allocated under present contracts, plus a small upward revision, they would have to find other sources for additional power needs.

The Interior Department set up marketing criteria making the sale of power from Federal projects a local responsibility.

One big fight centered on a contract with the Georgia Power Co. for the sale of power from the Clark Hill Dam in South Carolina.

The company was to transmit and sell the power to preference customers, taking for itself only a transmission, or wheeling fee. Public-power advocates objected to a plan under which the company could contract for the entire project output at the bus bar and the elimination of direct negotiations between preference customers.

After a congressional investigation of Interior Department policies began under Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania, there came to light a memorandum by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., on the Clark Hill contract. Mr. Brownell said that if preference customers wanted a more direct sale than the agreement provided they were entitled to it and should be allowed a reasonable time to provide the means for taking and delivering the power to their clients.

Aside from wheeling, the private companies may serve preference customers through displacement or substitution. Under this plan, the company finds it more economical to use all the project power itself and serves the preference customer through steam plants located closer to the customer.

Close to 85 percent of all the electric power produced in the country now flows from private plants. However, preference customers have been purchasing an increasing proportion of power generated by Federal projects.

The Library of Congress study prepared this year for Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, on the preference clause shows that preference customers were now buying 54 percent of the output. Back in fiscal 1951 they purchased only 35 percent from the Interior Department.

The study showed that the Bureau of Reclamation was selling 64 percent of its power to preference customers, compared with 52 percent 2 years ago, whereas private companies and industry were getting 26 percent, compared with 43 percent 2 years ago.

But the Bonneville Power Administration is selling 29 percent to preference customers, compared with 31 percent 2 years ago, while private companies and industry have upped their take from 63 to 65 percent. In the TVA area the preference customer allotment has dipped from 46 percent to 32, the industrial allotment from 22 percent to 14.

Opponents of the preference clause fear it is an opening wedge to nationalization of the power industry, but their rivals profess an equal objection to nationalization.

Private power forces argue that the preference clause is socialistic. Public-power forces reply that it simply insures to the people the benefits of what already belongs to them.

One reason the two are at such odds over the preference clause is that preference customers normally do not own transmission lines and must, therefore, rely on private companies to deliver their power. Without the preference clause, they say, they would have no guaranty of obtaining the electricity at reasonable rates.

The Lehman bill would probably not have included the preference clause if the Federal Power Commission had ever put such a provision into one of its licenses. But the FPC never has, and is, for the near future, anyway, unlikely to.

There is no preference in the marketing of St. Lawrence River energy.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 9, 1956]

PREFERENCE CLAUSE IS SEEN HOLDING UP NIAGARA POWER BILL—WOULD HAVE LITTLE DIFFICULTY PASSING WITHOUT IT, IS BELIEF

(This is the last of three articles on the preference clause.)

(By Alan S. Emory)

III

WASHINGTON, June 9.—Without the preference clause, most Washington observers agree, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S Niagara power bill would have little difficulty winning congressional approval.

But the bill does have that bitterly contested provision, and the Senator won a signal victory when it was included in the measure as it passed the Senate, 48–39. No effort was made to knock it out, even by opponents of preference.

The New York State Power Authority Act states only that rural and domestic consumers of electricity in the State should get first call on State-produced power. If 95 percent of these consumers were represented by private companies, then those companies would get a priority on buying 95 percent of State-produced power.

As a matter of fact, private companies serve about 95 percent of the State's electricity consumers. But they still object to a power purchase priority's being given to public agencies and rural cooperatives, even though combined they could only consume a maximum of 10 percent of Niagara or St. Lawrence power now.

The preference features of the Lehman bill, which give the priority to municipalities and rural co-ops, amount to a clarification of New York law and are not necessarily in conflict with it.

Chairman Robert Moses of the New York State Power Authority admits that an argument of such a conflict is a possibility, but he does not support the validity of that argument.

He says the Lehman bill's preference clause "can be retained."

Mr. Moses would like to see the Lehman bill preference changed—he says the change would make it more workable—by adding language "making it entirely clear that the preference customers to whom power must be sold are those within the area of reasonable economic benefit. This will avoid any requirement to carry power to distant areas at uneconomical transmission costs and through areas closer to the source of power."

The purpose of the declaration seems to be to shut New York City out of the field of preference customers.

But at no point does Mr. Moses object to the heart of the Lehman preference clause, which is the same one carried down through the years in congressional legislation on public-powers projects.

One of the severest attacks on the preference clause was launched by the Hoover Commission and its task force on water resources. The attack drew from dissenting Commissioner Chet Holifield this comment:

"It is curious how insistent the Commission is on following the private utility line in the face of congressional policies which have decreed in no less than 14 basic statutes since 1906 by the Commission's own count, that public agencies should have preference in purchasing power from Federal agencies."

The preference expressed in the 1954 Atomic Energy Act, he said, "does not set up a preference class of consumers of electricity with resulting discrimination against other consumers who must buy their electricity from private utilities which make profits and pay taxes."

Nothing in either Federal or State law clearly bars the preference clause from a New York power license. Under Thomas E. Dewey the State administration's policy was dead against preference in the traditional congressional sense.

Yet, while he was Governor, the State power authority told the FPC it could accept in its St. Lawrence license—and, therefore, presumably in a Niagara license—any conditions the FPC laid down. Mr. Dewey advanced this idea in 1951 himself.

Now that Averell Harriman is the State's chief executive, State administration policy finds no conflict between the Federal and State ideas on preference. Mr. Harriman is four-square behind the Lehman Niagara bill.

Proponents of the preference clause claim it will provide a "yardstick" for measuring all electric rates, with a resulting drop of high power costs to consumers served by competing private companies.

In 17 out of 23 areas where municipal utility systems' rates can be measured against neighboring private-company service in New York State, according to the 1954 FPC report, the public power rates were lower, based on charges for 100 kilowatt-hours.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for about 4 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona was going to make a similar request. The Senator from Arizona will gladly listen to the remarks of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for approximately 4 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have taken note of the fact that the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported H. R. 6888, a bill to provide for the admission, above quota, of a number of sheepherders and to eliminate the quota mortgaging resulting from previous special bills for the admission of sheepherders into the United States.

Mr. President, I think that my views on immigration legislation and policy are fairly well known. My opposition to our present immigration laws and policies is deep and unremitting. I shall not cease to fight, with all the efforts of which I am capable, until the McCarran-Walter Act is converted into a just and humane law, giving opportunity, under fair but strict overall quota limits, to all people, regardless of national origin, race, or creed, to be admitted into the United States on their individual merits, qualifications, and need—and the need of the United States.

It strikes me as surpassingly strange that every 2 years we are confronted with a proposition to admit more sheepherders above quota limits, but we never get an opportunity to vote on basic legislation to revise our quota system so that these special sheepherder bills will not be necessary.

In past years, Mr. President, I have voted for these special sheepherder bills because I have felt that it was good for the United States to have these additional and undeniably useful workers come in, even though this permission was granted to only one group, for the benefit of only one industry. But the time has come, Mr. President, for the Congress to face the issue frankly and to admit that the McCarran-Walter Act is a cruel, unreasonable, and repressive law, and that action must be taken to change it substantially. I do not expect to continue to vote for special bills for sheepherders, while capmakers, watchmakers, carpenters, doctors, scientists, and metal workers—to name at random just a few types of workers—continue to be barred from the United States by the operation of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Some of the very sponsors of these sheepherder bills are the most vociferous in defending the national origins quota system. Let them admit that these special sheepherder bills violate the so-called principle of the national origins quota system. Let them admit that the national origins quota system is a shame and a scandal upon the fair name of the United States.

The other day the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], former chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, who was himself a strong supporter of the last sheepherders bill the Senate passed, declared that this sheepherders bill could not be accepted as constituting an immigration program for 1956. If any immigration legislation is to be passed, it should be substantial immigration legislation which will grant relief to the sheep-raising industry, to other industries, and to mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, uncles, and friends of aliens who want to come to the United States but who are now barred because of the quota system and the other restrictions in the McCarran-Walter Act.

Let me call attention again to S. 1206, the bill which I and 12 other Senators have introduced in this Congress, which would revise our immigration and citizenship laws in a constructive and positive manner, and remove those discriminatory features which plague us today.

There are also pending before the Senate four bills introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], representing the recommendations of the administration. I do not think that these bills go far enough. I am glad, however, to recognize them as constituting, for the most part, steps in the right direction.

The President of the United States has recommended the enactment of substantial immigration legislation at this session. The majority leader of the Senate has urged that substantial immigration legislation be enacted at this session. There is no partisanship involved. No party stands to win selfish credit from the enactment of immigration legislation, but both parties will deservedly be blamed if no substantial immigration legislation is enacted at this session of Congress. And what is much more important, America will be the loser.

Suitable immigration legislation should be, and must be, enacted by this Congress. I hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will yet consider and report my bill, S. 1206. If the committee does not see fit to recommend S. 1206, I hope it will recommend substantial portions of it. I would even be glad to see the committee recommend the administration's four bills, although those bills do not go far enough, as I have said, and in some particulars at least, represent a backward movement. I shall be glad to take my chances of seeking amendment to those bills on the floor.

I hope that the Judiciary Committee will shortly move to show as much consideration for human beings as it has shown for sheep.

CURRENT EVENTS IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE POWER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed at this time for not to exceed 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Arizona is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I called the attention of my colleagues to some very interesting current events in the field of public versus private power. I say these events were very interesting because they were of considerable significance to me, and I assume them to be of equal interest to the Members of this body, particularly to those who have been carrying the torch for public power in all of its ramifications.

I took the occasion to recite the results of 2 recent elections, 1 in the State of Oregon and 1 in the State of Washington, in which people at the grassroots, after having experienced public power, voted overwhelmingly to solve their public power problems—and I assure you they were serious problems—by selling their public power systems to private enterprise.

The election in the State of Oregon which I mentioned was the vote of members of the Sandy Electric Cooperative, with headquarters at Sandy, Oreg., to sell their system to the Portland General Electric Co. The vote by the members was 571 to 99 in favor of the sale. The Sandy Electric Cooperative had been operating at a loss, and had reached the end of its rope. Its rates had been about one-third higher than the rates of the Portland General Electric Co., which serves similar customers in neighboring areas. By this time the Sandy Electric Cooperatives customers are enjoying what is believed to be better service, at a saving of some 33⅓ percent, at the hands of that much-maligned monster, private power. At least, the people most directly affected are not afraid of that big, bad wolf.

The second instance was a similar election held recently in Stevens County, Wash. The people who were the patrons of the Stevens County Public Utility District voted 5,008 to 2,019 to sell the district's facilities to the Washington Water Power Co., another big, bad wolf of public power fiction.

Again, in this instance, the people had experienced not only a taste but a bellyful. They were not voting on an ideological abstraction. They had lived through years of public power, had been on the receiving end, and were in a position to know from experience its merits and demerits. If public power, as has so often been claimed, is the bonanza from whence all blessings flow, the fact had escaped their attention.

Now the people of Stevens County, Wash., too, are benefiting from lower electric rates and from tax dollars generated simultaneously from a privately owned electric company.

After describing these current events, I proceeded to document a comparison of electric rates for farm service, as received by another private electric utility company, the Idaho Power Co., with those of all REA systems operating in the State of Idaho; also a similar comparison of Idaho Power Co. farm service rates with those of REA-financed systems in the State of Tennessee.

Suffice it to say at this point that the four REA distributors in Idaho which purchase power from Bonneville Power Administration received for the year 1953 an average price per kilowatt-hour 32.7 percent higher than the average price per kilowatt-hour for electric service supplied to farm customers by Idaho Power Co. for the same year. The five REA distributors in Idaho which purchase their power requirements from privately owned, taxpaying electric companies and from the United States Bureau of Reclamation received an average price per kilowatt-hour, for the year 1953, which is 54.4 percent higher than the average price for farm electric service received by Idaho Power Co.

These disparities occurred in spite of the fact that the private electric company, Idaho Power, paid 33.32 percent of its gross revenues for taxes of all kinds in 1953.

Having spread these facts upon the RECORD, I was interested in the reaction a few days later by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. On May 18, 1956, he arose to decry those facts, not to dispute them. He used his privilege in an attempt to divert attention from the facts, with a plea to "look behind the statistics."

That is an intriguing exercise, Mr. President, if, in fact, it can be done. Being of a curious turn of mind, I am perfectly willing—in fact, I invite the Senator—not only to look behind the facts, but also to look under them and look around them, and even through them; but he cannot overlook them.

The further intriguing thing to me about the Senator's dissertation is that he had not a single, blessed thing to say about the current events in the public-power field described above. Perhaps he followed his own advice in the other instance, and, having taken a look behind the statistics of the two free elections among people who have experienced a full dosage of public power, decided there was no merit in further talk about them.

I submit to the Senator from Oregon that the votes by American citizens, those in Oregon being among his own constituents, are a far more potent commentary upon the subject at hand than anything he or I may say.

In the process of looking behind the statistics, the Senator from Oregon tries to gloss over the facts, by describing my data as "selective and partial." He said:

> That the co-ops selected for comparison serve some of the most rugged and sparsely populated sections of the West, where construction costs are high and operating conditions difficult, when compared with Idaho Power's more compact service area.

I can assure the Senator from Oregon there was nothing selective or partial about the data. The comparisons included all REA units in the entire State of Idaho, broadly scattered throughout the State, with varying degrees of operating conditions, and not unlike the farm areas served by the private company which has a record of farm electrification which embraces a near 100 percent saturation, and not only including irrigated farms, but extending throughout vast expanses of upland ranch areas, up the gullies, and along the creeks.

He says the co-ops came into existence in the first place because the private company did not want to add these areas to its system, out of belief they would be unprofitable. A sweeping generalization such as that might mislead the uninformed, but is ludicrous to the extreme to those who have even only a slight acquaintance with Idaho geography. Some of the REAs which the Senator from Oregon suggests should, in all conscience, have been rendered unnecessary by Idaho Power Co. service to their areas years ago are 400 miles away from the company's service area.

Let me make it clear that nothing I say or have said is intended to disparage the value of electric service, from whatever source, to an isolated area. Many, many REAs across the Nation, as well as in Idaho, are serving a splendid purpose. Without them, many of our people would not have the modern advantages of electric aids to living and to agriculture. Perhaps the REA rates are justifiably higher than those of private companies, and their service still a bargain to the people.

My objection is to the all-too-common practice of clothing public power, whatever its situation, with all righteousness,

and the accompanying failure to give credit for accomplishment to private enterprise when that credit is due.

Getting back to the voice of the people in these matters of public versus private power, the junior Senator from Oregon should be reminded that his disclaimers will not stand up against the experience and the votes of the people themselves in several areas, some in his own State of Oregon, where the Idaho Power Co. renders electric service. If this company's record of service and rates require a look behind the statistics, why have the members of four REAs in that area taken the same course of action recently followed by the people of Stevens County, Wash., and of the Sandy, Oreg., rural community?

The citizens of Jordon Valley, Oreg., whom the junior Senator from Oregon represents, pioneered the path some years back, when they voted overwhelmingly to sell their REA system lock, stock, and barrel, to the Idaho Power Co., after an unsatisfactory public-power experience. Since that vote, they have enjoyed better service, lower rates, and wider extension of farm service.

The REA at Juntura, Oreg., also in a part of the Senator's bailiwick, made a like decision. Later, the REA unit headquartered at Vale, Oreg., where there are real, live voters in the Senator's jurisdiction, followed suit, after several years of operation. In Long Valley, Idaho, REA members reached a similar decision for the same reasons.

Is not this the voice of the people?—not people who deal in theories but people who have had the experience of unfulfilled expectations which abound in the myth of public power being always beneficent, always a cure-all, always doing public good and, incidentally, in opposition to the terrible ogre of private enterprise.

EVELYN COLE, MONTANA'S CONTEMPORARY WESTERN ARTIST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently I was presented by one of our Senate pages—Jack Upshaw, of Chinook, Mont.—with an original oil painting.

The artist responsible for the fine piece of art work is Miss Evelyn Cole, also of Chinook. In my estimation, Miss Cole is one of the outstanding contemporary western artists, and a worthy successor to Charles M. Russell, the greatest American frontier artist.

The creative brushes of the Russells, Remingtons, and the Coles have preserved for us on canvas a vanishing era—the era of the settler, the cowboy, and the Indian on the western frontier.

The painting is a landscape scene of north-central Montana, near the Bearpaw Mountains, set within an outline of the Treasure State. The foreground of the painting depicts a band of Nez Perce Indians led by the great Chief Joseph.

Miss Cole is a native Montanan. Her art deals largely with history and landscapes associated with central Montana. A number of her paintings are on display in museums and libraries in Montana. At present, Miss Cole's art is not known as well as it should be beyond the limits of Montana; but I am sure that national recognition will be forthcoming in the near future, because Evelyn Cole's art is fine in detail, pleasing in color, and presents true and accurate portrayal of the West.

Miss Cole's painting hangs in a prominent place in my office, and I welcome all admirers of western art who may care to inspect it to come in and see a real masterpiece.

BUTTE AND MONTANA CELEBRATE A BIRTHDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Butte and Montana Celebrate a Birthday," published in the Montana Standard of May 27, 1956. I believe this editorial is worthy of the consideration of all Members of the Senate, because it outlines in some detail the growth of these two fine entities, first, the city of Butte, the most picturesque city in the United States, with the finest people, and Montana, the Treasure State, also with the finest people in the Union.

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

BUTTE AND MONTANA CELEBRATE A BIRTHDAY

The city of Butte and the State of Montana are both 92 years old.

But the fact is cities and States do not grow old; they grow young until they die.

And both Butte and Montana are still growing young.

Ninety-two years ago last week the legislation which made Montana a Territory, separating it from Idaho Territory, was passed in Congress and signed by President A. Lincoln.

And at about the same time a couple of prospectors, G. O. Humphrey and William Allison, panned sufficient gold along Silver Bow Creek to establish a gold camp and attract other prospectors here. Within 2 years the population had reached 500.

Since then Montana and Butte have had their ups and downs, but they have continued to grow.

New mining developments and extension of old ones bring assurance that the population of Butte will increase materially within the next few years. Similarly, these developments have given the mining camp a new lease on longevity. The end isn't in sight.

Economists and scientists concluded in recent years that Montana's varied assortment of natural resources have only been scratched, thus giving the State a new lease on the future.

Although Montana's extensive deposits of minerals are irreplaceable once they have been removed from the ground, the supply as the years have passed has constantly grown larger and larger.

It has been similar with Montana's other natural resources.

New discoveries in scientific methods, irrigation, and new machinery have constantly increased Montana's agricultural productive capacity.

Montana's attractiveness as a tourist haven are only beginning to be realized. The tourist business has grown up within the memory of our young people from almost nothing to third rank in the State's income producing resources.

The State's population has been steadily increasing with the trend of the movement of people away from the crowded East to the wide open spaces of the West.

One resource which has scarcely begun to be developed is Montana's vast supply of water, a large amount of which is stored naturally in the form of snow in the mountains during the winter and seeps away gradually during the summer in clear, cool mountain streams.

Another resource which has only been scratched is that of petroleum.

In both of these categories there is room for tremendous growth, thus making the State of Montana younger even though it is growing older in years chronologically.

The migrations of people constantly westward across the United States is merely one of the signs that the areas from which they are coming are actually growing old, both chronologically and in resources.

In another field, Montana has a great opportunity to achieve still more youthfulness. This is in the manufacturing field. The trend here again is in our favor. The trend is to move the factory closer and closer to the source of raw materials needed for fabrication.

In the past, Montana has existed chiefly as a source of raw materials. Processing adds greatly to the value of a raw product. There is no reason why Montana can't grasp this advantage. It has most of the necessary ingredients.

So, here's a salute to Butte and Montana on their twin birthdays.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice the blushing modesty of the Senator from Montana when he says that Butte is the finest city in the country, and that the people of Montana are the finest people in the country. Does not the Senator from Montana think he should sprinkle a little modesty on such glowing statements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I was being unduly modest because of my sensitive feeling for other Senators. However, I could have gone to extremes and really told the truth about Montana, the Treasure State, which, of course, words are not sufficient to express.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is always excellent to find people with such a charitable opinion of themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Especially when it is the truth.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSALS TO AMEND ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, I announce that tomorrow at 10 o'clock, in room 318 of the Senate Office Building, hearings will be opened upon H. R. 11, S. 11, and several other bills dealing with the amendment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The committee has received communications from at least 60 different persons who desire to express opinions with respect to this issue. It is one of the most important questions confronting the Nation. It is a part of the same problem which the Senate had under discussion yesterday when the bill giving automobile dealers their day in court was passed by a vote of 76 to 1.

The problem of violations of the Robinson-Patman Act affects all sorts of small business. Drugstores in many

localities are very much affected. Small grocers are very much interested. Small jobbers in the gasoline and oil business, filling stations, small refiners, and big refiners, are all interested.

Recently I received a letter from the Governor of my State in which he expressed great concern over the gasoline wars which have been opened in Wyoming. The same situation has developed in other States. The big refiners cut prices, and the small filling station and the small refiner cannot compete. There have been instances of big companies moving into a local community, spending large sums of money on the construction of luxurious filling stations, offering their commodities at a lower rate, and driving the small, independent dealers out of business.

The issue we are facing is whether the local independent businessman is seeing the end of his day as a part of the economic system of America, and is being succeeded by the national operator, who is in a position to write the whole law for himself.

It will be the endeavor of the subcommittee, as I stated to Governor Simpson in response to his letter to me, to make arrangements for the full presentation of the problem by representatives of independent filling stations, independent jobbers, small refiners, and big refiners. I hope to be able to lay on the table the entire story of the devices by which local independent enterprise is losing its economic freedom.

One of the bills, S. 11, was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The commitee is also about to open hearings on the meat industry. The Senator from Tennessee will preside at the opening session, which will be held tomorrow. The bills which are involved are not only S. 11, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, but also H. R. 1840, introduced by Representative BYRON G. ROGERS of Colorado, and S. 780, which was introduced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am pleased to learn that hearings are to be conducted upon this important issue. I very much hope that the committee will report S. 11, or a bill which will accomplish the same purpose, some time during the next few weeks, because Congress will not be in session much longer. I am a cosponsor, along with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], of S. 11.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wyoming is familiar with the problems involved. It seems to me that the price discriminations which are adversely affecting small business are very serious. Unless Congress acts to afford some element of protection to small business which does not now exist, we shall see very many more business failures and bankruptcies than are necessary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. I believe it will be possible to report proposed legislation which will, at least, be of some assistance in the situation which is developing.

The problem affects the entire economy. The struggle is now reaching its most critical point. I refer to the struggle between small independent enterprise in local communities and the great national, concentrated companies which operate throughout the United States, and sometimes throughout the world. We are losing the power to regulate commerce in the public welfare, and shall continue to lose it unless legislation of this kind, well drafted and properly conceived, is enacted.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3897) to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes.

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

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in my opinion, the pending bill, if enacted, will bring about the most important reforms and improvements in the Government's financial structure in a decade or more.

Cosponsored by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who is a great authority on the subject and has done a tremendous amount of work in this field of legislation, and by 30 other distinguished Members of the Senate from each side of the aisle, S. 3897 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations on June 7.

It has the unqualified endorsement of the major financial departments of the Government, including the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury, each of whom submitted testimony before the Subcommittee on Reorganization which held the hearings upon this matter.

The bill implements directly the recommendations of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the Second Hoover Commission—relating to budgeting and accounting.

The task force on budgeting and accounting was headed by Mr. J. Harold Stewart, of Boston, to whom the subcommittee is strongly indebted.

The bill would enact into law the recommendations made by the President of the United States to the Congress in his special message delivered May 10, 1956, when he urged early enactment of appropriate legislation in this field.

As I pointed out on yesterday when I filed the committee's report, this proposed legislation would place the entire governmental structure on an accrued annual expenditures basis, thus improving the financial management within the executive agencies, and immeasurably strengthening the control of the Congress over the purse strings.

As the Senate probably knows, more than $25 million of Government expenditures in 1956 are being made from funds appropriated in previous years. It seems to me, therefore, that the pending measure, if enacted, would bring about a radical and important reform in governmental accounting.

The bill provides that the executive agencies shall determine their budgets on a cost basis and shall maintain their accounts on an accrual expenditures basis to provide the foundation for the stating of appropriations by the Congress on an annual accrued expenditures basis, which is the heart of fiscal control.

In other words, upon the enactment of this bill, the Congress would make its appropriations for each fiscal year upon the estimates of expenditures actually to be made or to be accrued during that fiscal year, as opposed to the present appropriations procedure whereby appropriations are made upon an obligation basis which at times extends over several fiscal years in the future.

I am fully aware that this is a revolutionary change in our fiscal processes which could not be effectuated overnight, but which in all probability would be implemented gradually with the least disturbance within the executive agencies. Nor do I believe—nor was there any evidence in the hearings—that it would have any adverse effect upon the Government's financial operations.

To the contrary, there is every indication that substantial operating economies will accrue to the Government from the establishment of more business-like budgeting, accounting, and appropriations procedures. I strongly urge favorable action upon this bill.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, who has attended every hearing on the bill and whose fine assistance was extremely important in bringing about action on the bill in committee and having it reported to the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his kind expressions. My purpose in rising is to make sure the record shows that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the proposed legislation, handled it in his characteristic, able fashion. He gave it his constant attention. Hearings were held with great care. Testimony from the Comptroller General of the United States, from the Bureau of the Budget, and from departments involved, including the Department of Defense, was taken and carefully sifted and screened.

As a minority member of the subcommittee, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished Senator from Masachusetts for his able,

careful, and painstaking handling of this important measure, and other measures to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, to express my confidence in the subcommittee and the staff and also to assure the Senate that the measure has been carefully screened. We are all in hearty accord in urging the Senate to pass the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator, very much. I also wish to express regret that the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who played such a major role in preparing this measure, is unable to be present because of a death in his family. In talking with him yesterday he expressed his great interest in the measure.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my commendation of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] for his nonpartisan approach to this matter and for the comments he has made regarding the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is a coauthor of the measure. He expressed the hope that it would not be brought before the Senate during his absence, which was made necessary by a death in his family, but that did not fit in with the wishes of some other Senators.

I appreciate the contribution of both the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Maine, and I also wish to commend my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in the comments made by the Senator from New Hampshire. As has been stated, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is unavoidably absent because of a death in his family. He is vitally interested in the measure and has asked me to convey to the Senate the great importance he attaches to this measure in connection with the operations of the Federal Government.

I wish to join, also, in commending the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who has done such good work on the bill. I also wish to commend the entire committee and those who have worked together, on both sides of the aisle, in bringing the measure before the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to state that too often, I think, we overlook the importance of the work and the responsibilities which are assumed by subcommittees of the various standing committees. In this particular instance, as my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and other Members realize, the chairman of the Government Operations Committee is carrying a very heavy workload; and were it not for Senators, like the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who are willing to cooperate and willing to take the chairmanship of subcommittees and actually do the heavy work in developing and processing proposed legislation of this character, our committees would bog down.

I am personally indebted to the Senator from Massachusetts and to those who served with him on both sides of the aisle for the splendid job which has been done on this bill. It is an important measure. We can make substantial progress in getting ready for action on important and needed legislation only as our subcommittees take responsibility and do the job as thoroughly and efficiently as it has been done in this instance. The chairman of the full committee is thoroughly appreciative of the labors of the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

In considering appropriations for the armed services, we noticed a great number of obligated but unexpended balances which have been carried over for years. This bill will prevent such a situation from arising. It will give far greater authority to the Appropriations Committee each year, and it will be necessary for the committee to decide each year how much shall be appropriated to prevent the tremendous carryovers. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that this measure offers a hope of substantial savings, and also far greater control by the executive branch and by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3897) was passed.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the passage of the Kennedy-Payne bill, Senate bill 3897, there be printed in the RECORD a statement by me.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

KENNEDY-PAYNE BILL

I am a patron on this bill because it is expressly a step in the direction of two objectives which I believe to be urgently needed in the Federal fiscal system:

1. Annual review of Congress of all major appropriations for expenditure in the coming fiscal year; and

2. Reduction in unexpended balances carried over from prior appropriations which now are available for years with ineffective legislative control over the annual rate of expenditure from them.

We must keep constantly before us the fact that there is a wide difference between annual appropriations and annual expenditures.

It is annual expenditures—not appropriations—measured by annual revenue which result in annual deficits or surpluses.

To demonstrate the difference between annual appropriations and annual expenditures, I shall summarize the record for the past 10 years.

In 1948 we appropriated $39 billion and spent $34 billion.

In 1949 we appropriated $41 billion and spent $40 billion.

In 1950 we appropriated $50 billion and spent $45 billion.

In 1951 we appropriated $84 billion and spent $45 billion.

In 1952 we appropriated $93 billion and spent $66 billion.

In 1953 we appropriated $80 billion and spent $74 billion.

In 1954 we appropriated $63 billion and spent $68 billion.

In 1955 we appropriated $57 billion and spent $65 billion.

In 1956 we appropriated $62 billion and it is estimated that we shall spend $64 billion.

In 1957 the President has requested appropriations totaling $66 billion and the Budget Bureau has estimated that we shall spend $66 billion.

The accumulation of unexpended balances in appropriations over the years in excess of expenditures, after deducting lapses, now totals $74.6 billion. If we should appropriate in this session of Congress the full amount requested by the President for fiscal year 1957, beginning July 1, we would enter the new fiscal year with appropriations and other authorizations for expenditure totaling $140.9 billion.

Of the $66 billion in new appropriations requested by the President for fiscal year 1957, only $42.7 billion is for actual expenditure during the year. This means that of the appropriations we are making at this time, assuming the budget requests, $23.3 billion would be for expenditure in some subsequent year. Under the legislative appropriation practices, expenditure from this $23.3 billion balance would be subject to very little annual review by Congress in subsequent years.

This huge balance has been built up under a policy of financing tremendous long-lead time projects in advance by appropriating the full amount of the cost at the time of their inception. After the original appropriation, in practice, very little legislative control is exercised over annual expenditures from multiyear appropriations.

Under this bill the President's budget ultimately would be submitted on an annual accrued-cost basis, and appropriations would be made each year to finance the annual cost of contracts entered into pursuant to statutory authority.

I do not contend that this legislation would accomplish all which is desirable for the recapture of congressional control over the annual rate of expenditure of Federal funds. But it would be a step in the general direction of more meaningful appropriation action. It would provide a more practicable control over annual expenditures. It would produce a more tangible relationship with revenue requirements for a given year. It would develop a clearer disclosure of Federal activities on an annual basis. And it would establish Federal operations on a more businesslike basis not only for purposes of revenue and appropriations but also for more effective accounting and auditing.

I hope the bill will pass as a progressive reorganization in Federal fiscal procedures,

methods, and techniques which may result in more efficient government at reduced cost to taxpayers.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2262, House Bill 101.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 101) relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF COLUMBIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2263, Senate bill 3663.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3663) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill comes to the floor of the Senate with the unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee. The explanation is brief. I make it for the purpose of the Record.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the exemption from taxation of the real estate described as lot 79, in square 115, in the District of Columbia, owned by the Columbia Historical Society so long as the same is owned and occupied by the Columbia Historical Society and its member organizations and is not used for commercial purposes.

The Columbia Historical Society is the historical society of and for the Nation's Capital, as well as the District of Columbia. It was founded and incorporated in 1894, and is a nonprofit cultural, educational, philanthropic, and historical society.

The loss of revenue from annual real estate taxes on this property, under present valuation, amounts to $2,876.28.

I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3663) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the real estate described as lot 79, in square No. 115, situated in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, owned by the Columbia Historical Society, is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is owned and occupied by the Columbia Historical Society and its member organizations and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091; D. C. Code, secs. 47–801b, 47–801c, and 47–801e).

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE OVER POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2264, Senate bill 3838.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3838) to provide for the maintenance and operation of the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of a brief explanation, the bill also comes to the Senate by unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee.

The purpose of this bill is to provide that the bridge authorized to be constructed over the Potomac River from Jones Point, Va., to Maryland, shall be maintained and operated by and at the expense of the States of Maryland and Virginia, and the District of Columbia, in accordance with such arrangements as are agreed to by such States and the District of Columbia.

The act of August 30, 1954—Public Law 704, 83d Congress—authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to construct, maintain, and operate a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River, from a point at or near Jones Point, Va., across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the State of Virginia.

The President, at the time of his approval of the above act, issued a statement that it improperly vests responsibilities in the Department of the Interior, which is not a construction agency, and that such responsibilities should be placed in the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, or the Corps of Engineers of the Army.

Public Law 534, 84th Congress, approved May 22, 1956, amended the act of August 30, 1954, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to construct a six-lane bridge at the site hereinbefore mentioned.

I urge passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3838) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge authorized to be constructed by title II of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954, shall be maintained and operated by and at the expense of the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia in accordance with such arrangements as shall be agreed upon by such States and the District of Columbia.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 101) relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the request I have just made, and ask him to explain the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this bill is made necessary because of changes made in the reclamation law by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. Under reclamation authorizations, the Department of the Interior got itself in the situation where irrigation districts could not be assured of renewal of the so-called 9 (e) or utility irrigation contracts after 40 years. In doing so, we found it was necessary to say that the Secretary of the Interior could renew so-called 9 (e) contracts or convert them to 9 (d) contracts. When it comes to renewals, he can work out with the contracting organizations a procedure to go ahead on a basis which will be satisfactory to them and protect the interests of the Government. He can include in the long-term contracts provisions which take care of circumstances such as assurances of a share of whatever water is available or to change the terms and amounts in view of construction costs.

The Bureau of Reclamation has asked for the bill, and the Bureau of the Budget has approved it. The bill was passed by the House after full consideration. The Senate committee also considered it thoroughly and we think the bill is satisfactory.

I may say to the Senator from California that most of these so-called 9 (e) contracts are in the State of California. The irrigation districts there would like to have this bill, I am informed, and there has been no objection to it from any source. The purpose of the bill is to extend to the 9 (e) contract districts the same conditions as under the standard provisions of the reclamation law. I think it is a desirable bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no

amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 101) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC., IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2265, House bill 8493.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8493) to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill also comes to the Senate with the unanimous vote of the District of Columbia Committee.

