cal plan. Blue Shield would offer surgical and medical-care protection only up to the $200 and $100–$200 limits.

And, as a result, many employees would find themselves with less real protection than they now have.

Instead of near 100 percent protection against certain brackets of health cost, they would have only the 75-percent protection of the major medical plan.

In recent testimony before a House committee, Washington's Dr. Donald Stubbs, speaking for Blue Shield plans, cited an actual case to illustrate how the administration plan would increase out-of-pocket medical expenses for many employees.

FILES

His case came from the files of Medical Science of the District of Columbia, of which he's president of trustees.

It involves a male employee who had both Blue Cross (group hospitalization) and Blue Shield (medical service) coverage.

He incurred $1,301 in hospital expenses and $500 in surgeon's fee—a total of $1,801, which Blue Cross-Blue Shield paid in full.

But had the major medical plan been in effect, and had this same employee been covered by downgraded Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans (up to $500 hospital protection and $250 surgical) the situation would have been far different.

His downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid $750.

His major medical coverage would have paid three-fourths of the remainder—$788.

And the employee himself would have had to pay $363, all out-of-pocket loss, traceable policy to the major medical plan.

Here are three other cases which illustrate how the major medical plan would hurt many employees—cases from the files of Group Hospitalization.

BILL

Case 1: Involved an employee who incurred a $542.85 hospital bill, and $500 surgical bill, a total of $1,042.85 of which Blue Cross and Blue Shield paid all but $6.10. Had the administration plan been in effect, his downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid the first $750, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the remaining $292.85, and the employee would have wound up paying $73.46.

And the employee's out-of-pocket loss, as a result of major medical, would have been $73.62.

Case 2: Involved an employee with Blue Cross coverage only who incurred a bill (hospitalization plus $39 for pathology) of which Blue Cross paid all but $39.30. Had the administration plan been in effect, downgraded Blue Cross coverage would have paid $500, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the remainder—and the employee would have paid $447.64.

In this case, the employee's out-of-pocket loss would have been $408.34.

Case 3: Involved an employee with Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage who incurred hospital bills for $946.23, and a surgeon's fee for $500 which is coverage paid in full. Had the administration plan been in effect, his downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid $750, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the rest, and the employee would have paid $236.56—all of it out-of-pocket loss.

HOW

Here is how the administration plan would hurt married women in Government.

Thousands of these women now are enrolled in Blue Cross or Blue Shield plans which provide the only medical protection for their families. In many cases, the woman is the one who buys the protection because group coverage is not available to her husband.

If the major medical plan went into effect, her Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would be downgraded to major medical levels like that of other employees.

But that's only part of the story.

Under the administration plan, families of married women would not be covered by major-medical protection unless the husband was physically or mentally unable to work.

Thus, the married woman would lose much of the coverage she now has—and be barred from the extra coverage extended other employees.

Let Us Keep Up the Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, wherever American citizens are in peril through no fault of their own it is the duty of our Government to rescue them.

I ask, what has our Secretary of State done to cause the release by Red China of the 13 Americans held prisoners these many years?

Their release was promised by Red China last September 1955. They are businessmen and Protestant and Catholic missionaries. It is high time our Government did something about them.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1956

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

Our Father who art in Heaven and in the earth and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name: Give us, we beseech Thee, that lowly and humble heart, emptied of presumptuous pride, which is the only shrine where any altar pleasing to Thee can be raised. May our own spirits be quarries out of which stones for the new temple of humanity may be fashioned.

May those who here serve the public weal be wise interpreters of the signs of the times, the brave spokesmen of Thy will and of Thy truth which sets men free from ancient wrongs. Reveal unto us the means Thou wouldst have us use to establish justice and peace among men in all the earth. Make our America, we pray, more and more the hope of all who suffer and the dread of all aggressors who would enslave the human spirit. We ask in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 25, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

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 Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of May 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the memorial of Thomas H. Feeley, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against the sale of pornography by Army PX stores, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3828. A bill to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes (Rept. No. 2365);

H. R. 8452. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in the State of Mississippi to Richard C. French, Lewis M. French, and Ruth French Hershey (Rept. No. 2366);

H. R. 10535. A bill to include the present area of Zion National Monument within

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2367);

H. R. 11558. A bill to relinquish any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in and to certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land (Rept. No. 2368); and

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Liberty Island (Rept. No. 2356).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3773. A bill to provide for an extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims located under the provisions of the act of August 11, 1955, may be made, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2362).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 7426. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 2354);

H. R. 8385. A bill to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2352);

H. R. 9768. A bill relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii (Rept. No. 2353); and

H. R. 9769. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds (Rept. No. 2355).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3397. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2369).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 7811. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration of architects and professional engineers, and the regulation of their practice (Rept. No. 2357); and

H. R. 11027. A bill to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for experimental operation and testing of vessels owned by the United States (Rept. No. 2358).

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

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Morton J. Krakow (Rept. No. 2359);

H. R. 5522. A bill for the relief of Florida State Hospital (Rept. No. 2360); and

H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn M. Baker (Rept. No. 2361).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 9893. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2364).

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

S. 3592. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service (Rept. No. 2363).

HELLS CANYON DAM—INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 2275)

Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement entered into on June 21, 1956, Mr. MURRAY submitted the individual and minority views to accompany Rept. No. 2275, on the bill (S. 1333) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM (S. REPT NO. 2370)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit a unanimous report of that committee on the resolution (S. Res. 294) extending further the time for a study of the Government employees security program. The resolution would extend the life of a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without asking for any additional funds. I ask that the resolution be immediately referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, rather than to have it lie over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 4117. A bill to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 4118. A bill for the relief of Petronella Elisabeth Deimbeck Major; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 4119. A bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes; and

S. 4120. A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 4121. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 4122. A bill for the relief of Josefine Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 4123. A bill to renew and extend the term of patent No. 1,917,634 for 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota:

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the Ferry County, State of Washington, highway by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. Res. 297. Resolution extending the time for making report and providing additional funds for the Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SENIOR CITIZENS OPPORTUNITY AND SECURITY ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to initiate a program of action through which America's older citizens may enjoy more fully the fruits of the lengthened life-expectancy that our magnificent advances in health and economic well-being have made possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a joint statement by the Senator from Massachusetts and myself explaining the provisions of the bill, its objectives, and the need for its enactment.

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

The bill (S. 4117) to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The joint statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS HILL AND KENNEDY

The bill, entitled "The Senior Citizens Opportunity and Security Act," authorizes a total of $154½ million for a 6-year program. The funds are to be granted on a matching basis to States, local communities, and nonprofit organizations and institutions to finance action projects aimed at helping older people in one or more of the following ways: to secure employment and self-employment through the aid of loans and other financial assistance, to enjoy adequate retirement income, to live in decent homes, to

obtain proper medical care, to share in voluntary hospital insurance protection, to receive rehabilitation service of various kinds and vocational retraining, and to benefit from increased research and training of personnel in fields important to older citizens.

The 6-year program envisaged by the bill centers upon the development and expansion of pilot, or demonstration, projects conducted by States, local communities, and private nonprofit organizations for the benefit of our older people.

Although science has prolonged the average life in America to an age never before attained in the Nation's history, our society has yet to take adequate measures to render that longer life truly livable.

Because of inadequacies in existing laws or because of circumstances over which our older people have little or no control, millions of our finest citizens as they grow older are being deprived of the opportunity for normal, self-reliant, happy lives, for satisfactory standards of living and suitable homes, for their rightful place in the life of the community.

Today we are wasting resources of incalculable value: the accumulated knowledge, the mature wisdom, the seasoned experience, the skilled capacities, the proven productivity of a great and growing number of our people—our senior citizens. At the very time when America's success in the contest with communism demands the fullest utilization of the talents and productive capacities of all our people, millions of our most able, most experienced and most dependable workers are being foreclosed from participation, even on a part-time basis, in the Nation's labor force. Our population is aging and employment of older persons is sharply declining. Yet we have done little to make sure that our most highly trained, skilled, and valuable older workers have an opportunity to keep their talents at work in their own and their country's behalf.

A number of constructive pilot and demonstration projects are already underway in several States and cities, and many more will begin with passage of the bill.

We propose a threefold program: First, action on a scale large enough to be meaningful. Second, continuing study and analysis, not of theories but of real, vital programs voluntarily participated in by large numbers of our senior citizens. Third, a national conference to be held while experimental projects are underway as a forerunner of further action.

Most communities are not today equipped to meet the leisure-time needs of older retired residents, or to rehabilitate, retrain and restore to activity and productiveness older people who do not wish and cannot afford complete withdrawal from active economic and social participation. No pragram which omits any aspects of the problem of the aging can hope to offer an overall approach toward solution. America's concern is with human dignity and human worth, yet today with respect to our senior citizens we are far from living up to the best of which we are capable. We cannot afford to continue this costly waste, either from the standpoint of the national interest or from that of the individual American.

CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Treasury I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4119) to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1: This section would clarify the applicability of the rules for preventing collisions on the Great Lakes and connecting and tributary waters by making the rules specifically applicable to all vessels navigating upon such waters when within the jurisdiction of the United States.

This would be accomplished by amending obsolete phraseology and bringing the applicability provisions of the Great Lakes rules into conformity with the applicability provisions of rules governing harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States other than the Great Lakes.