The purpose of this bill is to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia, so long as such property is not used for commercial purposes, and is subject to the provisions of the act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District.

I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8493) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC-SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2266, House bill 10768.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10768) to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the bill. I want to say that it, too, was unanimously reported by the District of Columbia Committee.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for increased annuities for all teachers and school officers who are now retired or may retire prior to December 31, 1957. The bill is designed to parallel the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended—Public Law 369, 84th Congress amended that act to provide increases to annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The amount of the increase is set forth on a percentage basis and would depend upon the commencing date of the annuity. Since the increases provided by H. R. 10768 would apply only to a group of persons who may have retired prior to December 31, 1957, the annual disbursements for such increases would be on a gradually declining basis by reason of mortality of annuitants.

The present value of all such future disbursements, as of July 1, 1956, is estimated as $2,619,100. The first year's cost would be approximately $252,800. The bill would permit retired teachers to waive all or any part of their annuity to which they are entitled, in the same manner as persons retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10768) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2267, S. 2704.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2704) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is presently considering S. 2704.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Oregon propose to offer an amendment to correct a typographical error in spelling?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I was going to do so in my explanation, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. First, I want to give an explanation of the bill, and then take up the amendment.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize partial reimbursement of the District of Columbia for its share of the cost of certain highway-railroad grade separations. Assessment of any of the cost against the railroads involved is prohibited.

The project is at a point in the southeast section of the District in the vicinty of East Capitol Street, where the proposed extension of East Capital Street as shown on the highway plan of the District will cross the right-of-way of the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad—operated under lease by the Pennsylvania Railroad—and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

The total cost of the project is estimated at $1,995,000.

I have an amendment to correct a printing error in the bill. The word "Treasury" is misspelled, and the amendment seeks to have the print corrected so the proper spelling will be in the print. I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to say, in defense of the Government Printing Office, that seldom do they make mistakes. When they do, I think we should understand that the factor of human error is bound to creep in, even in such an efficient organization as the Government Printing Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 9, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out "$634,000" and insert "$665,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of all members of the committee, I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2704) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in recognition of the fact that the need to bring traffic to and from the Washington-Baltimore Parkway and to handle such traffic requires the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia for credit to the Highway Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $665,000, which shall be in addition to any other amounts authorized, appropriated, accruing, or otherwise made available to the District of Columbia under any other provision of law, for the construction and maintenance in the District of Columbia of a highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, where the

proposed extension of East Capitol Street as shown on the highway plan of the District of Columbia will cross the right-of-way of the Philadelphia, Baltimore, & Washington Railroad and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Such sums as are appropriated shall remain available until expended when specifically provided in the Appropriation Act.

SEC. 2. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for construction, maintenance, and expenses incident to construction and maintenance, including planning, design, overhead, and supervision.

SEC. 3. Since the construction of East Capitol Street extended is to provide connections between the District of Columbia and the Federal Highway System, the entire cost of construction and maintenance of the grade-separation structure referred to in the preceding sections of this act shall be borne by the District of Columbia, out of funds authorized to be appropriated by this act and any other funds available to the District, and no contributions to such cost of construction and maintenance shall be required of any railroad whose right-of-way is involved by such structure, except as provided in section 4 of this act.

SEC. 4. The dedication by the railroads to the District of Columbia of the right to use as a public thoroughfare the portion of East Capitol Street extended shall not impair or affect the right of the railroads to use for railroad purposes the portion of its right-of-way so dedicated.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE VILLAGE OF CAREY, OHIO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2260, House bill 9671; and I call this motion to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9671) to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The bill was considered by the full committee, and was reported unanimously by it.

The bill has to do with the conveyance by the United States of some land to Carey, Ohio.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have checked the report on the bill, and I see from the report that I can obtain an answer to the only question I had in mind. In short, I find that the transfer involves payment by the city of the fair market value of the property.

Mr. BENDER. I have before me a letter from the Bureau of the Budget which I think will satisfy the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied, if the committee report is correct. It says that "the village will be required to pay the fair market value of the property at its highest and best use as determined by the Administrator, as of the date of such conveyance."

That is perfectly satisfactory to me, if the United States is to receive the fair market value of the property.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Ohio for having taken care of that matter in connection with the bill, because, as he knows, I am the watchdog of the Treasury in connection with getting the fair market value for all property belonging to the United States. Therefore I am perfectly willing to have the bill passed.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9671) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2268, House bill 11487.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11487) to amend the act entitled "an act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937, as amended.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show the committee's brief explanation of the bill. This bill also comes before the Senate as a result of the unanimous vote of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to reduce the registration fee for small two-wheel trailers; to permit such trailers owned by nonresidents to be operated in the District of Columbia without District registration; to provide a special registration fee for antique motor vehicles, and to authorize the issuance of congressional tags to the Chief Clerk, the Parliamentarian, and the Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. Comparable officers in the House are issued such tags under existing law.

There is a growing expansion in the automotive field in the small, two-wheel trailer rental service, under which a person may rent a trailer in one jurisdiction, attach it to his private motor vehicle, travel to another jurisdiction, and surrender the trailer to the local branch of the rental service. It may thus happen that a trailer registered in another jurisdiction will terminate a trip in the District. Inasmuch as this type of service is a convenient and practical service for persons moving small quantities of personal property, it is believed that the provision in existing law prohibiting the operation by District residents of trailers registered elsewhere than in the District should be qualified.

I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 21, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 4. The first proviso of paragraph (c) of section 3, chapter 6, of title 40 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition, relating to issuance of congressional tags, is amended by inserting after the phrase "to the elective officers and disbursing clerks of the Senate and the House of Representatives" a comma and the words "the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Auditor, and Procurement Officer of the Senate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 245. An act for the relief of Ahmet Haidun Koca Taskin;

S. 1375. An act for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung;

S. 1622. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes; and

S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Guiseppe Corrado Cilli.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2842) for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5590. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever, approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert"; and

H. R. 11473. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its

disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment No. 50, to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1403. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.;

H. R. 1986. An act for the relief of Robert M. Deckard;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Onie Hack;

H. R. 4336. An act for the relief of Z. A. Hardee;

H. R. 5155. An act for the relief of Peder Strand;

H. R. 5690. An act for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching;

H. R. 6765. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.;

H. R. 7738. An act for the relief of Scott Berry;

H. R. 9106. An act for the relief of Saul Lehman;

H. R. 10818. An act for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry;

H. R. 10204. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11530. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain finances of United States citizens; and

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson;

S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 2202. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

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. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

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

S.3581. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

S. 3945. An act for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Co. of Louisiana, Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1403. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.;

H. R. 1986. An act for the relief of Robert M. Deckard;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Onie Hack;

H. R. 4336. An act for the relief of Z. A. Hardee;

H. R. 5155. An act for the relief of Peder Strand;

H. R. 6765. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.;

H. R. 7738. An act for the relief of Scott Berry;

H. R. 9106. An act for the relief of Saul Lehman;

H. R. 10818. An act for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11530. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain fiances of United States citizens; and

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5690. An act for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10204. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-6827809, Ai, Kuo-Yen or Kuo-Yen Thomas Ai.

A-6916280, Ai, Josephine Yueh-Li Mao.

A-7383344, Avella, Eva Maria (nee Ruttkay).

A-6059371, Banaszkiewicz, Leszek Romuald.

A-7444647, Benedikt, Erwin.

A-8036432, Berkovits, Ervin.

0300-402795, Bloks, Peteris.

A-9748478, Bok, Leung Koon.

A-8079746, Braun, Naftali.

T-2760124, Chai, Sum.

A-5770643, Chan, Sik Hung or Howe Chan or Henry Sighung Chan.

A-8955072, Chang, Ching Shan.

A-6084090, Chang, Fu-Kuei.

0300-471516, Chang, Chang-Chwan.

A-8875962, Chang, Ho Shing.

A-6967248, Chang, Mary Mei-Li.

0300-322153, Chang (nee Joi).

A-7355370, Chang, Phillip Wei-Li, also known as Chang Wei-Li.

A-7292164, Chang, Silas Hsien-Ta.

A-6959863, Chang, Carol Fang.

A-6848012, Chang, Wen-Han.

T-359293, Chao, Howard Hao Sheng.

A-6251861, Chao, Hsien-Gieh Sie.

0300-471322, Charbani, Chaoul Ibrahim or Saul Charbani.

A-4825480, Cheng, Chow Sun.

A-6084186, Yi-Hsien, Chow.

A-7782851, Chen, Chung Peng.

A-356977, Chen, Hsu-Tu.

A-7389479, Chen, Hue-Chen.

A-10066139, Chen, Katherine Chih-Mei.

T-301887, Chen, Leo Hsiao-Lin, formerly Chen Hsiao-Lin.

T-301886, Chen, Helena H. (nee Hsun Hsin Cheng)

T-301888, Chen, Carlson.

T-301889, Chen, Kiki Nelson, formerly Kee Chen.

A-6967327, Chen, Lydia Pi Lin.

V-753648, Chen, Mary or Sister Mary Anunciata Chen.

0300-467050, Chen, Shueng Ching Chang.

A-7292410, Chen, Victor Anchao.

0300-419633, Chen, Vung Yueh.

A-7056595, Chen, Yia Shen.

A-9678204, Cheng, Ah Tooi.

A-6973688, Ch'eng, Kuang Chin.

V-1242064, Cheng, Mary Molan.

E-057486, Cheng, Sun Tong.

A-6084123, Cheo, Ying Chang, also known as Vincent Y. C. Cheo.

A-9579541, Cheong, Tsang.

A-7295490, Chia, Teh-Tsao.

A-6522853, Chiang, Chin Long.

A-6522854, Chiang, Fu Chen.

A-4919939, Chiang, Pei-Run.

A-7583971, Chiang, Lena.

A-6992023, Chi-Lung, Li or Sister Mary Claudia.

0300-93183, Ching, Tung Jui.

A-1161839, Chiu, Churchill Too-Ming.

A-7445196, Chiu, Shiao-Yuen (Victoria Maria Chiu).

A–6849825, Cho, Frank Fu-La.
A–9245145, Chong, Ah Sung.
A–7860200, Chou, Albert Sze-Ching.
V–885173, Chow, Hee Yar Wong.
1600–106555, Chow, Some Foot.
1600–106556, Chow, Some How.
1600–106557, Chow, Some Kid.
A–9073827, Choy, Soo.
A–6709314, Chu, Bark-Ho.
A–6877770, Chu, Chih-Cheng.
A–6967268, Chu, Herbert Yuan-Sing, formerly Yuan-Shing Chu.
A–8057137, Chu, Tsu Hsi.
A–7243064, Chu, Yueh Chang.
A–9568331, Chu, Yung Shing.
0300–436371, Dai, Chan.
A–7480686, Dembitzer, Abraham.
A–6980355, Djang, Jane Chu, also known as Chang Chu.
A–8258348, Fang, Ta-Chuan.
A–7095389, Fang, Tao Yao.
A–9684299, Fat, Ho, also known as No Kong Hon.
0300–469308, Fatt, Chin, also known as Ching Fott, also known as Cham Fatt.
A–6650785, Fong, Tsung Butt.
A–8198637, Gluck, Andor.
A–7819648, Gluck, Aron.
0300–463505, Gluck, Hela.
A–10141603, Gratzer, Rozina.
A–7830718, Ha, Chen Chun.
T–300009, Han, Andrew I-Chih.
A–6855624, Han, Rebecca Chih Lan.
A–8153566, Hartman, Dora Meisels.
A–5153507, Henry, Wei (Mun-Hee).
A–7632418–T, Ho, Lok Shang.
A–6704241, Ho, Thomas C. K., also known as Chi-Kao Ho.
A–6847752, Ho, Lucy Chao (nee Lucy Wan-Chen Chao).
0300–457392, Hong, Than Sien.
A–8915816, Hong, Yung Shing.
A–6849397, Hsiao, Chi-Mei.
A–6027123, Hsiao, Feng.
T–2699670, Hsiao, Kuang Hao.
A–8876992, Hsiao, Samuel Chi, also known as Wang-yuan Hsiao.
A–8876994, Hsiao, May Lee, also known as Elsie Marie Hsiao.
A–8876995, Hsiao, Victor, also known as Chi-sheng Hsiao.
A–8876993, Hsiao, Christopher, also known as Chi-min Hsiao.
A–7389362, Hsieh, Hua-Kuang.
A–6967604, Hsieh, James Ke Ming.
A–7389467, Hsieh, Po Yuen.
0300–182009, Hsieh, Tsu Hsi.
A–0944164, Hsu, Chih Kien.
A–8979938, Hsu, Han-Kuang.
A–6848375, Hsu, Kwan.
A–7805868, Hsu, Robert Ying Hwang.
A–6033147, Hsu, Tony Tatung.
1103–13015, Ting, Rosalind Yi Ming.
A–8982869, Hsueh, Wei Yuan.
A–8982868, I-Chieh, Mai Yin.
A–8982873, Hsueh, Mary Andy.
A–8982872, Hsueh, Angy.
A–8982871, Hsueh, Army.
A–8982870, Hsueh, Antung.
0300–344285, Hu, Mabel Liang.
A–7731146, Hu, Yung Chun.
A–10076472, Huang, Chamber.
0300–362053, Huang, Dorothy Hsiu Ting.
A–7948396, Huang, Paul.
A–8957076, Huang, Margaret Jean.
A–6196024, Hui, You.
A–8093871, Huskel, Joseph Haim.
A–8980010, Hwang, Ching Yun.
A–8980011, Hwang, Ella Koh-Chang Li.
A–8980012, Hwang, Chien Sheng.
A–6669707, Hang (Wong), Joseph Ru-Yu.
A–8951034, Hwang, Beth Han-Chen Liu.
A–8951033, Hwang, Betty Shao-Chen.
E–47222, Ivanov, Victor Michael.
E–47223, Ivanov, Zenaida Alexandrovna.
A–7985645, Jeng, Chorng-Shiaw, also known as Douglas Chorng-Shiaw Jeng.
E–118862, Kalebota, Oliver.
A–7290189, Kalish, Edith.
A–6848587, Kao, Wen Shui.
A–7952708, Kaufman, Samuel.
A–7120687, Kaye, Show-Wei (Alan).
A–7366383, Kendi, Zekiye.
A–7356384, Kendi, Linda Chahoud.
A–6985805, Kiang, Sheng Piao.
V–305645, Zee, Lin Chen, also known as Mimi Kiang.
A–6694224, King, Lucia, Joan Wou.
A–7081614, King, Memee Hien-Kouen.
0200–102836, King, Lung Chang.
A–7790652, King, Yun Ching Mao.
A–7790649, King, Josephine Schweng.
0200–130574, King, David Da-Wei.
A–6849450, Kuh, Ernest Shiu-Jen.
A–10015956, Kuzura, Hans.
A–5394024, Lam, Tam.
A–7365686, Lan, Yu Hu or Lucy Yu Hu Lan.
0300–454039, Leban, Ivan Stanislaus, also known as John S. Leban.
A–7274351, Lee, Chwan-Chang Nai-Kuan.
A–7389484, Lee, Ding Wong.
A–6049385, Lee, Mov.
0300–457461, Lee, Tsung-Dao.
A–6967640, Lee, Jeannette Chin.
A–6872458, Lee, Yung Chia.
A–8982880, Leung, Tak So, alias Catherine Tak So Leung.
A–6703452, Li, Hui-Sen or Victoria Hui-Sen Li.
A–6958557, Li, Louis Hsiao-Chao.
A–7202735, Liang, Hou Jan.
A–7295485, Liang, Kang-Shun.
A–7399259, Liang, Rio (Shui-Oi) Lin.
A–6442562, Liang, Siu Seu Kei.
0300–470029, Lien, Ho.
E–083509, Lillimagi, Leonardo.
E–083510, Krup, Arne, also known as Arne Lillimagi.
A–6847733, Lin, Hung Chang.
A–6567581, Lin, Anchen Wang.
A–6967590, Lin, Lan Ying.
A–7354778, Lin, Lucy Kwen-Yuan.
A–6843380, Lin, Mary Elizabeth, formerly Mary Elizabeth (Betty) Young or Yang Wei-Tsung.
A–6552714, Lin, or Po-Chen.
A–8153629, Lin, Hsi-Chuan (nee Chen, Hsi-Chuan).
A–7295496, Lin, Samuel Paoshi, formely Lin Pao-Hsi.
A–7078166, Liu, Elizabeth Hwai-Ying.
A–8982882, Liu, Hannah Man-Hwa.
A–6847864, Liu, Hsiao-Chuan.
A–7850968, Liu, Jeannette Che-Chien.
0300–314881, Liu, Norah Tang, also known as Shiu Ming Tang.
A–8995041, Liu, Philip Sze-Yung.
A–7456051, Liu, Theresa Hui.
0300–399845, Liubicich, Ivan.
A–9128943, Lo, Yen.
A–7387939, Leoffler, Olga nee Weisz.
V–754182, Loh, James Mei-Huang.
0300–382462, You, Tai Yeong Shiue.
0300–468623, Lou, Whei Ling.
0300–468622, Lou, Whei Ping.
A–7857768, Lowe, Diana Ming-Duh.
A–7808104, Lowy, Bertha.
A–8955198, Lu, Ponzy.
A–8955199, Lu, Kai Roh, also known as Cary Lu.
A–6958639, Lui, Chum Lau.
A–6983525, Maday, Maria.
A–8150145, Maday, Zsolt Bela Gaspar.
1308–8483, Maday, Katalin (Kathy) Maria Erzsebet.
A–9550839, Manka, Jan.
A–8995042, May, Chu Tom Chung.
A–6962962, Meng, Ching-Hwa.
1300–134705, Miao, Pei Chi.
A–6848595, Nee, David Shou-I.
0300–369097, Ogorek, Leib.
A–7436639, Ogorek, Cily (nee Meyerovich).
A–7282130, Pao, Huei-Yuan (John).
A–7444657, Pejsa, Lubomir Oscar, also known as Larry Pejsa.
A–9759315, Perme, Milan.
A–8853556, Peros, Venci.
A–9576034, Piew, Jan.
A–7367940, Poon, Wai Ha or Mrs. Henry Louis.
V–1184123, Popoff, Leo.
V–1184124, Popoff, Alla.
T–1495443, Popoff, Marina.
T–1495444, Popoff, Andrei.
A–9665946, Porubov, Roman Deevich.
0300–305335, Posner, Pola.
A–7828309, Quo, Diana Shu.
A–7828310, Quo, Edward.
A–7365708, Rabinovici, Benjamin.
A–7988114, Roth, Miklos.
A–7988111, Roth, Geza.
E–8381, Rubin, Maximilian.
A–7223159, Rubinstein, Adolph.
A–9519927, Sak, Fung or Fung Sik.
E–058296, Sang, Chan.
E–084407, Sawicki, Jerzy Grzegorz.
A–7243000, Scheiner, Herbert.
0300–466312, Sha, Tseng, Lu.
A–7865359, Shang, Ching-Ting.
A–7350585, Shao, Lillian Chang.
A–7350586, Shao, Eugene.
A–7350587, Shao, Betty.
A–7350588, Shao, Jane.
A–7350589, Shao, Stella Lou.
A–7350590, Shao, Susie.
A–7350592, Shao, Connie.
A–8995044, Shee, Wong.
A–8245890, Shen, Chen Tung.
1600–107942, Shen, Yung Chung.
0300–457390, Shoo, Koo Ah.
A–7118648, Sih, Kwang Chi.
A–7395232, Soong, Kwan Hua.
V–469348, Sun, Arnold Yiu Fang, formerly Sun Yiu Fang.
A–7456028, Sun, Betty Chia-Hui.
A–6851441, Sun, Ho Sheng.
A–7463623, Sun, Sung Huang.
A–7248491, Sung, Albert Yun-Hua.
A–6848633, Sung, Neng-Lun.
A–7416448, Sung, Rodney Lu Dai.
A–6704103, Swen, En-Lienor Ruby En-Lien Swen.
A–7821882, Szu-Tu, Anthony Yen-Sheng.
0300–408601, Tai, Chao Yao, also known as Clement Leo Tai.
0300–408602, Tai, Chu Ching Hsin, also known as Clare Chu Tai.
E–058041, Tai, Chew Jee.
A–10065565, Tawil, Clement Ibrahim.
A–7174723, Teng, Hsi Ching.
A–5753754, Toa, Chan Sze.
A–5182572, Tom, Wallace, also known as Tam Kam Cheung.
T–2080412, Tong, Long-Sun.
A–8173633, Tsai, Bruce Kuo-Hai.
A–6973686, Tsai, Stephen Wei Tun.
A–6153407, Tso, Piao Frank.
A–7282962, Tung, Agatha Feng-Mei.
A–7457555, Vassos, Christos Antonios.
A–8190484, Vernitsky, Nadezda, formerly Nadezda Leithammel (nee Kepper).
E–085343, Wadhsmuth, Leonard or Leonhard.
A–9623511, Wah, Chin.
A–8878066, Wah, Chu Kwong, also known as Kwong Wah Chu.
A–7284218, Wang, Allan Tsong Kao.
A–5369089, Wang, David Kehsin.
A–6463163, Wang, Jimmy Peng-Lin.
0300–472021, Wang, Jinq Bor, or Jinq Bor Tang.
0300–469273, Tang, Fan Kuo.
0300–469702, Tang, Ping Chien.
A–4374750, Weber, Estera P.
T–1496395, Wong, Chung Dong.
1300–84918, Wong, Lee Yung.
0300–387779, Wong, Yung.
A–9798854, Wong, Yung Ching.
T–2809651, Woo, Lin Siang.
A–7297983, Wu, Joseph.
A–7073634, Wu, Tao-Yuan.
A–6259104, Wu, Yuan-Li.
0204/5969, Yang, Chen-Ping.
A–7418233, Yao, John Chun-Yu.
A–10135697, Yao, Mary Soo-Wah.
T–1746758, Yao, Sin Ping.
V–1438199, Yeh, Tsun-kai.
A–7274654, Yih, Chia Moun, also known as Manette Chia-Moun Yih.
A–7424859, Ying, Chieh-Liang.
A–8870545, Yu, Edwin.
A–7462148, Yu, Eileen Hsiu-Yung (nee Wu).

A–7202749, Yuen, You Liang.
E–086499, Yurman, Alberto, or Alberto Jurman.
0300–17305, Zaveckas, Adomas, also known as Adomas Plecuakas Zaveckas.
A–6325061, Altenbrun, Juliane.
A–6325059, Andre, Maia.
A–8172278, Bandera, Vittorio Giovani.
A–8830712, Bronevsky, Sergiu Aristotel.
A–9825253, Bussanich, Antonio, also known as Anthony Bussanich.
A–7415211, Chai, Chiuling.
0400–46784, Chan, Chow Shun.
0300–226262, Chan, Gat Chong, also known as Johnny Chan.
0300–279131, Chan, Raymond Loi-Ming.
0300–460911, Chan, Anita Wu.
0300–360856, Chan, Roger Chi-Yit.
A–9633955, Chan, Sow.
1300–113468, Chang, Betty Low, also known as Foon Ngan Low.
A–7389486, Chang, Yunshan Katherine, formerly Yunshan Shih.
A–6623720, Chao, Tzu-Chow.
A–7439036, Chao, Frank Yin-Tzu.
A–7439037, Chao, Jimmy Min-Tzu.
A–7439038, Chao, Gene Jao-Tzu.
A–10141625, Chen, Chunjen Constant.
A–10141624, Chen, Eva Yi-Fu Chien.
A–10141635, Chen, Yung Ming.
A–10141623, Chen, Yung Kang.
A–9769854, Chen, Mai Kong.
A–6851419, Chiang, Alpha Chung-I.
A–7354784, Chiang, Emily.
A–7143990, Chiang, Robert Sish-Hauan.
A–6967664, Chiang, Ruby Ju-Pi.
V–754381, Chiang, Tung Ming.
A–7389360, Chian, Kun Li.
0300–394851, Chin, Moy, also known as Kong Moy Chin.
A–6967643, Ching, Amy.
A–6858243, Ching, George Pao Kang, also known as Pao Kang Ching.
E–084353, Chong, Chung.
A–7436768, Chou, Chan Fong.
0300–347788, Chow, Ting-Chuan.
0300–460088, Chow, Fengling Ou.
0300–460090, Chow, Ninota Stephen.
A–6071279, Choy, Kee.
A–10135617, Choy, Som or Seng Tsai.
T–2064297, Chu, Helen Yu Li Chao.
A–8153740, Chu, Janet Yun.
T–1408515, Chu, Mabel Chen-Mi.
A–7274381, Chu, Wen-Chi (Diana).
E–082668, Cnesich, Antonio.
E–118711, Dai, Leong Kam.
A–7243251, Diminich, Milan.
E–057950, Doo, Sze, Wod.
E–086370, Eckstein, Ervine.
0300–444834, Eng, Hu, also known as Chin Inn.
A–8055364, Fajncajg, Chaja.
A–7865110, Fajncajg, David.
A–8055371, Fajncajg, Icchok.
A–9731873, Fat, Kan Chung.
0300–414355, Fat, Tsung.
A–8916443, Fatt, Cheng.
A–7802066, Fisers, Karlis Hermanis.
A–7913545, Fishman, Chaim.
A–9782527, Fong, Cheng.
E–086609, Fong, Mon or Fong Mon or Feng Ming.
A–8826832, Fook, Ng.
A–1762198, Fook, Wong Ah.
0300–475315, Four, Lum.
A–7424925, Frey, Andrew, also known as Andras Frey.
A–7424926, Frey, Clara, also known as Klara Frey (nee Rudas).
A–7480684, Fried, David.
A–10067763, Fried, Livia.
0300–313392, Friedman, Miklos.
0300–313393, Friedman, Edith(nee Weisz).
0300–314455, Frosh, Magda.
T–1496401, Fu, John E. Kai-Cheng, formerly Yuh Sen Fu.
A–8211344, Fu, Frances Hsing-Chao (nee Lee).
A–6851290, Fung, Shui Ching.
A–7223143, Gluck, Abraham.
A–7228321, Grunfeld, Rose (nee Schwartz).
A–7197486, Gyongy, Imre.
A–7197487, Gyongy, Alice.
A–7366218, Gyongy, Adrienne Gloria.
0300–471519, Hing, Ting.
A–6083399, Hin-Cheung, Hoh or David H. C. Hoh.
A–9646320, Hong, Lai.
A–10135618, Hroncich, Antonio.
T–1499144, Hsieh, Chia Chi, now known as Kate Hsieh.
A–7915690, Hsieh Ching-Kien, also known as Ching Chien Hsieh or C. K. Hsieh.
A–7396905, Hsiung, Chi Hwa.
A–6461174, Hsu, Chia Pi.
T–359254, Hsu, Pao Li.
A–6967601, Hsu, Yun Kung.
A–7882617, Huang, Jean Cho-Wu.
A–6848579, Huang, Jwo-Shauo.
A–7415301, Huang, Kee Chang.
A–6589910, Huang, Robert Kih-Hua.
V–605862, Huang, Stella Wong.
0300–460541, Huang, Yung-Chih.
A–7286963, Hwa, Chuan Shi or Francis Chuan-Shi Hwa.
V–57435, Hwang, Chen Hon.
A–7355248, Hwang, Yeu Puu.
A–4808163, Ivin, Sime Kuzman.
A–9764686, Jea, Foo.
A–6730662, Jeng, Wu Yung also known as Nelson J. Wu.
A–6542228, Karaulnik, Matus.
A–6542229, Karaulnik, Chana.
A–6542230, Karaulnik, Gloria Golda.
A–9948140, Kerkez, Bogdan Milo.
0500–48784, Ki, John Tche-Jen.
0300–356308, King, Wang Ying, also known as Ying King Wang.
A–9907380, Kloo, Francois.
A–10187248, Kokins, Edward or Eduards Kokins.
A–7868139, Kong, King Tong or Tom King.
A–7247542, Kung, Son Sung or Robert Son Sung Kung.
A–7267071, Chia, Mei Yun or May Mei Yun Chia.
E–094491, Kwai, Chan.
A–9709002, Kwai, Chang, also known as Chang Kwai Tsang.
A–7296134, Kwoh-I, Ai or Daniel Kuo Yi Ai.
A–7945953, Kwok, Clifford.
0300–336774, Kwok, Donald Chi Ping or Donald Kwok.
0301–21061, Kwok, Dennis Chu-Ming.
A–6967572, Kwok, Chin-San, also known as Rosalind Chin-San Kwok Chow.
A–6848555, Kwong, Shue-Shan.
0300–392478, Lam, Yat Fong, also known as Lam Fang.
A–7897517, Lebovitz, Miklos.
A–6589922, Lee Kung Ching.
A–7118661, Lee, Feng Chih Han.
A–9798519, Lee, Wen Kan.
A–7391013, Lederfajn, Abram.
A–7454543, Lerner, Isadore.
A–7991023, Lerner, Maria.
A–7991024, Lerner, Estera.
A–8037900, Ley, Hsiao-Min.
A–3073395, Li, Hui Lin.
0400–51309, Li, Chi Ying Hsu.
0400–55967, Li, June Sing Ju.
A–3640930, Liang, Hung.
0300–390885, Hung, Elsie, also known as Elsie Yahsieh Lee Liang.
0300–366350, Liang, Lone.
0300–344286, Liang, Suying.
A–7354764, Liang, Teresa Ai-Ling, also known as Carolina Ai-Ling Liang.
A–10060061, Liao, Lettice Ho.
A–10060122, Liao, Darwin Harry.
A–7362899, Ling, Sui-Lin.
A–7388007, Lieu, Aloysius.
A–6620896, Lin, Yin Po.
E–057315, Ling, Woo Zai.
A–4974265, Liu, Haosun.
A–5551670, Liu, Baogee.
A–7039102, Liu, Sze Swui.
A–6737213, Liu, Shih Jan.
V–885354, Liu, Chang Chih.
A–8105197, Lo, Hui Ch'uan or Howell Charles Lowe.
A–6848026, Lo, William Hui-Wen.
A–8091311, Loy, Wan.
A–6702200, Lu, Go.
0300–315394, Lum, How.
A–8198523, Ma, Gertrude, formerly Yun Chu Ma.
E–057985, Ming, Tong.
A–9518302, Moo, Wo Yee.
A–9541791, Ng, Ho.
E–057393, Ng, Shiu.
0300–398092, Nin, Leung.
A–9533426, On, Mark Tai.
A–8956479, Palango, Viktor, also known as Viktor Palovnikov.
A–8956481, Palango, Agnes (nee Walker or Valker).
0300–475079, Pao, Fah Lin.
0300–452721, Peras, Mario.
A–10135780, Picinich, Lorenzo Antonio, also known as Lawrence Picinich.
A–9541787, Pin, Lo.
A–7807631, Puhk, Heino.
0800–111738, Riszner, Rosa Ida (nee Schoepflin).
A–7393981, Rubin, Bernard.
0300–329210, Rubin, Ilona.
0300–376025, Rubin, Bluma.
A–7952698, Schapiro, Ely.
A–6967725, Sheng-Wu, Wang.
A–6967723, Shuen-Shan, Wang.
A–6848671, Shuen, Shih Chieh, now known as Anthony Shuen.
E–086380, Sing, How.
A–6848686, Soo, Shao Lee.
A–7821538, Dan, Gung-Tai, also known as Hermia Gung Tai Dan Soo.
A–7374695, Soong, Constance Yu-Ru (nee Sun).
A–8057789, Sow, Sin.
A–8234000, Sun, Emily I-Chu.
A–9948306, Suurhans, Rudolf.
0300–410182, Tai, Chan.
A–6041694, Tang, Chang Jun.
1600–91347, Tcheng-Tchao, Chen or Tcheng Tchao Chen.
A–6613770, Tchou, Pao-Hui, also known as Howard Pao-Hui Tchou.
A–6695454, Tiao, Hui-Li.
0300–468233, Tiao, Pei-Yun.
A–6851458, Tien, Ping King.
A–7389359, Tien, Nancy Nai-Ying Chen.
0300–469050, To, Sheng Sze.
0300–459049, Chin, Ham Po.
A–3397292, Tom, Won Shee.
A–8198643, Treitel, Leopold.
A–6976657, Tsai, Dora Yung-Chen (nee Yung-Chen Chu), also known as Yung-Chan Tse.
A–7399263, Tsao, Carson Kuo-Hsiang.
A–6849436, Tsao-Hwa, Kuo, also known as Edward T. H. Kuo.
A–7383370, Tse, Stephen Yung-Nien.
A–10142001, Tsing, Di-Tsin.
A–8091385, Tso, Feng Ah or Feng Ah Chu or Fah Voong Ah.
0300–323918, Vorhand, Victor, also known as Hersch Vorhand.
0300–323919, Vorhand, Niesel.
0300–323919, Vorhand, Berta.
0300–472736, Walinska, Wanda.
A–7269686, Wallach, Chnaier.
A–6849389, Wang, Ben Chang.
A–6851543, Wang, Chen I.
A–6848029, Wang, Chih-Chung.
A–10141552, Wang, Fang Wen.
A–6967633, Wang, Lillian Lin-Yen.
A–6967592, Wang, Marian Mei-Yen.
0300–471923, Wang, Men Chun.
0300–471924, Wang, Helen, also known as Hwei-Chen Helen Wang.
V–889926, Wang, Ming Kang.
A–6054040, Wang, Tso.
A–7223132, Weiss, Gerszon, formerly Weisz.
A–7444697, Wen, Bertha Yoen-Ngai.
A–10141627, Wen, Robert Kuo-Liang.
A–9766046, Wong, Chen.
A–10075791, Wong, Pao Hsiang.
A–10135746, Wu, Bosco Ting Lin, also known as Nicholas Wu.
A–8982881, Wu, Nan Hwa or Nancy Wu.
A–7903455, Wu, Nancy Yung-Chun.
A–7903454, Wu, Percy Liang-Yu.
A–10015501, Wu, Sophie Ann.
A–6967290, Yang, Hanford Han Foo.
A–7962614, Yang, Ih Cheo.

A–7830615, Yang, Julie Chi Sun.
A–6952369, Yang, Ling.
A–6263746, Yang, Ching-Sing Miao.
0300–468795, Yen, Hsin Yung.
0400–57735, Yip, Loretta Yuen Fong Hsu.
E–057257, You, Liu.
A–7476314, Yu, Moses Lee Kung.
V–754236, Yu, Cornelia.
A–8917908, Yu, Margaret.
A–6990735, Yuan, Robert Hsun Piao.
A–7383311, Yuan, Si-Chen.
T–2946897, Yuan, Jen-Chi Lu.
A–8217598, Yuen, Wai Lum or Ywai Lam Yuen, now known as William Yuen.
A–8065228, Yu-Seng, Hsia or H. Chu-Bao Shaw or Harrison Hsia.
A–8979849, Zielka, Siegfried.
A–8190221, Zivkovic, Bogdan Dusan.
E–082248, Zywko, Peter.
A–8845060, Ang, Huan Chun (Edith) (nee Kwoh).
0300–471573, Berzins, Laimonis.
A–7859850, Blonder, Josef.
A–6084180, Chang, Shu-Tsing (Street).
A–7060821, Chao, Pius Kuang-Wen.
A–7805871, Chen, Billy Deh-Bin.
A–7277348, Chen, Chung Cheng.
A–8125688, Chen, James Wen-Po.
A–7927821, Chen, Daisy Parker.
A–8015358, Chen, Ross, also known as Kong-Chie Chen.
0300–463699, Cheng, Chang-Chun.
1300–136558, Cheng, Sung Yuan.
V–885352, Chin, Fong-Von.
T–358275, Chiu, Yung Chuan.
A–7243149, Deutsch, Laszlo (Leslie).
A–7243148, Deutsch, Rosalia Olga.
E–057844, Gow, Won Kun, also known as Won Sing.
A–6940545, Ho, Stanley Siang-Lin.
A–6881737, Hsi, Ching Seng.
A–6986514, Hsi, Kathy C.
A–7860201, Hsi, Helen Yu-Ching.
T–358271, Hsin, Ling Hsien.
A–7865335, Hsu, Chao Yung.
A–6967274, Hseuh, Rosemary Sun King.
A–10135565, Johanson, Elmo.
A–7374669, Kai-Li-Diao, Elizabeth.
A–4473105, Karlic, Sime Ivan, also known as Sam Karlich.
A–7354781, Kee, Lau Cheong.
A–7865355, Keh, (Edward) Shou Shreu.
A–7865356, Keh, Martha Mei Sing (nee Chen).
A–6845062, Keng-Kwan, Chuan Mary, now Edwards.
A–1003584, King, Wei Hsien.
A–1617804, King, Yao Ying Sze.
A–10074297, King, Richard Lien Chao.
A–7897518, Koo, Chia Tsung.
A–7282999, Ku, Chia Cheng.
A–7526796, Kwok, Jean Gee Hing (Gee Hing Kwok).
A–7376935, Lee, Chiu Tseng.
V–1183770, Lee, James H.
V–1183775, Lee, Laura.
A–6848553, Lee (Seward), Say Wah.
A–6848708, Lee (Simone), Shi Wen (nee Yoh).
A–6847779, Lee, Vivian Yang (nee Yang Pao Chiu).
A–7118694, Li, Huon.
A–7118680, Li, Wei-Shan.
A–7450486, Liim, Villi.
A–6991765, Ling, Wilfred Chen-Sun.
A–8873894, Lis, Stanislaw.
A–7857694, Lowe, Joseph Dzenhsi.
A–8951035, Lowe, Madge Lee (Ting-Yu Lee).
A–8951036, Lowe, Benny Tsin-Yuan.
A–10073387, Lu, Yen Shen.
A–10073386, Lu, Yen Chi.
A–7118690, Mao, Tchen-Lien, also known as Lucy T. L. Mao.
0300–359383, Marciniewicz, Czeslaw.
A–7853070, Nissan, Anwar Yacoub.
A–7419931, Pao, Yee.
1300–106845, Profaca, Vincenzo.
1300–108948, Profaca, Maria.
1300–110382, Profaca, Diana.
1300–110383, Profaca, Luciana.
A–7299349, Sah, Chih-Tang.
A–7830664, Shen, Tsuh-Ming, also known as James Tsuh-Ming Shen.
A–7962545, Sing, Wong Wing.
A–7463307, So-Yuk, Lew Chao.
A–7362938, Sun, David Chen-Hwa.
A–6781264, Sung, Wong Yang.
A–9208465, Tabulov, Ante Truta.
1300–136085, Ting, Chiew Heer.
0501–20280, Tseng, Chin Kuan.
A–7391680, Tung, Shiu Hang.
A–7285811, Wang, Chi-Wu.
A–7491837, Wang, Hsueh Jeh.
A–7491838, Wang, Hwei Chen Lu.
A–6843445, Yang, Ping-Shiang, also known as James Yang.
A–6967760, Wei, Ling.
A–7202733, Wei, Alice Jun.
A–10053722, Wei, Lilly Kay.
A–7292439, Wei, Young.
A–7118695, Lee, Young Ho.
A–7297990, Weidenmiller, Helen Carla, also known as Helena Carla Stembera.
A–7244892, Weingarten, Arthur.
A–6886896, Willinger, Rosalia.
A–8916442, Wong, Tsa Chung.
A–8082677, Wu, Fa Hsiang, also known as Frazer Wu.
A–8956275, Wu, Chin, Chung Yu.
A–8956276, Wu, Lan Sing.
A–8956277, Wu, Fu Sing.
A–7123419, Yen, Chih-Min.
A–8015340, Yin, Ken Hu.
A–8259445, Yin, Yee Fang Kwan.
A–8015342, Shen, En, also known as John Yin.
0400–59703, Yin, Cheng Shu, also known as Philip Yin.
A–7296133, Yu, Arthur Jun-Shen.
A–7436727, Zee, Frank Wei Min.
A–9759314, Zuber, Novak.
0300–406963, Duck, Chow.
0300–459682, Pao, Li Ah, also known as Pao, Lee Ah.
0300–423722, Tim, Tam or Tim, Harold Tam.
0300–456055, Liang, Chen Fou.
E–086835, Sung, Lam Kim.
T–1892794, Wong, Ding.
A–7247308, Farkas, Adam.
A–9673450, Ken, Lo Lien or Seng, Lo Lien.
E–086119, Kao, Hai Chuen.
A–9732049, Potman, Axel.
0200/121276, Tong, Kun.
A–9825413, Yu, Pang.
0300–471507, Ching, Wong Ping.
A–6703360, Li, Tsung Ming.
A–7350836, Li, Mary Loh.
E–096788, Nam, Chan.
0300–461417, Seng, Choy.
A–7486941, Lau, Wing Gong.
T–1496495, Tan, Shu-Tsun.
T–1496494, Tan, Jeon E. Chang.
A–6849829, Yu Yi Yuan, also known as Yu, Rutherford Berkeley.
A–6699880, Chen, Lien Ching.
0300–464139, Strklja, Yerko Grgas.

RAILWAY–HIGHWAY GRADE ELIMINATION STRUCTURES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2269, Senate bill 2895.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2895) to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 2, line 7, after the word "such", where it appears the second time, to strike out "project" and insert "projects"; in line 17, after the word "project", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944;"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "such", to strike out "project" and insert "projects"; and in line 15, after the word "project", to insert *"Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of the second paragraph of section 10 of the act of February 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 918), as amended (sec. 7–1214, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows: "The cost and expense of any project for opening any such street or highway within the limits of such railroad company's right-of-way, including the cost of constructing the portion of any viaduct bridge, within said limits, shall be borne and paid as follows:

"(1) The District of Columbia shall apply to the payment of such cost and expense all Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds available for use by the District of Columbia at the time any such project is programed and all such funds which become available for use on such projects by the District of Columbia during the construction of such project;

"(2) If such Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds are insufficient to pay the cost and expense of any such project, the portion not so covered shall be paid one-half by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed and one-half by the District of Columbia: *Provided,* That in no case shall the obligation of the railroad company affected exceed 10 percent of the total cost and expense of such project: *Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944;

"(3) After construction, the cost of maintenance shall be wholly borne and paid in the case of highway overpasses by the District of Columbia, and in the case of highway underpasses by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed; and

"(4) The portions of such streets planned or projected as above which lie within a right-of-way belonging to such railroad company shall be dedicated by such company as a public thoroughfare when the portions of such street adjoining such right-of-way have been similarly dedicated or otherwise acquired."

SEC. 2. (a) That section 3 of the act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1353; sec. 7–1215, D. C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by striking therefrom the word "steam."

(b) So much of section 3 of such act approved March 3, 1927, as reads: *"Provided,* That one-half of the total cost of constructing any viaduct or subway and approaches thereto shall in such case be paid by the railroad company, its successors or assigns, whose tracks are so crossed; and in the event the rights-of-way of two or more railroad companies are so crossed said half cost as herein provided shall be paid by the said railroad

companies, their successors or assigns, in proportion to the widths of their respective land holdings, and all" is amended to read as follows: *"Provided,* That the total cost of constructing any project for such viaduct or subway and approaches thereto shall be borne and paid as follows:

"(1) The District of Columbia shall apply to the payment of the cost of such project all Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds available for use by the District of Columbia at the time any such project is programed and all such funds which become available for use on such project by the District of Columbia during the contruction of such projects; and

"(2) If such Federal aid highway-railway grade separation funds are insufficient to pay the cost of any such project, the portion not so covered shall be paid one-half by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed and one-half by the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That in no case shall the obligation of the railroad company affected exceed 10 percent of the total cost of such project: *Provided further,* That the obligation within this limit of the railroad carrier affected shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subparagraph (b) of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944: *Provided further,* That in the event the rights-of-way of two or more railroad companies are so crossed said half cost as herein provided shall be paid by the said railroad companies, their successors and assigns, in proportion to the widths of their respective landholdings, but the obligations of such companies shall not, in the aggregate, exceed 10 percent of the cost of such project: *Provided further,* That after construction the cost of maintenance shall be wholly borne and paid in the case of highway overpasses by the District of Columbia, and in the case of highway underpasses by the railroad company, its successors and assigns, whose tracks are crossed: *Provided further,* That in the event the rights-of-way of two or more railroad companies are so crossed, the cost of maintenance shall be borne and paid in the case of highway underpasses by the said railroad companies, their successors and assigns, in proportion to the widths of their respective landholdings. All".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of explanation of the bill, let me say it also has been reported unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to provide that the District of Columbia shall apply to the payment of the cost and expense of the highway-railway grade separation projects referred to in the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, all Federal-aid, highway-railway grade separation funds available for use by the District on such projects at the time they are programed, and all such funds which become available for use by the District on such projects during the construction of such projects.

In the event that Federal-aid, highway-railway grade separation funds available to the District are insufficient to pay the total cost and expense of such grade separation projects, the total cost and expense of said separation projects not paid with such Federal-aid funds shall be borne and paid one-half by the railroad company whose tracks are crossed and one-half by the District of Columbia, provided that the railroad company's share of such cost shall not in any case exceed 10 percent of the total cost of such projects.

After construction, the cost of maintenance shall be wholly borne in the case of highway overpasses by the District, and in the case of highway underpasses by the railroad company.

This proposed legislation was requested by the Commissioners, as a result of recommendations of the Railway-Highway Division of Costs Committee which was appointed by the Commissioners.

I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1935

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2270, House bill 7380.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7380) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1935, to correct certain inequities.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended, so as to provide that the basic annual salary of a private of any class of the fire department shall be increased by $224 while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator or tillerman of a fire department hose wagon, pumper, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance.

Hearings on the bill indicated that practically all the men affected by this proposed legislation are men who formerly served for many years as hose wagon or truck drivers, and who were reassigned to their present positions in order that younger members could be made available to perform the more arduous duties incident to driving certain fire apparatus. It appears to your committee that no penalty should be attached to reassignment of duties unless a lack of ability or efficiency has been established. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia were on page 1, after line 9, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Section 201 (b) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by (1) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), (2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and", and (3) by adding at the end of such section 201 (b) the following new paragraph:

"(5) $420, while he is assigned to duty as acting sergeant."

SEC. 3. Section 202 (f) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In computing service in the grade of inspector for the purpose of determining longevity increases, service in excess of 3 years rendered prior to the effective date of this act in the grade of private, when the individual was assigned to duty as a fire inspector or assistant marine engineer shall be considered service in the grade of inspector.".

SEC. 4. Title II of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 203. Not less than fifteen privates of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who have passed all examinations required for promotion to sergeant, shall at all times be assigned to duty as acting sergeants. Privates shall be selected for such assignment in the order in which they are scheduled for promotion to the grade of sergeant."

SEC. 5. Paragraph (2) of section 404 (a) of such Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", and the first and second provisos of section 4 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 4–802)."

On page 3, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "6" to "2," and in the same line, after the word "The", to strike out "amendments" and insert "amendment".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be kind enough to do so, I shall appreciate it if he will handle the list of 6 or 7 other District of Columbia bills, by asking that they be considered by the Senate in the order in which they appear on the list. The majority leader must be out of the Chamber for a few minutes, to attend another meeting.

If the distinguished Senator from Oregon—who has had such a great interest in all District of Columbia legislation, and who has done more for the District of Columbia than any other Senator I have known since I have served in the Senate, and who plans to handle these measures anyway—will take charge of them, I shall be very much indebted to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Texas leaves the Chamber, I wish to say that I appreciate very much his comments about my service to the District of Columbia. However, I assure him that this service is shared very much by my colleagues on the committee, particularly by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. President, to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I wish to say that I think the record will prove that during his service in the capacity of majority leader, more legislation in behalf of the District of Columbia has been passed under his leadership than at any other time during my more than 11 years of service in the Senate of the United States. As a member of the Committee

on the District of Columbia, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on the Judiciary, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for the cooperation we have always received from him when we have had District of Columbia problems to present.

Mr. President, today is almost city council day for the District of Columbia, here in the Senate. As we consider this long list of District of Columbia bills, we are almost sitting as the District of Columbia City Council. So, in the capacity of an alderman, I shall be very glad to carry out the instructions the majority leader has left with me, if that meets with the pleasure of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statements of my generous and kind friend; and I thank him for them.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

CEMETERY ASSOCIATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2271, Senate bill 2896, to amend the act relating to cemetery associations.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2896) to amend the act relating to cemetery associations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, without regard to the provisions of section 27–114 of the District of Columbia Code—act of March 3, 1901—to license for cemetery purposes any parcel of land in the District of Columbia which does not exceed 1 acre in size and which except for a one-sided frontage of less than 100 feet on a public street or highway, is otherwise completely bounded by land dedicated to cemetery purposes.

While the language of the bill is general, and can apply to any parcel of land, it is at this time intended to take care of a particular situation which has existed for several years. The plot of land immediately concerned was acquired almost 30 years ago by the Washington Hebrew Congregation. It has a frontage of 90 feet on Alabama Avenue SE., approximately 400 feet east of Congress Place. Apart from this public-highway frontage, it is completely surrounded by cemetery lands owned by the Washington Hebrew and Adas Israel Congregations.

In keeping with my duties on the committee, I made a personal inspection, with counsel for the District of Columbia, of this piece of land, so that from my own observation I could pass upon the equities involved in the petition for the passage of this measure. There is no question about the fact that we would do a gross injustice to this congregation if we were to say that this little piece of land, surrounded by a cemetery property and graves on three sides, and by Alabama Avenue on the other side, could not be used for burial purposes. I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2896) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, without regard to the provisions of section 27–114 of the District of Columbia Code (act of March 3, 1901, 31 Stat. 1295, ch. 854, sec. 670), the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to license for cemetery purposes any parcel of land in the District of Columbia which does not exceed 1 acre in size, and which, except for a one-side frontage of less than 100 feet on a public street or highway, is otherwise completely bounded by land dedicated to cemetery purposes.

DELAYED REPORTING OF BIRTHS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2272, House bill 9582.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9582) to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize and empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to adopt rules and regulations governing the filing of reports of births and the issuance of delayed birth registration certificates in such cases where certificates of birth have not been recorded pursuant to the act of March 1, 1907. Under that act, a birth must be registered by some person in attendance—a physician or midwife, or in their absence, any person who is actually in attendance of the birth. However, there have been many cases where such reports have not been filed.

Existing law makes no provision for a person whose birth has not been reported to establish his parentage and the date and place of his birth by means of baptismal, school, census, physician's, family, insurance, marriage, military, employment, voting, or other records, or by affidavits of persons having known such person since his birth. As a result, persons born in the District prior to the act of March 1, 1907, may not have had their births reported, and, because of the death or other unavailability of the person in attendance, are unable, under present law, to report the birth and to have such report form the basis for the issuance of a birth certificate by the District of Columbia.

I urge the passage of the bill, for obvious reasons of fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9582) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCORPORATION OF OAK HILL CEMETERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2273, House bill 10374.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10374) to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery in the District of Columbia.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to amend the act approved March 3, 1849, which incorporated the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia, so as to permit the board of managers of the Oak Hill Cemetery Co. to dispose of certain real property now usable only for cemetery purposes.

This cemetery was incorporated under a special act of Congress in 1849, and as is the general custom, it contained a provision in the act making all of its real estate inalienable. A number of years after the cemetery was incorporated, it purchased a parcel of ground across the street from the cemetery on R Street NW., which was used strictly for ancillary purposes such as worksheds and a stable and other activities that would not ordinarily be carried on within the cemetery proper.

Under existing law it would be impossible for the Oak Hill Cemetery to use this parcel for burial grounds as it would be necessary to obtain the consent of all property owners within 200 yards which, under the circumstances, would be unlikely. The cemetery now has an opportunity to sell this parcel of land; however, this proposed legislation is necessary before the sale can be consummated.

I therefore urge passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10374) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TESTS TO DETERMINE THE PRESENCE OF ALCOHOL IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MORSE. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2274, Senate bill 313.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 313) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That if, as a result of the operation of a vehicle, any person is tried in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia for operating such vehicle while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor in violation of section 10 (b) of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, approved March 3, 1925, as amended (D. C. Code, title 40, sec. 609), and in the course of such trial there is received in evidence competent proof to the effect that at the time of such operation—

(a) defendant's blood contained five one-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, or that defendant's urine contained eight one-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall be deemed prima facie proof that defendant at such time was not under the influence of any intoxicating liquor;

(b) defendant's blood contained more than five one-hundredths of 1 percent, but less than fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, by weight, of alcohol, or defendant's urine contained more than eight one-hundredths of 1 percent, but less than twenty one-hundredths of 1 percent, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall constitute relevant evidence, but shall not constitute prima facie proof that defendant was or was not at such time under the influence of any intoxicating liquor; and

(c) defendant's blood contained fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, or defendant's urine contained twenty one-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, such proof shall constitute prima facie proof that defendant at such time was under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

SEC. 2. (a) CHEMICAL TESTS.—Any person who operates a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of his blood or urine for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content of his blood or urine: *Provided*, That such test is administered at the direction of a police officer having reasonable grounds to believe such person to have been driving in an intoxicated condition and in accordance with the rules and regulations established by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent. If such person having been placed under arrest and having thereafter been requested to submit to such chemical test refuses to submit to such chemical test the test shall not be given but the Commissioners or their designated agent shall revoke his license or permit to drive and any nonresident operating privilege: *Provided, however*, That the Commissioners or their designated agent shall grant such person an opportunity to be heard but a license, permit, or nonresident operating privilege may, upon the basis of a sworn report of the police officer that he had reasonable grounds to believe such arrested person to have been driving in an intoxicated condition and that said person had refused to submit to such test, be temporarily suspended without notice pending the determination upon any such hearing, which shall be held within 10 days from date of suspension unless an extension of time be requested by such person. If, as a result of such hearing, it be determined such person did not refuse to submit to such a test, his license or permit and any nonresident operating privilege shall forthwith be restored. The provisions of section 13 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (sec. 40-302, D. C. Code), shall be applicable to revocations under this section.

(b) Upon the request of the person who was tested, the results of such test shall be made available to him.

(c) Only a physician acting at the request of a police officer can withdraw blood for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content therein. This limitation shall not apply to the taking of a urine specimen.

(d) The person tested shall be permitted to have a physician of his own choosing administer a chemical test in addition to the one administered at the direction of the police officer.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

The bill creates two presumptions with respect to tests for alcohol in the blood or urine:

First. If the defendant's blood contains five-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, or if his urine contains eight-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, he shall be presumed not to be under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

Second. If the defendant's blood contains fifteen-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, or if his urine contains twenty-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, he shall be presumed to be under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

This proposed legislation would permit the District to offer in evidence the results of such chemical tests without the necessity of securing the services of an expert witness.

Twenty-two States have adopted chemical-test laws, as will be seen from the report.

Section 2 of the bill is similar to the implied-consent law of the State of New York.

The testimony was, without exception, that if the blood or urine contains the weight of alcohol set forth in the bill, there is no question about the driver being under the influence of alcohol. A laymen might possibly question that statement, but it is very interesting to point out what the witnesses made very clear. There is a body of unquestioned scientific data which bears out the testimony. It seems to be the invariable rule that, no matter how much an individual may drink, no matter for how long a period he may have been a heavy drinker, nevertheless, if his blood contains a certain quantity of alcohol, by weight, he is under the influence of alcohol.

So we are not dealing with the problem which was raised in the discussion in the committee, as to whether or not such a test might be unfair to the so-called heavy drinker, because when the alcohol in the blood or urine reaches a certain weight, no matter how long one had engaged in the drinking of alcohol, he is under the influence of liquor, so far as intoxication is concerned.

The second point I wish to bring out is that this procedure has become pro forma in the District of Columbia courts. There is only one doctor, and he volunteers his services by going to the police court and reciting what he very good naturedly said to us has now become almost a rote with him—a statement to the effect that the test had been given and the blood contained a certain weight of alcohol. He is doing this as a great public service to the District of Columbia, without charge, as did his father before him. As the record will show, he received the high commendation of the District of Columbia Committee for this public service. But it is pro forma. It is not necessary. It ought to be eliminated, and this bill seeks to eliminate it, as has been done in 22 other States.

Lastly, it will be noted that the bill provides for the adoption of a provision relative to so-called implied consent, which is found in the New York law, which has been thoroughly tested in the courts. Briefly, the application of the provision would be as follows:

Assume, for example, that an accident has occurred at Constitution and Delaware Avenues. X runs into Y. Y's car is damaged and Y is injured. The police officers come upon the scene, escort X to precinct headquarters and ask him to take an alcohol test. He refuses, which he has the right to do. He then automatically loses his right to drive a car until such time as a hearing is held, as provided in the bill, to determine whether or not he refused to take the test.

If my hypothetical Mr. X, who has been taken to the precinct station house, refuses to take the test, he loses his right to drive an automobile until the following events occur:

First. A hearing is held, as provided in the bill, which goes into the question as to whether or not he had refused to take the test. If, as the result of the hearing, it is found that he did refuse to take the test, he cannot drive an automobile until his innocence of the charge of driving while intoxicated is established.

Second. If his innocence is established he can drive again. If it is not established, or, in other words, if he is found guilty, automatically, under District law, he loses the right to drive for 6 months anyway.

The members of the committee on the District of Columbia are unanimous in their opinion. We wish to make it perfectly clear that we intend to do what we can to tighten the traffic laws in the District of Columbia so as to try to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries that are occurring on the streets of the District of Columbia. We want drivers to know that we are somewhat intolerant of the growing evidence that there is too much driving in the District of Columbia by people who have taken a cocktail or two, who cannot handle a cocktail or two. Since Congress still

maintains its city council functions—and we ought to get rid of them by passing a District of Columbia home-rule bill—the time has come to get tough with alcoholic drivers.

This section of the bill, which I urged in committee and with regard to which I accepted some amendments, is a section which in my judgment will cause people who go to cocktail parties believing they can handle 3 or 4 cocktails and then demonstrate they cannot handle even 1 cocktail, to think twice before they drive under such circumstances, for they will know they will be found guilty if an accident occurs as a result of their having had too much alcohol, as shown by weight in either their blood or urine. I urge the passage of the bill as a long-needed safety measure in the District of Columbia to protect the innocent from alcoholic drivers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 313) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor."

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS, BARBITURATES, AND DANGEROUS DRUGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2275, H. R. 11320.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11320) to effect the control of narcotics, barbiturates, and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Narcotic" and insert "Dangerous Drug"; on page 9, line 22, after the word "or", where it appears the first time, to strike out "hynotic" and insert "hypnotic"; on page 17, line 3, after the word "other", to insert "drug or"; in line 10, after the word "and", where it occurs the first time to insert "(1)"; in line 21, after the word "drugs", to strike out "including barbiturates or amphetamines)"; on page 19, line 23, after the word "to", to insert "Federal and"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "or of the United States" and insert "and the laws of the United States applicable within the District of Columbia"; on page 25, line 17, after the word "the", to strike out "provision" and insert "provisions"; on page 34, line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "provitions" and insert "provisions"; on page 35, line 16, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "section"; on page 36, line 3, after the numeral "(1)", to insert "if committed prior to July 1, 1958; (2)"; and in line 6, after the word "and", to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I read my prepared statement on the bill I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], in which he discusses the use of the phrase "in the course of his professional practice," which is included in the definition of "practitioner" appearing in title II of the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

A question has been raised over the use of the phrase "in the course of his professional practice," which is included in the definition of "practitioner" appearing in title 2 of the proposed Dangerous Drug Control Act for the District of Columbia. It is thought that such definition might conflict with the use of the term practitioner appearing in section 503 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U. S. C. 353).

The definition of the term "practitioner" in the District bill is as follows:

"The term 'practitioner' means any person duly licensed by appropriate authority and, in conformance with the law, licensed to prescribe dangerous drugs, and to administer and use dangerous drugs in the course of his professional practice."

The term "practitioner" is not defined in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as such but appears in section 503 defining a prescription drug which reads in part as follows: "shall be dispensed only (1) upon a written prescription of a practitioner licensed by law."

The selection of the definition of the term practitioner in the proposed District bill was deliberate, having in mind the objectives of the legislation which differ fundamentally from those of the Federal act.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is designed primarily to regulate and control the introduction and flow in interstate commerce of certain items, including drugs, to insure that the ultimate consumer shall not be harmed or injured by any impure, adulterated, or inherently dangerous substance, or one which has not been properly labeled or branded. Therefore, the Federal act is not directly concerned with individual conduct on the local level of those who handle and use these items which are not adulterated, impure or inherently dangerous, or which have not been misbranded.

To fill the gap between the introduction in interstate commerce of pure and unadulterated drugs, as provided by the Federal act, and the handling and use of such drugs on the local level, over two-thirds of the States have already adopted legislation to police the conduct of those who deal in or use these drugs.

Under the provision of this new Dangerous Drug Control Act for the District of Columbia it is intended that the conduct of those who handle, distribute, and use these dangerous drugs shall be regulated and controlled in order to minimize the chances and opportunities for abuse and misuse. By including the phrase "in the course of his professional practice" in the term "practitioner" the District act does nothing more than recognize and acknowledge the high type of professional conduct which governs the practice of local physicians who dispense and prescribe these drugs. Yet is must be recognized that there are unscrupulous persons who may be tempted to make indiscriminate use of their licensed authority to dispense these drugs to individuals who do not share the bona fide doctor-patient relationship. To strike the phrase "in the course of his professional practice" from the definition of practitioner in the bill would leave the door open to unethical doctors and illicit users.

The phrase itself is not new and can be found in identical usage in our Federal narcotic laws, in the Uniform Drug Act for the District of Columbia and in many of the State acts. With such precedents to follow, and with full understanding the purposes of the Federal act and the proposed new legislation for the District of Columbia, I feel any effort to change or alter the language of the definition of the term "practitioner," as the bill is presently written, would seriously weaken the more important enforcement and regulatory features of the act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to improve existing programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic drug addicts, to provide controls over the distribution and use of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other dangerous drugs, and to strengthen present law enforcement procedures to combat the illicit drug traffic in the District of Columbia.

The first title corrects the manifold weaknesses in the present addict law and insures swift and certain commitment of drug addicts who show promise of benefiting from hospital treatment and rehabilitation in the community. Juveniles are specifically included among those subject to the provisions of the bill.

Title II regulates and controls the sale and use of amphetamines, barbiturates, and other dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia. Prescriptions, invoices, records, and inventories would be subject to inspection at all times by both Federal and District officials.

Title III amends the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act to permit arrest without a warrant as in the case of a felony or probable cause that the person to be arrested is violating a provision of the act at the time of his arrest.

The Public Health Service Act is also amended to require the Surgeon General to furnish to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, the name, address, and other pertinent information of any resident drug addict of the District of Columbia who has volunteered for treatment for addiction.

I would supplement my statement by saying that this is a long-overdue act. We held very thorough hearings on the bill. We had the cooperation of the very able chairman of the District Board of Pharmacists. Of course, there were some objections made to some of the procedural phases of the bill at one stage in the hearings, and probably there are still some objections to the bill. It does mean the placing of an additional burden of inspection on the pharmacists of the District.

However, when we weigh that burden against the need of protecting the public

from what is represented to us to be evidence of a constant increase in the drug traffic in the District and an increase in the use of the particular types of drugs we seek to regulate very stringently, there is no question that an inconvenience to druggists must give way to the public good.

I wish to say in behalf of the druggists, without committing any of them, that they cooperated with our committee and that they are entitled to the commendation of the committee and, for that matter, of the people of the District for their willingness at least to accede to the additional supervision which goes along with the provisions of the bill.

I urge its immediate passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time, the bill (H. R. 11320) was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to effect the control of narcotics and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2276, H. R. 3693.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3693) to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to increase the term of the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court from 4 years to 10 years, and provides retirement for the judge of such court as follows:

First. After having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 20 years or more, whether continuously or not;

Second. After having served as a judge of such court for a period or periods aggregating 10 years or more, whether continuously or not, and having attained the age of 70 years; or

Third. After having become permanently disabled from performing his duties, regardless of age or length of service.

The bill was supported by the members of the Tax Bar Association of the District of Columbia and by other bar associations.

In support of the bill I wish to say that they convinced the committee unanimously that we are dealing here with a District tax court which is almost identical in every respect so far as type of case handled, and is identical with respect to procedure followed, with the United States Tax Court.

We are dealing also with a court on the bench of which there is required a man who has had many years of tax experience. Therefore, very frequently, the man appointed to a judgeship in the court is in the declining years of life. We feel, therefore, that such a judge should stand somewhat on a par with Federal Tax Court judges when it comes to retirement benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was on page 1, line 7, after the word "for", to insert the word "a".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 2. The amendment to the first paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, set forth in the first section of this act, shall take effect after the expiration of the term of office of the present judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, in line 19, to strike out the word "eflect" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "effect." My amendment is to correct a typographical error in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3693) was read the third time, and passed.

LICENSING OF SECONDHAND DEALERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2289, H. R. 6782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6782) to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to bring up to date the act of July 1, 1902, relating to the licensing of secondhand dealers, by empowering the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to classify and regulate secondhand dealers in the light of modern merchandising methods.

Existing law requires the same procedure for licensing, as a secondhand dealer, of every person dealing in used personal property, regardless of whether such dealing is their primary business or whether such dealing is only incidental to the buying and selling of new personal property.

Existing law also requires every person licensed as a secondhand dealer to pay an annual license fee of $50, without regard to the extent to which such person deals in used personal property.

The bill merely brings up to date an old law of the District, and enables the Commissioners to properly regulate the sale of goods in the District by permitting the Commissioners to classify dealers. It would permit a better and more equitable administration and application of the license act.

I urge the immediate passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. A. 6782) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 20, 1956, pp. 10679–10681, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9739, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 20, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 to the bill (H. R. 9739) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$75,000" named in said amendment, insert: "$50,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 50.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the House and Senate actions on various items in the bill.

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

Comparison of House and Senate action on independent offices appropriation bill, 1957

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Item	Appropriations, 1956 [1]	Budget estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill for 1957	Amount recommended by Senate	Amount agreed to in conference
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$17,282,500	$17,618,000	$17,282,500	$17,532,500	$17,407,500
Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations	[2] 107,100	574,000	450,000	525,000	487,500
Annuities, Panama Canal construction employees and Lighthouse Service widows	2,240,000	2,024,000	2,024,000	2,024,000	2,024,000
Payment to the civil-service retirement and disability fund	233,000,000	295,000,000	600,000,000	440,438,000	525,000,000
Administrative expenses, Federal employees' life insurance fund	(117,500)	(186,700)	(100,000)	(186,700)	(117,500)
Total, Civil Service Commission	252,629,600	315,216,000	619,756,500	460,519,500	544,919,000
FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION					
Operations	[3] 12,125,000	21,700,000	15,560,000	21,700,000	15,560,000
Federal contributions	12,400,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
Emergency supplies and equipment	32,650,000	64,000,000	42,000,000	64,000,000	47,000,000
Surveys, plans, and research	10,000,000	14,500,000	10,000,000	14,500,000	10,000,000
Salaries and expenses, civil-defense functions of Federal agencies	[4] 1,500,000	6,000,000	1,540,000	6,000,000	4,000,000
Total, Federal Civil Defense Administration	68,675,000	123,200,000	86,100,000	123,200,000	93,560,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Disaster relief	28,500,000	----------	5,386,030	6,000,000	6,000,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	7,323,000	7,850,000	7,800,000	7,828,000	7,828,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	4,900,000	5,250,000	5,200,000	5,250,000	5,225,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	4,548,500	5,500,000	5,400,000	5,550,000	5,550,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	33,481,000	34,581,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	102,280,500	128,598,000	122,694,200	128,084,500	125,000,000
Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia	26,150,000	44,138,000	42,565,550	42,638,000	42,565,550
Sites and planning, purchase contract and public buildings projects	15,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	----------	237,000	237,000	237,000	237,000
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia (liquidation of contract authorization)	9,700,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	3,395,000	4,028,000	[5] 2,809,400	[5] 2,959,400	[5] 2,884,400
Expenses, general supply fund	[6] 13,625,000	15,344,000	14,270,000	14,770,000	14,770,000
General supply fund	----------	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	5,997,500	6,977,000	6,818,650	6,893,650	6,893,650
Survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices	----------	200,000	----------	200,000	----------
Operating expenses, transportation and public utilities service	----------	1,407,000	1,251,100	1,251,100	1,251,100
Refunds under Renegotiation Act	4,000,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Strategic and critical materials	521,500,000	[7]	[5] (3,000,000)	[5] (3,351,000)	[5] (3,175,500)
Abaca fiber program (administrative expenses)	(119,500)	(117,500)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	----------	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000
Administrative operations fund	----------	(9,745,300)	(9,278,200)	(9,802,550)	(9,540,375)
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia	1,610,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Emergency operating expenses	11,865,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
U. S. Post Office and Courthouse, Nome, Alaska	1,100,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Strategic and critical materials (liquidation of contract authorization)	27,400,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Administrative operations	4,410,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, General Services Administration	748,033,000	221,624,000	211,340,900	217,728,650	214,296,700
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY					
Office of the Administrator:					
Salaries and expenses	5,398,500	6,450,000	6,000,000	6,450,000	6,225,000
Urban planning grants	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	1,500,000
Statistics on housing demand	----------	175,000	----------	----------	----------
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)	3,000,000	12,000,000	6,000,000	9,000,000	7,500,000
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal	50,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Total, Office of the Administrator	60,398,500	70,625,000	53,000,000	57,450,000	55,225,000

[1] Includes pay increases and other items in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[2] Unobligated balances continued available.
[3] And transfer of $362,000 from "Emergency supplies and equipment."
[4] And transfer of $40,000 from "Emergency supplies and equipment."
[5] And $1,935,600 from funds derived from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.
[6] And transfer of $450,000 from "Sites and planning," etc.
[7] Language only.
[8] Limitation and rescission of $199,349,000 of prior year appropriations.