The original enactment providing rules for preventing collisions was the act of April 19, 1864 (ch. 69, 13 Stat. 58). That act made the rules applicable on all waters, to be followed by vessels of the Navy and the mercantile marine of the United States. That applicability was continued in section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in 1878. Since that time, exceptions to section 4233 have been enacted into law and there are now four different sets of rules governing the prevention of collisions.

The first set of rules is found in the international rules which are applicable to public and private vessels of the United States upon the high seas and certain connecting waters. These rules are contained in the act of October 11, 1951 (ch. 495, 65 Stat. 406; 33 U. S. C. 143 et seq.).

The second set is found in the Great Lakes rules which are applicable to all public and private vessels of the United States navigating upon the Great Lakes and their connecting waters. These rules are contained in the act of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 645; 33 U. S. C. 241 et seq.).

The third set is found in the western rivers rules which are applicable to all vessels upon parts of certain western rivers. These rules are based on section 4233 of the Revised Statutes, which was revised by the act of May 21, 1948 (ch. 328, 62 Stat. 249; 33 U. S. C. 301 et seq.).

The fourth set is found in the inland rules which are applicable to all vessels upon the rivers, harbors, and other inland waters of the United States (except the Great Lakes and connecting waters and parts of certain western rivers). These rules are contained in the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (ch. 4, 30 Stat. 96; 33 U. S. C. 154 et seq.).

It is clear that, at the time of the enactment of the Revised Statutes in 1878, section 4233, the forerunner of all the various rules, was directed specifically to vessels of the United States. However, at the same time, section 4401 of the Revised Statutes provided that all coastwise seagoing vessels and all vessels navigating the Great Lakes should be subject to the navigation laws of the United States, when navigating within the jurisdiction thereof (46 U. S. C. 364). Since 1878, revision of the rules have made the Inland Rules and Western Rivers Rules specifically applicable to all vessels, thus obviating the necessity of invoking the provisions of Revised Statutes 4401 in connection with foreign vessels in those waters. Section 1 of the proposed bill would do the same thing to the applicability language of the Great Lakes Rules and will specifically declare that they are special rules duly made by local authority, in the sense of rule 30 of the International Rules (act of October 11, 1951, supra; 33 U. S. C. 147b). The addition of the phrase "when within the territorial waters of the United States" has been added to make it clear that the legislation is intended to cover only waters within the jurisdiction of the United States and that United States vessels when within the Canadian territorial waters will be subject to the navigation laws of that country. Present language is ambiguous in that regard.

SEC. 2. This section would amend the provisions relating to the penalty for violating the Great Lakes Rules. The present penalty section was contained in the act of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 649; 33 U. S. C. 244) and provided for a fine of $200, which could be assessed against the vessel for a violation of the act. Although that statute, as amended, authorizes the Commandant of the Coast Guard (authority transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan 26, 1950) to establish other regulations which "shall have the force of law" (33 U. S. C. 243), there is no specific penalty for violating those regulations. Furthermore, a penalty provision applicable to the pilot, engineer, mate, or master of vessels, although it was originally contained in section 4413 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 381) and is included in the Inland Rules (33 Stat. 158) and the Western River Rules (33 Stat. 354) is not presently included in the Great Lakes Rules. In order to facilitate the enforcement of the rules and authorized regulations, it is desirable that such a penalty provision be added. The change of the penalty now contained in the statute from $200 to $500 will bring the penalty provisions into conformity with the penalty provisions of the Western Rivers Rules, revised by the act of May 21, 1948 (ch. 328, 62 Stat. 250; 33 U. S. C. 354, 355).

Section 3: This section would repeal sections 4412 and 4413 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. These two sections have been specifically repealed only as far as the Inland rules are concerned (June 7, 1897, ch. 4, 30 Stat. 103; 46 U. S. C. 381). However, they were also repealed by implication as far as the United States vessels subject to the Great Lakes rules were concerned by the acts of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 650) and February 19, 1895 (ch. 102, 28 Stat. 672). They were further repealed by implication as to the western rivers by the act of May 21, 1948 (62 Stat. 250; 33 U. S. C. 353, 354). The two sections may now be applicable to foreign vessels on the Great Lakes; however, this applicability has been questioned. The proposed amendment of 33 U. S. C. 241 will bring foreign vessels on the Great Lakes within that section. It follows that after such amendment the application of sections 4412 and 4413 of the Revised Statutes will have been completely superseded with respect to the Great Lakes. Section 3 would specifically repeal sections 4412 and 4413 for the Great Lakes and western rivers.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5 OF AIR COMMERCE ACT OF 1926, RELATING TO SALE OF CERTAIN SERVICES TO OWNER OF AN AIRCRAFT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Air Force, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale

of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes.

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

The bill (S. 4120) to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, in 1958 the World Health Organization will celebrate its 11th anniversary. Those of us who have been interested in WHO during its first decade of life are especially eager that this anniversary be marked in an appropriate manner. After many consultations with organizations and doctors who are intimately in touch with WHO activities, it has occurred to us that the most appropriate gesture to the World Health Organization would be an invitation by our Government to hold the 1958 World Health Assembly in the United States.

This Assembly would provide an excellent opportunity for the ministers and directors of health from WHO's 88 member countries, to view American health and medical methods, as well as an opportunity to focus American public attention on the economic and social program of the United Nations.

Because the cost of holding such an assembly in the United States would exceed the amount provided in WHO's budget for holding the assembly at Geneva, Switzerland, the WHO headquarters, an additional sum of $400,000 has seemed sufficient.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am happy to submit a joint resolution today in conjunction with Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, who is submitting a companion resolution in the other House, to implement these objectives. This joint resolution would authorize an appropriation to enable the United States to extend the invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Whereas the 11th World Health Assembly is scheduled to be held in 1958; and

Whereas the year 1958 is considered particularly appropriate for holding the assembly in the United States since that year will mark the decennial anniversary of the entry into force of the constitution of the World Health Organization, which was originally drawn up and signed in New York City; and

Whereas the assembly and related functions will provide outstanding opportunities for the ministers and directors of health of the World Health Organization's 88 member countries to view American health and medical methods in practice, and to make and renew friendships among American health and medical leaders; and

Whereas the assembly will focus public attention in the United States on the important work of the World Health Organization as an integral part of the economic and social program of the United Nations and as a constructive work contributing to better international appreciation and world peace; and

Whereas American health and medical groups and certain urban organizations have suggested arrangements to make the World Health Assembly in the United States a particularly useful professional occasion through related seminars, field trips, and social activities; and

Whereas the cost of holding an Assembly in the United States would exceed the amount provided in the budget of the World Health Organization for holding an Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland, the headquarters of the organization: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400,000 for the purpose of defraying the expenses incident to organizing and holding the Eleventh World Health Assembly in the United States. Funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for advance contribution to the World Health Organization for additional costs incurred by the organization in holding the 11th World Health Assembly outside the organization's headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland; and shall be available for expenses incurred by the Department of State, on behalf of the United States as host government, including personal services without regard to civil-service and classification laws; employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; rent of quarters by contract or otherwise; and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I introduced the joint resolution, and earnestly hope that we may still have time to act upon it favorably during the present session of Congress. I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 183) authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL AID FOR MARSHAL TITO—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning conducted a hearing with regard to the proposed $65 million of additional aid for Tito and Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I do not agree with the position taken by the administration or the Secretary of the Treasury that we should provide additional aid to support that Communist government. My feeling is that if Tito can walk the streets of Moscow treading on rosebuds, enjoying the plaudits of the Communist multitude, then it is no longer necessary that we squeeze the resources out of our hard-pressed taxpayers to give him arms to protect himself from his old and new friends. Apparently his friendship with the Soviet Union has been reestablished, and I see no need of our continuing to pile additional millions of dollars of foreign aid to be sent to Yugoslavia in addition to what we have already given that country. It seems to me it would be just as well to tell Tito that we agree with him, that his danger of being overrun by Russia has subsided.

It was thought that if he went to Moscow he might be boiled in oil. He now finds that he can go there and be completely safe and be greeted as an old friend and welcomed back into the fold.

I have always questioned whether it was wise for us to demonstrate a greater interest in defending another country than that country would take in saving itself. It seems to me that Tito should pay for the arms we send to Yugoslavia, just as Egypt agreed to pay for the arms supplied to her by Russia. It might be a good idea to sell him all the spare parts he wants for the equipment he has, but I see no reason to give anything to him.

Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the bill (H. R. 11356), the foreign-aid bill, and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk awaiting the day when the foreign-aid bill comes before the Senate for consideration. I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I suggest that we appropriate no more for foreign aid this year than we appropriated last year. My recollection is that the administration requested $4,700,000,000, and I suggest that we appropriate no more than we appropriated for the foreign-aid program last year, which was $2,765,875,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

ECONOMIC WELFARE OF INDIANS LIVING ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2632) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on Indian reservations in the United States, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Senate bill 2632 was considered at an executive session of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee yesterday, and it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the predominant subject matter of the proposed legislation lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I was therefore instructed by my committee to make this unanimous-consent request for its referral to that committee.

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

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

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

By Mr. HILL:

Commencement Day address delivered by him at the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 7, 1956.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate—and I call the attention of the distinguished minority leader to this announcement—that Calendar No. 2311, H. R. 9952, which provides for a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, has been cleared for action on the floor. My staff has communicated with the minority policy committee. I should like to give notice that it is likely that bill, which has already been cleared by the minority policy committee, will be sandwiched in some time during this week or the early part of next week.