Comparison of House and Senate action on independent offices appropriation bill, 1957—Continued

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES—continued

Item	Appropriations, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill for 1957	Amount recommended by Senate	Amount agreed to in conference
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—continued					
Public Housing Administration:					
Administrative expenses	$9,636,500	$10,700,000	$9,700,000	$10,700,000	$10,500,000
Annual contributions	81,750,000	96,000,000	90,000,000	96,000,000	93,000,000
Total, Public Housing Administration	91,386,500	106,700,000	99,700,000	106,700,000	103,500,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	151,785,000	177,325,000	152,700,000	164,150,000	158,725,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses		14,000,000	13,900,000	14,879,696	14,879,696
General expenses	11,107,000	[9]	[9]	[9]	
Railroad safety	1,035,000	[9]	[9]	[10] (1,230,178)	(1,230,178)
Locomotive inspection	754,000	[9]	[9]	[10] (849,500)	(849,500)
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission	12,896,000	14,000,000	13,900,000	14,879,696	14,879,696
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS					
Salaries and expenses	60,135,000	64,700,000	[11] 61,475,000	[12] 63,200,000	[12] 61,887,500
Construction and equipment	12,565,000	15,000,000	13,000,000	15,000,000	14,000,000
Total, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	72,700,000	79,700,000	74,475,000	78,200,000	75,887,500
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
Maintenance and operation of properties	38,400	39,000	37,000	39,000	38,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses	16,000,000	41,300,000	35,915,000	41,300,000	40,000,000
International Geophysical Year	37,000,000				
Total, National Science Foundation	53,000,000	41,300,000	35,915,000	41,300,000	
NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	40,000	75,000		75,000	50,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	4,150,000	3,750,000	3,675,000	3,657,000	3,675,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	5,278,000	5,749,000	5,700,000	5,749,000	5,749,000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses	[13] 27,216,000	29,050,000	28,442,000	29,050,000	29,050,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
General operating expenses	167,502,000	164,436,000	162,118,260	163,936,000	163,027,130
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	16,049,600	16,453,000	16,099,600	20,773,800	20,773,800
Inpatient care	[14] 649,790,600	[15] 662,900,000	[15] 662,900,000	[15] 662,900,000	[15] 662,900,000
Outpatient care	85,971,200	82,638,000	82,638,000	82,638,000	82,638,000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	1,628,000	1,671,000	1,628,000	1,628,000	1,628,000
Compensation and pensions	2,810,000,000	2,907,000,000	2,907,000,000	2,907,000,000	2,907,000,000
Readjustment benefits	812,097,000	775,000,000	775,000,000	775,000,000	775,000,000
Military and naval insurance	4,868,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
National service life insurance	81,300,000	23,200,000	23,200,000	23,200,000	23,200,000
Servicemen's indemnities	40,500,000	26,750,000	26,750,000	26,750,000	26,750,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Hospital and domiciliary facilities	30,000,000	47,000,000	50,935,000	51,635,000	51,635,000
Major alterations, improvements, and repairs	3,900,000	4,447,000	4,447,000	4,533,000	4,533,000
Service-disabled veterans insurance fund	750,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, Veterans' Administration	4,706,856,400	4,719,495,000	4,720,715,860	4,727,993,800	4,727,084,930
Total, Title I	6,182,049,900	5,783,704,000	6,010,543,290	5,925,187,646	5,966,517,826

Rescission of prior year appropriations recommended in the bill:	
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials	−$199,349,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Public facility loans	−1,960,945
Total rescissions	−201,309,945

[9] Consolidated in above amount.
[10] Earmarked in bill.
[11] And not to exceed $600,000 of prior year funds continued available.
[12] And not to exceed $1,500,000 of prior year funds continued available.
[13] And $1,226,000 of prior year funds continued available.
[14] And in addition, $7,229,600 from reimbursements.
[15] And in addition, $7,216,900 from reimbursements.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorizations, 1956 [1]	Budget estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill for 1957	Amount recommended by Senate	Amount agreed to in conference
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	$978,400	$1,095,000	$978,400	$1,095,000	$1,036,700
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	985,000	596,000	532,000	596,000	596,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
College housing loans	706,300	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Public facility loans	159,500	475,000	318,000	418,000	368,000
Public facility loans (RFC Liquidation Act)	40,000				
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	2,788,000	2,310,000	2,000,000	2,310,000	2,165,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	3,950,000	4,000,000	3,700,000	3,850,000	3,775,000
Federal Housing Administration	6,692,500	7,150,000	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
Public Housing Administration	[2] (11,966,500)	[2] (12,800,000)	[2] (11,550,000)	[2] (12,800,000)	[2] (12,475,000)
Total, administrative expenses	16,299,700	16,726,000	15,528,400	16,269,000	15,940,700

[1] Includes pay increases in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[2] Amount includes funds appropriated in title I and available from "Revolving fund (liquidating programs)." Duplication eliminated in totals.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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

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

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2277, S. 2429.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2429) to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation, and cargo handling on ships and at ports.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill, which received the unanimous approval of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, authorizes research and experimental work on vessels, port facilities, and cargo handling.

Without taking the time of the Senate, I should merely like to say that the bill would give specific authority to the Maritime Administration, in collaboration with public and private interests concerned, to carry on research activities in the fields of ship design, propulsion, and equipment; of improvement of port facilities; and of all phases of passenger and cargo handling. In effect, the bill would authorize studies looking to reducing the time spent by vessels in port.

There is some obsolescence in the way cargoes are now handled by our merchant marine, and the bill would allow the Maritime Board and Administration to make the proper studies with a view to bringing about more efficient cargo handling.

It so happens that the average running ship in the American merchant marine spends 60 percent of its time in port, and 40 percent of its time at sea.

It is hoped that as a result of the studies there will be more efficient loading and unloading, better propulsion and equipment, and new designs which are necessary in order to keep our merchant marine modern.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2429) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 212 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1122), is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) two new paragraphs, to read as follows:

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy, to conduct research and experiments, developmental, trial, and demonstration work with vessels, propelling machinery, cargo-handling and other vessel equipment, improvements, and facilities, and to prepare plans and designs for new and improved vessels, machinery, equipment, and facilities;

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy in the transfer of cargo and passengers between vessels and shore-transportation faciilties in ports, to conduct research and experiments, to develop plans and designs, procedures, and equipment for the improvement of wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, and other port facilities used in the movement and handling of cargo, passengers, and other commerce in ports in connection with water transportation."

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on Senate bill 2429 be printed at the conclusion of the passage of that bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

This bill would give broad authority to the Maritime Administration to conduct experimental work and research on all phases of vessel design, construction and propulsion, as well as covering projects for modernization of cargo-handling equipment, docking facilities, etc. As the Maritime Administrator so well explained at the hearings on the bill, such research as this may afford many answers to the problems now facing the American merchant marine.

When I was in Europe last summer, attending the Atoms for Peace Conference, I could not help but note the progress that had been made there in modernizing docks and dock facilities. We must keep abreast of that overseas development and, if possible, exceed it, and I believe that the pending bill offers ample opportunity to do both.

FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2278, H. R. 5790.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5790) relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the report on the bill, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2257) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5790) to amend the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act, as amended, and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, as amended, having considered the same, report favorable thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to modify the provisions of the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act as they relate to the Territory of Hawaii, so as to place Hawaii on a parity with the several States in the distribution of Federal-aid funds under the formula and matching fund requirement as expressed in existing law, which, at present, does not apply to the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Section 8 (a) of the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act of September 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 917; 16 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 669a) and section 12 of the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 431; 16 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 777a) each provide that the Territory of Hawaii receive a fixed annual amount "not to exceed $25,000.00" to accomplish the purposes expressed in the legislation. The present bill modifies such provisions and removes Hawaii from the "fixed" sums and places it on a parity with the several States.

Allocations to the several States are based upon a formula designed to give each State its equitable portion of Federal aid based upon its area and the number of hunters or fisherman purchasing licenses. The funds are allocated on the basis of one-half in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States, and one-half in the ratio which the number of paid license holders of each State bears to the total number of paid license holders of all the States. The funds are derived from the excise tax imposed on sporting arms and ammunition. In order that a State can become eligible for grants-in-aid, it must provide at least 25 percent of the funds needed for individual projects.

Hawaii, during the past 10 years, has made great strides in the wildlife and fish-restoration fields. In the former, it has established 14 public shooting areas, containing about 243,000 acres of land and conducted wildlife surveys and investigations gathering data urgently needed for management use. In the latter, it has conducted a study of the fresh-water goby and is conducting research on the ultimate restoration on the one valuable off-shore-reef fisheries, which have been severely overfished. Thus, placing Hawaii on a parity with the several States in the distribution of these grants-in-aid funds will enable it to undertake additional projects that are badly needed. Such equality of treatment will also result in imposing upon the Territory stricter matching requirements than now apply to it. Accordingly, this committee recommends that the bill do pass.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection 4 of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italics, matter proposed to be omitted is in brackets, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT OF SEPTEMBER 2, 1937 (50 STAT. 917)

"SEC. 2. * * * the term 'State fish and game department' shall be construed to mean and include any department or division of department of another name, or commission, or official or officials, of a State empowered under its laws to exercise the functions ordinarily exercized by a State fish and game department[.]*; and the term 'State' shall be construed to mean and include the several States and the Territory of Hawaii.*

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, [the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii,] the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce

of Puerto Rico and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of wildlife-restoration projects, as defined in section 669a of this title, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to said [Territories,] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, out of money available for apportionment under sections 669–669j of this title, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, [not exceeding $25,000 for Hawaii,] and not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by said sections; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 per centum of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the [Territories] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory-Bird Conservation Act.

"FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1950 (64 STAT. 431; 16 U. S. C., 1952 ED., SEC. 777A)

"SEC. 2. * * * the term "State fish and game department" shall be construed to mean and include any department or division of department of another name, or commission, or official or officials, of a State empowered under its laws to exercise the functions ordinarily exercised by a State fish and game department [.]*; and the term "State" shall be construed to mean and include the several States and the Territory of Hawaii.*

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Alaska Game Commission, [the Division of Game and Fish of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii,] the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of fish restoration and management projects, as defined in section 2 of this act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to said [Territories] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, out of money available for apportionment under this act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, [not exceeding $25,000 for Hawaii,] and not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, in any one year, which apportionments, when made, shall be deducted before making the apportionments to the States provided for by this act; but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 percent of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made, pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in the [Territories] *Territory of Alaska,* Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of the year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying on the research program of the Fish and Wildlife Service in respect to fish of material value for sport recreation."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all the bill does is to modify the provisions of the Federal Aid To Wildlife Restoration Act so as to have it apply to Hawaii. The act does not now apply to Hawaii. The bill was passed by the House, and was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5790) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF PROTOTYPE CARGO SHIP AND CONVERSION OF LIBERTY SHIP

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2280, S. 3821.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3821) to authorize the construction of 2 prototype ships, and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration Department of Commerce.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "test", to strike out "two prototype merchant ships, one of the 'Freedom' class and one" and insert "one prototype merchant ship", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, to construct, outfit, and test one prototype merchant ship of the "Clipper" class, as designed by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, and to convert, outfit, and test one reserve fleet Liberty ship. Such construction and conversion outfitting and testing shall be subject to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this bill, which again received unanimous approval of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, is an authorization measure. It allows the construction of one prototype ship of a new type, and also the conversion of our present mothball fleet of Liberty ships. The Maritime Administration has some plans with respect to this matter. The Administration would construct the ships or do the experimental work in conjunction with shipyards and private operators. That would result, we hope, in a new type of ship, which the administration wants to have called the Freedom class—vessels of 8,770 deadweight tons. We hope it will be the type of ship which can replace the Liberty ships, which are now reaching obsolescence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3821) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the construction of one prototype ship and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce."

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I have prepared on Senate bill 3821 printed at the conclusion of the passage of that bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

This bill would authorize the Maritime Administration to construct and operate a prototype merchant ship of the clipper class and to convert another Liberty ship of the reserve fleet to a more modern type of propulsion machinery. I think both projects are entirely worthy of all the support that can be given them. We have more than 1,000 Liberty ships on hand which are too slow to be economical and which are really suitable for use only in an extreme emergency. If we can step up the speed by one of the new types of powerplants, it will make them intensely more valuable both to our peacetime and wartime economy; and in my opinion, be one of the best returns for our money than can be received.

With regard to the prototype clipper ship, I think the Maritime Administration is to be congratulated on its farsightedness in designing this ship, which not only can be of great assistance to the American merchant marine but also will afford, ready at hand, an austerity type of ship for mass construction, in which our naval authorities already have expressed the deepest interest.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED PROTOTYPE MERCHANT SHIPS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2279, S. 2523; and I call my motion to the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2523) to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had gone through the following committee procedure:

On July 23, 1955, the bill had been reported without amendment from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign

Commerce; on July 30, 1955, it had been reported from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) in order to demonstrate to the peoples of the world the great peaceful use and potential of atomic energy and the humanitarian and industrial applications of such energy, the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to construct an atomic energy propulsion facility, consisting of one or more reactors and auxiliary equipment, and to install such facility and equipment in a merchant vessel to be converted or constructed, and operated by the Secretary of Commerce for accomplishing the purposes of this act.

(b) On completion of such vessel, the Secretary of Commerce shall make suitable arrangements for such licenses as are required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and, in consultation with the Atomic Energy Commission, for the display on such vessel, insofar as practicable, of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and for the training of qualified personnel. The Secretary of Commerce shall make such regulations and prescribe such fees as he deems necessary for the display of goods and wares of United States manufacture or origin. Such vessel may be equipped and utilized to generate electricity from atomic energy and, under such terms, rates, or conditions as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe, may be utilized (1) to supply for demonstration or emergency purposes such electrical energy to the electric utility system of any port in which such vessel is a visitor, and (2) to transport cargo.

(c) No charge shall be made to any person visiting such vessel in the normal course of viewing the vessel or its exhibits while the vessel is operated by the Government.

(d) The itinerary of such vessel shall be determined by the Secretary of Commerce on direction of the President and, to the maximum extent consistent with the common defense and security and the health and safety of the public, the vessel and its contents shall be made freely accessible to public view.

(e) The name of such vessel shall be the U. S. S. *Atomic Enterprise*.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of developing the economic uses of nuclear transportation power in peaceful pursuits of domestic and foreign commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, with the assistance of the Maritime Administration, is authorized to develop and construct an atomic energy propulsion facility and auxiliary equipment for adaptation to a surface vessel of such characteristics and design as will make it usable in the American merchant marine fleet. The Maritime Administration, with the assistance of the Atomic Energy Commission, is authorized to construct such vessel. Upon completion of such vessel, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to arrange for its operation or charter in such manner as circumstances and the public interest then warrant.

SEC. 3. Except as otherwise determined by the Atomic Energy Commission, the development, construction and installation of the reactor propulsion facilities and auxiliary facilities herein authorized shall be so conducted as not to impair substantially the prosecution of other atomic energy research and development or construction projects of the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 4. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, are authorized to utilize such funds as may be presently available to them to accomplish the purposes of this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

And to amend the title, so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for the development, construction, and operation of two atomic energy propulsion facilities, and for other purposes."

On May 10, 1956, it was rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and on June 18, 1956, was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with the following additional amendment:

To strike out all of the amendment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

"That section 212 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1122), is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) two new paragraphs to read as follows:

" 'That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration in carrying on activities and functions under this paragraph, may collaborate with and employ persons, firms, and corporations on a contract or fee basis for the performance of special services deemed necessary by the Administration in carrying on such activities and functions, and may, for the same purposes, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and where appropriate the Atomic Energy Commission, avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof;

" 'In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy in the transfer of cargo and passengers between vessels and shore transportation facilities in ports, to conduct research and experiments, to develop plans and designs, procedures, and equipment for the improvement of wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, and other port facilities used in the movement and handling of cargo, passengers, and other commerce in ports in connection with water transportation;'."

And to amend the title, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield at this point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The effect of the recommendation which has just been read is to strike out all except the original provisions of the bill which the Senator from Washington introduced, and which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and I joined in sponsoring. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It may be that some amendments to the language reported by the committee will be proposed. If the committee amendment is adopted, will amendments to it then be in order; or must such amendments be submitted and acted on prior to adoption of the committee amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the procedure followed will not prohibit the offering of amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, are in order before a vote is taken on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe any amendment has been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee has reported an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a similar bill, House bill 6243, is before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I shall ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6243; that that bill be considered by the Senate; that all after the enacting clause of House bill 6243 be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof, the text of Senate bill 2523. In other words, by that means we shall agree to the text of Senate bill 2523.

The Senate bill authorizes the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration to proceed with the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship. The bill relating to the so-called peace ship is still before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That is the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. All I am trying to ascertain is the language to which we are addressing ourselves at this moment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The language of the Senate bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand the provisions of the bill. But three separate reports have been made on Senate bill 2523, and we are confronted with three separate texts. I wish to know which one is before the Senate at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will attempt to state the parliamentary situation:

The bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without amendment. The bill was then referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy then reported an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute for the bill.

The bill was then referred back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that committee reported a complete substitute for the amendment in the nature of a substitute which had been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—which had the effect of restoring the original language of the bill.

The parliamentary situation is that the first vote will occur on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

If that motion be rejected, the vote will then occur on the amendment reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on page 5 of the bill the Senator from Iowa will see in italics the language reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I know what the Senator from Iowa is trying to do, and I think he is completely correct. He wishes to be sure that if the Senate adopts the language of the original bill as a committee substitute, he will not be barred from offering amendments to it. If that is not the procedure, I should like to ask unanimous consent that we consider the bill as originally reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that if any amendments are to be submitted to the amendment reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, they must be submitted and acted on before adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that nothing reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment in the nature of a complete substitute has been reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been reported by the committee headed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been reported twice by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the intervening period the bill was reported once by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In each case an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute was reported. The Chair has before him the report by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The parliamentary situation is that the first vote will be taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the bill as originally reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am willing to accept the ruling of the Chair. But the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does not have any bill before the Senate. The Joint Committee joined in an effort to send the bill back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

All I am trying to do is to request unanimous consent that the language now in the bill, namely, from line 20, on page 5, through to the end of page 7, shall be regarded as original text, and be open to any amendment which may be offered by any Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would it not clear up the legislative situation—if the suggestion may be made in keeping with the desires of the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Iowa—to have the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as reported by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, laid on the table. That would leave us with the bill reported the second time by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. At that point, we could enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to consider that language as the original text of the bill; and then the Senator from Iowa could offer any amendments he might wish to offer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that in connection with any amendments I may wish to discuss, I have only one thought, namely, I am not opposed to the general principle of the bill as finally reported by the committee, except I have a very deep feeling that the nuclear elements in the ship should be constructed and built under the supervision of the Atomic Energy Commission, which is equipped to perform that function. I wish to speak to those matters at the proper time.

I do not think the Atomic Energy Commission has anything to do with building a ship; that is not its business. The Maritime Administration is the shipbuilding organization. My sole interest is to see whether we can provide that only the nuclear elements—such as the nuclear powerplant—which are specialized, and are strictly dependent upon atomic energy, shall be handled under the responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission, which shall either build or shall supervise the construction of that particular phase of the operation. That is my sole interest in this matter. I am not opposing the Senator's bill or its principle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that the testimony before the committee, as received from both the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission, was to the effect that the nuclear elements of the nuclear-propelled ship would be supervised by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In drafting the bill we were very careful to protect the rights of the Atomic Energy Commission to license or give out information, or in granting the Maritime Administration access to its files. The bill gives the Commission complete control and supervision in such matters. All the testimony on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce, and also the testimony by Admiral Strauss, himself, was that preliminary negotiations have already taken place between the Maritime Administration, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and they have perfected a plan whereby they will work together.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That still does not reach what I believe to be fundamental in connection with this matter. There is a tendency on the part of every department of government to try to get into the atomic field. We can, if we permit it, dilute the technicians and experts in that field to such an extent as to be of disservice to the development of atomic energy.

The Atomic Energy Commission has the setup, the equipment, the proper organization, the know-how, and the experience; and I hope we shall be realistic about this matter.

So far as I am concerned, I think the Maritime Administration should build the ship and should draw up its design. But the responsibility for the nuclear powerplant should be vested in the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not so familiar with the matter as is the Senator from Iowa. But my understanding is that the Maritime Administration could not possibly build the powerplant; that would have to be done under the supervision of the Atomic Energy Commission; and then, under license from the Atomic Energy Commission, it could be turned over to the Maritime Administration, to be installed in the hull of the ship.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator is entirely correct about that. However, in view of the form in which the bill is drafted, I think that 1 or 2 amendments are necessary in order to correct the authorization set forth in the bill. Therefore, I believe that the bill should be corrected by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in such fashion as may be needed in order to conform to the desires of the Atomic Energy Commission regarding this matter. I think it essential that the powerplant be constructed by the Atomic Energy Commission. Thereafter, the licensing authority provided in the bill will take care of the operation of installing the powerplant in the hull of the ship.

In my judgment, the authorization contained in the bill should be drawn in such a way as to make a division between the authorization for construction of the ship and the authorization for construction of its powerplant.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection to having that done. The only reason the bill is before the Senate in its present form is that the Atomic Energy Commission, through its Chairman, Admiral Strauss, and other members of the Commission, approved this language, and said the Atomic Energy Commission would do the preliminary work under the liaison which now exists between the Department of Commerce and the Atomic Energy Commission; and the Commission unanimously approved the bill. So I have no objection to an amendment of the character suggested.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. All that is necessary is a technical amendment to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to take its proper share of the appropriation, in order to do what we intend it shall do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator submit his amendment?

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator from Iowa has such an amendment.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have some language which I think will take care of the situation, but I should like to submit it to the Senator from Washington so that there may be agreement. I do not want the Atomic Energy Commission to get into shipbuilding, any more than I want the State Department to start building battleships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator. However, this language was approved by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I arrived too late to join with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with Senate bill 2429 and Senate bill 3821, as well as the bill under discussion. These are bills upon which the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have been working for the past 2 or 3 years. I am glad to see that action is being taken upon them. I hope the Senator from Washington and other Senators can reach a proper agreement with respect to the atomic energy ship. That is a very important prototype ship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am only trying to clear up the legislative history, so that perhaps we shall not have to worry quite so much about the amendments.

I invite the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the fact that in the accompanying report the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommends that the United States give No. 1 priority to the construction of a ship using the *Nautilus*-type reactor and having the characteristics outlined by Under Secretary of Commerce Rothschild, namely, that it be a vessel of 16,000 tons displacement, with a speed of 18 knots, and so forth.

The *Nautilus*-type reactor is not a commercially attractive type of reactor. If priority is to be given to that type, a vessel will be built which will have no real practical application in developing nuclear-powered merchant ships.

In that connection, I invite attention to the fact that in November the Maritime Administration invited proposals for the design, manufacture, installation, and test of a 20,000 shaft horsepower nuclear reactor and associated machinery for a 36,000-ton deadweight merchant tanker, for operation by June 30, 1959. It has since been explained that the estimated construction time for this type, after the date of the contract, would be between 36 and 40 months. Therefore the actual date would be somewhere near June 30, 1959. Invitations to bid on the project were sent to 25 companies. Last March the Maritime Administration announced that it had received fixed price bids from four firms for this project, namely, Babcock & Wilcox Co., Foster-Wheeler Corp., General Electric Co., and Ingalls Shipbuilding Co.

If it is to be a tanker rather than a dry cargo ship, the tonnage is 36,000, rather than 16,000 tons, and the estimated date of completion is about a year later than in the case of the demonstration plant.

I say we cannot do the two things simultaneously without additional authority. The language of the bill seems completely to override what the Maritime Administration has done, and to set aside the bids it has received. It is proposed to say, "We will not go ahead with what has been more or less agreed upon, and upon which the Maritime Administration is progressing."

I hope there may be some legislative declaration on the floor that the Maritime Administration is to proceed with the ship which is now under construction, of 36,000 dry tons, and an additional ship, if that is our desire. I think there should be some clarification at that point before we go further.

I shall be glad to deal with other questions if the chairman so desires. I invite attention to the following language in the report:

> The question therefore presents itself—should this be the exhibition-type proposed by the President, on a dry cargo vessel or an oil tanker?
>
> We would choose one of the latter two types because, first, the psychological effect on the people of the world would be as pronounced as it would be in the case of the exhibition ship, which relatively few people of other countries would ever see.

When reference is made to one of these types, is it to the first ship, or to a dry cargo vessel? From reading the report I cannot find out what is contemplated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Maritime Administration representatives testified that they desired to proceed with a merchant-type ship, and that they had also had some negotiations or discussions regarding a tanker-type ship. All parties concerned, including the Director of the Budget, Admiral Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the reactor expert, Dr. Davis, agreed that they wanted this authorization to proceed with a merchant-type ship.

Mr. ANDERSON. And not the tanker?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not the tanker.

Mr. ANDERSON. A merchant-type ship would not necessarily have a *Nautilus*-type reactor. A completely different design has been asked for. The report states that is should be a *Nautilus*-type reactor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is a year's difference in the construction time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Perhaps there is a year's difference, but I think probably it would be more accurate to say that the difference is 3 or 4 months. If the *Nautilus*-type reactor is desired, then it will not be a merchant-type ship which is contemplated. The chairman of the committee has just stated that it was a merchant-type ship that was wanted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not so well informed as is the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is chairman of the very important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. However, the testimony of the Maritime Administration, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Atomic Energy Commission itself was to the effect that whatever the type of reactor to be used, this authorization would allow them to continue the talks and planning which had been proceeding for the past few months.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should appreciate the attention of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Iowa. Is it the understanding of the chairman of the committee that if this bill is passed the Atomic Energy Commission will be fully empowered to select the type of powerplant to put into this vessel, the type which it thinks would be most desirable under all the circumstances?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only should the Commission have such authority, but I think it would be very unwise to proceed with any type of merchant ship unless the Commission had such authority, because the Commission would know what type of reactor to use.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. That was the intention of the committee, and there was no dissent from that point of view. That is the reason why I think the amendments which the Senator from Iowa mentioned a moment ago, and which I fully support, should be made. The authorization should be contained in this bill. To that end, I have submitted to the chairman of the committee certain amendments which I think would carry out the intent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will allow me, I think I can clear up this question.

The suggested amendments are:

On page 6, line 4, after the words "Maritime Administration", to insert "and the Atomic Energy Commission."

On page 6, line 10, after the words "the Maritime Administration", to insert "and the Atomic Energy Commission."

On page 6, line 14, after the word "by", to strike out "the Administration" and insert "such agencies."

On page 6, line 15, after the word "functions", to insert a period, strike out the word "and" and insert "The Administration."

In line 25, after the word "ports", to insert "the Maritime Administration is authorized."

Mr. BRICKER. Those amendments would clear up the situation, except that I think the title should be amended to show that this is not an amendment of the Merchant Marine Act, but in the nature of an original bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the title be so amended.

Mr. BRICKER. In the last paragraph, provision should be made for an amendment to the title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title will be amended after the passage of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I point out to the chairman of the committee that this matter caused much discussion in the joint committee. The question is, Who is responsible for trying to design a ship? The decision is that the Maritime Administration shall have responsibility for designing the ship. I quite agree with the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Ohio that the Maritime Administration should perform that function. The Atomic Energy Commission ought to deal with the powerplant. But the difficulty heretofore has been that the Maritime Commission wanted to build a merchant-type ship, and the Atomic Energy Commission did not approve proceeding with the construction of a second nuclear-propelled ship.

I suggest that if the language of the bill remains as it is, there might be a question as to who would build the ship—who would force it down the other fellow's throat. The two proposals are diametrically opposed.

Mr. BRICKER. The bill determines that fact. The bill provides for the building of a merchant ship.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. The bill provides that the Atomic Energy Commission shall fit into the ship a powerplant. It will have to be a powerplant which will fit within the dimensions of the ship. The two functions are separated. The Maritime Administration has no business building an atomic reactor, and the Atomic Energy Commission has no business building a ship. The determination of the type of ship to be built is already made in the bill itself. That question is solved. There is no difference of opinion as to what kind of ship shall be built.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe this discussion is very useful. The Senator from Ohio and I are not apart in this matter. It so happens that after a year and a half of steady pleading with the Atomic Energy Commission, the only proposal the Commission has to make is for the building of a floating playhouse.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is not provided in the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. It may not be provided in the bill——

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is out, so far as the bill is concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. It may be out so far as the bill is concerned, but it is not out of the minds of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have pleaded with the Atomic Energy Commission to submit a recommendation which is something other than a recommendation for the building of a floating playhouse. They have declined to do so. It must be that the playhouse idea is still in their minds. I should like to have the Commission make a proposal which will not be for a vessel which will end up as a playhouse. I believe it would be a mistake to leave this possibility open. The Maritime Commission should have responsibility for designing the ship, and the Atomic Energy Commission the responsibility for the design and the construction of the reactor. If that were clearly provided, I would have no objection.

Mr. BRICKER. That is exactly what this bill would do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what I thought the bill would do.

Mr. BRICKER. The bill provides:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, in carrying on activities and functions under this paragraph, may collaborate with and employ persons, firms, and corporations—

And so forth. Therefore, I say the type of ship is determined by the bill. It is to be a merchant ship. It is to be a "nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential to maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States."

The reactor, of course, would depend on the proportions of the ship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Admiral Strauss testified that he wanted to proceed with it, and that it was a worthwhile undertaking.

Mr. BRICKER. The controversy over the showboat is not before us. It constitutes no objection to the pending bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was not discussed at all.

Mr. BRICKER. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe the statement made by the Senator from Ohio and the statement made by the Senator from Washington are extremely helpful in setting forth clearly the legislative intent. I agree with the statements as to the legislative intent. If the amendment is so drawn as to clearly carry out that legislative intent, I have no objection. On the contrary, I believe we will be making real progress.

I agree with what the Senator from Ohio has stated as to what the purpose is to be. Because of his position on the committee and because of the position of the able chairman of the committee, I believe what has been said here establishes sufficient legislative history for me. If the amendments do not go beyond that, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point the testimony of the chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee when he appeared before the committee on behalf of the bill.

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

STATEMENT OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS, CHAIRMAN, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. STRAUSS. We appreciate the opportunity to testify before your committee today to present the Atomic Energy Commission's position concerning the application and development of nuclear power for the propulsion of merchant vessels. I would first like to express the Commission's views on what we conceive to be an appropriate merchant-ship program after which I will discuss the particular bills before your committee in the light of our views as to the appropriate program.

We feel that it is highly desirable to proceed as rapidly as possible to construct a vessel to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion. Such a vessel will afford the United States the opportunity to demonstrate convincingly and appealingly the practical application of atomic power to propel a surface ship and make clear our intention to pursue with vigor the peaceful applications of atomic energy to nuclear surface propulsion.

The President in a letter to Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut, last July stated the desirability of such a vessel, if you will permit me, I would like to quote from that letter:

"The world, by and large, now looks at atomic science as a destructive force, and of primary importance only to two great world centers—Washington and Moscow. We for our part simply must demonstrate convincingly to the world, in as many ways as we can, and to as many people as we can, that we are utilizing atomic science to improve the lot of man. Our pursuits in this field are in fact paving the way to the betterment of human welfare everywhere.

"The atoms-for-peace ship would dramatize these efforts all over the world. It would help generate a moral force to turn atomic energy more and more into peaceful uses and away from destructive channels. I conceive of it as an important step in our progress toward peace."

In his 1957 budget message the President reiterated his interest in a ship to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion, stating that "work on this ship should go forward as rapidly as possible."

As you may know, other countries are believed to have undertaken programs to adapt nuclear energy to the propulsion of surface ships.

The CHAIRMAN. I might just interrupt right there. I have that clipping. And, I also have a clipping which I brought from home from the Seattle Times of February—in February in which the Russians announced an atomic icebreaker.

Mr. STRAUSS. I do refer to that later. This statement was prepared after we had that information but before the other——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. All right.

Mr. STRAUSS. While these programs, to our knowledge, may not have yet progressed to the construction phase, the intention of a number of countries is clear and certainly in the not too distant future such countries will employ this energy source to propel their surface vessels. Of some significance are announcements from the Soviet Union of its plans for the construction of an icebreaker which will employ a nuclear propulsion plant.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Maritime Administration are in a position to proceed immediately with the construction of a ship to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion. The urgency of earliest possible completion of such a ship requires the utilization of a proven reactor system presently capable of rapid assembly. In light of this, we feel that the optimum solution is a powerplant based on the reactor system similar to that installed in the *Nautilus*. The estimated completion of this project is 27 to 30 months from the time Congressional authorization is received. If action is taken during the present session of Congress, the United States could launch a nuclear powered vessel early in 1959. We believe we can obtain from industry fixed price proposals for the major portion of the reactor work.

And, since that sentence was dictated, we have, as a matter of fact, assurances, and we will later produce it, if you require it.

General agreement has been reached between the Atomic Enregy Commission and the Maritime Administration with respect to the areas of responsibility to be assumed by each agency. The Commission would assume responsibility for and direct the development, design, and construction of the nuclear power source. The Maritime Administration would be responsible for converting or constructing and operating the surface vessel. This would be the same type of arrangement that the Commission has worked out with the Department of Defense in regard to certain propulsion units of joint interest. Such an arrangement avoids duplication of facilities and competition for the already scarce technical personnel between agencies of the Federal Government.

Looking beyond the ship proposed by the President, the Commission is firmly convinced that further effort should be made toward developing competitive commercial propulsion. While the ship we have been discussing will not provide competitive propulsion, it will add measurably to our know-how and skills and thus create a base from which to undertake construction of ships of more advanced design. Further, it will provide opportunity for training and equipping a greater segment of our industry for the future, thereby hastening our progress on advanced vessels. The Commission believes that the initiation of construction of a second nuclear-powered merchant ship should be predicated upon the ability to take a significant technological step and should not prejudice the prompt building of the ship that we need to complete at the earliest possible date. We would envisage a period of study during which time full advantage would be taken of all available research and development. These studies would be followed by a period of development of the most promising approaches and aimed at the availability of a significantly improved propulsion system both from a technical and economic standpoint at an early date.

At the present time the AEC and Maritime Administration are undertaking the joint support of feasibility and design studies for this purpose. We are prepared to continue to work closely together to provide to the merchant marine the most advanced nuclear propulsion system our technology can produce for this application.

In light of the Commission's position that I have just attempted to set forth, I would like to comment on two of the bills being considered by your committee. The Commission is in favor of S. 2523 as reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and referred to your committee several weeks ago. This bill, we believe, fulfills the Nation's need at this time to progress with the application and development of atomic energy for the propulsion of surface vessels. This bill properly spells out the responsibilities of the AEC and Maritime Administration for the two projects to be authorized.

We understand that S. 2523, as originally introduced, and H. R. 6243, were not intended to apply to the project requested by the President for the expeditious construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship in order to demonstrate peaceful nuclear surface propulsion. We agree with what appears to be the basic objectives of these bills—accelerating the development of practical and economical power for merchant ships.

We believe, however, that a significantly improved reactor system will evolve most quickly as a result of a carefully planned well-integrated development program extending over a period of several years. The demonstration ship, on the other hand, is essentially an adaptation of proven technology with primary emphasis upon immediate construction. In our minds, therefore, the two programs do not compete nor in fact should one adversely affect or impede the other. If you do not authorize us to proceed with the demonstration vessel, the United States may have to concede to some other nation the first achievement of peaceful nuclear power for merchant ships.

H. R. 6243 would appear to place responsibility for development of a nuclear propulsion unit in the Maritime Administration. The Commission feels that development work on this nuclear propulsion unit should be performed under the supervision of the AEC to minimize competition with and assure proper coordination with other nuclear research and development being performed by the Commission, and in particular other nuclear propulsion development. For this reason, the Commission feels that the delineation of responsibilities in S. 2523, as reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is preferable to that contained in H. R. 6243.

We assume that the provision in H. R. 6243 which would authorize the Maritime Administration to "avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees" of any other Federal agency is not intended to affect the licensing authority of the Commission, or its discretion in providing assistance requested by the Maritime Administration in the light of the overall requirements of the Commission's programs. If our assumption is incorrect, we believe that the provision should be amended to make it entirely clear that the Commission's authority in these respects is unaffected by the provision.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that S. 2523, as reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. STRAUSS. That, Mr. Chairman, is the end of the prepared statement.

We would like to attempt to answer any questions that may arise in your mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, No. 1: I am sure that I speak for at least myself as author of the bill, that there was no intent to affect the licensing authority of the Commission. If we need further language in the bill to spell that out much more clearly, why, we will be glad to accept it and put it in.

Now, Admiral, of course, there is before us only the bill, the House and the Senate bill, which merely in itself authorizes the construction of a nuclear powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce.

The matter of how the ship would be used or the two ships in this particular case, would be a matter of policy that Congress would have to determine itself. I guess you would agree with me that if we do authorize this, that then the ship, or the two ships, could be used in any way that it was determined.

And I presume you further agree with the committee that regardless of this controversy over whether we should have a so-called peace ship of that term, or as spelled out in S. 2523, that we ought to go ahead regardless, and then determine what we are going to do.

Mr. STRAUSS. I most emphatically agree with that, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me that since the first ship, the most expeditious job cannot be completed from 27 to 30 months, which is over 2 years in any case, that to attempt to spell out now the precise method in which it is going to be used would be premature. And the main purpose that I have in coming before you is to get a nuclear propelled surface ship of merchant type built as quickly as possible, and before anybody else can do it.

That is the thing in a nutshell.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has had several discussions, as well as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I think the only difference of opinion arises as to which one we should go ahead with first.

I think that the majority of opinion was that we should go ahead with the merchant ship, the commercial merchant ship, first. But I think we must agree regardless of that controversey that we have got to go ahead anyway with the beginning ship.

Mr. STRAUSS. I was hoping you would agree.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. And that can be evolved as we proceed. Because I would think that the beginning, regardless of how the ship would be used for joint or the two purposes, the basic thing has to be constructed, regardless of that.

Mr. STRAUSS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through their chairman, also have this statement in their summary. And I might ask your comment on this. And I quote from Senator ANDERSON's statement to the committee here:

"It would appear on the basis of technical information furnished us to date that our first step should be to design and construct a nuclear-powered oil tanker."

They specify the type of merchant ship in this particular case. Has the Commission any comments to make on that?

Mr. STRAUSS. I would say this, Mr. Chairman: that any complication in this construction beyond that which has been recommended by the Maritime Administration for haul, and the Commission for propulsion machinery, will operate to delay the completion of the job.

Since this will not be an economic operation in any case——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I must agree with you there.

I do not care whether it be a tanker or merchant ship or this other so-called type of ship, that in the beginning it is an experiment to prove that we might make it economic.

But the first ship could not be economical.

Mr. STRAUSS. The only requirement that I would put on it, were I sitting as a Member of the Senate or House, would be: it should be the kind of vessel which can be the most rapidly produced to operate successfully.

I hope that will be the stipulation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. I see.

Of course, it may be as they move along that Congress may decide that this could be a specific type of ship as you move along. But we have got to get going.

Well, I have no further questions. I think you have cleared up the fact that both the Commission and the Maritime Administration have been doing a great deal of preliminary work on this.

Mr. STRAUSS. Yes, sir. Secretary Rothschild is here, and he will speak for his own agency.

I would like to express thanks to you for permitting me to go on as the first witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you venture a guess on the cost of a merchant ship?

Mr. STRAUSS. We have some overall estimates, Mr. Chairman.

Since it has been a matter of months that I have reviewed them, I would like to refresh my memory by calling on, with your permission, Dr. Davis, who is here and whom I have identified as the Director of the Reactor Division.

What is the figure for the reactor and propulsion machinery, Dr. Davis?

Dr. DAVIS. Well, the estimate that we had and used last year was $21 million for the propulsion plant and $3,500,000 for the core, which represents the first batch of fuel which would go into such a ship.

And the Maritime Administration has also estimated the cost of the ship into which this would go. So our total estimate is on the order of $37 million for the propulsion plant and for the ship.

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-seven million dollars?

Dr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There are several members of the committee who might want to ask some questions as to whether on this controversy you should have a peace ship or a merchant ship. But I do not think the

Atomic Energy Commission should be burdened with that.

That is a matter of policy, I think, that Congress should determine.

Mr. STRAUSS. Further, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me a matter which could very well be determined if it were controversial at a later date without running the risk of arresting this development so that we would run the risk of Congress adjourning without this authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Now, in that case, let me ask this: if this bill was passed before Congress adjourned, then you would proceed with the Maritime Administration on the basic construction. Then Congress, if it should, say, come January or April make a definite determination on what should be done on this matter—they may make it in the report on this bill—which I would hope they would—but that would not seriously hamper the situation even if we did, say, 6 months from now say, "Well, we want this ship, say, to be a tanker." Use that example.

Mr. STRAUSS. It would not affect us in the Atomic Energy Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. It might affect the design.

Mr. STRAUSS. I will have to ask you to direct that specific question to Mr. Rothschild as to whether it would handicap him on that.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. STRAUSS. I could say emphatically that we would go ahead with the reactor and with the propulsion machinery at once under those circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. And that there could be, as you move along, a change toward the ultimate use of the ship?

Mr. STRAUSS. That is right, assuming no change in shaft horsepower and other physical requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. Which would be technical matters that the Maritime technicians and engineers would have to work out?

Mr. STRAUSS. That I cannot answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Well, thank you, Admiral Strauss. We appreciate your coming here.

I have no further questions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may we have the proposed amendments read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

That section 212 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 1122), is amended by inserting at the end of subsection (c) two new paragraphs to read as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for the construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation, including training of qualified personnel, of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign commerce of the United States. The Maritime Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, in carrying on activities and functions under this paragraph, may collaborate with and employ persons, firms, and corporations on a contract or fee basis for the performance of special services deemed necessary by such agencies in carrying on such activities and functions. The administration may, for the same purposes, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and where appropriate the Atomic Energy Commission, avail itself of the use of licenses, information, services, facilities, offices, and employees of any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency of the Government, including any field service thereof.

"In collaboration with public and private interests concerned, and in the interest of improved efficiency and economy in the transfer of cargo and passengers between vessels and shore transportation facilities in ports, the Maritime Administration is authorized to conduct research and experiments, to develop plans and designs, procedures, and equipment for the improvement of wharves, docks, piers, warehouses, and other port facilities used in the movement and handling of cargo, passengers, and other commerce in ports in connection with water transportation."

Mr. ANDERSON. I make the same observation I made a while ago, that these are the original amendments which were proposed to the bill by the Atomic Energy Commission more than a year ago. I suggest to the Senator that, if he will read the language of the amendments, he will see that it is the same language that came to our committee more than a year ago.

Mr. BRICKER. The situation this year is different. The provisions this year will limit the ship to a prototype merchant ship. The question as to what type of ship it is to be is determined by the bill. There is no question about what kind of ship it is to be.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say, in support of what the Senator from Ohio has stated, and I hope in reassurance to the Senator from New Mexico, that I do not believe there is any question about the ship now. The ship to be built is to be a merchant ship; the bill specifically so limits it. The Atomic Energy Commission will have the responsibility of building the powerplant, not for building the ship, or influencing the design of the ship, except that there may be certain collaboration and cooperation in determining how the plant is to fit into a particular hull.

I may say that I am not very strongly in favor of a bill of this kind; but I will go along with it. I think it is well to get an atomic powered ship on the ocean. I believe, however, that we would gain tremendously, comparatively speaking, by putting a so-called showboat, or whatever the Senator from New Mexico may call it, type of ship on the ocean as an exhibit ship and send it around the world, instead of building merely a merchant transport hull-type of ship. However, a so-called showboat is not in good favor, apparently, and I will not press that point at this moment. I merely say that I am less enthusiastic for the merchant type of ship.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let us not delude ourselves that this will be a competitively and economically sound ship when it comes into operation. We should not attempt to delude anyone about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not expected to be.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I say that so that the record will be clear. Therefore, if we are going to build and put on the ocean a ship which is unsound from a competitive and economic standpoint, we ought to build one which will be able to demonstrate many phases of atomic energy.

I am pointing that out so that there will be no question about it, and because I prefer the other type ship. However, I will go along with the proposal, because I believe it to be important to get a ship of this type into operation.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement made by the former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], is extremely helpful, as I believe are also the observations of the able Senator from Ohio and the able Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. They are all very helpful. With those statements in the RECORD, I do not believe I will have any objection to the language which is proposed by way of amendment to the bill.

The Senator from Washington a moment ago suggested there was a House bill pending and that the bill pending before the Senate would go to conference with the House. Is that correct? Does the Senator know whether the language of the House bill is identical with the language of the Senate bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, I do not. I have the House bill here, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask that question because if the language is not identical, and if the two bills will be in conference, there is a possibility of being absolutely sure about the final language.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The language in the House bill is not exactly the same, but it is very specific that the ship is to be a merchant type of ship.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from New Mexico propose that we substitute in the House bill the language contained in the Senate bill as perfected?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I do. In that way, there would be a conference on the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, we would substitute the language of the Senate bill for that of the House bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. In that way the bill would go to conference.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I believe the difficulties could be ironed out in that way.

Mr. ANDERSON. Otherwise, if the two bills were identical, there would be nothing for a committee of conference to consider.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They are not identical.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the bill went to conference, there could be a discussion of whether the *Nautilus* type of reaction should be used, for example—and that type of reactor obviously does not contribute to the art at all—or whether it would be possible by substitute language to provide that another type of reactor should be used.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing that that be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am merely trying to make legislative history in the event the conferees desired to deal with this question. In other words, does not the Senator believe that the conferees would be free to deal with the matter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would be free to deal with it; yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. On that basis, I have no objection to the amendments which have been proposed. I am anxious, as I say, as is the Senator from Ohio, to have some sort of bill enacted. On that basis, and with the statements made by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Iowa, I suggest that the amendments be adopted and that the bill be quickly passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to say again, in order to make the legislative history clear, that on June 6 the committee received a statement from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in which he pointed out the Commission's position concerning the development of nuclear power for the propulsion of a merchant vessel. He makes it clear that that is what they were talking about. They, of course, would like to proceed with the other ship about which we have been speaking, but it is not provided for in this bill and is another matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. I assume that is what the committee referred to on page 4 of its report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think the amendments are satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 6243, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill, that all after the enacting clause of the House be stricken and the language of the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted therefor, and that following the passage of the House bill the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is the motion to strike out all the language of the House bill after the enacting clause, and to substitute the language of the Senate bill as amended?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the construction of nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and that the language of the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 6243) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, port facilities, planning, and operating and cargo handling on ships and at ports, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed after the passage of House bill 6243, a statement I have prepared on the bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

As a stanch supporter of the American merchant marine, I have been interested in the possibilities of an atomic-powered merchant ship from the earliest suggestions of the feasibility of such a vessel. With Senator SALTONSTALL I cosponsored S. 2005, to build a nuclear-powered merchant ship. I also was strongly in support of the President's proposed nuclear demonstration ship which was designed to show to the peoples of other countries the interest of this country in the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes.

However, the committee, in its wisdom, has considered the necessities of the shipping industry to be such that they have reported out the bill favoring construction first of a nuclear-powered merchant ship for use in the foreign commerce of the United States. Having been a vigorous proponent of an adequate merchant marine and realizing the need for upgrading our shipping to the greatest possible extent to meet the ever-increasing foreign competition, I must lend my heartiest support to the proposals for immediate construction of this atomic merchant ship.

During the next 10 years, the shipping interests of the Nation must replace almost 100 percent their present commercial fleet. If we can develop enough experience and know-how in the field of atomic propulsion of vessels, it is entirely possible that our merchant ship replacements may take advantage of this newest and most extraordinary form of energy and once again step out to the forefront of the shipping nations of the world.

TRANSMISSION TO UNITED NATIONS OF INFORMATION CONCERNING THE TERRITORIES OF ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the United Nations Charter, chapter XI, article 73, provides:

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and to this end—

And then follow subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

I ask unanimous consent that article 73 in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, article 73 of the United Nations Charter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER XI

DECLARATION REGARDING NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Article 73

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

(a) to insure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

(b) to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;

(c) to further international peace and security;

(d) to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this article; and

(e) to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which chapters XII and XIII apply.

Mr. President, I was quite surprised to learn that since the year 1946 the Government of the United States has been filing reports to the United Nations relative to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and I sought some additional information from the State Department. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of the various types of dependencies and territories for which the several nations belonging to the United Nations presently file reports. It is dated June 11, 1956.

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

Australia: Papua.

Belgium: Belgian Congo.

France: French Equatorial Africa, French Somaliland, Comoro, Madagascar, French West Africa. Morocco, Tunis, last reported on in 1954.

Netherlands: Netherlands New Guinea.

New Zealand: Tokelau Islands, Cook Islands, Niue Island.

United Kingdom: Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, British Somaliland, Bechuanaland, Kenya, Uganda, Zanzibar, Basutoland, Swaziland, Mauritius, Seychelles, Gambia,

Gold Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Cyprus, Gibraltar, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, Windward Islands, Brunei, Federation of Malaya, Hong Kong, North Borneo, Sarawak, Singapore, Fiji, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, New Hebrides (condominium with France), Pitcairn Island, Solomon Islands, Aden colony and protectorate, Falkland Islands, St. Helena.

United States: Alaska, American Samoa, Guam, Hawaii, Virgin Islands of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, which reads as follows:

JUNE 19, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox.

Frankly, I was greatly shocked to learn that the United States since 1946 has been transmitting information under article 73 (e) for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. I hope that steps will be taken to correct this situation as these two organized Territories have elected their own legislatures and both have adopted constitutions in anticipation to being admitted as full members of the Union as the 49th and 50th States.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. President, the letter which I wrote Mr. Francis Wilcox, also under date of June 19, 1956, reads as follows:

JUNE 19, 1956.

Hon. FRANCIS O. WILCOX,
Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANCIS: Your letter of June 11 has been received, and I wish to thank you for sending me the information.

I would certainly see no objection to the United States filing a report under article 73 (e) relating to American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

I most strenuously do object to this Government having filed such reports for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, both of which are destined to become States of the American Union. Both have adopted State constitutions and are awaiting admission as the 49th and 50th States.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to Secretary Dulles.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. President, I should like to add that, as every Member of the Senate knows, and as Members of the House know, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii elect delegates to the Congress of the United States who sit in the House of Representatives. So, Mr. President, I hope that prompt action will be taken to get the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska out of the category into which they have apparently been placed.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Have there been any reports from the State Department setting forth why the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii were included in the first place? If so, on what assumption did they make such reports?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am awaiting a full and complete report. The preliminary information I had when the matter came up in 1946 was that it had been determined that it might encourage some of the other nations to file reports if we included Hawaii and Alaska. I do not agree with that decision, needless to say.

Mr. BRICKER. I join the Senator from California in his attitude in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Chair would like to inform the Senator from California that he has requested replacement in the chair so that he might comment on what the distinguished Senator from California has just said, because the cause of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii has been one of my major interests for a long time. The Chair wishes to thank the Senator from California for the additional argument he has made for their admission into the Union. The Chair has been impressed every time he has gone North with the way in which we deny Alaska self-government. The Yukon Territory of Canada has only about 10 percent of the population of Alaska, and yet that territory is allowed a voting representative in the House of Commons of Canada, while our Delegate from Alaska is still denied the right to vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

SIMPLIFICATION OF ACCOUNTING METHODS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2287, Senate bill 3362.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3362) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill was reported unanimously from the Subcommittee on Reorganization and by the Government Operations Committee. It would put into effect one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Under present law, unexpended balances of appropriations with limited fiscal-year availability, lapse, or cease to be available to the agencies to which they are provided at the end of two full fiscal years following the fiscal year or years for which appropriated. At that time such balances are transferred to a consolidated Treasury Department appropriation account known as "Payment of certified claims."

This bill authorizes agencies of the Government to pay undisputed bills chargeable in precisely the same manner as are bills payable from currently available appropriations. It is anticipated that enactment of the bill will result eventually in direct savings of approximately $600,000 annually. Savings will also be effected by the agencies concerned, and there will be a far more accurate idea of the exact amount to be appropriated to the Treasury Department each year instead of, as at present, all balances being charged to the Treasury Department rather than to the agencies involved.

As I have said, the bill has been reported unanimously, and I hope it will be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Government Operations were on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "except as otherwise provided by law"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "of" and insert "for"; in line 8, after the word "the", to strike out "activity" and insert "agency or subdivision thereof"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "derived", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That when it is determined necessary by the head of the agency concerned that a portion of the remaining balance withdrawn is required to liquidate obligations and reflect adjustments, such portion of the remaining balance may be restored to the appropriate account established pursuant to this act: *Provided further,* That the head of the agency concerned shall make a report with respect to each such restoration to the Chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget"; on page 3, line 7, after the word "account", to insert "as of the close of the fiscal year"; in line 10, after the word "appropriations", to strike out "as of the close of the fiscal year"; in line 22, after the word "withdrawals", to strike out "required" and insert "made"; in line 23, after the word "to", to strike out "subsection (a)" and insert "subsections (a) and (b)"; on page 4, line 20, after the word "each", where it appears the second time, to strike out "activity responsible for the liquidation of the obligations chargeable to such accounts" and insert "agency concerned"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; on page 6, line 23, after the word "the", to strike out "activity" and insert "agency or subdivision thereof"; on page 7, line 6, after the word "been", to strike out "fulfilled or will not be undertaken or continued" and insert "fulfilled"; on page 8, after line 6, to insert:

(f) Any provisions (except those contained in appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957) permitting an appropriation to remain available for expenditure for any period beyond that for which it is available for obligation, but this subsection shall not be effective until June 30, 1957.

In line 13, after the word "Columbia", to insert "or to the appropriations disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives"; and after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 9. The inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions excepting any appropriation or appropriations from the operation of the

provisions of this act and fixing the period for which such appropriation or appropriations shall remain available for expenditure is hereby authorized.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That (a) the account for each appropriation available for obligation for a definite period of time shall, upon the expiration of such period, be closed as follows:

(1) The obligated balance shall be transferred to an appropriation account of the agency or subdivision thereof responsible for the liquidation of the obligations, in which account shall be merged the amounts so transferred from all appropriation accounts for the same general purposes; and

(2) The remaining balance shall be withdrawn and, if the appropriation was derived in whole or in part from the general fund, shall revert to such fund, but if the appropriation was derived solely from a special or trust fund, shall revert, unless otherwise provided by law, to the fund from which derived: *Provided*, That when it is determined necessary by the head of the agency concerned that a portion of the remaining balance withdrawn is required to liquidate obligations and reflect adjustments, such portion of the remaining balance may be restored to the appropriate account established pursuant to this act: *Provided further*, That the head of the agency concerned shall make a report with respect to each such restoration to the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(b) The transfers and withdrawals required by subsection (a) of this section shall be made—

(1) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the period of availability for obligation expires, in the case of an appropriation available both for obligation and disbursement, on or after the date of approval of this act; or

(2) not later than September 30 of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which this act is approved, in the case of an appropriation which, on the date of approval of this act, is available only for disbursement.

(c) For the purposes of this act, the obligated balance of an appropriation account as of the close of the fiscal year shall be the amount of unliquidated obligations applicable to such appropriation less the amount collectible as repayments to the appropriations as reported pursuant to section 1311 (b) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 830; 31 U. S. C. 200 (b)). Collections authorized to be credited to an appropriation but not received until after the close of the fiscal year in which such appropriation expires for obligation shall, unless otherwise authorized by law, be credited to the appropriation account into which the obligated balance has been or will be transferred, pursuant to subsection (a) (1), except that collections made by the General Accounting Office for other Government agencies may be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(d) The transfers and withdrawals made pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which the appropriations concerned expire for obligation, except that such transfers of appropriations described in subsection (b) (2) of this section shall be accounted for and reported as of the fiscal year in which this act is approved.

SEC. 2. Each appropriation account established pursuant to this act shall be accounted for as one fund and shall be available without fiscal year limitation for payment of obligations chargeable against any of the appropriations from which such account was derived. Subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, payment of such obligations may be made without prior action by the General Accounting Office, but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to relieve the Comptroller General of the United States of his duty to render decisions upon requests made pursuant to law or to abridge the existing authority of the General Accounting Office to settle and adjust claims, demands, and accounts.

SEC. 3. (a) Appropriation accounts established pursuant to this act shall be reviewed periodically but at least once each fiscal year, by each agency concerned. If the undisbursed balance in any account exceeds the obligated balance pertaining thereto, the amount of the excess shall be withdrawn in the manner provided by section 1 (a) (2) of this act; but if the obligated balance exceeds the undisbursed balance, the amount of the excess may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. A review shall be made as of the close of each fiscal year and the transfers or withdrawals required by this section accomplished not later than September 30 of the following fiscal year, but the transactions shall be accounted for and reported as of the close of the fiscal year to which such review pertains. A review made as of any other date for which transfers or withdrawals are accomplished after September 30 in any fiscal year shall be accounted for and reported as transactions of the fiscal year in which accomplished.

(b) Whenever a payment chargeable to an appropriation account established pursuant to this act would exceed the undisbursed balance of such account, the amount of the definciency may be transferred to such account from the appropriation currently available for the same general purposes. Where such deficiency is caused by the failure to collect repayments to appropriations merged with the appropriation account established pursuant to this act, the amount of the deficiency may be returned to such current appropriation if the repayments are subsequently collected during the same fiscal year.

(c) In connection with his audit responsibilities, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the head of the agency concerned, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, respecting operations under this act, including an appraisal of the unliquidated obligations under the appropriation accounts established by this act. Within 30 days after receipt of such report, the agency concerned shall accomplish any actions required by subsection (a) of this section which such report shows to be necessary.

SEC. 4. During the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which this act becomes effective, and under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, the undisbursed balance of the appropriation account for payment of certified claims established pursuant to section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), shall be closed in the manner provided in section 1 (a) of this act.

SEC. 5. The obligated balances of appropriations made available for the obligation for definite periods of time under discontinued appropriation heads may be merged in the appropriation accounts provided for by section 1 hereof, or in 1 or more other accounts to be established pursuant to this act for discontinued appropriations of the agency or subdivision thereof currently responsible for the liquidation of the obligations.

SEC. 6. The unobligated balances of appropriations which are not limited to a definite period of time shall be withdrawn in the manner provided in section 1 (a) (2) of this act whenever the head of the agency concerned shall determine that the purpose for which the appropriation was made has been fulfilled; or, in any event, whenever disbursements have not been made against the appropriation for 2 full consecutive fiscal years: *Provided*, That amounts of appropriations not limited to a definite period of time which are withdrawn pursuant to this section or were heretofore withdrawn from the appropriation account by administrative action may be restored to the applicable appropriation account for the payment of obligations and for the settlement of accounts.

SEC. 7. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(a) The proviso under the heading "Payment of certified claims" in the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 90; 31 U. S. C. 690);

(b) Section 2 of the act of July 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 407; 31 U. S. C. 712b), but the repeal of this section shall not be effective until June 30, 1957;

(c) The paragraph under the heading "Payment of certified claims" in the act of June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 358; 31 U. S. C. 712c);

(d) Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 418; 31 U. S. C. 713a); and

(e) Section 3691 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 715).

(f) Any provisions (except those contained in appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957) permitting an appropriation to remain available for expenditure for any period beyond that for which it is available for obligation, but this subsection shall not be effective until June 30, 1957.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the appropriations for the District of Columbia or to the appropriations disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. The inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions excepting any appropriation or appropriations from the operation of the provisions of this act and fixing the period for which such appropriation or appropriations shall remain available for expenditure is hereby authorized.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, to facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Committee on Government Operations is discharged from the further consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9593.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, to facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken, and that the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted for the language of the House bill, and that following the passage of the House bill the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 9593) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 3362 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. KENNEDY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, following the passage of House bill 9593, a brief explanation of the differences between that bill and Senate bill 3362.

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

COMPARISON OF H. R. 9593, AS APPROVED BY THE HOUSE, WITH S. 3362

Section 1 of S. 3362 provides for the transfer and merger in no-year accounts of all obligated balances of appropriations which are made for a definite period of time (1 year for obligation and 3 years for liquidation of obligations) immediately after the close of the first year.

H. R. 9593 postpones the transfer of the obligation balances until the end of the second year after expiration of the obligation period, i. e., at the end of the third year or expiration of the appropriation for expenditure purposes.

Section 1 (a) (2) and (3) of S. 3362 provides alternate authority to restore amounts withdrawn as unobligated or to effect transfers from current appropriations for supplying funds to balance the liquidated accounts, effect adjustments, and to pay outstanding obligations.

H. R. 9593 provides that funds necessary for these purposes will be limited to, and supplied from, amounts withdrawn as unobligated. Balances restored to liquidated obligations and to effect adjustments are required to be reported to the Bureau of the Budget prior to restoration.

The Senate bill is silent as to when the report must be made but requires report to the Appropriations Committees, Bureau of the Budget, and to the Comptroller General of the United States.

Both bills eliminate the requirement that all bills chargeable to lapsed appropriations must be submitted to the General Accounting Office before payment.

Both bills permit the agencies to pay prior year obligations in the same manner as current bills.

Both bills contemplate that expenditures on account of prior year obligations will be charged against the agency actually incurring the obligation rather than charging the Treasury Department as is done at the present time.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 2288, H. R. 7227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7227) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. 484 (j)), is amended to read as follows:

"(j) (1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, any equipment, materials, books or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for any such purpose. In determining whether property is to be donated under this subsection, no distinction shall be made between property capitalized in a working-capital fund established under section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, or any similar fund, and any other property. No such property shall be transferred for use within any State except to the State agency designated under State law for the purpose of distributing in conformity with the provisions of this subsection, all property allocated under this subsection for use within such State.

"(2) In the case of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall determine whether such property is usable and necessary for educational activities which are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies or military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard preparatory schools. If such Secretary shall determine that such property is usable and necessary for such purposes, he shall allocate it for transfer by the Administrator to the appropriate State agency for distribution to such educational activities. If he shall determine that such property is not usable and necessary for such purposes, it may be disposed of in accordance with paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(3) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with par. (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of education or public health, or for research for any such purpose, in any State shall be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator to such State agency for distribution to (A) tax-supported medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities, and (B) other nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, colleges, and universities which are exempt from taxation under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. No such property shall be transferred to any State agency until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received, from such State agency, a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public-health purposes in the State, and until the Secretary has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property.

"(4) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for civil-defense purposes, including research, in any State shall be made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, who shall allocate such property on the basis of need and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to such State agency for distribution to civil-defense organizations of such State, or political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, which are established pursuant to State law. No such property shall be transferred until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has received from such State agency a certification that such property is usable and needed for civil-defense purposes in the State, and until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator for the disposal of surplus property. The provisions of sections 201 (b), 401 (c), 401 (e), and 405 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, shall apply to the performance by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of his responsibilities under this section.

"(5) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator may impose reasonable terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon the use of any single item of personal property donated under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4), respectively, of this subsection which has an acquisition cost of $2,500 or more.

"(6) The term 'State', as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) Clause (C) of paragraph (2) of subsection 203 (k) of such act is amended by striking out the word "or" at the end thereof.

(b) Clause (D) of paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by striking out the comma at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or."

(c) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by inserting, immediately after clause (D) thereof, as amended by this section, the following new clause:

"(E) the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this act to civil-defense organizations of the States or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which are established by or pursuant to State law,".

SEC. 3. Subsection 203 (n) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(n) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of subsections (j) and (k), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies designated in conformity with paragraph (1) of subsection (j). Such cooperative agreements may provide for utilization by such Federal agency, without payment or reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency in carrying out any such program, and for making available to such State agency, without payment or reimbursement, property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in connection with such utilization."

SEC. 4. Subsection (h) of section 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, as added by clause (3) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and

maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes," approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 697), is redesignated as subsection (i) of such section.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), the amendments made by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) In the case of any State which on the date of enactment of this act has not designated a single State agency for the purpose of distributing surplus property pursuant to subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, transfers of such property may be made by the Administrator of General Services under such subsection, as amended by this act, to the State agency heretofore designated in such State to distribute property in conformity with such subsection for purposes of education and public health to the extent that such agency is authorized under State law to receive and distribute any class of property transferred pursuant to such subsection, or in the absence of any such agency or in the absence of authority of such agency to receive and distribute any such class of property, to any State agency or official authorized under State law to receive and distribute such property, until 90 calendar days have passed after the close of the first regular session of the legislature of such State beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the donation of Government-owned surplus personal property to civil-defense organizations of the States and political subdivisions thereof which have been established by or pursuant to State law. This will mean that the civil-defense organizations will share as donees of surplus property with health and education departments in the various States. The bill has been highly recommended by Governor Peterson of the civil-defense organization. The committee held hearings on the bill, and reported it unanimously. There is no objection to it. The bill has the support of the Bureau of the Budget and all other agencies of the Government. I hope the Senate will pass the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 7227) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, and for other purposes."

PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS IN RAPID VALLEY UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes, which were on page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "of the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota,"; on page 2, line 5, strike out "$18,383 as reimbursable" and insert "$16,382 as reimbursement"; on page 2, line 7, after "thereof" insert "on other lands", and on page 2, line 10, strike out "13" and insert "30."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on June 19, the House of Representatives passed S. 1622, with certain corrective or clarifying amendments recommended by the Department of the Interior. I have conferred with members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and with the sponsor of the bill (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). All are agreeable to accepting the House amendments.

I, therefore, move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

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

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 1957

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that at the conclusion of today's business of the Senate H. R. 10986, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, be made the pending order of business.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

H. R. 2106. An act to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10060. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended;

H. J. Res. 533. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 535. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

THE NEED FOR LIBERALIZING THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM BY ADDING CERTAIN BENEFITS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment which will shortly be offered to provide benefits to insured Americans at the age of 50 for total disabilities which will be relatively permanent in nature. Such a provision was in the House bill which passed that body last year by a vote of 372 to 31. This feature, along with others, was, however, eliminated by the Senate Finance Committee, although there were three of us, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and myself, all members of the Democratic Party, who voted for it.