The Senate will not be in session on Wednesday, July 4. The majority leader will be out of the city the latter part of this week and next week, but his friends, the minority leader and the assistant majority leader, are going to assume some of the majority leader's duties. The Senate will be in session on Monday and Tuesday and Thursday and Friday of next week. It will take the day off only on July Fourth.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its dsagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6243) authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on June 20, 1956, the Senate passed H. R. 6243, authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The House disagreed to the Senate amendments and has requested a conference.

I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. DUFF conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Ninety-four postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 256, and I ask that it be stated for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 256) was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the 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 Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In section 3 of the bill strike out "year."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, section 3 of the act reads:

SEC. 3. The first section of this act shall take effect on November next year after the approval of this act.

The concurrent resolution simply strikes out the word "year," which was erroneosuly included in the section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 256) was considered and agreed to.

COST OF HIGH DAM IN HELLS CANYON

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on May 29 I inserted in the body of the RECORD a table which showed the cost to each State if the Federal Government built the high dam in Hells Canyon of the Snake River. On May 31 the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] voiced objection to this table, basing his objection on the grounds that the Bonneville project has been ahead of schedule in its paybacks to the Federal Government. The junior Senator from Oregon completely misses the main point of my contentions in this matter when he expresses the belief that merely because a Federal power project pays itself out more Federal moneys should be expended on the development of public power. I maintain that when private money is available and willing, it is a waste of the taxpayers' money to build the same project with public funds. Mr. President, we have many uses for public money, not the least of which are the balancing of the budget and the reduction of the deficit; so I must again voice my objection to doing with Federal money that which private money is not only willing to do but is doing.

In this respect I have in my hands Bulletin No. 153, dated June 25, 1956, of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce entitled "Federal Spending Facts" which carries a short discussion of the Hells Canyon project and another breakdown on the cost to each State if the Federal Government undertakes this work.

I ask unanimous consent that the bulletin be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FEDERAL SPENDING FACTS—POLITICS IN HELLS CANYON AND WHAT IT MAY COST AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

The majority leadership in Congress seems determined to put through a bill which would add a totally unnecessary burden of one-half billion dollars on American taxpayers. The first official move in this direction was made last week by the Senate Interior Committee when it favorably reported S. 1333. This bill, introduced by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, authorizes construction of a Federal hydroelectric project at Hells Canyon in the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon. A similar bill, H. R. 4719, introduced by Representative PROST, of

Idaho, will be voted on by the House Interior Committee June 26.

Federal construction of this project is unnecessary for the simple reason that the power potential of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River is already in process of development with private financing. On August 4, 1955, the Federal Power Commission, acting in accordance with its responsibility under the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, issued a license to the Idaho Power Co. to construct three hydro projects in the Snake River. Three months later construction workers and equipment were at the site of the first dam to be built and work on it has now been under way over 7 months.

If the Federal Hells Canyon project should be authorized and started, however, the private development would, for practical purposes, have to be stopped. Moreover, the millions of dollars spent and the work done to date would be wasted because the Federal project would be located at a different site than the first dam under the company's plan. There is the probability, too, that the taxpayers would have to bear this loss since the company is proceeding under a duly authorized Federal license.

Since a move is on, nevertheless, to authorize the Federal project, the obvious question is, why? In considering the question, account should be taken of these facts from proceedings of the Federal Power Commission on the matter:

1. The decision of the FPC in granting the license to Idaho Power Co. was no hurried action. It was made after lengthy hearings and study and after opponents, as well as proponents, of private development of Hells Canyon had been given ample opportunity to be heard.

2. There is very little difference in the power-producing capacity of the company's three dams and the proposed single Federal dam. The dependable capacity of the former will be 767,000 kilowatts as compared to 785,000 kilowatts for the Federal dam. The Federal project, however, would cost a quarter billion dollars more than the 3-dam project.

3. The FPC found that other benefits, such as flood control, navigation and recreation, "could be effectuated to about the same extent under either the private or Federal plan of development." The Commission noted, however, that under private development these benefits "will be realized without expense to the United States."

4. The Commission concluded that the private company's 3-dam project "is best adapted to a comprehensive plan" for developing the Snake River in the Hells Canyon area. It also stated its judgment that "the United States itself should not undertake the development of the water resources of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River."

THE POLITICAL ANGLES IN THE HELLS CANYON BILLS

It is clear from the findings of the FPC that the power needs of the Pacific Northwest will be served sooner and just as well by the company's plan as by the proposed Federal project. The main difference is that the Federal project requires involuntary financing by all taxpayers while the private project is being financed by investors. A second difference is that the private project will help finance the Government to the tune of almost $10 million a year in taxes.

What, then, is the reason for the present effort to substitute the Federal project for private development at Hells Canyon? The only apparent logical reason is that its supporters believe it will serve a political purpose. Here are some of the political angles in connection with it:

1. The 2 bills being actively considered in the Senate and the House were introduced by 2 Members of Congress who have campaigned in the past and continue to campaign on the basis of putting through a Federal Hells Canyon bill.

2. The granting of the license to the Idaho Power Co. has been termed by some administration opponents as a "giveaway" by the administration; and this charge is being made in spite of the fact that it was a unanimous decision by a bipartisan commission. Nevertheless, some politicians seem to think political hay can be made from the charge, not taking into account, of course, the fact that they open themselves to the charge of taking away money from taxpayers of all the States for an unnecessary purpose.

3. The Federal Hells Canyon project was included in Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON's 13-point program "from the heart" which he announced last November as the legislative objectives of his party in 1956.

4. Representative CHENOWETH, Republican of Colorado, who has previously opposed the Federal project informed the press June 11 that he had made a deal with House Speaker RAYBURN to get the Hells Canyon bill out of the House Interior Committee of which he is a member. By his agreeing to vote for the bill, or abstain from voting, the deadlock in the committee would be broken. In return for this action, he said, Speaker RAYBURN agreed to use his influence to get the $156 million Fryingpan-Arkansas bill cleared for House action. This Colorado project, incidentally, was also included in Senator JOHNSON's 13-point program.

WHAT THE FEDERAL PROJECT WOULD COST EACH STATE

So that taxpayers of each of the States can see how much money will be taken unnecessarily out of their States to finance the Federal Hells Canyon project if it is approved by Congress, the table below allocates its cost to the States on the basis of their respective shares of the present Federal tax burden. The $508.3 million total cost consists of $356.8 million for project construction, $22 million for interest during construction, and $129.5 million for transmission facilities:

	Percent of Federal tax burden borne by the States	Cost of project to the States
Alabama	0.91	$4,625,530
Arizona	.42	2,134,860
Arkansas	.46	2,338,180
California	9.29	47,221,070
Colorado	1.14	5,794,620
Connecticut	1.88	9,556,040
Delaware	.52	2,643,160
Florida	1.62	8,234,460
Georgia	1.34	6,811,220
Idaho	.25	1,270,750
Illinois	7.59	38,579,970
Indiana	2.41	12,250,030
Iowa	1.26	6,404,580
Kansas	.98	4,981,340
Kentucky	.99	5,032,170
Louisiana	1.10	5,591,300
Maine	.37	1,880,710
Maryland	2.19	11,131,770
Massachusetts	3.24	16,468,920
Michigan	5.66	28,769,780
Minnesota	1.70	8,641,100
Mississippi	.45	2,287,350
Missouri	2.47	12,555,010
Montana	.30	1,524,900
Nebraska	.74	3,761,420
Nevada	.17	864,110
New Hampshire	.27	1,372,410
New Jersey	3.71	18,857,930
New Mexico	.30	1,524,900
New York	14.95	75,990,850
North Carolina	1.41	7,167,030
North Dakota	.19	965,770
Ohio	6.26	31,819,580
Oklahoma	1.02	5,184,660
Oregon	.93	4,727,190
Pennsylvania	7.12	36,190,960
Rhode Island	.52	2,643,160
South Carolina	.62	3,151,460
South Dakota	.23	1,169,090
Tennessee	1.17	5,947,110
Texas	4.22	21,450,260
Utah	.33	1,677,390
Vermont	.15	762,450
Virginia	1.49	$7,573,670
Washington	1.60	8,132,800
West Virginia	.66	3,354,780
Wisconsin	2.00	10,166,000
Wyoming	.15	762,450
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc	1.25	6,353,750
Total	100.00	[1] 508,300,000

[1] Estimate as submitted by a representative of the Department of the Interior to the Senate Interior Committee during its hearings on the bill.

APOLOGY TO SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 20, an incident occurred in which two security officers from the Department of Defense and a member of the Capitol Police Force inspected a part of my office in the Senate Office Building without notice or consultation with me and, of course, without obtaining my prior permission. The account of the visit of these officers was carried widely in the press.

The following day, on June 21, I reported the incident to the Senate in some detail, and pointed out the potential danger in permitting unauthorized inspection of congressional premises by administrative agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

In the long debate which ensued, many Senators, including the majority and minority leaders and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, expressed regret and concern over the incident.

In the meantime, the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Armed Services Committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], held a hearing at which testimony was taken concerning the incident. At the hearing, Mr. Mansfield D. Sprague, general counsel of the Department of Defense, advised the committee that a letter of apology to me would be issued from the Department of Defense. A full transcript of the hearing by the subcommittee was introduced into the record yesterday by its distinguished chairman.

This morning, General Counsel Mansfield D. Sprague visited me in my office and personally handed to me a letter of apology from the Department of Defense, and expressed the personal regret of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter of apology from the Department of Defense be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1956.