1. THE PROBLEM OF DISABILITY

First, let us make no mistake about the seriousness of the problems created by those who are totally and in large part permanently disabled. The total number of those so disabled has been estimated in 1954 at 5.3 million, or 3.3 percent of the population. This includes mental as well as physical cases—see Social Security Bulletin, June 1955, pages 20–21. A quarter of a million of this total were believed to be under 14 years of age or about one-half of 1 percent of the total number in this age group. About 2.9 million were suffering from long-term disability in the 14- to 64-year age group. Since there were about 100 million persons in this very group, this was equivalent to a long-term disability rate of 2.9 percent. For those over 64, the long-term disability rate was much higher, namely, approximately 16 percent, with the estimated total number of the disabled amounting to about 2,150,000.

Two other overall figures are important. The total number of the long-term disabled who were in institutions was estimated at 1.2 million—Social Security Bulletin, June 1955, pages 20–21. This includes mental patients. While there are no definite statistics on the numbers in this subgroup, nevertheless, since there are 750,000 hospital beds for the mentally sick, and since these are overtaxed, it can safely be assumed that the mentally ill furnish the large majority of the 1.2 million who are hospitalized with long-term disabilities.

The Social Security Administration estimates that of the total number suffering from long-term disability about 2.2 million would otherwise be in the labor force. This is a loss of a little over 3 percent of the total labor supply. It should be noted that all these people are unable to work and that their loss of earning power will either continue throughout their life or for long periods of time. During this entire period they will be unable to earn and except in rare instances cannot support themselves, let alone aid in the support of others.

But not only are they unable to earn current income; their expenses are commonly heavier than those who are able to work, for they require special medical attention, appliances, medicine, and in many cases hospital care.

All this rapidly eats up savings and makes the disabled person dependent upon others. Whole families are dragged down by the crippling accidents and diseases which swell the numbers of the disabled.

We all know individual cases of families where literal havoc has been created by those misfortunes. They are vivid in our memories as individual cases. We sometimes forget, however, how widespread is this destruction and how great is the total human and economic loss. The mass figures which I have given may therefore indicate the dimensions of this very real national calamity and strengthen our desire to do something effective about it.

2. ATTEMPTS TO MEET IT

The proposal for benefits to those gravely disabled is no sudden innovation. In 1938 the advisory committee to the Senate and to the Social Security Administration, of which I was then a member, recommended the ultimate adoption of benefits for so-called total and apparently permanent disability although there was some disagreement as to when such a system should be instituted. In 1941 the Social Security Board recommended that it be adopted. In 1948, the second advisory committee, after a long study of the problem, voted 15 to 2 in favor of such a system. In 1949 the House of Representatives passed a revision of the Social Security Act which provided for benefits for total disability without any restriction as to age. This provision was eliminated by the Senate Finance Committee, just as the committee has done this year to a more limited proposal.

What we did instead, in 1950, was to provide public assistance on a Federal-State matching basis for those who, though less than 65 were, according to the advice of responsible medical opinion and administrative determination, permanently and totally disabled. There are today approximately 247,000 persons who are receiving such assistance, plus 104,000 blind who have been granted corresponding assistance from the very beginning of the Social Security Act.

3. THE WEAKNESSES OF THE ASSISTANCE SYSTEM

There are, however, many critical weaknesses in this assistance system. In the first place there are seven States which have not accepted the Federal-State matching system, and which therefore are not making such payments. These States are Arizona, California, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Nevada, and Texas—see testimony of Secretary Folsom, hearings, page 1263, and other material. I should also add the Territory of Alaska. One-fifth of the population of the country lives in those States, and is therefore outside the scope of such protection. Furthermore, in many of the States which do grant aid to the disabled, the program is so restrictive that an individual must be virtually helpless to qualify. Secondly, in order to get such assistance the disabled in the remaining States must be subjected to a means test. This, in most cases, is very rigorous. In the majority of States they must first have used up virtually all of their liquid assets. Then, if they own their own home, reversionary rights are taken by the State in such assets. Children and close relatives are directly responsible for the maintenance of their parents, and assistance is not given if the younger generation has any ability to shoulder the load.

These restrictions are probably necessary in any system of public assistance. But they should be frankly recognized for what they are. They mean that the disabled, like the aged, must in most cases be virtually destitute and stripped of all resources before they can qualify for assistance. In addition to all the pain and sacrifice which the disabled must undergo, they must also be ground down close to the bloodless pulp of destitution and forced to sacrifice virtually all savings and assets before they can receive aid.

In fact, this so-called assistance is, indeed, much like the old-fashioned relief. It is more liberally financed and more certain than the old-time relief. But it is still humiliating and relatively inadequate. It is humiliating because the disabled man or woman has to fill out forms pleading not only poverty, but virtual destitution. Then the personal affairs and financial standing of the applicant are subjected to a detailed probing which is embarrassing to all, and still further humiliating to most. And then even if assistance is granted, it is in the barest amounts which will just enable the disabled person to exist. The ingenuity of budgetary experts and of social workers are all harnessed in this cause. Supervision over the expenditures which the disabled and aged can make is lodged with the case workers who have a large degree of disciplinary power over the recipients if the distribution of their expenditures differs appreciably from those that have been recommended. It is small wonder that the disabled do not like this system, which they feel erodes their self-respect.

That the relief is still relatively inadequate is seen by the fact that the average monthly payment for the disabled, for the country as a whole, amounted to only $56.43 in February of this year. About $8 of this was in the form of medical care paid for by the welfare authorities. This meant that the average monthly cash assistance amounted to only around $48 a month. This was about the equivalent of $24 in 1939, since the cost of living has almost doubled since that time. There were moreover eight States in June of last year where the combined cash and medical benefits amounted to less than $40 a month and, of course, a still larger number whose cash benefits were less than this amount.

The hardships of total and long-continued disability are in fact even more severe than those of old age, for the aged customarily accumulate more reserves, and a considerable percentage of them retain at least some ability to earn. The totally disabled, on the other hand, tend to use up their reserves through their long-continued inability to earn and in trying to meet the costs of the medical treatment and care which they must undergo.

4. THE NEED FOR INSURANCE

Disabilities of so grave and serious a nature are precisely the type for which insurance is the most effective protection. Only a relatively small percentage of the population are hit by them; but those who are, are struck with terrific force. There are few individuals who can save up enough to protect themselves if the dread accident or disease should come, for such misfortune will not wait until the victim has accumulated an adequate nest egg. The worker may be struck down in early manhood, before he has accumulated any reserve, or when his family is growing up and his resources are strained to and beyond the limit to care for them. And even if all men were to save for this contingency, in the vast majority of cases it would not be needed, for the great majority escape; and these could have spent their money for more urgent and, to them, more necessary purposes.

Insurance is designed to meet this very situation and to furnish pooled protection against losses, the total of which can be roughly approximated, but the specific incidence of which cannot be foreseen.

It is better for the many to make small payments, and hence to decrease their incomes slightly, than for a small minority to suffer heavy and crushing losses. What could not be borne by the few whom grave misfortune visits can easily be supported by the many, all of whom are endangered, even though the vast majority ultimately escape. In addition, because of insurance, all will worry less because one fear will be reduced or removed. People will sleep better at night, and will be happier and more productive by day.

This is the fundamental justification of life, fire, accident, and marine insurance. It is better for each of a thousand homeowners to pay $15 a year in premiums for $15,000 of insurance on their homes, than for the one householder whose home does burn to suffer the full loss of $15,000.

This is exactly the case with crippling disability. Individual and voluntary disability insurance is an excellent thing. Those who sell and manage it are performing useful service. But we cannot depend solely, and probably not even primarily, upon it. In the first place, the immediate needs of a family are so pressing that well-meaning and even prudent individuals will tend to let this contingency rest in the background of their consciousness, and trust to their good fortune to bring them through. Just as the average soldier going into battle does not expect to be killed or seriously wounded, so does the average worker believe that he will go through life relatively unscathed.

Those who are already sick, and who believe that they will become sicker, and those who are afflicted with one or more

ills of the flesh, will want to insure against the greater blows which they believe or fear may fall upon them. The insurance companies naturally try to protect themselves against this tendency by very stringent health requirements, so as to cut down their losses. This in itself shuts out from protection a large portion of those who need assistance the most.

Even with all these precautions, however, there is an adverse selection of risks, so that the insurance companies in self-protection have to raise their rates in order to provide for their heavier loss ratio. This makes it harder for those in moderately good health who do want to protect themselves to pay the cost of such insurance, and hence tends to deter them from taking it out. If all were to share the burden of financial support, the average cost to the insured would be markedly lower. General coverage is, therefore, highly desirable.

Bringing those almost completely disabled for long periods of time under the Social Security System will be far better than to depend solely on either disability assistance or voluntary insurance.

Such protection will be at once more adequate and more self-respecting protection than that which old-age assistance can give. Under the insurance system, for which half of the cost has been paid by the covered workers and the other half by their employers, the disability benefits are paid as a right, not as a gratuity. There is no humiliating means test. Once it is determined that the covered worker is so seriously disabled as to be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity, then at age 50, and subject to conditions which will be stated later, he becomes eligible for benefit, without regard to whether he is destitute. As we shall see, certain rather rigid requirements are imposed to check fraud and malingering, but these tests do not deal with whether the insured is poverty-stricken. The aim is, instead, to give the disabled person aid before he is destitute, so that he and his family may be spared this worry and hardship.

The benefits which are to be given are also on the average more generous than the aid given under disability assistance. This is shown by the following table:

Average previous monthly earnings	Workers' monthly disability benefits [1]	Percent benefits of earnings
$100	$55.00	55
$150	68.50	46
$200	78.50	39
$250	88.50	35
$300	98.50	33
$350	108.50	31

[1] There are of course some disabled workers living in States with high assistance payments, but whose previous wages were low, who would get more under disability assistance than disability insurance. But these would be very much in the minority. In these cases, as in old age, both insurance benefits and assistance could be given.

The average benefit which will be paid will be between $75 and $80, or $20 more than the average assistance payment, including medical benefits.

It should be realized that, although the disabled worker who is over 50 receives the same benefit as he individually would be entitled to after 65 years under old-age insurance, he is not entitled to added benefits for a wife or other dependents. No dependency benefit is attached to this proposal.

We are, in fact, trying to do for long-term disability in 1956 what we did for old age in 1935 and for premature death in 1939, namely, to replace assistance by insurance. In 1935, we designed old-age insurance as the method by which old-age assistance was ultimately to be supplanted or greatly reduced. While in the early years of the Social Security System, the number of those receiving old-age assistance was much greater than those receiving insurance benefits, because eligibility had not then been acquired by those in the insurance system, this has been reversed in recent years, as more and more acquired eligibility. Today 4½ millions are receiving old-age insurance benefits, as compared with the 2½ million receiving old-age assistance.

With the broadened coverage of the Social Security Act, which now includes approximately 90 percent of the gainfully employed, this disparity will be still further increased. This is all to the good. The American people have decided that they want self-respecting insurance, rather than public relief. The attempts which were recently made by the United States Chamber of Commerce and others to abandon the insurance principle throughout the Social Security System, and to rely, instead, solely upon assistance, have now been given up, for when they were exposed to the light of day, they collapsed, and they have now gone where the woodbine twineth.

It is the same with disability. Self-respecting insurance is better than humiliating relief; and I feel confident that American workers are willing to pay their share of the extra cost. This has been estimated on a level-premium basis by Robert J. Myers, the actuary for the Social Security Board, at .42 of 1 percent. I think I should add that Mr. Myers' cost estimates have been found to be substantially accurate up to date. To the degree that they have erred, it has been on the conservative side, with an overstatement of probable costs.

5. THE OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED

The objections to insurance against disability which were advanced in the hearings, and which have been raised in public discussion, seem to be approximately four in number: It is objected, first, that the medical determination of eligibility would be very difficult, and that an undue and improper strain would be placed upon doctors and would lead to abuses; second, that the payment of total disability benefits would lead to widespread malingering, because of the desire of the beneficiaries to obtain the security of the disability payments, rather than face the uncertainties of the competitive world; third, that the payment of these benefits would retard the medical and vocational rehabilitation of the disabled, which, it is urged, is more important than their cash compensation; fourth, that it would cost too much.

Let us consider each of these objections in turn. Perhaps the best answer to the first objection is that the determination of disability is already being made in many hundreds of thousands of cases, and is being conducted with substantial satisfaction. Veterans, railway workers, those in Federal employ, under State and local government retirement plans, and those in the employ of large numbers of private companies are already eligible for benefits for long-term disability.

The following are receiving long-term disability benefits from Government administered systems:

1. Veterans (with 70 percent or more disability):	
World War I	41,000
Korean war	18,000
World War II	128,000
Regular Establishment	10,000
2. Railroad retirement	85,000
3. Federal civil service	57,000
4. Federal noncontributing	81,000
5. State and local government retirement plans	45,000
Total	465,000

As Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of department of social security, AFL–CIO, has cogently observed:

> Persons who say that the Government cannot administer a disability program apparently shut their eyes to the fact that it is administering a number of such programs.

Nearly half a million are receiving disability benefits from publicly administered funds. In addition, many thousands are being paid under private plans, while workmen's compensation for industrial accidents creates a large additional caseload.

In addition to those receiving benefits for virtually total disability, large numbers have been examined, and their cases considered, under the disability freeze which Congress enacted in 1954. By this provision, those who were adjudged, because of physical or mental impairment, to be unable to engage in gainful activity which could be expected to result either in death or in a long-continued and indefinite term of disability, had their old-age-benefit rights continued as of the date of their disability. The fact that they had not been able to be covered during the period of disability, and hence did not make contributions to the fund during that time, was not allowed to count against them, so far as receiving old-age benefits at age 65 was concerned.

To carry out this provision, it was necessary to devise a procedure for determining such long-term disability. The administration was put in the hands of State authorities, generally the boards of vocational rehabilitation, which passed on the reports made to them by members of the medical profession and with ultimate appeal to the Social Security Administration and presumably to the courts.

According to the most recent reports which I have seen, the claims of approximately 105,000 persons for such a "freeze" have been processed. Approximately 65,000 have been granted and about 40,000 rejected. It is thus apparent that the claimants have not ridden roughshod over the administrative agencies. These have indeed shown marked restraint in certifying persons to be entitled to such a freeze.

The most interesting thing about this illustration is that the definition of what is long-term disability and the procedure for determining it is the same under the George amendment to this bill, upon which we shall shortly vote, as it is under the freeze provisions of the 1954 act which I have just described. Since all this has worked efficiently under the "freeze," why could it not work efficiently under the George amendment.

I have studied very carefully the objections which the representatives of the various medical societies have made against the payment of benefits for so-called long-term disabilities. Apparently they boil down to this: There is said to be a subjective as well as an objective factor in disability. Some men may consciously or unconsciously decide to give up the struggle. They will either develop psychosomatic ailments which will apparently disable them or will feign them. They will claim or honestly believe themselves to be afflicted with ailments which are essentially nondiagnosable. Headaches, backaches, and so forth, are frequently of this nature. Cases of rheumatism and arthritis, when traced to their roots, are often similarly caused.

It is, therefore, argued that essentially all these cases are nondiagnosable. Under these circumstances, many claim that doctors would be under great pressure to certify applicants as being more or less totally and permanently disabled, even though, in fact, they might not be. For, it is argued, if doctors acquire a reputation of being tough, they will lose patients who will, instead, flock to the doctors who hand out certificates of disability with a flowing and uncritical hand.

I have, apparently, a higher opinion of the medical profession than many of its official representatives. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the doctors of the country are scrupulously honest in their diagnosis. I do not believe them to be venal, and I will defend their characters and their professional integrity against the implications which have been leveled against them by some of their official spokesmen. Of course, there are probably a few black sheep and some weaklings in their profession, as in all others. But I believe they will be detected rather quickly and their findings will be properly discounted.

This brings us to a basic misunderstanding or misrepresentation of what the role of the physician will be in the administrative process. The representatives of the American Medical Association seem to assume that the doctors will be the men who determine whether or not a claimant is to receive benefits. But this is not the case.

What the doctors will do is to furnish medical information to a State board, which then makes the determination both on the medical and other information. This State board, under the freeze, now consists typically of another doctor and a lay member. In this way the doctors are made consultants rather than State functionaries, and at the same time are largely freed from the pressure to which their spokesmen persist in claiming that they would be subjected.

The definition of a compensable case is quite clear and concise. As has been stated, it is identical with that used for the disability freeze, namely:

> The term "disability" means inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long continued and indefinite duration.

Under this provision in the "freeze" determination of disability, a number of commonsense rulings and precedents have been established which will be of great help in making similar determinations for disability benefits. The administrative machinery on the State level has already been set up and is operating. The trail, in short, has been blazed and the way laid out. We have accumulated the experience and the know-how which should enable the benefits to be efficiently administered.

It should also be clearly understood that in addition to the rather precise tests of disability which are set up, four further requisites for eligibility are prescribed—all of which must be satisfied: first, the individual must have had 1½ years of coverage under social security out of the last 3 years; second, he must have had 5 years of coverage in the last 10 years; third, there must have been coverage for half of the time since 1950, or alternatively for 10 years; and finally, fourth, the disability must have been in existence for at least 6 years before monthly benefits will be payable.

All these qualifications, when added to the fact that only those who are 50 years and over are eligible, constitute a very tough set of conditions. While complications are introduced by carrying over the "freeze" provisions for the determination of the disability benefit, these are not unduly serious. They are explained in a technical statement appended to my remarks. In short, while there will still be problems, they can be solved. If we are ever to be ready to handle disability benefits, we now are. And the circumstances under which the George amendment will be carried out could not be more favorable.

Perhaps it should be added for those who believe in decentralized and State rather than Federal administration, that this is precisely what is provided for under the George amendment. The determination and administration will be in the hands of State authorities, with the Social Security Administration merely setting general standards and acting as upper reviewing and appeals body.

In the hearings there are about 10 pages of fine print discussing in great detail the administrative procedures which are followed in determining disability under the "freeze" provision. It is presumed that these procedures will be followed if the George amendment is adopted. A careful study of them will, I believe, show that the criticisms advanced by a great many people against disability benefits are not well founded.

The second and third objections to providing disability benefits, namely, that they will greatly stimulate malingering and impede the rehabilitation of the disabled, are really two phases of the same set of feared dangers and hence may properly be considered together.

What so many of the doctors seem to be afraid of is that once the disabled are in receipt of benefits they may become reconciled to the idea that they are disabled and hence will not strive to rehabilitate themselves either physically or occupationally. It will be easier, it is said, to keep on drawing benefits and to stay out of the stream of productive activity.

It is undeniable that there is something to this objection. But the question is whether it should be controlling. Many of us have carefully considered this question for many years—I have thought about it for 20 years—and have come to the conclusion that this tendency can be largely checked under the George amendment.

For example, the disabled man or woman will not be neglected and will still be checked and aided once he is in receipt of benefits. Unlike the case of old-age benefits, his right to disability benefits is not an absolute one. If the disabled person seems to be neglecting opportunities for improvement, he can be admonished and if he persists, his situation can be reassessed.

A second variation of this fundamental fear of subjective and often unconscious malingering is the argument that disability benefits will impede rehabilitation. Rehabilitation, it is urged, is the all-important goal and to get men and women restored to self-respect and self-support we should not keep them in a dependent position through the payment of benefits.

I yield to no one in my enthusiasm for rehabilitation. I have watched wounded men being rehabilitated in military hospitals, and I am happy to have played a part, although a very minor one, in the improvement and expansion of these services under the Truman administration. I rejoice in the further progress which has been made since then. I believe that in Miss Mary Switzer, who is heading up the rehabilitation work in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have a truly magnificent public servant. I shall support the rehabilitation program with my full strength.

But it is a great mistake to believe that the benefit system set up by the George amendment is in any real sense antagonistic to, or a substitute for, rehabilitation. On the contrary, it not only supplements, but actually strengthens, the rehabilitation work.

Let us be clear about a very essential fact. Rehabilitation by itself is indeed a very imperfect way of caring for the disabled. For there is competent medical opinion that probably not much more than 25 percent of those above 50 years who are so severely disabled can be restored to self-support. This is a considerable percentage to be sure and every effort should be made to realize it. But, we may ask, what about the other three-quarters? Are they and their families to be crushed into abject poverty? No sane and humane person would agree to that.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very much interested in the Senator's remarks on this subject. He and I served together for many years on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and we had before us many questions dealing with rehabilitation.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois will recall that at the hearings a great deal of testimony was given to the effect that there is today a backlog of more than 2 million cases of physically handicapped people in this country, and that the number is increasing at the rate of 250,000 a year. On the other hand, we are rehabilitating, or seeking to rehabilitate, only 50 or 60 thousand a year. As the Senator will surely recall, there was a great deal of testimony from the head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and from important members of his staff, to the effect that for every dollar the United States spends in rehabilitating people, $5 is returned to the United States, through making a person self-supporting again, able to bear his share of the burden, and to pay taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New York is entirely correct. He is quite right about the importance of rehabilitation. However, the point I was trying to make is that even if we were to do as good a job as we could, probably in three-quarters of the cases over the age of 50 rehabilitation would not be effective. Therefore we must have some method of taking care of people who cannot be rehabilitated.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully understand what the distinguished Senator from Illinois is pointing out, and I am in complete agreement with him. But I have been disturbed and distressed for a long time because the very people who are opposing the George amendment or an amendment similar to the George amendment are the ones who have constantly, consistently, and vigorously opposed the Government's taking any adequate steps whatsoever to rehabilitate the physically handicapped. Even this very year a wholly inadequate amount of money has been appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator from New York is correct. When we try to do one thing, we are told that we should do the other; when we try to do the other, we are told that we should do the first.

Mr. LEHMAN. Personally—and I am sure I speak for the other members of the committee—I very much regret that the distinguished Senator from Illinois is no longer a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which he served so devotedly and so effectively. My only consolation is that he is being replaced by a very excellent man, too, the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York. I, too, in many ways regret the transfer.

The objectors, moreover, seem to ignore the fact that under the George amendment the disabled man is required to avail himself of the services of the State rehabilitation agencies upon penalty of losing his benefits. Thus, the scope and importance of rehabilitation work would be greatly increased rather than decreased by the adoption of the George amendment and a powerful enforcing device would be imposed to prevent rehabilitation from being shirked. This is a big improvement over the 1950 provision for disability benefits which was passed by the House and rejected by the Senate Finance Committee. For that bill had no such provision in it and the payment of benefits was almost completely divorced from rehabilitation. I can well remember urging some of the sponsors of the 1950 bill to include such a requirement, as well as my strong feelings of doubt over its absence.

But as I have said, this lack has now been removed and the inclusion of this requirement should remove all legitimate grounds for opposition. Sometimes it seems to me that the opponents ignore the changes that have been made in the draft and do not realize that rehabilitation can be required as a condition of receiving benefits.

To make the transition into gainful employment much easier, it is provided that the benefits will continue in effect during the first year of substantial gainful activity. In this way, everything the disabled man earns during this trial period will be so much added income instead of merely reducing his insurance benefit. In this way, an added inducement is given to disabled men and women to rehabilitate themselves and then, as they acquire more confidence and ability during the initial year, they will be able to strike out for themselves and become completely self-supporting.

Finally, as the American Medical Association itself has pointed out in another connection, the payment of disability benefits should actually make rehabilitation more possible and effective. The fact seems to have been lost sight of that the house of delegates of the AMA approved in December of 1955, only 6 months ago, a report of a special committee on medical relations in workmen's compensation. I hold this report in my hand and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of Senator DOUGLAS' remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me read some salient paragraphs of the report:

> The physician's interest involves recognition that the amount and method of indemnification have a direct and important bearing on an effective rehabilitation regime. While overgenerous indemnity can dull the will for rehabilitation, inadequate indemnity requirements can destroy an employer's incentive to support rehabilitation by providing him with an easier or cheaper alternative. More important, inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale, or force return to gainful employment in advance of clear-cut medical indications.

I should like to call especial attention to this last sentence, that an inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale. This point is developed at length in subsequent paragraphs of this same report.

Now, I think this is good commonsense, and I commend our friends in the American Medical Association for it. But I cannot understand how the American Medical Association can endorse adequate benefits as an aid to the rehabilitation of the industrially disabled, and yet simultaneously condemn in an unmeasured and unrestrained manner the payment of similar benefits for the long-term disabled as an entire group. This is certainly not understandable from the standpoint either of logic or of medical reasoning. The American Medical Association in this respect is indeed like the character in Stephen Leacock's story who mounted his horse and rode off in all directions. I can only conclude that the attitude of the leaders of the American Medical Association, on this as on so many other questions of social policy is largely shaped by their political and social prejudices and likings. These doctors say they are opposed to state medicine, but many of them seem to want to create a medical state. Thus, a leading candidate for the presidency of the American Medical Association, without having personally examined any of the men in question, has solemnly announced that the President, after a critical heart attack and a major operation, is in better physical condition than any of his various Democratic rivals. It is about time that the rank and file of the profession expressed their disapproval both of politics in medicine and medicine in politics.

The fourth objection to the George amendment is that it will cost too much. As I have pointed out, the actuary for the Social Security Administration, Robert J. Myers, has made an intermediate estimate of cost which is between the high and low estimates. On a level premium basis through time, this average was set at forty-two one hundredths of 1 percent of the covered payroll. In the beginning, the cost would be much less than this. Mr. Myers estimates that in the first year, approximately 250,000 persons would draw disability benefits totaling a little over $200 million at an average cost of about one-sixth of 1 percent of the covered payroll. This number would probably increase in 25 years to a total of around 1 million persons and a payroll cost of around $900 million, or about two-thirds of 1 percent of the covered earnings.

But the surplus accumulated during the earlier years, on a forty-two one hundredths of 1 percent contribution plus accumulated interest, would probably be sufficient according to Dr. Myers to meet the costs into the foreseeable future—it should be noted that this is an intermediate cost estimate based on the assumption of high-level employment.

To provide an assessment of one-half of 1 percent of payroll, distributed equally between employer and employee should, therefore, provide a safety factor of nearly one-tenth of 1 percent or one-fifth of the basic estimates.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, who has played such a magnificent part in this whole fight.

Mr. LONG. The Senator was very gracious in permitting me to look at an advance copy of his remarks, which I appreciate very much. I completely agree with the Senator's position. The speech he is making is one of the best speeches that has ever been made on the subject of disability insurance.

I completely agree with him that spreading the risk with small payments, which everyone can afford, is the way to take care of disability. It is certainly far better than the public welfare approach, which requires that the person applying for relief be needy, that he have no means of getting other assistance, or that his relations cannot help him, or similar situations.

The idea of preserving a person's pride and self-respect, by having him pay for the insurance which he receives in payments, appeals to me.

We can say, of course, that the man who receives the smallest percentage return with regard to the amount he pays in is the person in the upper brackets. For example, a man who makes as much as $4,200 or more a year will receive in disability payments only about 31 percent of his earnings, whereas a person who earns $100 a month receives about 55 percent of his earnings.

I believe that when it is worked out, it will be found that a person would be paying about 75 cents a month to insure himself against disability, and that his employer would be paying 75 cents a month also.

When such a man lost his job because of disability he would be in a position to draw, starting at age 50, a total of approximately $19,000, to carry him from the time he was 50 years of age until he was 65.

That is certainly a large amount of assistance for a person to receive in the event he is disabled, to offset the terrific hardship which his disability in all probability would entail. It is a rather high payment, and I am sure that almost every workman in the country would be willing to pay such a small amount for that kind of protection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. It comes to about $10 a year. I regard that as a good investment. The Senator from Louisiana the other day made his case on the floor of the Senate. He made it very succinctly in a few sentences. He made the very best brief statement of the issue that I have ever heard. If people will only realize what is involved here, they will cease to make many of their objections.

I may say that this is not only insurance, but it is social insurance. In social insurance it is possible to introduce a principle which it is not possible to introduce in private insurance, namely, some sharing of the benefits and some of the allocation of the costs.

Social security is good for everyone in most circumstances. Its broader effect is to give a greater proportionate benefit to those who are most in need, on the Christian principle of "Share ye with one another your burdens."

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that, as the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Louisiana have pointed out, unless we adopt a plan of disability insurance such as is provided in the George amendment, the only alternative is that a great number of the men who are permanently and totally disabled will necessarily become objects of charity?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. There is no alternative that I can think of, except using up one's private resources.

Mr. LEHMAN. In many cases there are no private resources to draw on, because those private resources usually have already been consumed and the families are poor and are unable to take care of the person. As I see it, the only alternative is for the person to become an object of charity.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One thing which I do not understand is why some people who appreciate the need of this type of insurance oppose it so vigorously. I have in mind the American Medical Association. It was only a year ago that spokesmen for the American Medical Association came before the committee and asked us to pass a bill giving them a tax deduction to assist them in insuring themselves against disability.

In other words, the doctor recognizes that if he should go blind, for instance, he could not continue his practice as a doctor. So they came before the committee and asked for a tax deduction. Most doctors are in a relatively high income-tax bracket. If we had adopted that proposal, it would have meant that Uncle Sam was picking up about 50 percent of the check. That is what it would have amounted to.

Under such a proposal the cost of disability insurance for doctors would have been about the same cost to the doctors as it would have been if they had placed themselves under social security because the social-security program costs only about half as much as it would cost to take out similar insurance with a private company. The working man wants what the doctors want. If it is good enough for the doctors, it should be good enough for the workingmen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They want to be taken care of under the social-security system.

Mr. LONG. That is correct. The doctors constitute the only large remaining group of professional people who are opposed to social security. The lawyers asked to be taken under this system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is in the case of young lawyers.

Mr. LONG. Yes. But they learned what it was all about. In the great city of Cleveland, the lawyers started to wake up to what the social-security system was all about. Some of them came before us at the time the American Bar Association was against the social-security system.

They had a discussion group. Two men debated in favor of social security and two men debated against it. After the debate was concluded before the whole group of attorneys, they proceeded to take a vote of all the attorneys present as to whether they were for or against lawyers being covered by social security. Every lawyer present, including those who had conducted the debate, voted in favor of social security. They were convinced, after they had studied the subject, that it was the best type of insurance for the cost that could be devised.

The only group of professional people who will be left out, after we pass this bill, will be the doctors and the chiropractors. I understand the chiropractors want to be considered in the same category with doctors, and I can understand why. It somewhat dignifies them to be in the same category with doctors. Those are the only professional groups of any consequence that will not be covered by social security after we pass this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, there are some members of the medical profession who do wish to be included.

Mr. LONG. I would be willing to leave out the doctors, so long as a majority of them do not want to be under Social Security. If they do not want it, that is alright with me. But I do not see why the doctors should send a representative from every medical association in the United States to testify against letting the workingman purchase that which the workingman wants to buy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is referring to disability insurance, is he not?

Mr. LONG. Yes. They do not want the working man to have what is good for the doctors. If they do not want it, they can be left out. But I do not see why they should oppose letting the workingman have something for which he is willing to pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am greatly disappointed that they are opposing it, and I hope Members of the Senate will not be overpowered by their opposition. It is true that the American Medical Association had a powerful influence in the 1952 elections, though I do not think it was as great as was claimed by them. They claim credit for defeating several Members of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I believe the proposal is, in a sense, a subsidy for the medical profession, because, if we consider the disabling diseases, it will be found that the top one in the list is heart disease with hardening of the arteries. Anyone who has that disease needs a doctor. How can such a person pay the doctor? He cannot work. He would be able to pay his doctor bill if he had disability assistance.

I believe arthritis is next on the list. If a man has arthritis, he needs a doctor.

Cancer of the blood tops the list of the various kinds of cancer. A person with such a disease needs a doctor.

Polio is one of the top disablers. People suffering from that disease need doctors. They have to have doctors to look after them from day to day. The income realized from social security disability insurance would pay the doctor bill.

One of these days, the medical association will wake up to the fact that when payments are made for these various disabling diseases, the doctor will be one of the persons sharing in the check.

Why they have not figured that out up to this time, I cannot understand.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not at all surprised, because I have seen a similar attitude taken in many other activities affecting the health of the people.

The American Medical Association is opposing social security on the ground that the people could and should be rehabilitated. But as governor of a great State for many years, and as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, I do not recall any occasion whatsoever when the American Medical Association tried to use its influence to obtain appropriations sufficient to advance the cause of rehabilitation. They just have not done that. I have the greatest admiration for most medical practitioners. Individual doctors frequently make tremendous sacrifices. I am not referring to them but to the American Medical Association. The officers and governing body of the American Medical Association have opposed social security as they have opposed so many other things which are necessary to the welfare of the people, and to which the people are entitled.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think one of the tragedies of modern life in America has been the fact that doctors who are so generous and kind in their individual treatment of patients have allowed themselves to be governed by an inner clique of physicians to the well-to-do who do not have a great deal of personal contact with the problems of poor people, and who are largely the articulate members of the various medical societies. As a result, they have opposed in all too many cases measures which would really help the health and welfare of the American people. I think it has been a tragedy that they have adopted such an attitude.

Mr. President, I have said that the assistance will be ample to meet the costs.

Our critics, however, claim that this would not be enough and say that the tendency toward malingering and the way in which the disability rate rose under private plans during the great depression of the thirties is clear indication that the costs might be double Myers' intermediate estimate.

Here it should be noted, however, that real efforts will be made to root out and discourage malingering and that the experience of the thirties is no guide. For then, there was no unemployment insurance and men who were out of work and deprived of income were at once adversely affected from a physical and mental standpoint and, at the same time, came to look upon the receipt of private disability benefits as a way out of their tragic situation.

Our people are now better protected than they were during the great depression. Because of unemployment insurance, their income does not stop when their job ceases. This relieves the temptation to use disability benefits as protection against unemployment, while it also lessens the danger of psychosomatic sickness.

Probably a major reason for the difficulties of private companies with disability insurance was the problem of writing into contracts language which would cover all possible cases of disability. However, this problem does not arise with respect to this legislation, because the determination as to disability is an administrative one. Experience with the disability freeze indicates that the determination of disability can be tough but fair.

Dr. Myers' estimates are conservative because he assumes that the average earnings per covered worker will continue to be the same as in 1954. This is a proper assumption for an actuary to make.

At the same time, we know it has not been true in the past and that there is little likelihood that it will be true in the future. Weekly earnings are, instead, nearly twice what they were in 1945, and between 3 and 4 times what they were in 1935, when the Social Security Act was launched. Even if the price level were to remain constant, the increase in per capita productivity and, hence in average money earnings, will in all likelihood send up the total amounts taken into the system by not far from 2 percent a year. Since benefits paid out under these conditions do not increase as rapidly as total contributions, a large further margin of safety is built into the system. Due to the fact that while benefits are 55 percent of average earnings up to $110 a month, they are only 20 percent of earnings above that figure.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator has outlined what the cost of this program would be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. According to Dr. Myers' estimate, forty-two one-hundredths of 1 percent of covered payroll on a level premium basis.

Mr. LONG. When the program goes into full effect for those who are disabled, after they have achieved eligibility over some period of time, there will be some increase in the cost of the program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is right.

Mr. LONG. But from that point forward, there is no reason to believe that the cost of the program will increase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is right.

Mr. LONG. Because there will not be an increase of disabled persons, on a percentage basis.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Therefore, when we shall have assumed the normal case burden of disabled persons, the number could not be expected to increase, as would be the case with the aged.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The percentage will not increase relative to the working population.

Mr. LONG. The percentage of persons disabled will not increase, as would be the case with the aged, because it is expected that persons will live longer and longer. For that reason, there will be an increasing number of people over the age of 65. However, that situation does not apply to disabled persons, and there is no reason to believe, after the normal caseload is reached, that there will be an increase percentagewise in the number of disabled.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is right.

We should not be afraid, therefore, of financing the benefits by an additional tax of one-quarter of 1 percent upon employers and employees alike on earnings up to $350 a month or $4,200 a year, and three-eighths of 1 percent upon similar earnings of the self-employed. If added contributions are needed, labor at least would be ready to foot its share of the bill. For the A. F. of L. and the CIO, at their first joint convention, adopted a resolution pledging themselves as follows:

> We continue also our full support of the increased contribution rate necessary to keep social security soundly financed when these increased benefits are provided.

With this, the last objection to providing disability benefits should disappear.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is still another factor. The introduction of insurance benefits for disabilities of persons over the age of 50 will not immediately decrease by very much assistance or welfare payments for those handicapped, because it will take time to build up eligibility. However, as the system comes to cover more and more people, it should reduce the assistance payments. Those assistance payments are paid for entirely by the taxpayers, partly by the taxpayers of the Federal Government, and partly by taxpayers of the State governments. So that what would otherwise be a tax burden would be reduced in some degree by the substitution of the insurance benefits for the assistance payments, and the insurance benefits would be jointly contributed by employer and employee on a self-respecting basis for the purchase of insurance and not for a charitable handout.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Persons in the upper income brackets should welcome the program, because they make the major tax payments. Some of the general revenues into which go payments for income, corporation, and inheritance taxes all help to pay for the cost of welfare payments. That being the case, they could expect to have some relief, insofar as concerns the taxes they pay on corporate and personal income.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that all those persons who would be covered under the George amendment at age 50,

rather than at age 65, have been members of the system of social-security insurance?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LEHMAN. Some of them have been members of the system for a great many years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In order to meet the eligibility requirements under the George amendment, persons must have had a large amount of prior employent under the system—at least 5 years of covered employment.

Mr. LEHMAN. What I cannot understand is the argument which has been raised that the proposal to pay disability insurance at a certain age is something entirely new, that it is something that is socialistic. As a matter of fact, many insurance companies pay disability insurance at certain ages, even though the insured persons may be younger than 65 years of age. Under the policies of some insurance companies, they pay disability insurance at any age. There is nothing new or socialistic about the proposal in any way. It is a system which has been recognized by insurance companies as far back as I can recall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is simply a better method of protecting against great risks than the method which the majority of the people can obtain for themselves.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say in conclusion that the time is ripe for us to take the next forward step in social security, and to insure against severe, crippling, and long-continued disability for those over 50.

This will be an investment in self-respect. It will not cost much—probably less than one-half of 1 percent of payroll.

Those who object to it are, in the main, those who have opposed each previous step in social security. The fact that their past fears have been proved to be largely groundless should prevent our being frightened by their present claims.

I regret that the administration has seen fit to oppose this proposal.

I regret that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for whom personally I always entertain a high opinion, should have seen fit to appear on the last day of the hearings and to make a very vigorous statement in opposition to the proposal.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I would imagine that if the administration were to succeed in defeating the proposal, assuming the same administration should continue in power for a while longer, the same proposal may be sent down in an administration bill. The administration witnesses testified in such a way that they left the door open so that they could make their own proposal later on, after they had succeeded in defeating the proposal made in a previous Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That may be the politics of the administration, but it is not the politics of the Senator from Illinois. If the administration were to come forward with a proposal to help mankind, I would support it even if it originated with the administration. And I think it is poor policy to oppose a proposal simply because it comes from the Democrats.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois has had outstanding experience to qualify on the subject he is discussing. That is why I am particularly happy to have him as a member of the Finance Committee, which handles social-security matters. However, the Senator from Illinois was not a member of the committee at the time hearings were held on the bill.

I think if the Senator will review the statement of Secretary Hobby last year, when she was Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he will find that she urged that we ought to think about the subject, study it, and mull over it a while, notwithstanding the fact that the subject has been studied for almost 20 years.

The Senator will further find that Secretary Folsom's testimony this time was that we should study the matter, see what experience will yield, and eventually they might consent to doing something like this, although he himself was a member of the very group which studied the matter in 1948. He had 8 years to think about it, after that very group made its recommendation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana has brought to mind some memories of my own, because I was a member of the group set up by the United States Senate and the Social Security Administration in 1938 to study the social-security law. Of course, I was not a Member of this body at that time. Mr. Folsom was a member of the same group with me. I liked him. I still like him very much, as a matter of fact. We held meeting after meeting. We decided to recommend benefits and insurance for survivors; and we debated the question of disability benefits. I do not remember whether he was for them or against them. I know I was for them, although I had great desire to tie them up with rehabilitation and to prevent malingering. This subject has been studied by official bodies for at least 18 years. Secretary Folsom was a member of the 1938 committee, and he was a member of the 1948 committee. In 1948, I was engaged in some other matters—in trying to get elected to this body. So I was not a member of that group. But certainly there has been ample time to study it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator from Illinois was not a member of the 1948 committee, perhaps he would not know about this matter. But my information is that in the 1948 committee, out of a 17-man group, 15 members recommended that the time was ripe, and that disability insurance should then be proceeded with. Mr. Folsom and one other member at that time said it should be thought about and studied longer—although he had been studying it for at least 10 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Illinois remember the name of the other member of the committee who took that position?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it was Albert Linton, then president, and now chairman of the board, I believe, of the Provident Mutual Insurance Co.

Mr. LONG. That is correct. And back in 1948, Mr. Folsom wanted to study the matter further. However, these needy persons will be dead long before the study is completed, if we proceed at the rate Mr. Folsom and others like him have suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say that although I think Mr. Folsom is wrong on this matter, I have known him for almost 30 years, and he is a high-minded person and a rather socially minded person. But he is extremely cautious. If we had to depend on him, I believe that no new steps would be taken during the life of any of us. He will administer very well the programs which have been decided on, but he is never found launching out into bold new programs.

Mr. LONG. The chances are that if we had had to proceed on the basis Mr. Folsom prefers, we never would have had any program such as this one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Illinois for his remarkably fine work in the field of social security. As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has said, the record of the Senator from Illinois in this matter is one of years of study and of great understanding in this area of important social-welfare legislation.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that although Mr. Folsom, for whom I, too, have respect and admiration——

Mr. DOUGLAS. And he is a great improvement over his predecessor in the Office of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, there is no doubt of that. But although Mr. Folsom was engaged in studying and studying, in postgraduate course after postgraduate course, I think one must recognize that Mr. Folsom was not really one of the mainsprings or one of the big wheels in the Republican organization, as such. Mr. Folsom represents the study side of the administration. But the Republican Party never did study this matter. Instead, the Republican Party opposed it, and just said, "No," from the very beginning.

So, really, it is quite a concession from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that he even would say publicly that he is studying these things.

Mr. Folsom is an enlightened man; and I was delighted when he became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. But everyone knows that any program that a department submits to Congress has to be the President's program, and is worked out through the Bureau of the Budget and the White House

organization, with its special assistants and advisers in and out of Government; and Mr. Folsom is doing what the President's program calls for. The President's program in regard to social security is to study, but to oppose lowering to age 62 the eligibility for benefits for women; to study disability; but not to do very much about rehabilitation.

I wish to concur in what my colleagues have said here in regard to rehabilitation. I am interested in this matter, and my record will bear out what I am saying. I have spoken several times in the Senate in advocating the appropriation of funds for rehabilitation work and rehabilitation facilities, and in favoring that one of our public-health laws be amended so as to provide funds for rehabilitation facilities.

One of the best rehabilitation centers in America is located at the Mayo Foundation at the University of Minnesota Medical School. Dr. Kottke is in charge of it, and is associated there with Dr. Frank Krusen, one of the outstanding rehabilitation experts in the country. I have the greatest respect for these two gentlemen. They are friends of mine, and I admire them.

But let me make it crystal clear that—as has been stated here—I have not witnessed any militant effort on the part of the administration or on the part of the medical profession to fortify the rehabilitation programs with the facilities and authorizations and appropriations which are required for this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is quite correct.

Let me say that a good part of Mr. Folsom's niceness can be attributed, I think, to the fact that he grew up in Georgia, and therefore presumably came from Democratic parentage, and thus had a good start in life, and has been traveling for some time on the accumulated moral energy furnished to him by the Democratic Party. However, his basic decency has suffered some erosion from contaminating contact with the present administration. I suggest that on this issue he "get his batteries recharged."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. When it is stated that the Republican Party is opposing this program, attention should be called to the fact that the time element is involved, inasmuch as the Republican Party is not only opposing the program now, but has been opposing it for a great number of years. Not only has the Republican Party for a long time been opposing the proposal to make adequate provisions for those who are disabled, but the majority of the Republican Party has also been fighting proposals to increase the welfare payments to the needy, the blind, and the aged.

The Republican administration has been fighting the proposal to lower the retirement age for women. The administration has been fighting that proposal bitterly, and has been using every device it could to defeat it.

However, I am confident that if the bill is passed, the President will sign it; and then, when he runs for reelection, he will say it is one of the great accomplishments of his administration. I am as sure of that as I am certain that I am now standing on this floor.

I recall that when, 2 years ago, we reduced the excise taxes, the Eisenhower administration resisted that reduction, and did everything it could to prevent it and defeat it. However, Congress passed the bill, notwithstanding the administration's opposition; and then the President signed the bill. That was the only tax reduction made during the Eisenhower administration—out of the entire $7 billion of tax reduction—that did the average workingman any good whatever. But after Congress insisted that that reduction be made, the President began to attempt to take credit for making it.

Since then, whenever we have said that the billions of dollars of tax reduction made under the Republican administration did not help workingmen of the country, some Republican Senator has immediately jumped to his feet and has referred to this excise-tax reduction that the Congress insisted upon, over the opposition of the administration; Republican Senators have said that it was proper for the President to take credit for that reduction in excise taxes, because the President signed the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois recalls very well that situation. He proposed the cut in the tax on household appliances. That proposal was bitterly opposed by the administration but there was a little break in the otherwise solid front on the other side of the aisle, and we succeeded in having that bill passed and enacted into law. But then, when the Senator ran for reelection, he found that in the literature the opposition party distributed, the opposition party claimed credit for itself—for the Republicans—for that reduction in the excise tax on household appliances.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois will recall that when the bill was passed, there was colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota; and even though the bill was then referred to by the Secretary of the Treasury as "fiscal irresponsibility," at that time both of us said—just as the Senator from Louisiana has stated now—that "Now that the bill has been passed, we can be sure that the Republicans will claim it as their own, will pull it to their bosom, will hug it and love it, and will say, 'This is ours.' "

Mr. President, that is exactly what happened—even though prior to that time the attitude of the Republican candidate for the Presidency and the attitude of the Republican Party was consistently one of opposition to everything related to social security; and their position regarding it was entirely one of adverse comment and negative statement and negative approach. They said it was collectivism and socialism and that it would wreck the private insurance companies and would undermine the moral fiber of the people.

But then, all at once—when the program did work, and when it was found that the funds were adequate, and that the program was solvent, and that the benefits were proving to be of help to both individuals and insurance companies, and the national economy—the Republican leadership began to say, "Yes, this is a fine program, something we have been working for for years."

Mr. President, that situation reminds me of a man who refused to acknowledge his parentage of a little boy, and simply had nothing to do with the boy for his first 6 years. Then the boy went to school, and did very well, and then went to high school, where he continued to do very well as a student; and also did very well as an athlete, and made the football team and made the basketball team; and became valedictorian of his class, won a scholarship, and went to college, where he also did very well, made the college football team and made the basketball team, and made "All American," and graduated from college with honors. Then, all at once, out of the catacombs came his father, then on old man, and—although for more than 20 years he had denied being the father of the young man—suddenly said, for the first time, "That's my boy," and pointed to him with pride.

That is what the administration has done in this case. For 20 years the administration opposed this program and used every means at its command to thwart it. But during those 20 years we worked hard and made great sacrifices for the program, and the political bodies of those who fought for it have been piled high, so to speak. But now, all of a sudden, after 20 years of constant opposition to the program, the Republicans step forward—handsome, well dressed, looking affluent——

Mr. DOUGLAS. In fact, they are affluent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed, Mr. President; they are very affluent. [Laughter.] And now the Republicans say—for the first time—"This is a fine program, and it is sound and solvent"—except when something new is tried.

I think it fair to say that if, during all the years which have passed since the early days, it had been necessary to rely upon the Republicans, insofar as determining the shape of the world was concerned, today we would not have round globes to show the shape of the world; but, instead, it would still be said that the world was flat. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say, in reply to the comments of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Minnesota about the reversal of the position of Republicans on social security, that I think we all remember very well the trip which the then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower made to Texas in 1949, when he was entertained by a great many wealthy Texas oilmen. Upon one occasion he made the statement that if anyone wanted social security he should go to jail.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the statement was that if anyone wanted security he should go to jail. However, I believe that statement was generally interpreted

as referring to the social security type of program. It was widely hailed by many vigorous opponents of social security and public welfare as a great statement of principle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I now have a copy of the New York Times article of December 9, 1949, which quotes him as saying, "If all that Americans want is security, they can go to prison. They'll have enough to eat, a bed, and a roof over their heads." Perhaps he should have added, "Or go into the Army."

At the time I felt that that statement was not worthy of the general. Of course, that position has since been reversed. I regret to find the administration opposing the extension of this same principle to the field of disability.

Mr. President, I have only a sentence left to complete my speech.

I may be quite naive, but I simply cannot believe that the spokesmen for the administration really want to shut the gates of mercy on mankind. I hope that this discussion and that which is to follow may serve to change their opinion, and that we may adopt the George amendment by a resounding vote when it comes up.

The matters heretofore referred to are as follows:

ELIGIBILITY FOR DISABILITY

To be eligible for the "freeze" of benefits because of disability the person has to meet two requirements with respect to coverage:

1. He must have 20 quarters of coverage out of the last 40 quarters (5 years out of 10) ending with the quarter in which disability began.

2. He must have 6 quarters of coverage out of the last 13 quarters (1½ years out of 3¼) ending with the quarter in which disability began.

Since the freeze is retroactive, a person whose disability began (as early as the fourth quarter of 1941) 5 years after the effective date of the act (1937) is eligible if he met the two requirements. For example: Mr. A worked in covered employment throughout the years 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941. He is found to have become disabled in December 1941. He meets both requirements as to coverage and is therefore eligible for the freeze of benefits at the level of December 1941.

Mr. B worked in covered employment throughout 1937, 1938, 1940, and 1941. Throughout 1942 and 1943 he was either ill or working in employment that was not covered. He worked again in covered employment throughout 1944, but became disabled at the end of 1944. He had 20 quarters of coverage out of the previous 40, but had only 5 quarters of coverage out of the last 13, and therefore would not be eligible for the disability freeze.

Mr. C worked in covered employment throughout 1940 and 1941. He then had a heart attack which kept him out of work during 1942 and 1943. He recovered sufficiently to return to work throughout 1944 and 1945, but then suffered another heart attack and has not since been able to work. He would have 8 out of the last 13 quarters of coverage, but only 16 out of the last 40, and would therefore not be eligible for the disability freeze.

The same rules would apply at any period. These early examples were used to show how far back the freeze goes.

The requirements for eligibility for disability payments under the House bill are the same as for the present freeze with two additions:

1. Payments do not begin until age 50.

2. The beneficiary must be fully insured.

In both the freeze and the payment plans a 6-month waiting period is required.

Fully insured status may be acquired by having 40 quarters (10 years) of coverage or by having one quarter of coverage for each two quarters elapsing after 1950 or after the quarter in which the individual became 21 years of age, in other words coverage for half of the time. (The quarters of coverage may be acquired either before or after 1950.) Fully insured status can also be acquired by being covered in every quarter elapsing after 1954. In all cases a minimum of six quarters of coverage is required for an individual to be fully insured. Any person who is fully insured at the time he is determined to be eligible for the disability freeze has his fully insured status frozen, and at age 50 he would be eligible for disability payments.

Until 1961, any person who met the 20 quarters (5 years) of coverage requirement for disability payments or the freeze would automatically meet the fully insured requirement of coverage for half the time elapsing after 1950. Therefore all persons currently under the freeze (with an exception noted below) would be eligible for payments at age 50.

For example: Mr. D incurs a disability in December 1960, after working 5 years in covered employment. He meets the requirements for the freeze and he is fully insured because he was covered for 5 of the 10 years elapsing after 1950. He would therefore be eligible for disability payments at age 50.

Beginning with 1961, and until 1971, one additional quarter of coverage for each two quarters of elapsed time would be required in order to be fully insured. Beginning with 1971, 10 years of coverage would be required in order to be fully insured.

For example: Mr. E becomes disabled in 1966, after 6 years of covered employment. He would be eligible for the freeze, which would preserve his benefits until he was age 65, but he would not be eligible for disability payments at age 50 because he was not fully insured—he had only 6 years of coverage but needed 7½ to be fully insured (one-half of the 15 years elapsing after 1950). By 1971, and thereafter, he would need 10 years of coverage.

In the case of younger people, the requirement of coverage for one-half of the time elapsing after they became 21 years of age would apply. Thus, any person who acquired 5 years of coverage and became disabled before he was 31 years of age would be fully insured and eligible for payments at age 50. For example: Mr. F becomes disabled in 1980, at the age of 30, after working in covered employment throughout 1957–59. He is eligible for the freeze and is fully insured, having been covered for more than half of the time elapsing after he became 21. He would be eligible for disability payments at age 50.

However, if the disability did not occur until he was 41, he would need 10 years of coverage (one-half of the 20 years elapsing after he was 21) in order to be fully insured.

NOTE.—There is one small group of people under the freeze who would not automatically qualify for payments. The act defines blindness and makes this a disability for purposes of the freeze. However, to receive disability payments a blind person must demonstrate inability to engage in substantial gainful employment as must all others.

In 1950 and in 1954 amendments were adopted to the Social Security Act which substantially expanded coverage. Those people taken in under the amendments of 1950 become eligible for the disability freeze, and subsequently for payments, if they became disabled during the last quarter of 1955—that is the earliest date at which they could have acquired 5 years of coverage. For those taken in under the amendments of 1954, the earliest date at which they could become eligible is the last quarter of 1959.

The total number of workers in covered employment for selected years follows:

1940	35,393,000
1941	40,976,000
1946	48,845,000
1950	48,283,000
1951 (due to amendments of 1950)	53,100,000
1952	59,600,000
1953	61,000,000
1954	60,000,000
1956 (estimated) (due to amendments of 1954)	69,000,000

MEDICAL RELATIONS IN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION: A GUIDE FOR THE EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRESSIVE PROGRAM BY THE MEDICAL PROFESSION

(Adoption by house of delegates, December 1955)

FOREWORD

Since its inception the Council on Industrial Health has maintained an active interest in workmen's compensation. In recent years a series of studies has made it clear that there is widespread dissatisfaction with current policies, programs and procedures. Those studies with special emphasis on medical aspects strongly suggest that present-day laws have not kept pace with advances in professional skill, technical knowledge and with substantial alterations in the political and socio-economic milieu. Official actions by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, requests for assistance from State medical societies, and information developed through the council's own investigations have demonstrated a need for a guide by which physicians, individually and as organizations, can reassess their proper role in this important sphere of medical service.

In formulating these guides, thoughtful consideration has been given to the views of recognized authorities and to representatives of many agencies whose interests are closely identified with workmen's compensation. Of special value was the session on workmen's compensation at the 15th Annual Congress on Industrial Health in January 1955. At that time statements on the essentials and goals of a modern program were presented by spokesmen for labor, industry, law, medicine, and administrative bodies. The Council on Industrial Health acknowledges with sincere appreciation assistance and encouragement received from these sources.

The preparation of this report has been the work of the Council's Committee on Workmen's Compensation and Rehabilitation made up of the following members: Drs. Henry H. Kessler, chairman, Newark, N. J.; Lloyd E. Hamlin, Chicago; Rutherford T. Johnstone, Los Angeles; E. S. Jones, Hammond, Ind.; and O. A. Sander, Milwaukee. Special thanks are due to Earl D. Cheit, St. Louis; Bernard Hirsh, law department, Chicago; James J. Reid, Columbia, S. C.; and Herman M. Somers, Haverford, Pa.; consultants who participated actively in the various stages of investigation and preparation.

THE MEDICAL PROFESSION'S INTEREST IN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

The workmen's compensation program in the United States was adopted primarily to meet certain needs of employees or their survivors resulting from disability or death of an employee arising out of and in the course of employment. In general, the program sought to remedy inadequacies stemming from common law and employers' liability statutes by providing laws based upon the principle of insured liability without regard to fault on the part of either employee or employer. Of primary concern was the provision of cash payments to replace a portion of wages lost by disabled employees. Little or no consideration was given to the

provision of medical care for occupational disabilities. Under the Federal, State, and Territorial laws enacted between 1911 and 1948, the major emphasis of the various systems and their administration has continued to be on monetary satisfaction of liability, with insufficient attention given to the rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled.

Substantial progress has been made in the extension of medical care, the application of improved clinical techniques and other aspects of the rehabilitation process, including vocational training and selective placement of the disabled in kinds of work suited to physical and emotional capacity. It is a matter of great and growing concern that a considerable gap exists between potential services to the occupationally disabled and what is actually available to them.

In any event, many physicians have been deterred from widespread and active participation in workmen's compensation affairs. They are largely unaware of the significance of medical and economic policies under these laws and the undesirable and often harmful effects of existing systems. Whatever the causes the attitude has been short-sighted and unwise to the end that not only workmen's compensation laws but other similar laws in related fields of social security are and have been formulated largely without medical consultation or any clear identification of medicine's primary interest. The predominance which economic considerations have come to occupy in both the professional and administrative aspects of workmen's compensation is a natural consequence. These same considerations have led to a concentration of professional services and responsibility in a few and not always the best hands. The Council's studies and others call attention to the need for critical appraisal of medicine's past record of performance and its present opportunities for the implementation of new and creative concepts (1).

The Council on Industrial Health is convinced through its consideration of the findings in this report that physicians have a duty and responsibility, both as members of professional organizations and as citizens in an industrial society, to improve the lot of the occupationally disabled. The several recommendations contained herein are presented with that purpose in mind.

GOALS OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

The basic goals of workmen's compensation today are:

1. Rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled;

2. Assured, prompt and adequate indemnity for the occupationally disabled or their survivors;

3. Minimal cost to employers and society commensurate with the above provisions.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE GOALS

The essential elements in the implementation of these goals from the medical point of view are described in the following sections of this report. Actually, sustained cooperative effort by all individuals and groups concerned with the welfare of the occupationally disabled are essential to success.

REHABILITATION OF THE OCCUPATIONALLY DISABLED

Rehabilitation implies the effective use of all disciplines and skills dedicated to the conquest of disability. Aside from great benefit to the disabled, their families and to society, current experience has amply demonstrated that the provision of rehabilitation services results in substantial savings in both medical and indemnity costs, just as the development of medical care provisions has resulted in savings in indemnity payments.

The establishment of workable rehabilitation programs calls for specific statutory provision; planned and improved cooperation from the medical profession; and intelligent, forceful administrative supervision.

1. Statutory provision. Periodically, workmen's compensation legislation and rulings come up for review. To implement a proper rehabilitation program the medical profession should seek adoption of statutory provisions that recognize these points:

(a) Rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled is the intent and responsibility of the compensation system and the legal right of the employee.

(b) The disabled employee is entitled to all services, appliances and supplies required by the nature of his disability or the process of his recovery and that will promote his restoration to or his continuance in employment. Services include medical, surgical, dental, hospital, and nursing attendance and treatment, as well as the training necessary to rehabilitation. Appliances and supplies include medicines; medical, surgical and dental supplies; crutches; artificial members; and apparatus. Services, appliances and supplies are to be paid for by the employer under the supervision of competent professionals responsible to the administrative agency.

(c) In the absence of stipulated agreements, professional fees should approximate those that would be charged the employee as a private patient for similar services.

(d) Disabled employees should have the right to accept physicians' services provided by employers, or to select another attending physician from a register of all other physicians in the community willing and qualified to perform the essential services (2).

(e) Vocational counseling, training, transitional employment and placement services require prompt analysis of problems, efficient screening, and referral and follow-up techniques to assure proper training and results. Effective supervision of these services in public or private facilities requires prompt reporting of occupational disabilities to the administrative agency.

(f) When necessary administrative procedures for such a system of rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled do not exist, or when adequate facilities are not readily available, steps should be taken to provide them.

2. Planned cooperation from the medical profession: Successful operation of a workmen's compensation system depends increasingly upon the medical profession. Although the administrative agency has the ultimate responsibility by law, medical care is the core of the system and physicians play a major role.

Every year hundreds of thousands of the occupationally disabled depend upon physicians for care and guidance from the beginning of disability until they return to gainful employment and even beyond. Physicians are also responsible indirectly for the payment of a substantial portion of their patients' income during disability. Compensation payments amounting to many millions of dollars annually are based upon reports and, in disputed cases, upon testimony provided by physicians.

The medical profession in each workmen's compensation jurisdiction can best fulfill its responsibilities by providing a broadly representative committee to advise the administrative agency on medical policies and practices and to assist in the operation of the systems in the following ways (2):

(a) The committee should prepare and submit at stated intervals to the administrative agency appropriate information for its use in establishing a register of physicians who are willing and competent to accept calls for services to the occupationally disabled. Regulations governing enrollment on the physicians' register should be established by the administrative agency after consultation with the medical advisory committee.

(b) It should mediate, if possible, complaints that a physician has neglected or refused to furnish reasonably necessary reports in accordance with general orders of the administrative agency.

(c) It should mediate, if possible, complaints of unreasonable interference with matters properly within the discretion and control of the attending physician.

(d) It should mediate, if possible, differences that may arise relative to remuneration.

(e) Claims of violation of medical ethics should be reviewed and relevant facts referred to the appropriate agency.

(f) Complaints should be heard about the competency of those serving on the physicians' register and recommendations made to the administrative agency concerning the removal of names therefrom, if complaints are justified.

If the advisory committee is unable to function promptly, the administrative agency should take appropriate action within the powers vested in it by law.

The medical profession should join with the administrative agency in sponsoring educational programs for all concerned on clinical and administrative problems in the compensation system. Other joint activities should include the development of proper medical report forms, desirable legislation to improve the workmen's compensation system and its administration, and handbooks for physicians.

3. Role of individual physician: The primary obligation of the individual physician is to see that his patient is restored as nearly as possible to the economic and personal effectiveness which he possessed before he was disabled. This requires not only competent and impartial medical care but also that the physician use or recommend the use of other technical skills and resources available, whether in the community or not.

Physicians who wish to receive calls for service to the occupationally disabled should be prepared to assume duties and obligations which are not encountered in private practice. The best interests of the disabled patient will be served in the following ways:

(a) Concise, accurate information and reports descriptive of the disability should be furnished promptly and to the same extent to the patient or his dependents, the employer, the workmen's compensation insurance carrier and the administrative agency.

(b) Testimony should be given before the administrative agency upon reasonable notice. The physician's testimony must adhere to reasonable scientific deductions regarding the injury, disease, or possible sequelae to the end that every deserving claim receives just consideration.

(c) Consultation should be requested in case of serious illness, especially in doubtful or difficult conditions, and agreement given for consultation with mutually acceptable physicians when requested by one of the interested parties. Effective rehabilitation goes beyond accurate diagnosis and expert treatment. Although the attending physician should remain in charge, he must embrace the modern concept of teamwork in the rehabilitation process. Physicians should not only cooperate with each other but also collaborate with the whole team of paramedical workers to assure maximum rehabilitation.

(d) Determination should be made by scientific methods and upon the basis of objective measurable factors of the permanent anatomic or functional impairment of a specific member or of his patient as a whole as compared to normal. From the medical standpoint, permanent anatomic or functional impairments cannot vary because of geographic locations or circumstances under which they were incurred. Therefore, the physician should determine the percentage of permanent impairment without regard to age, sex, occupation or real, presumed or potential wage loss. The application of these and all other factors provided by law to the

percentage of permanent impairment established by the physician is the responsibility of the administrative agency in determining the indemnity award. In general, physicians are no more qualified by experience or training to evaluate such factors than any other disinterested individual.

4. Administrative supervision: Rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled requires a competent administrative agency with full statutory authority and responsibility.

The administrative agency must have more than adjudication and appeals functions; it must have an affirmative duty to see that the intent of the law is carried out. It may delegate functions, but it cannot abdicate responsibility. Proper discharge of this trust requires adequate resources in terms of qualified, permanent, professional personnel and proper facilities.

Duties should include supervision of the rehabilitation process and indemnity payments for permanent disability during and following the maximum rehabilitation of the disabled employee.

To assist in the administration of the law, the agency should seek the advice and active cooperation of appropriate professional, private and public organizations.

The administrative agency should have a medical director, approved by the medical profession, and a qualified vocational counselor. As staff officers, they should be in charge of the administration of appropriate provisions related to the rehabilitation of the occupationally disabled and should participate in such policymaking deliberations of the agency. They should have the full support of their superiors and constantly strive to provide leadership and promote effective professional relations in their fields through the maintenance of approved professional standards and practices.

INDEMNITY

The physician's interest involves recognition that the amount and method of indemnification have a direct and important bearing on an effective rehabilitation regime. While overgenerous indemnity can dull the will for rehabilitation, inadequate indemnity requirements can destroy an employer's incentive to support rehabilitation by providing him with an easier or cheaper alternative. More important, inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale or force return to gainful employment in advance of clear-cut medical indications.

In view of these relationships, it is consistent for the medical profession to support methods of indemnification which contribute to, rather than obstruct, rehabilitation procedures. Certain factors merit consideration:

1. Inadequate cash indemnity encourages "lump-summing" of payments, which tends to interfere with rehabilitation motivations. The practice should, therefore, be limited to instances where dependable evidence supports the contention that such a payment would contribute to the overall rehabilitation of the employee. Problems of paying for legal, medical, and other services should not influence the determination of whether a lump sum should be allowed.

2. Workmen's compensation is not a relief program. It is the proper intent of the program that a disabled employee and his family should not suffer a serious reduction in normal living standards during the rehabilitation period. This requires that the benefit level be maintained at an adequate percentage of usual wage and include reasonable personal expenses incurred by the employee in the course of the rehabilitation process.

3. Effective rehabilitation can drastically reduce the number of permanently disabled employees which now constitutes the heaviest burden on workmen's compensation systems. Physicians interested in a rehabilitation program acceptable to permanently disabled employees recognize that attempts to relate indemnity payments solely to loss of earnings is impractical and unscientific. While it is not the purpose of workmen's compensation to indemnify all individual consequences of a disability, such as pain, suffering, and humiliation, the employee's right to personal effectiveness is not confined to employment or a limited period of time. Personal motivation to maximum rehabilitation can be hindered by complete deprivation of indemnity for permanent anatomic or functional impairment, whether it be a member or an organ of the body. Therefore, indemnity for permanent disability should be related to the employee's permanent impairment of earning capacity—in effect the anatomic and functional handicap incurred in working for a given employer. Maximum rehabilitation should be encouraged, and to this end the award for permanent disability should be based upon the effect of such a handicap on the earning capacity of the average employee so as not to penalize a disabled employee for exercising individual initiative.

4. The administrative agency should have continuing jurisdiction of these cases and indemnity payments should be subject to review whenever evidence is clear that the original evaluation of permanent impairment of earning capacity was in error.

5. Various methods of compensating employees with preexisting permanent impairments have been devised. Most commonly the impairments must involve loss of a member that, combined with a subsequent injury, results in permanent total disability. In these cases liability is apportioned generally between the employer at the time of subsequent injury and a State fund established for this purpose. In recent years increasing consideration has been given to cases where the preexisting condition is an organic disease that, combined with a subsequent injury, results in increased or total permanent disability. While the medical complexities alone of this problem are apparent, intensive study is currently being given to the equitable resolution of the whole problem when:

(a) Further decrease in earning capacity or death of these employees can be clearly established on the basis of responsible scientific knowledge to be casually related to their employment; and

(b) Such casual relationship cannot be so established.

CONCLUSION

The Council on Industrial Health wishes to emphasize again the importance of participation by physicians, individually and collectively, in a critical appraisal of medicine's past performance and its present opportunities for the implementation of new and creative concepts in workmen's compensation. Requests for additional information and assistance should be addressed to the Council on Industrial Health, American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago 10, Ill.

REFERENCES

1. Operating Principles for a Modern Workmen's Compensation System (Bull. Am. Coll. Surgeons 40:57, January-February 1955). Medical Relations Under Workmen's Compensation in Illinois, Monmouth, Ill. Illinois State Medical Society, Committee on Industrial Health, 1953.

2. Physicians and the Workmen's Compensation Act, Wisconsin (M. J. 54: 77, January 1955; Agreement on Panel Practice (ibid. 54: 84) January 1955).