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I am writing you concerning the incident which occurred in a portion of your office on June 20. I am doing so because I have been attending the

hearings of the Subcommittee on the Air Force to the Senate Armed Services Committee as the representative of the Department of Defense and was present at the session of the committee on June 21 at which testimony was taken concerning the unfortunate debugging incident.

The first I knew of the matter was at that hearing and I would like to call your attention to what I said which appears on page 15 of the record:

"Mr. SPRAGUE. Mr. Chairman, if you think it would be advisable, and I do, I would be glad to see to it that a letter of apology to Senator LEHMAN is issued from the Department of Defense. But I do feel on the basis of what the gentlemen have said, that they were just trying to carry out their normal duties."

Thereafter, Senator SYMINGTON suggested that I might call on you personally. I did so, but I was very sorry to find that you were on the floor of the Senate. I thereupon requested your secretary to convey to you the apology which I had intended to make personally.

Today I have read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 21 pertaining to this incident and the report of the proceedings before the Symington subcommittee of June 21 at which the two security officers and the Senate policeman testified.

First of all let me say that while the record does not reflect it, I have the personal assurance of the two security officers that they at no time discussed the matter with a representative of any newspaper. I have no idea how it received the initial publicity in the New York Times.

Secondly, I agree fully with the statements which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD referred to wherein it is indicated that all three of the men should have obtained your permission to investigate a portion of your office. It is most unfortunate that this did not occur to them, perhaps because they were acting through a Senate police officer or because permission was requested of your receptionist, which appears to have been granted, according to their testimony.

Thirdly, the fact that it was a portion of your office that was investigated is no reflection whatsoever on you, sir, but was solely a coincidence based on its proximity to the room in which the hearings were being held in which a portion of the wall adjoining your office had been under repair.

The presence of the Department of Defense security officers at the hearings of the Symington committee has been for the sole purpose of protecting not only the witnesses, but the members of the staff, and, in fact, the committee itself and the security of the United States. Their zealousness in the performance of their duty resulted in the invasion of your privacy, for which I apologize on behalf of the Department of Defense. I explained the occurrence to Secretary Wilson and my intention to write such a letter as this to you and I would like you to know that in his absence he wanted me to express his personal regret that the incident occurred in the manner in which it did.

Respectfully,

MANSFIELD D. SPRAGUE.

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO SENATOR KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I think the distinguished majority leader will be interested to know that today is the anniversary of the birth of the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND. I wish to take this opportunity to say that I am sure all of us wish him many happy returns of the day and many years of success and happiness.

Senator KNOWLAND, a very able man, has furnished the Republican Members of the Senate with able and courageous leadership at all times since I have been in the Senate, and has earned the respect, I am sure, of all Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Therefore, Mr. President, on this occasion I am happy to call attention to the fact that today is his birthday anniversary, and to wish him happiness and success in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I apologize for my ignorance, and I envy the Senator from Connecticut. If I had been possessed of the knowledge he has just indicated he is possessed of, I would have taken great pleasure in making the announcement myself.

I wish to associate myself with everything the very able Senator from Connecticut has said about the distinguished minority leader. There is no Member of the Senate to whom I am more devoted or for whom I have greater respect.

Always honorable, always diligent, ever conscious of the problems of his Nation and of the world, he leads the minority with courage and with conviction. In the 20 years I have served in Washington, I do not believe I have ever observed a session which has been freer of envy, jealousy, or acrimony than the session of the Senate this year. Although I like to feel that in part I have been responsible for that situation, I do not think anyone is more entitled to receive the plaudits of the country and the Senate than is the distinguished minority leader.

This morning, when the prayer was concluded, the minority leader handed me a copy of the calendar, on which he had written a statement on the part of the minority policy committee in regard to every measure on the calendar. At this session we have passed literally hundreds of bills; but we have never taken up one bill without the knowledge and, I believe, without the consent of the minority leader. By working closely together and by understanding each other's problems, we have been able to accomplish much which otherwise would simply not have been accomplished.

The minority leader is one of the youngest grandfathers I know, and one of the finest minority leaders.

It is my wish that he will have many more happy birthdays, and that he will forever remain the minority leader. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader; and I wish to say to him that if I have been remiss in not observing the amenities, it is due to ignorance on my part. Possibly it would have been better if, in advance, I had called the attention of the majority leader to the fact that today is Senator KNOWLAND's birthday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, Mr. President; it has been quite appropriate for the Senator from Connecticut to have done what he has just done. I did not mean to indicate any criticism of him; I simply meant to congratulate him.

Mr. BUSH. Certainly we are very appreciative of the wonderful spirit of the Senator from Texas, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to associate myself with everything my distinguished colleagues have just said regarding the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. All of us—even all of us on this side of the aisle—are very proud of Senator KNOWLAND. After all, in addition to being the minority leader, he is a Democratic nominee, as well as a Republican nominee. Therefore, not all of the credit should be given to the Republicans, because the Democrats of California also have nominated him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in wishing for the distinguished minority leader many more successful and happy years. Certainly he is a wonderful leader. Although I am on the Democratic side of the aisle, and come from the State of South Carolina, I wish to state that those who read the speech I made before the Democratic convention will see that there I said that although many persons in South Carolina think that one who is called a Republican has horns, yet certainly the distinguished minority leader is an extremely fine man. I am very glad, indeed, to join in extending to him congratulations and very best wishes.

REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE SENATE AT CONCLUSION OF THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour, or not later than 1:10 p. m., I may be recognized to address the Senate for 15 minutes on the subject of Germany and NATO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the request of the Senator from Vermont is a rather unusual one. The Senator from Vermont made a similar request on yesterday.

Personally, I do not like to object to such requests; but I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont would mind waiting until the morning hour has been concluded. If we begin to establish priorities for recognition for 10 minutes, 12 minutes, 14 minutes, and so forth, at 1:30 or subsequent hours, we shall get into difficulties. The distinguished minority leader and I have worked out a program for today, following the morning hour; and if the Senator from Vermont will add his name to the list, that will take care of the situation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I expect to make a series of eight short talks which, to my mind, represent my duty and a contribution which I can make to this body. I am willing to withdraw the request I have made, and later to request

recognition by the Presiding Officer or President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Vermont will withdraw his request, Mr. President, then as soon as the morning hour is concluded, the unfinished business will be laid before the Senate; and I have asked that the name of the Senator from Vermont be included in the list at the desk, and I am sure he will be recognized.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when I was a small boy of 9 or 10, my folks took me to a nearby amusement park. Among the main attractions was the "fun house." Inside the "fun house" was a distortion mirror.

If a person faced the distortion mirror from the left it made him appear slender; from the right it made him look fat; in the center, from close up, he resembled a pygmy; from a little distance he appeared to be a giant; and at intermediate points he became a jumbled combination—partly tall, partly short, some of him fat, and the rest of him thin.

Nothing reminds me quite so much of that distortion mirror as the administration's action on Federal personnel legislation.

Let me be specific: Such legislation when sponsored by the administration is good, but such legislation under another label is bad; administration proposals always bear a low-cost figure and a high value, whereas congressional proposals have a high cost and a low value—or so says the administration.

My colleagues will recall the history of the fight waged by Congress to obtain a wage increase for Federal employees. During the closing days of the 83d Congress a bill providing for an increase of approximately 5 percent was approved and sent to the President, by whom it was vetoed on September 7, 1954, after Congress had adjourned and gone home.

Four months later—on January 11, 1955, to be exact—the administration advised Congress that on the basis of a "comprehensive study" it could recommend an increase of 5 percent in the pay of postal employees and a somewhat lesser amount for other Federal employees.

Mr. President, is it not strange that a 5-percent increase should be vetoed, and an increase of the same amount recommended, all in the space of 4 short months? Was the first bill vetoed because the increase originated in Congress, and not downtown? Or did the administration recommend an increase only after it reviewed the 1954 election returns?

Early in the first session of the present Congress, a bill providing for a pay increase of somewhat more than 8 percent was passed, and sent to the President. It, too, was vetoed.

A third bill was quickly passed by Congress. It, like the bill that had been vetoed by the President, provided for somewhat more than an 8 percent pay increase. This bill, however, unlike the two former bills, was not vetoed, but was signed, thereby bringing to an end a long-drawn-out fight on the part of Congress to accord Federal employees a merited increase in pay.

What is there about an 8 percent pay increase that makes it unjustified one week, and justified only a few weeks later? Is it that the administration has a rule "Do it our way and as we say, or not at all?"

Is it not strange that throughout the long fight to obtain a decent pay increase for Federal employees, the administration protested over and over on the basis of cost, but that since enactment of the bill, their spokesmen have shouted from the housetops, telling employee groups of their generosity in giving them an increase. It should be noted, however, that the administration's self-proclaimed generosity to Federal employees has become more and more pronounced as the magic month of November draws nearer. I wonder whether there could be a connection. Or is it that at this late date the administration has honestly come to realize that Federal employees were actually entitled to an increase all along, and that the administration was wrong in its prolonged opposition to an increase?

Mr. President, we now see the telltale shadows of history repeating itself, this time in regard to retirement legislation.

A few short weeks ago the administration opposed a major overhaul of the civil service retirement system. Instead, the administration was wedded to the proposition of coordinating the civil service retirement system and the social security program—coordination without major improvement in the retirement benefits of Federal employees.