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Senate now has before it for action a measure that is of greater and more immediate significance to millions of Americans than any other that may be acted upon by this Congress—the proposed amendments to the Social Security Act. The most important of the amendments that will be considered would provide for the payment of benefits to persons at the age of 50 who become totally and permanently disabled and would reduce the retirement age for women from age 65 to age 62.

These provisions, which were the key features of the bill (H. R. 7225) passed by the House last year by a very large majority, were deleted by the conservative majority in the Senate Finance Committee. We deeply appreciate the effort led by members of this same committee to restore these provisions on the floor of the Senate. It is now up to the Members of the Senate as a whole to demonstrate their concern for the welfare of disabled workers, older workers and their wives and of workingwomen who suffer discrimination in the search for employment because of their age, by voting to restore these vital provisions to the Senate bill. This is the most important, and perhaps the only, opportunity that Senators will have this year to record themselves for or against a step toward the fulfillment of the modest hopes and most pressing needs of this deserving group of citizens. Millions of Americans will be watching the outcome with keen personal interest.

We strongly urge each Member of the Senate to record himself on the human side of this issue by voting to restore the disability benefit feature and the reduced retirement age for women to the bill that is now before that body.

We continue also our full support of the increased contribution rate necessary to keep social security soundly financed when these increased benefits are provided.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that I may request consideration and confirmation of some Republican postmaster nominations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. I would ask that the proceedings in connection with the executive session be printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may yield to me, in order that I may request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar; and with the understanding that the proceedings in that connection shall be printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from Illinois; and with the further understanding that he will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

David A. Hamil, of Colorado, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, vice Ancher Nelsen, resigned; and

Glen A. Boger, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William G. Juergens, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Fred L. Wham, retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, out of order, I introduce and send to the desk a bill to amend Public Law 285 of the 84th Congress, H. R. 6382 of last year. The purpose of the new bill is to correct legislation heretofore enacted by the Congress by amending it so as to carry out the actual intent of the Congress last year. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4094) amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to reductions in certain Federal income and excess profits taxes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will recall that we passed legislation amending the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was aware of the fact that if tax benefits are added to the benefits under the bill as written, it would be possible for some large corporate claimants to receive more in total benefits than was actually lost abroad. At the same time some of the smaller claimants would not receive anywhere near the amount of money they lost in foreign countries. To correct this patently unfair and unsought-for effect, the Senate committee adopted an amendment which I introduced. The Senate saw fit to accept the amendment and it went with the bill to conference.

During our meetings the conference committee, of which I was a member, was informed by representatives of the Internal Revenue Service that the Senate's interpretation of the bill as it related to existing tax law was inaccurate. We were told that in fact it would not be possible for large corporate claimants to receive an amount larger than their actual loss by virtue of the operations of our tax laws. On the strength of those representations by the Internal Revenue Service, the conference committee agreed to drop the Senate amendment.

It is now unmistakably clear that the conference committee on H. R. 6382 was misinformed by an official of the Internal Revenue Service. I am sure it was not intentionally misinformed, but there was some misunderstanding or some erroneous information. I am certain that the erroneous information was provided us unwittingly and that it was not the intent of the Department to mislead the Congress. The Department now seems to agree, however, that the information given to the conference committee was in error.

On February 25, 1956, I wrote to Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey outlining the situation and asking for his help in considering appropriate remedial legislation. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 25, 1956.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY HUMPHREY: During the first session of the 84th Congress we enacted into law a bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. That bill is now Public Law 285.

While the bill was under consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I became interested in certain problems created by the fact that the total amount of claims will greatly exceed the amount of money available to pay them. It would seem, in particular, that claimants against the Ungarian Fund will receive compensation of less than 10 percent of their losses. As now written, however, the law fails to distinguish between the claimant who still bears the full burden of his loss and the claimant who may have cut his loss through a tax deduction by up to 92 percent. It was also called to my attention that as the law is now written some large corporate claimants may, if their net compensation under Public Law 285 is added to their tax benefits, receive more in benefits than they actually lost.

In the light of the foregoing I proposed an amendment which was adopted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was passed by the Senate. It was, however, eliminated in conference. While a number of objections to the amendment were considered, I must say, in all candor, that an important factor in the rejection of my amendment was certain incorrect information supplied to the conference committee by the Internal Revenue Service. I am sure that this error was made inadvertently and resulted from the great pressure under which all of us were working during the closing days of the session.

When the conference report was adopted by the Senate, I announced that I expected to raise this question again at the second session and it is my full intention to do so. I still feel that a claims compensation program which pays compensation of less than 10 percent is hardly worth its name. Such a program is particularly objectionable if it closes its eyes to the fact that some claimants may have written off their losses while others have not.

I am not oblivious to the fact that my amendment raises certain administrative problems for your Department. I believe, however, that these problems can easily be minimized or entirely eliminated without affecting the basic purpose of the proposal. I think, therefore, that it would be helpful that my office consult with an official of your Department for the purpose of preparing appropriate language to carry out that objective. I would like to ask you, therefore, to designate such an official, who could meet with my counsel, Mr. Thomas L. Hughes, for the purpose of preparing the amendment.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is with great pleasure that I inform the Senate that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and the officials of the Treasury Department have responded to this set of events in a spirit of complete cooperation. Following that letter, a series of staff conferences have taken place which resulted in the Department furnishing me with a memorandum explaining the tax provisions which govern the bill passed by us. That memorandum fully agrees with my own understanding of the law as I expressed it to the Senate and to the conference committee last year. It proves the information given the conference committee by the Internal Revenue Service to be incorrect.

As a result of the cooperation by Treasury officials, a bill has been prepared which is readily acceptable to both the Treasury Department officials and to me. It is the bill which I have just sent to the desk. It would cure the defect which the Senate tried to correct last year and which the House of Representatives undoubtedly would wish to have corrected had we been furnished with accurate information in the conference committee.

I am pleased that a mutually agreeable approach has been reached on this matter, and I urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to take speedy action on this bill so that it may be enacted into law during the current session.

PROGRESS OF CONFERENCE ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that I have been informed that the conferees have reached an agreement on the Federal-aid highway bill. I should like Senators to be on notice that there is a possibility that the conference report may be submitted to the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not wish to misinform Senators as to the status of the road bill. We have agreed in principle in conference on every item. However, a meeting is scheduled for tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock to discuss certain language in the bill in which every member of the conference committee is interested. I am pretty sure that the conferees will be able to report tomorrow.

DEFINITION AND STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF CERTAIN DRY MILK SOLIDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1614) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids", title 21, United States Code, section 321c, which were on page 1, line 3, strike out "numbered"; on page 1, line 7, strike out "for" and insert "that for"; and on page 2, strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert:

The term "milk" when used herein means sweet milk of cows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. Let me explain that the House amendments are technical and clerical. They are a matter of drafting. They make no substantive change whatever in the bill. The purpose of the amendments is clarification.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Is this a House bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it is a Senate bill. The bill was passed by the Senate, and the House accepted the Senate bill, but the drafting clerk of the House used different language. The amendments are clarifying, and are not substantive in nature.

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

The motion was agreed to.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S SCIENCE ATTACHÉ PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently had occasion to comment on the Senate floor about the deterioration of the State Department's science attaché program. In the May 1956, issue of Geological Newsletter, issued by the American Geological Institute, an editorial was devoted to this subject.

The American Geological Institute is also, of course, greatly interested in the State Department's corps of mineral attachés. Critics have recently pointed out too, Mr. President, that in this field as well the distribution of the attachés is very sparse and bears very little relationship to our dependence on foreign mineral resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Geological Newsletter appear at this point in my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES RECALLS SCIENCE AIDS

To be commended is President Eisenhower's move to establish on April 3 a National Committee for the Development of Scientists and Engineers. A group of outstanding Americans have been appointed to serve on this Committee. The National Foundation is to provide the President's Committee with staff services under the direction of Robert L. Clark as Executive Secretary. The Committee is charged with the task of stimulating greater educational efforts in the training of scientists and engineers to meet the ever-increasing demands of the modern era and to encourage a better understanding of science and technology by the general public.

To be condemned is the extreme shortsightedness of the President's United States Department of State for its policy with regard to science attachés. In mid-1952 the State Department had the impressive total of 10 science attachés in foreign service scattered sparsely among its many embassies and consulates. By January 1956 all science attachés had been recalled, so that at the present time the United States overseas arm has its scientific head in the sand. Furthermore, indications are that no effort is planned to remedy the situation. To make matters still worse, many of our top scientists feel that international travel restrictions imposed by the United States are curbing our advancement of science and technology.

The State Department is equally deficient in another area—that of mineral attachés. Despite the fact that our prosperity and future security are contingent upon vital supplies of minerals, such as oil, manganese, chrome, and many others, our policymakers continue to shape our future course abroad without the benefit of observation and interpretation by staff career men with mining and petroleum backgrounds. We have only five mineral attachés abroad today. It cannot be disputed that mineral endowment is a major factor in the destiny of any nation and that our highly industrialized economy would languish without the flow of ores and minerals from many sectors of the globe. Is it unrealistic to propose a well-trained corps of mineral specialists as foreign-service career officers to provide continuing mineral surveillance abroad for the United States, which in 1952 imported nearly $2 billion in mineral raw materials?

The apathy of our United States Department of State toward science is a matter of grave concern. The tremendous surge of the Soviets in the education of scientists and technologists has been much publicized. One prominent American scientist has pointed out the real danger of a Russian scientist surplus that can be exported to spread a scientific intelligence network throughout the world. The growing number of Russian scientists and technologists cannot be denied and we can ill afford to speculate disparagingly concerning their scientific abilities.

It could be that the State Department lacks confidence in its own abilities to delineate programs for and the staffing of worldwide corps of scientific and mineral attachés. Many scientists would hasten to agree. The State Department could scarcely do better than to seek the recommendations of scientists themselves. The National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, in its independent position, detached from government and political pressures, is able to call on the best scientific resources of our Nation to address these vital problems.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I present the editorial in the hope that the State Department will read the RECORD, because the program of scientific attachés has practically come to a dead stop. The number involved today is so few that for all practical purposes there is no program. It seems to me that at a time when there is serious concern in our Nation about the technical and scientific training of large numbers of scientists and technicians in the Soviet Union, it might be very well for our State Department to give friendly consideration to the advice and counsel of distinguished editors, publishers, and scientists.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

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

THE ILO FORCED LABOR ISSUE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of Senators an editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times. I shall not ask to have it reprinted.

I also invite attention to a news story which has appeared in the American press in the past 2 days, from Geneva, Switzerland. The news story and editorial relate to the ILO conference which is taking place there, and the unbelievable spectacle the representatives of our country are affording, when, instead of spearheading the efforts to outlaw forced labor, they are advocating halfhearted measures.

Mr. President, those of us who have been concerned about the administration's foot-dragging on the ILO forced labor issue can now take cold comfort that our fears seem to have been well founded. The New York Times this morning contains a dispatch from Geneva pointing out the Soviet Government is taking the lead at the ILO conference to promote a convention that will "outlaw forced labor in all its forms and anywhere."

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SOVIET RUSE SEEN ON FORCED LABOR—DELEGATES TO I. L. O. PARLEY NOTE MOSCOW MANEUVERS TO EMBARRASS THE WEST

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, June 18—The Soviet Union has tried to grab the ball from the Western Governments and trade unions on the forced labor issue in the International Labor Organization.

The essentially simple Soviet tactics were revealed today in a committee of the international labor conference in which the long process of working out a convention to outlaw forced labor is geting under way.

One delegate said the Soviet delegates clearly intended to try to get such extreme amendments into the draft convention that hardly any non-Communist Government could ratify it. If they succeed, they will be able to earn credit throughout the world by being in favor of the convention while the main western governments oppose it.

If they fail, they easily can oppose the convention as being inadequate, not going far enough and being a mere screen to hide the bad practices of the colonial and capitalist nations.

BROAD PROHIBITION URGED

Today, for instance, Amazasp Arutiunian, Soviet Government delegate, urged the committee to insert in the preamble to the main operative article of the convention that forced labor should be outlawed "in all its forms and anywhere."

He introduced these words as an amendment to an amendment of the workers' group, that would put into the preamble a reference to human rights and the United Nations Charter—an amendment to which no one objected.

The Russian language of the amendment would clearly outlaw prison labor, which in many countries is regarded as a progressive penal practice.

The effect was that the Soviet delegates spent the afternoon as the champions of a really sweeping abolition of forced labor while western government, employer and labor spokesmen argued for limiting the scope of the convention to what could be expected to be adopted in practice.

Neither this nor any other Soviet amendment was adopted. However, on one vote the Soviet delegates lacked only one vote of a majority and succeeded in splitting, and embarrassing, the workers' group which previously had adopted a group position against the Soviet proposals.

UNITED STATES PLAN MAKES LITTLE GAIN

The United States Government delegation does not seem to be making much progress in its effort to have the organization adopt a convention with alternative operative clauses so that the United States could ratify it without raising a constitutional issue on the use of treaty powers to establish labor standards within the United States.

The United States Government delegation has proposed language that would enable a country to get credit for having ratified the convention if it agreed only to prevent the movement into international trade of goods made with forced labor.

The texts submitted by the United States Government delegation have not been debated in full committee. However, it is clear that the worker delegations, including those from the United States, do not think the United States Government plan goes far enough toward outlawing forced labor. Even the Australian Government, which also has a problem of federal-state division of authority, regards the United States Government delegation's position as essentially an evasion of the issue.

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions announced today it was challenging the credentials of the workers' delegates sent from Spain and Rumania. J. H. Oldenbroek, secretary general of the confederation, said at a news conference that neither delegation had been chosen truly by workers. In both cases they really represent Governments, he said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This dispatch says that the effect yesterday "was that the Soviet delegates spent the afternoon as the champions of a really sweeping abolition of forced labor while western government, employer and labor spokesmen argued for limiting the scope of the convention to what could be expected to be adopted in practice."

The article goes on to say:

The United States Government delegation does not seem to be making much progress in its effort to have the organization adopt a convention with alternative operative clauses so that the United States could ratify it without raising a constitutional issue on the use of treaty powers to establish labor standards within the United States * * * it is clear that the worker delegations, including those from the United States, do not think the United States Government plan goes far enough toward outlawing forced labor. Even the Australian Government, which also has a problem of Federal-State division of authority, regards the United States Government delegations' position as essentially an evasion of the issue.

I agree, Mr. President, that the official American position is an evasion of the issue. I felt so last January when I introduced my resolution calling for the administration to take the lead in adopting a convention aimed at effectively outlawing forced labor. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate Labor Committee, now that hearings have been concluded on this resolution, will still see fit to adopt Senate Resolution 248, already favorably recommended by the appropriate subcommittee. Even at this late date we still have an opportunity to indicate to the world that the United States Senate does not support the pettifogging position of the State Department.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the Senator's remarks. It is very disturbing to me that in the year 1956 my Government should not be taking an unequivocal stand on the question of slave labor, not only with respect to the convention the Senator from Minnesota has referred to, but in respect also to aid to certain foreign nations into which American taxpayers' dollars are going, when we know that slave labor exists in those States. For instance, Mr. President, we are pouring money into Saudi Arabia when we know that human beings are sold on a slave market in that country.

I believe it is about time our Government started to keep faith with our professed ideals. The State Deraptment, however, is walking out on our ideals when it comes to slave labor. It is about time for America to stand up and be counted among the nations of the world and in the councils of the world on the question of slave labor, but instead the State Department ducks the issue.

I hope the American people will keep in mind that we have a "ducking" State Department, and that it is about time the Secretary of State be "ducked" and "dumped," because of his failure to keep faith with the ideal of America on this great human issue.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that it is a disgrace. When we say that, in my opinion, we have uttered the most devastating criticism that can be made against the State Department. It is acting in a disgraceful fashion on this great issue of human values.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon. He has studied the ILO charter, and he is familiar with the workings of the ILO, and he knows the provisions of the ILO constitution. He knows that it contains a separate article regarding our type of constitutional structure and Federal-State relationship as they relate to conventions of the type now being proposed by the ILO conference.

There is no treaty problem involved. There is no constitutional problem involved. The only problem involved is a recalcitrant attitude, and the attitude of halfhearted measures and halfhearted words which are being indulged in by representatives of our Government.

I can surely sympathize with our labor representatives at ILO, when they realize that the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization voted its unequivocal opposition to forced labor and has asked for an international convention to declare it illegal and to outlaw it.

We, the great champion of democracy in the world, stand literally paralyzed by legalism, which no one seems to understand, including the lawyers in the State Department. Even a nonlawyer like myself is able to answer the arguments of the lawyers in the State Department. When that happens, I suggest that their case must be rather poor.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very fine editorial published in the Dalles Optimist of June 7, 1956.

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

STORAGE RESERVOIRS THE ULTIMATE ANSWER

The other night at the city council meeting, Councilman John H. Skirving introduced a resolution calling for strengthening by the United States Army engineers of the Dalles dike, "in the most vigorous language possible." The resolution was ordered adopted by the council.

There is nothing that so sharpens the recognition of the peril that exists from year to year for the communities which are adjacent to the Columbia River as a flood such as the one which has been descending this great river of the West this year.

Little damage has resulted here this year from the high water, though the city and county will have some costs to pay for sandbagging and pumping of seepage water. Heavy damages have resulted, however, on the lower river.

If we didn't experience a flood such as the one this year from time to time, however our people would soon forget all the hazards of floods, and when another 1894, or even a 1948, came along, it would be too late.

What is needed and needed at once is either a better dike here or a bypass route through the city along the waterfront which will serve the double purpose of dike and freeway for movement of through traffic.

Years away is the full control of the river brought about primarily by storage dams on the headwaters. Political considerations, and opposition by fishermen, private power interests, and others all enter into such a

public program on a vast scale, and it is unlikely this control plan will ever be adopted in its entirety.

In Portland this week Gen. L. H. Foote, North Pacific division engineer, made some interesting comments. Here are some of his views:

Floods aren't necessary. They can be controlled within reason. The flood of 1956 would have ranked next to the flood of 1948 if existing reservoirs along the United States portion of the Columbia and its tributaries had not been used to reduce the peak flow.

The crest was cut about 2 feet. Without Grand Coulee and other dams, the crest would have exceeded the 28.2-foot level at which Smith Lake broke suddenly through the S. P. & S. Railway fill on Memorial Day, 1948, smashing the city of Vanport. It would have been the third worst flood in the history of the river.

The Columbia crested at Vancouver, Wash., at high noon, June 13, 1948, at 30.2 feet (29.9 at Portland). Had all the present resources of the river, including existing reservoir capacity at Grand Coulee, been used in 1948, the crest could have been held down 1¾ to 2 feet.

Peak flow of the Columbia at The Dalles in 1948 was 1,010,000 cubic feet per second on May 31. This peak outpouring of snow and rain water has been exceeded only once in history, June 7, 1894, when 1,240,000 cubic feet per second flowed past The Dalles, raising the river at Portland to 33 feet. (No data was kept on Vancouver at that time.)

The 1894 flood, highest crest—although not the greatest runoff—in history, could have been cut down by 2 feet by full use of all the 4,900,000 acre-feet of storage now available on the river, General Foote points out.

The engineers could pull the teeth of Old Man River almost completely. They have a plan for dams to provide 20,900,000 acre-feet of storage which could cut the flow of the river in a flood of 1894 proportions down to 800,000 cubic feet per second at The Dalles. That would cut the crest at Vancouver by 7.7 feet.

The worst flood in history could be cut down to dike size—about 25 feet—if all the dams proposed were constructed to the heights proposed.

Would it be worth the cost? The cost of the program has not been estimated, but General Foote estimates a flood of 1894 proportions under present conditions would approximate $300 million damage on the lower Columbia River.

To achieve practical flood control would require construction of the following dams:

The high dam at Hells Canyon, 2,600,000 acre-feet; Payette River, increased by 300,000; John Day, 1,400,000; Priest Rapids, 2,100,000; Libby Dam, 3,900,000; Glacier View, 1,800,000, and increase of 3,900,000 acre-feet of storage at Grand Coulee by installation of new gates would operate under high pressure, and by upriver storage from new dams.

These projects, together with 4,690,000 acre-feet of storage usable at existing dams, would provide 20,890,000 acre-feet of usable storage for flood control.

Opposition to the proposed full flood control program, however, will cut the available storage in half, according to the present outlook, General Foote estimates.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial deals with the very serious flood problem in my State. I have just returned from a few days' visit in my State, during the course of which I made an inspection of certain areas along the Columbia River in Oregon which have suffered devastating floods.

They constitute further proof of the contention of the two Senators from Oregon for some time in the past, namely, that such floods can be prevented. I wish to stress that fact. When we are talking about adequate flood control, Mr. President, we are talking about a great waste in America which can be prevented; we are talking about saving the taxpayers of the country great economic wealth which is now going down the river and out to sea in the form of valuable topsoil; we are talking about saving millions of dollars in personal and real property. We are also talking about priceless human values.

The editorial which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD points out very clearly that flood damage is avoidable if we in our time take the necessary steps to control the streams by adequate dams.

The editorial comments on one of the greatest of flood-control projects, the Hells Canyon project, which would involve 2,600,000 acre-feet of flood control. I wish to stress that point. We are talking about preventing for the sake of our generation and of future generations all the damage which otherwise would be suffered because of a failure to save Hells Canyon Dam—if we should fail to save it—with its 2,600,000 acre-feet of flood control.

As I looked at the flooded areas during the past week, and as I sat on Monday night in Portland and looked at a film depicting the great catastrophe the people of my State in the flooded area had suffered this spring, as well as a few days ago again when the Columbia River went on a rampage, I found myself asking this question: "Why cannot all see it?"

This problem is of such a nature that, I am satisfied, if the American people could sit down before a showing of the film I saw on Monday night—a terrible film in the sense of depicting the frightful suffering caused when that river goes on a rampage—they would ask the Senate, "What are you waiting for? Why don't you appropriate the funds necessary to build these projects, from the standpoint of saving human values?"

As we note the sorrow on the faces of our fellow citizens who have just seen all they possess washed away down the river, we ask ourselves the question, "What is our moral obligation to these fellow citizens, when we know that the appropriation of funds to build the necessary dams will prevent such sorrow being visited upon them and upon other citizens in the future?"

Anyone in my position naturally finds himself in a very difficult posture in this regard, because as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I have been spending a great deal of time with my colleagues on that committee marking up the so-called foreign-aid bill. I am in favor of foreign aid. I shall continue to give the benefit of the doubt and all the presumptions to the President of the United States in his requests for foreign aid. I agreed in committee that our whole foreign-aid program should be subjected to an early study, and I therefore voted for the resolution which calls for a study and a reappraisal of the entire program.

In the meantime, I am willing to grant the benefit of all the presumptions and all the doubts to the President of the United States on the question of foreign aid, because I realize that we will win the fight for freedom in the days ahead on the economic front, or we will not win it at all. Therefore, we as a free people will have to export economic freedom to foreign lands, so that the people who are willing to stand with us can enjoy political freedom.

However, as a Senator, I am put in a very difficult position, for when I go back home and talk to constituents who have been subjected to the terrible sufferings and losses caused by a rampaging river, they ask me why Congress cannot provide an appropriation to stop this loss in our own country, since it does not seem to be too difficult to get from Congress appropriations of millions of dollars with which to develop great reclamation projects, flood-control projects, and other economic projects for people in far-away lands. Our own people, Mr. President, are not able to get from the Congress appropriations adequate for such purposes. We are living in a time when selfish private utility interests seem to have too much political power in this country to permit the people's interest to be protected in the Congress of the United States by providing appropriations necessary for great flood-control dams.

I offer Hells Canyon as exhibit A in support of my argument. The test soon will be made, Mr. President, as to whether this Congress places the flood-control interests of the American people first, or the selfish profit dollars of the Idaho Power Co. first. It is as simple as that.

I know I may tell the administration what the verdict of the people of my State will be, because I know that the people of Oregon, by an overwhelming majority, expect this Congress to pass a Hells Canyon Dam bill and to follow it with the appropriations necessary to start the great flood-control project on the Snake River, a project which will provide 2,600,000 acre-feet of flood control for the people of the Pacific Northwest. It is a project which the Army Engineer reports have said consistently would greatly help reduce flood dangers on the Snake and the Columbia—not eliminate them, because there are other projects.

Senators will find me continuing to support those projects, not only in the Pacific Northwest, but in any other State where the Army Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation can submit reports, as they have on the projects to which I refer, and which show that from an engineering standpoint the building of a flood-control dam will help to reduce or eliminate entirely the damage from future floods.

It is easy to translate one of these issues into an issue of morality, but I do so because, in my judgment, this is also a moral issue. It is an economic issue; it is an engineering issue; it is also a moral issue.

Having seen what I looked at during the last weekend with respect to flood damages on the Columbia this year, I have come back to the Senate to start what I believe will be a very historic debate in the history of the Senate, a

debate over the moral issue as to whether the Congress is willing to put the rights of the American people for protection from the damages of ravaging floods at least on a plane equal to the consideration being shown to the people of foreign lands, into whose countries we are pouring millions of the American taxpayers' dollars for the development of flood control and reclamation projects.

Mr. President, if we can pour money into Egypt to the tune of $56 million or $57 million, according to the latest figures I have seen, let me say that we had better spend it in the United States also, or else be ready for the political verdict of the American people on the heads of those who do not face up to the great moral issue of adequate flood control for the American people.

RESPONSE OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1956.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am deeply touched by and will always treasure Senate Resolution 280, adopted by the Senate on June 11, which conveys a most considerate and solicitous message of good wishes for my speedy recovery. For this extraordinarily kind act, I hope you will convey to every Member of the Senate my heartfelt thanks and appreciation.

With warm regard,
Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 20, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 417. An act for the relief of Pearl O. Seilaz;

S. 530. An act for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital;

S. 1146. An act to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives;

S. 1414. An act for the relief of James Edward Robinson;

S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine;

S. 2016. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2152. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

S. 2202. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the Valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

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. 3265. An act to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in the foreign commerce of the United States;

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

S. 3581. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act for the protection of walruses;

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

S. 3945. An act for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the agreement heretofore entered, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H. R. 10986), which will be the unfinished business, and which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 21, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 20, 1956:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law and regulation:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Herbert A. Hudgins
Stanley J. Sarnoff

To be senior dental surgeon

Seymour J. Kreshover

To be senior sanitarian

Robert Johnston

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Dorothy L. Connors
Margaret M. Sweeney

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 20, 1956:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Joseph E. Martin, Boaz.
Luther Palmer Bean, Clanton.
Winston S. Morris, Elkmont.

ALASKA

Michael Shepard, Anchorage.

ARIZONA

William F. Cole, Maricopa.
Sarah L. Smith, Randolph.
Ethelyn L. Pettijohn, Stanfield.

ARKANSAS

Boyd B. Hammer, Bradley.
John E. Hunt, Marianna.
Willis E. Varvil, Quitman.

CALIFORNIA

Hazel L. Krueger, Acton.
Sam R. Haley, Associated.
Windol M. Martin, Bellflower.
Frank S. Spires, Berkeley.
Laura J. Pawlus, Bridgeville.
Leonard A. Mannee, Colusa.
Virginia N. Tharp, Esparto.
James E. Orr, Lancaster.
Donald Burleson, Mendocino.
Charles F. Linck, Jr., Ontario.
Raymond C. Durant, Redondo Beach.
Warren H. Williams, San Rafael.
Major R. Rix, South Pasadena.

COLORADO

Fred C. Brewer, Loveland.
Willard W. Wieck, Salida.
Calvin C. Haarhues, Wiggins.

CONNECTICUT

Richard J. Brereton, Wilton.

GEORGIA

William C. Chambers, Jr., Fort Gaines.
Samuel H. Henderson, Gray.
Carlos M. Sisson, Hapeville.

HAWAII

Joe R. Ferreira, Hanamaulu.

ILLINOIS

Roland W. Schultz, Downers Grove.
Robert G. Wheeler, Mills Shoals.
Robert G. Root, Versailles.

INDIANA

Albert T. Morris, Eaton.
Billy L. Kruse, Elberfeld.
Wayne W. Sloan, Marengo.
Marjorie L. Van Dyke, Pimento.
Maurice C. Griffith, Pleasant Lake.

IOWA

Joe R. Gordon, Arlington.
Myrtle L. Lane, Colesburg.
Ray H. Aten, Humeston.
Charles R. Kremenak, Newell.

KANSAS

Warren L. Hartley, Belle Plaine.
James J. Hiner, Belvue.
Myrtle M. McNeive, Emmett.
Layne B. Lairmore, Newton.
Mayetta B. Decker, Oskaloosa.
Bertha I. Elniff, Randall.
Jack R. Houston, Seneca.
Merle E. Popplewell, South Haven.
Ralph R. Johnson, Vermillion.
Leroy E. Blocker, Wetmore.

LOUISIANA

Ollie H. Dosher, Kilbourne.
Claude Rogers, Saline.
William H. Prejean, Westlake.

MAINE

Elsie M. Decker, Darkharbor.
Pauline C. Nason, Poland.
Robert F. Belgrade, South Gardiner.

MARYLAND

Richard W. Dawson, Mayo.
Edward F. Boston, Princess Ann.
Hugh H. Hassell, Rockville.
Rayola M. Moore, White Marsh.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ernest A. Paradis, Dodgeville.
Arthur K. Tolman, Gilbertville.
Larz D. Neilson, North Wilmington.

MINNESOTA

Homer D. Little, Appleton.
Loren J. Schendel, St. Michael.
Adelbert O. Ames, Springfield.
Chauncey B. Erwin, Winona.

MISSISSIPPI

Allie Mack Coker, Brookhaven.
Wiley Lee Williamson, Collins.
Jake R. Van Devender, Gholson.
James B. Johnston, Shubuta.
Carl H. Parker, Sumrall.
Minnie L. Logan, Tinsley.

MISSOURI

Robert E. Hock, Fort Leonard Wood.
Wilma M. Henneke, Leslie.
Davis L. Owen, Moberly.
Joseph A. Wallenburn, Otterville.
James W. Buzzard, Seneca.

MONTANA

Stephen Sams, Joliet.
George W. Duffy, Whitefish.

NEBRASKA

Bernard A. Boots, Ashby.
Earnest A. Moxham, Chester.
Dale B. Morrill, Creighton.
Lowell L. Saunders, Dixon.
Albert W. Watsek, Humboldt.
Leonard E. Peterson, Kennard.

NEVADA

Walter J. Bitton, Imlay.
Garner Andersen, Overton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Samuel A. Towle, Hampton.

NEW JERSEY

Harry H. Pedersen, Jr., Absecon.
George W. Douglass, Cape May Court House.
Howard F. Koons, Perth Amboy.

NEW YORK

Florence M. Drankhan, Boston.
Bernice M. Murphy, Cattaragus.
Doris M. Robinson, Comstock.
Raymond V. Seaman, Gilbertsville.
Paul W. Christenson, Gowanda.
David O. Rourke, Madrid.
Percy Pembleton, Monroe.
William R. Costello, Red House.
Ruth H. Dexter, Wampsville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Walter L. York, High Point.
Ruth E. Parrish, Summerfield.
Marvin W. Thomas, Trenton.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold W. Bachman, Streeter.

OHIO

Glenn M. Price, Gahanna.
Ann M. Collins, Hooven.
Janice B. Hilborn, Tiro.
Richard G. Graham, Wapakoneta.
Owen F. Hartsock, Waynesville.
Stephen M. Snouffer, Worthington.

OKLAHOMA

R. C. Chastain, Clayton.

OREGON

Richard M. Bowman, Falls City.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert W. Newton, Blandburg.
Norman C. Mackrell, Conoquenessing.
Adrian E. Kibler, Hastings.
Mary E. Yost, Loganville.
Norbert C. McDermott, McKees Rocks.
Drue L. Eyer, Nescopeck.
Melvin S. Raudabaugh, New Kingstown.
Alfred E. Ingram, Norwood.
Robert D. Esbenshade, Paradise.
Millard L. Kroh, Seven Valleys.
C. Lyman Sturgis, Uniontown.
Frank A. Bialas, Wilmore.
Jack S. Karchner, Woodland.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Samuel A. Elliott, Windy Hill Beach.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clifford N. Nelson, Toronto.

TENNESSEE

Josiah A. DeMarcus, Norris.

TEXAS

Dewey E. Waggoner, Sundown.
Thomas J. Pippin, Van.
Henry M. Durham, Woodville.

UTAH

Garnel E. Larsen, Hyrum.
Lydia Johnson, Marysvalle.
Gordon A. Wood, Monticello.

VIRGINIA

Willoughby P. Taylor, Ashland.
Charles N. Wysor, Honaker.
Charles William Brown, Narrows.
Raymond N. Kinder, Rural Retreat.

WASHINGTON

Edna B. Gibson, Eastsound.

WISCONSIN

Boyd D. Wilson, Benton.
Walter L. Paepke, Burlington.
Elden F. Keller, Cochrane.
Lawrence W. Paul, Fox Lake.
Lydia I. Sievert, Greenvalley.
Neal E. Jones, Wausau.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, in this moment of prayer, may we come nearer unto Thee than we have ever known and may our human wills be made one with Thine in a bond of unity that can never be broken.

Grant that we may also be more firmly and closely united with one another in our plans and purposes to achieve for all mankind the blessings of a freer and fuller life.

Inspire us to search and struggle earnestly for that blessed day of universal peace when the tyrannies which oppress and the terrors which affright the soul of man shall be dethroned and destroyed and supplanted by the spirit of truth and righteousness.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were 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 of the House of the following titles:

On June 15, 1956:

H. R. 2216. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force;

H. R. 4229. An act to provide running mates for certain staff corps officers in the naval service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4437. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard;

H. R. 4569. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

H. R. 4704. An act to provide for the examination preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; and

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance.

On June 18, 1956:

H. R. 3255. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina.

On June 19, 1956:

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

H. R. 4363. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the State of New Mexico;

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

H. R. 6274. An act to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces.

On June 20, 1956:

H. R. 692. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace";

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen.

H. R. 5079. An act for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam);

H. R. 5516. An act to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 10721. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10899. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.