The administration plan would have cost the Government some two hundred million dollars a year, and would eventually have called for an employee contribution of 7½ percent. Yes, the administration could stand a two hundred million-plus expense for a bill of its own design, and Federal employees could afford a contribution of 7½ percent of their pay for a plan designed for them—a plan that by their unanimous testimony they did not seek and did not desire.

But, only a few weeks later when testifying before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the administration changed its tune.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission stated:

> The Civil Service Commission holds the view that if the Government is to obtain an improved and favorable competitive position in the recruiting and retaining of qualified employees and wishes to regain its former position of leadership in the field of progressive retirement legislation, the present 6-percent rate of employee deductions should be considered a maximum rate, which should not be increased. The Commission accordingly recommends that as a matter of policy 6 percent of salary be considered the maximum rate of employee contributions to the civil service retirement system.

Mind you, this recommendation followed by only a few weeks the hearings on the Senate side, at which time the Commission recommended a plan calling for a 7½-percent deduction. Also the Commission proposed modifications in the Senate-approved retirement bill that would reduce the Government's cost to $165 million a year. This followed by only a few weeks their support of the administration bill that would have cost many millions of dollars more.

The real point of all this is that it seems unmistakably clear that the administration will pay a price to secure something it desires and, moreover, will exact a toll from Federal employees for the same purpose. However, it is not so charitable when it comes to enactment of legislation which does not bear the administration's label. It is a case of "Papa knows best."

In commenting on the provision of the Senate-approved bill which would provide a more favorable factor for the computation of retirement benefits, the Commission stated:

> We do not find this proposal objectionable in principle. Nor do we find the benefit it produces would be excessive when compared with benefits provided other officers and employees. The Commission does believe that the cost involved in this provision must be carefully considered.

In other words, there is no objection as to principle. Neither is there objection on the basis that the benefits are excessive. Yet there is objection because of the cost.

Mr. President, I could not in good conscience object to a proposal that is sound in principle and which does not provide excessive benefits purely on the grounds that it will cost some money.

Are we to deny Federal employees fair treatment because it will cost some money to give them fair treatment? Are we to allow the career service to decay and wither because it will cost money to keep it in proper repair? Are we to be satisfied with a second-class public service because it will cost a few extra dollars to provide an efficient and effective first-class public service? I do not believe we will subscribe to such a short-sighted policy.

On the Senate side, the administration spoke fervently in support of its coordination plan because—

> Only through coordination can adequate survivorship benefits be provided. S. 2875 is inadequate in this respect.

But what happened on the House side? It seems unbelievable, but the administration completely reversed itself by opposing the survivorship benefits of S. 2875, not because they were inadequate, as claimed by the administration representatives when they testified on the Senate side, but because they had suddenly and without change become excessive.

I am convinced that it is the purpose of the administration to confuse and befuddle the issues, which are extremely complex at best, in order to scuttle S. 2875.

However, let me make one thing clear. S. 2875 is a good bill. It is a progressive bill. It is a desirable and greatly needed bill. It is the most important piece of employee legislation of recent decades. Its enactment would do more to improve

and strengthen the career service than any other measure considered by Congress since the turn of the century. Therefore, I do not propose to accept a diluted and emasculated substitute that falls short of the goal. If a proper and adequate measure cannot be enacted into law under the present administration during this session, I am confident of eventual success. Just as in the case of the pay bills, justice and right will eventually prevail in regard to retirement legislation.

PORTRAITS OF OUTSTANDING SENATORS TO BE PLACED IN SENATE RECEPTION ROOM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate resolution sponsored by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself.

According to the provisions of Senate Resolution 145, the selection of 5 outstanding Senators whose portraits are to be placed in the Senate reception room was to be made over a period of 10 years, 1 being selected every 2 years.

Upon reflection, the members of our committee unanimously decided that it would be more satisfactory if the five Senators whose portraits are to be placed in the Senate reception room should all be chosen at once. Therefore, the purpose of the resolution which I am submitting is to amend the original resolution so as to provide that the 5 Senators be chosen by May of next year, although we hope the date will be 2 or 3 months earlier.

The resolution also provides that the amount to be appropriated for the committee shall be increased from $5,000 to $10,000, although the committee does not expect that that amount will be expended. However, it will take care of contingencies, particularly clerical help. The select committee feels that this procedure is far more effective. It has the approval of the majority leader and the minority leader, who were the sponsors of the original resolution.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 297), submitted by Mr. KENNEDY for himself and other Senators, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 145, 84th Congress, agreed to on August 2, 1955, authorizing the placing of paintings in the 5 unfilled spaces in the Senate reception room, is amended as follows—

(1) strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than May 1, 1957, its selections of persons whose paintings shall be placed in the Senate reception room."; and

(2) strike out in section 4 "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Senators, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire are to certain committee amendments. The committee amendments have not yet been called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Aircraft and Related Procurement," on page 23, at the beginning of line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$6,048,500,000" and insert "$6,848,500,000"; on page 26, line 4, under the heading "Operation and Maintenance," to strike out "$3,684,185,000" and insert "$3,780,185,000"; and on page 29, after line 13, to insert lines 14 to 19, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Senators to the committee amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 17, in lieu of "$6,848,500,000", it is proposed to insert "$6,398,500,000."

On page 26, line 4, in lieu of "$3,780,185,000", it is proposed to insert "$3,770,185,000."

On page 29, it is proposed to strike out lines 14 to 19 inclusive.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire to certain committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At 1:30 o'clock p. m., the time limitation will begin to operate, and there will be 45 minutes to each side on the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that it was the intention of the Senator from New Hampshire to ask that his amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have the information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Maine have the information?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in order that Senators may be on notice, at 1:30 p. m. the time limitation will begin to operate in connection with the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire, and there will be 45 minutes to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont cares to yield to me for that purpose, I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum; or, if he prefers, he may proceed without it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I think it might be just as well if I were to proceed without a quorum call. The majority leader and I have had experience with quorum calls.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

FOREIGN POLICY

II. GERMANY AND NATO

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, this second of the series of brief speeches makes a drastic proposal. It is that Chancellor Adenauer be encouraged to negotiate with the Soviet Government for the reuniting of East and West Germany, in return for a united Germany which agrees to be unarmed and neutral, but is otherwise free.

The initial negotiations must be made with the Soviet Government, not with its puppet, East Germany. Warrant for this is to be found in the statement by Molotov, who, at the second high-level conference, after flying to Moscow to consult with the present government, made it plain that East Germany would not be released except on terms which preserved its puppet, Communist government. The Soviet holds the power and the responsibility not the puppet government.

It may seem strange that I am making such a suggestion so soon after the visit of the Chancellor, in the course of which rearmament and reunion were both reaffirmed. I shall endeavor to show that the two are practically incompatible. Germany and we must recognize this fact of life. The choice between the two must be put up to the Soviet Government. This can be done with some hope of a useful decision, as I will endeavor to show later.

First, let me recount a bit of history. About 2 years ago it had become clear to me that our endeavor to rearm Germany was an ill-conceived, expensive, and fruitless undertaking. Why this should be so is now becoming quite obvious. It was our own idea. It does not fit into the aspirations of the German people. It does arouse the fears of our allies.

The deepest desire of the German people is to have their west and east reunited in peace and freedom. Rearmament does not serve this aspiration but blocks it. Why did we ever believe that the Soviet Government could be persuaded to release East Germany to a rearmed Western Germany? The proposal has only to be stated and it becomes

evidently preposterous. Russia fears a rearmed enemy, and nothing we can say or do will remove that fear so long as we are pressing rearmament. The only way reunification could be effected under our program would be by a victorious war—World War III. Were we ever, are we now, prepared for that solution?

The only rational explanation of our policy does us little credit from the moral standpoint. It is that we gave lip service to the German aspiration for unity, while urging for other reasons a rearmament which made unity impossible. It is true that rearmament was conceived to be in support of larger ends, the resistance to Soviet aggression and the defense of freedom in Western Europe. These are worthy ends and we must never cease to work for them, but their attainment received no useful support from the keystone of our policy—a revival of German military might.

These matters were clearing up in my own mind and led to the thought that we might usefully revise and expand our policy. As suggested at the beginning, why not encourage Chancellor Adenauer to negotiate with the Kremlin for the reunification of East Germany with a West Germany which is unarmed and neutral, but otherwise free? Were negotiations successful, a great and populous area would be recovered from behind the Curtain, the German people would attain a substantial measure of their aspirations, the understandable fears of the Russians would be relieved, and the West would be protected by a neutral zone extending through Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, from the North Sea to within 50 miles of the Adriatic.

But would that neutral zone be a strength or a weakness for the defense of Western Europe? Would it not bring the vast Russian armies unopposed to the banks of the Rhine? Thinking, as we are so prone to do, in terms of World War II, it would be a serious weakness. But world war III—which God and man forbid—will be an atomic war. As I shall endeavor to show in a later talk of this series, the battlefront will not be a line drawn across the earth's surface but a stratum of the upper air—atmosphere, stratosphere, ionosphere, extrasphere—what have you. We are living in a new world and thinking in an old one.

With these thoughts in mind on September 20, 1954, I went up into a hidden valley where is located the village capital of my remote State, and in a public speech suggested the usefulness of an unarmed, neutral, reunited Germany, negotiated for by the Chancellor of that newly freed country.

Some slight notice of that speech appeared in American newspapers—about as much as experience had led me to expect. What was completely unexpected was the notice taken of my words in Germany itself. I had unexpectedly touched upon a fear deep in German hearts—a fear generated by the sad experience of two successive generations led to disaster by German general staffs, serving masters crazed by the lure of power. These correspondents had had enough of this. They wanted no more.

Following this evidence of German misgivings, I communicated with high officials of the State Department. I found our rearmament policy so firmly entrenched that it could not be reconsidered. My efforts there ceased with my prediction that the policy of German rearmament would disintegrate everything it touched. This prophecy has been measurably fulfilled.

My next step was to mention the matter to others high in the administration. Here, too, I found a monolithic support for rearmament. While still believing it to be fruitless and dangerous, I was not prepared to oppose my own Republican administration at a time when I was almost alone in my point of view. Being sure that events have so moved as to bring more support to the idea, I have no hesitation in speaking out again at this time.

What has been said relates to German interests and German sentiment. There are also serious problems with our allies, particularly the French.

When the French Assembly unwisely voted down the proposals for a European Defense Community, the situation became impossible. EDC, as it was called, would have permitted German, French, and other soldiers to have served in an allied army, under allied commanders and an allied general staff. This would have allayed the fears of both the German and French peoples. Yet the French turned it down.

For they are fearful. When I was in Paris last summer, a high-placed public figure said to me, "We are in favor of German reunification, but not too soon." Both as to reunification and rearmament I had a similar unofficial report from one of our own embassy staff who had been on a tour of the country.

Since the events just mentioned, there have been other evidences of the inherent weakness of the rearmament policy. The Chancellor visited Russia and returned with promises that German war prisoners would be returned. A few were. He made no headway on reunification. He was negotiating from weakness, for he had nothing with which to bargain. He could get no assurance of reunion, or of a thoroughgoing repatriation. With our assent he can have disarmament as a strong bargaining point.

More recently an important election went against him and a part of the political coalition on which he depended has defected. The structure of revived military power was built on sand, and the foundations are crumbling.

Meanwhile at the first Geneva conference in July, 1955, the Soviet rulers became convinced of the truth that we had no military designs on them. This has permitted a change of policy on their part from threats to wooings. Furthermore, the French have become so heavily engaged in North Africa that they are virtually evacuating their military defense at home.

NATO thus is weakened. General Gruenther is resigning. Lord Ismay's hope for a political and economic function for NATO comes to be about all that is left, and it is given strong support by the French Premier.

Are we sure that the strength we can draw from German rearmament continues to exist? We need to reexamine this question in view of the obvious shift of tactics and strategy towards atomic warfare.

On the other hand, can we have assurance that Germany will remain neutral? There is an old belief that a "power vacuum" will inevitably be filled. But Germany is not a power vacuum. It is a reservoir of commercial power and the interests of its people center on industrial and commercial activity, freed from military taxation. So much for internal interests. Externally, the Soviet and the Western Powers must and will spring into action if either side begins military aggression. The atomic stalemate must be extended to cover a Russian invasion, as will be suggested in my next talk.

Finally, our confidence in Adenauer is justified; but neither he nor we who are gathered in this Chamber are immortal. In years not now too far ahead, what a prize would be that rearmed Germany, open to Communist subversion.

Let us, therefore, in this area forego the hope of military aid as being illusory. Let us reach rather for another value, that inherent in a new area released from behind the Curtain and serving as part of a protective barrier against military ground attack.

This is indeed a drastic proposal. It requires that the Soviet withdraw completely from East Germany as we withdraw from the West. It requires that we put into effect the lessons learned from the debacle of the Korean truce. The Curtain must first be dropped and thrown aside. Mr. President, I repeat: The Curtain must first be dropped and thrown aside. Complete communication between East and West Germany must be established. Soviet forces and equipment must be moved out in step with our own evacuation. The terms of union must then be left to the freely elected representatives of East and West Germany.

Will the Soviet Government ever agree to this loss of population, territory, and productive capacity? This cannot be known until the proposal is made. A refusal would be a refusal to make an important advance toward peace and freedom. Can that Government afford to refuse, with the eyes of the world keenly searching for a willingness to act for peace as well as to talk about it?

In fact, a careful reading of Molotov's report on his return from Moscow would seem to indicate that the Soviet Government has so committed itself that it would find difficulty in refusing.

Should the Soviet Government, by refusal, show plainly that its policy is focused on power, not peace, then we resume our policies of power and look elsewhere for the means of directing power toward peace.

But, first, let this opportunity be put to the test.

STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BY CULTURAL AND ATHLETIC EXCHANGES AND PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL FAIRS AND FESTIVALS

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, yesterday I brought to the

attention of the Senate a disservice which I believe the United States Information Agency has done to our prestige abroad by retreating from its sponsorship of an exhibit of American painting overseas. I commented that this was one of several such instances of what I believed to be an unfortunate retreat and a very unwise action on the part of the USIA.

An editorial entitled "USIA Stumbles Again" was published in the Minneapolis Tribune of June 23, 1956. I call the editorial to the attention of my colleagues, because it goes right to the point. It says, in part:

The USIA evidently has decided not to sponsor what would have been one of the most significant exhibits of American painting ever sent overseas. Reason: USIA fears some artists represented might be attacked for pro-Communist leanings.

At USIA's request, the American Federation of Arts had lined up major works of a hundred American artists of this century from galleries, museums, and private collections across the country.

Then USIA declared 10 of the artists unacceptable for political reasons. AFA trustees rejected censorship, voting unanimously not to participate in the project if any paintings were barred.

Last month USIA canceled plans to send a painting exhibit called Sport in Art to the Olympic Games in Australia after a Dallas patriotic council charged that four of the artists represented had once belonged to Communist fronts.

A month earlier USIA had canceled a fall tour of India and the Middle East by the Symphony of the Air, implying that some players had dubious political loyalties. The orchestra had made a highly successful tour in Asia in 1955 under USIA's sponsorship.

This was the same orchestra which only recently was told it was unacceptable. The editorial continues:

In the latest fiasco, the arts federation did well to remind USIA of a 1954 statement by one Dwight D. Eisenhower on the subject, in which the President said:

"Freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land. * * * When artists are made the slaves and the tools of the state, when artists become the chief propagandists of a cause, progress is arrested and creation and genius are destroyed."

Mr. President, I think this is a matter of serious import, and I am hopeful that before long the USIA will reconsider the matter, exhibit some courage, and come to an honorable decision worthy of "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

USIA STUMBLES AGAIN

Comes now the United States Information Agency with one more demonstration that the silly season is still with us and that overzealous Americans can harm their country's prestige more than Communist propaganda.

USIA evidently has decided not to sponsor what would have been one of the most significant exhibits of American painting ever sent overseas. Reason? USIA fears some artists represented might be attacked for pro-Communist leanings.

At USIA's request, the American Federation of Arts had lined up major works of a hundred American artists of this century from galleries, museums, and private collections across the country.

Then USIA declared 10 of the artists unacceptable for political reasons. AFA trustees rejected censorship, voting unanimously not to participate in the project if any paintings were barred.

If the show finally gets abroad at all it will evidently have to be under private sponsorship.

Last month USIA canceled plans to send a painting exhibit called Sport in Art to the Olympic Games in Australia after a Dallas patriotic council charged that four of the artists represented had once belonged to Communist fronts.

A month earlier, USIA had canceled a fall tour of India and the Middle East by the Symphony of the Air, implying that some players had dubious political loyalties. The orchestra had made a highly successful tour in Asia in 1955, under USIA sponsorship.

In the latest fiasco, the arts federation did well to remind USIA of a 1954 statement by one Dwight D. Eisenhower on the subject, in which the President said:

"Freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land. * * * When artists are made the slaves and the tools of the state, when artists become the chief propagandists of a cause, progress is arrested and creation and genius are destroyed."

THE REMARKABLE CAREER OF CARROLL BINDER

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I have already had occasion to mention on the Senate floor the remarkable career of Carroll Binder, who died on May 1, shortly after paying a visit to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington. Mr. Binder was the editor of the editorial page of the Minneapolis Tribune at the time of his death.

Among the many things he wrote, for which he will be widely remembered, is his statement of personal faith, contributed in 1952 to Edward R. Murrow's "This I Believe." I can think of no statement by Mr. Binder which sums up his own career better than these words. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OF PERSONAL FAITH AND FALLING TILES

(By Carroll Binder)

"We are all at the mercy of a falling tile," Julius Caesar reminds us in Thornton Wilder's Ides of March. None of us knows at what hour something we love may suffer some terrible blow by a force we can neither anticipate nor control.

Fifty-five years of living, much of the time in trouble centers of a highly troubled era, have not taught me how to avoid being hit by falling tiles. I have sustained some very severe blows. My mother died when I was 3 years old. My first-born son, a gifted and idealistic youth, was killed in the war. While I was still cherishing the hope that he might be alive, circumstances beyond my control made it impossible for me to continue work into which I had poured my heart's blood for 20 years.

I speak of such things here in the hope of helping others to believe with me that there are resources within one's grasp which enable one to sustain such blows without being crushed or embittered by them.

I believe the best hope of standing up to falling tiles is through developing a sustaining philosophy and state of mind all through life. I have seen all sorts of people sustain all sorts of blows in all sorts of circumstances by all sorts of faiths, so I believe anyone can find a faith that will serve his needs if he persists in the quest.

One of the best ways I know of fortifying oneself to withstand the vicissitudes of this insecure and unpredictable era is to school oneself to require relatively little in the way of material possessions, physical satisfactions or the praise of others. The less one requires of such things the better situated one is to stand up to changes of fortune.

I am singularly rich in friendships. Friends of all ages have contributed enormously to my happiness and helped me greatly in times of need. I learned one of the great secrets of friendship early in life—to regard each person with whom one associates as an end in himself, not a means to one's ends. That entails trying to help those with whom one comes in contact to find fulfillment in their own way while seeking one's own fulfillment in one's own way.

Another ethical principle that has stood me in good stead is: Know thyself. I try to acquaint myself realistically with my possibilities and limitations. I try to suit my aspirations to goals within my probable capacity to attain. I may have missed some undiscovered possibilities for growth but I have spared myself much by not shooting for stars it clearly was not given me to attain.

I have seen much inhumanity, cheating, corruption, sordidness, and selfishness but I have not become cynical. I have seen too much that is decent, kind, and noble in men to lose faith in the possibility for a far finer existence than yet has been achieved. I believe the quest for a better life is the most satisfying pursuit of men and nations.

I love life but I am not worried about death. I do not feel that I have lost my son and a host of others dear to me by death. I believe with William Penn that "they that love beyond the world cannot be separated by it. Death is but crossing the world, as friends do the seas; they live in one another still." Death, I believe, teaches us the things of deathlessness.

MARKERS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES TO HONOR MEMORY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 880), is amended by adding after the word "action", the words "or who died or were killed while serving in such forces, and whose remains have not been identified, have been

buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered the amendment and reports favorably thereon. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. 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.

CANCELLATION OF VISIT BY PRIME MINISTER NEHRU

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the cancellation of the visit of Prime Minister Nehru to our country is a shocking setback to our international relations. Mr. Nehru is the leader of the largest community of free people in the world. It is extremely important to all of us that India remain a free country, directing its own destiny, independent of foreign domination.

Mr. Nehru was coming here to attempt to overcome some of the misunderstanding which has troubled our relations in the past. It is tragic that the administration has seen fit to cancel this visit, while at the same time announcing that the President will be flown to Panama 2 weeks later. These circumstances, together with the glowingly optimistic bulletins about the President's health can be interpreted as a deliberate snub by reasonable people.

Speaking for myself at least, and I believe for many of my colleagues, I sincerely hope that Prime Minister Nehru does not take offense at this treatment. We have the greatest respect for the Indian people and Nehru. We believe they are making a valiant and successful effort to remain free and to create a workable and stable democratic society.

I believe the American people desire to be helpful to the people of India; that they have a sincere and deep interest in the success of their struggle for a better life; and that they sincerely regret that the leader of the Indian people is not coming to confer with our President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1275) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanitariums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7641) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes.

The message further 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. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 11878. An act to extend the date upon which the Rubber Disposal Commission will terminate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia;

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 7227. 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; and

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 11878. An act to extend the date upon which the Rubber Disposal Commission will terminate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 26, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the events of the last few days in Egypt represent a serious set-back for the free world and a sobering disclosure of the futility of the administration's policies in the Middle East.

The British have withdrawn their troops from Suez. The base has been occupied by Egyptian forces. These forces have been recently equipped by Communist nations with modern implements for mechanized warfare.

The new foreign minister of the Soviet Union, Dmitri T. Shepilov, who engineered the Communist bloc arms deal with Egypt, has attended the 3-day celebration of these developments. He has used this visit as an occasion to renew his country's assurances of friendship and support, while attacking Western colonialism and oil monopolies, and otherwise fishing in whatever other troubled waters he could find. He has naturally ignored Soviet colonialism and oil monopolies.

In the meantime, the Cairo radio is reported to be parroting the Communist line on various foreign policy questions; and Premier Nasser, in what was described as an emotionally charged speech in the news story in the New York Times last week, has repeated thinly-veiled threats directed at the nation of Israel, urging that Egypt be strengthened "to restore to the people of Palestine their rights of freedom and existence."

Our own Government at the same time persists in its refusal to sell to Israel the arms she must have if she is to maintain the balance of strength in that area; and all of these developments seem to promise a realization of the prediction of Mr. Hanson Baldwin, made nearly 2 years ago, that with Egypt in sole control at Suez:

> The Egyptian-Arab friction, already at fever point, may even burst the bounds of the past.

The presence of Foreign Minister Shepilov clearly shows what force is determined to fill the vacuum of power created by the withdrawal of the British troops. The actions and statements of the Egyptian premier make all too clear Egypt's hostile intent toward Israel and indifference to the peace of the Middle

East. To the degree that our Government, under what I believe to be the misguided urging of American Ambassador Henry A. Byroade, has helped to bring about this weakening of the free world's power and strengthening of those who avow agressive intentions in the Middle East, it must share in the responsibility and blame for these ominous developments.

We recall the rather precise threats by the Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, Saleh Selim, 2 years ago, who said:

As for the problem of Palestine, it will not be solved except by force. This force will not be attained before the Suez Canal is freed. The Egyptian Army cannot fight while the British Army stands between it and its bases.

In the light of the removal of the British Army and the renewal of these threats by Premier Nasser, is it not time for our Government to review its policy in the Middle East and reverse its previous refusal to allow Israel to purchase necessary defensive arms in this country? Is it not also time to work out some blueprint for the future of our policy in that area which promises no more celebrations graced by the presence of the Russian foreign minister? Must we not more urgently and effectively press for a peaceful stabilization of the national boundaries, based on a recognition of the permanence of Israel, and for the economic upbuilding of the countries in the Middle East? Supporting fully the efforts of the United Nations, should we not likewise assist in mobilizing the free world both to maintain the peace of the Middle East and to block the attempted expansion of Soviet imperialism? It is high time, in my judgment, to end the blindness and futility that seem to have directed our Government's policy in more recent years.

It also seems important to me that we learn from the events of recent days that the basic objectives of the Soviet Union, despite all of their propaganda efforts to make it appear otherwise, are unchanged.

I ask unanimous consent to have printedn in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Visitor in Cairo," which was published in the New York Times on Monday, June 18, 1956. The editorial comments upon the cynical and dangerous game being played by Soviet diplomacy in that area of the world.

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

VISITOR IN CAIRO

Making his first appearance on the international stage outside the Soviet Union since his recent appointment, Foreign Minister Dmitri T. Shepilov is now in Cairo, where he has been received as an honored guest. The welcome now being shown him is no doubt motivated in large part by his role almost a year ago in laying the groundwork for Egypt's receipt of modern arms from Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Shepilov's remarks last Saturday on arriving in Cairo should help mightily to dispel any illusions that Soviet foreign policy objectives have changed. It would be difficult to find a more cynical statement by a modern statesman, or one more inspired by the desire to increase rancor among states.

The Soviet Foreign Minister poses in Cairo as the envoy of a "country that has totally repudiated colonial expansion." Yet the Soviet Union is today the largest colonial empire in the world, imprisoning among other subject peoples over 20 million persons of Moslem origin in Central Asia and the Caucasus. It might be in point to ask Mr. Shepilov when and where the Soviet Union repudiated Mr. Molotov's official communication of November 26, 1940, to the German Government—the statement which declares that "the area south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf, must be, recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union." Could there be a cruder statement of plans for "colonial expansion"?

Mr. Shepilov assured his Egyptian hosts his country "has no place for oil monopolies or any other kind of imperialist monopoly that sucks the vitality of less developed nations." But where is there a more complete oil monopoly than in Moslem Azerbaijan, whose petroleum has been ruthlessly taken for Moscow's benefit for over a third of a century? What better example of sucking the vitality of a less developed nation is there today than in Soviet Kazakhstan, whose native Moslem population is today being drowned in a flood of Slav migrants from the West?

These and other misstatements in Mr. Shepilov's speech were not accidental of course. He and his Moscow colleagues hope to exploit the tensions of the Middle East for their own benefit. When he speaks of "oil monopolies" he intends the Arab peoples to be inflamed against the Western oil companies which have invested vast sums to discover and develop Middle Eastern oil resources and which take their profits only after paying the Governments of these countries enormous sums each year for the oil they produce.

Already now it is clear that Moscow is playing a cynical and dangerous game in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli dispute, the oil question, anticolonial feeling, all these are instruments it hopes to play upon to breed ill will and to heighten Soviet influence. That the Soviet policy could bring war to this sensitive area is also a matter about which Moscow shows little concern.

Whether the Middle Eastern countries will succumb to Mr. Shepilov's honeyed words and the armament presents he has the power to distribute remains to be seen. The real test of the present leaders of the Arab States is here. These leaders have but to look at the plight of the subject Moslem peoples of the Soviet Union to understand their own fate if they ignore the real goals of present Soviet policy. Meanwhile we of the West are being given a valuable object lesson. Soviet policy in the Mideast just doesn't bear out Moscow's assertions that it wants to lessen international tension and bring peace to this troubled world.

NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY'S OWN STATISTICS SHOW PHILLIPS DECISION DID NOT STIFLE "EXPLORATION"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the proponents of the Harris-Fulbright bill to exempt the producers of natural gas from regulation repeatedly argued that, unless the bill were passed, exploration for natural gas would cease and probably no gas would be available for sale. The theme that supply is more important than price was played again and again, and the level of proved gas reserves was cited as evidence that the Phillips decision was resulting in a decrease in exploration for natural gas. For example, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated on the floor of the Senate on January 17 of this year:

The handwriting has already begun to appear on the wall. During the first 11 months of last year—the figures for December are not yet available—oil-well completions in America increased 8 percent. Gas-well completions, however, dropped 8.6 percent. If this trend continues, and I am convinced it will as long as utility controls are applied at the wellhead, the natural-gas consumer may soon find himself in the same situation as the lady who was pricing hamburger at her neighborhood market. When the butcher told her it was 69 cents a pound, the lady complained bitterly.

"Why, down the street," she said, "I can get it for 39 cents a pound."

"Then, why don't you buy it there?" the butcher asked.

"Oh, they're out of hamburger," the lady said.

"Well, that's different," said the butcher. "When we're out, our price is only 15 cents."

The same sort of situation could easily develop in the gas industry. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 17, 1956, pp. 563–564.)

On January 16, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], referring to the contention of a diminishing supply of natural gas for interstate sales, said:

Is this all an idle fear? Am I seeing ghosts under the bed? Better look at the statistics to see what has happened in just one year of this uncertainty.

In 1955, the year just closed, the number of new oil wells completed showed an increase of 7 percent over 1954. The number of new gas wells showed a decrease of 9.7 percent.

Each year, during the period from 1945 through 1953, the unregulated gas producers have added new reserves averaging twice the current production of that year. But the new reserves added in 1954 barely exceeded current production—for the first time in recent history. What greater warning could the Congress have of the ultimate effect of the Phillips decision? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 16, 1956, p. 458.)

Mr. President, at the time, I assured my distinguished colleagues that these were indeed idle fears; that the proponents were, in fact, "seeing ghosts under the bed." I was supported in this contention by Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, who, after the debate on the natural gas bill was ended, told the Joint Committtee on the Economic Report on February 17, 1956, that in 1955 "the oil industry turned in another record performance in new drilling"—hearings, page 547.

It should not be necessary to say again that, in exploratory drilling, almost invariably one drills for oil, and finds either gas or oil.

I now have further evidence from the natural gas industry itself to show that I was correct in asserting that the Phillips decision had not and would not stifle the growth of gas reserves, as so frequently alleged. The annual estimate of natural gas reserves is now available for the year 1955. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the annual estimate of natural gas reserves for the years 1945–55 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Annual estimates of natural gas reserves (natural gas added during year)

[Trillion cubic feet]

Year	Extensions and revisions	New discoveries	Total added [1]	Net production	Estimated proved reserves at end of year	Net increase
1945	------	------	------	------	147.8	------
1946	------	------	17.7	4.9	160.6	12.8
1947	7.6	3.4	11.0	5.6	165.9	5.4
1948	9.8	4.1	13.9	6.0	173.9	7.9
1949	8.1	4.6	12.7	6.2	180.4	6.5
1950	9.2	2.9	12.1	6.9	185.6	5.2
1951	13.0	3.0	16.2	8.0	193.8	8.2
1952	8.9	5.4	14.5	8.6	199.7	5.9
1953	13.4	7.1	20.9	9.2	211.4	11.7
1954	4.6	5.0	9.7	9.4	211.7	.3
1955	16.3	5.7	22.0	10.1	223.7	12.0

[1] Includes relatively small "change in underground storage." In 1953, the method of classifying this item was changed and resulted in an increase for that year of 0.5 trillion cubic feet.

NOTE.—Totals sometimes do not agree because of rounding. Comparable figures are not available for 1945 and 1946.

Source: Proved Reserves of Crude Oil, Natural Gas Liquids, and Natural Gas, Dec. 31, 1955. Published jointly by the American Gas Association and the American Petroleum Institute, 1956, p. 21.

1955 BEST YEAR IN INDUSTRY HISTORY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thus, from the industry's own figures, it is clear that in 1955, the first full year following the Phillips decision, there was the greatest addition to natural gas reserves in the industry's history—22 trillion cubic feet.

Gas Facts, the industry's authoritative compilation of gas statistics, says that—

additions to natural gas reserves may be the result of (1) discoveries of new fields, estimates for which are generally conservative for the first year; (2) new discoveries in old fields; (3) extensions and revisions of estimates for existing fields on the basis of additional drilling or field data; and (4) extensions and revisions because of changed operating conditions or abandonment pressures in existing fields.

Under the column in my table headed "Extensions and Revisions" are included the third and fourth, and under the heading "New Discoveries" are included the first and second.

There is no further breakdown of the figures, nor is any detailed information as to the components of these figures available. They are compiled by an industry committee, from figures submitted anonymously by the companies through regional committees. What figures are submitted, and even whether they are submitted at all, is a matter of company policy. There is no check on these estimates by any other agency, either private or governmental, nor does the final industry committee do anything but compile the figures submitted to it. Furthermore, I am informed that no working papers are kept, but that they are destroyed when the compilation is complete.

NEED FOR BETTER INFORMATION

It seems to me that, in this very important matter of our reserves of natural gas, it would be highly desirable to have some check by the Geological Survey or the Bureau of Mines or the Federal Power Commission upon the estimates. It would also be highly desirable to have some more detailed breakdown of the figures, so that we might know more precisely how they are arrived at, and what they mean. We can see that there have been great fluctuations in the extensions and revisions of natural gas reserves in the last few years, while new discoveries have increased rather steadily, along with drillings. We have no way of knowing whether the fluctuations in extensions and revisions—which became so marked after 1950—have resulted from technical factors or from an industry desire to buttress the arguments for exemption legislation.

Congress should not be asked to act upon exemption legislation, and the Federal Power Commission should not try to pass upon just and reasonable rates of natural gas producers in the dark. Neither should they act with blinders on which permit the lawmakers and the Commission to see only the facts or interpretations of facts which the affected special interests choose to disclose. Especially when arguments about "falling reserves" and "disappearing incentives" are made in support of exemption or loose regulation, the full facts about gas reserves should be determined and reported by some public or independent body with no ax to grind. This is why I have for many months been urging the Federal Power Commission to secure this information, as I reported in a brief speech in the Senate on June 11, 1956.

PHILLIPS DECISION HAD NO HARMFUL EFFECT ON EXPLORATION

At this time, however, even from the industry's own sources, it is clear that the Phillips decision and the subsequent efforts by the Federal Power Commission to institute some regulation over producers have had no adverse effect upon exploration for natural gas. Any effect of regulation as a deterrent to exploration would show up only in the figures for well drillings and new discoveries. It could not be reflected in revisions of existing reserves, if they are honest estimates, for these are merely changes in estimates, based on fuller knowledge. New discoveries do roughly reflect the extent of drilling activity for oil and gas.

Looking at the detailed figures recently released, we see there was some decrease in the volume of new discoveries from 1953 to 1954. However, 1953 was the biggest year for which we have figures in terms of new discoveries of natural gas. At least in part, this was a result of the rush to exploit offshore oil deposits which resulted in a substantial increase in proved reserves. It is possible, too, that the estimates of new discoveries in 1953 were less conservative than usual, which might account in part for the unusually low extensions and revisions in 1954.

At any rate, although there was a drop in new discoveries during 1954, it was the third best year for which we have the figures. Furthermore, since drilling and exploration are planned in advance and the Phillips decision was not issued until mid-1954, it is difficult to see how the decision could have had much effect upon new discoveries for 1954.

If the Phillips decision and the Federal Power Commission's hesitant efforts to carry it out were to have any effect, it should have come during 1955, not during 1954. But what happened in 1955? New discoveries increased substantially to a level exceeded only by the exceptional year of 1953. If there were any justification for the proponents of exemption arguing that the Phillips decision affected reserves adversely during 1954, I would have much greater justification for holding that regulation effected a substantial increase in reserves during 1955, and, therefore, we should have more of it.

Actually, of course, neither argument is valid. Drilling, as I have said many times before, is primarily for oil; the discovery of gas is incidental to it. Drilling for oil will continue as long as it is profitable, and all the evidence continues to show that the oil business is still fabulously profitable. Whatever direct drilling for natural gas takes place, including developmental drilling, is also dependent upon profitability, not upon court decisions. The proponents of exemption have yet to produce any evidence that the production and sale of natural gas is not a highly profitable industry.

As I said before, the fluctuations in reserves have not taken place in new discoveries, but in extensions and revisions in the estimates of already discovered reserves. The only explanations I can find for the fluctuations in extensions and revisions are, first, that they are due to technical factors which are certainly unrelated to regulation; second, that there was some holding back by the industry in revising the estimates at the end of 1954, perhaps to bolster the case for exemption legislation; or, third, some combination of both. These fluctuations clearly do not in any way support the claim that regulation is inhibiting exploration.

Although reserve figures for 1956 will not be available until sometime next year, the industry does make available weekly figures on drilling. In the issue of June 4, 1956, the Oil and Gas Journal compares drillings from January 1, 1956, through May 26, 1956, with the period January 1, 1955, through May 28, 1955. The total number of wildcat wells drilled during the 1956 period was 5,016 as compared with 4,663 for the like period in 1955. This represents an increase this year of about 8 percent. Producing gas wells completed this year totaled 161 as compared with 148 in 1955, an increase of 9 percent. Thus we see that exploration is continuing at an accelerated pace, even after the veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill.

OIL INDUSTRY FIGURES DEMOLISH ITS OWN ARGUMENTS

In conclusion, therefore, the natural gas industry's reserve figures for 1955 demolish the argument of the proponents of exemption legislation that exemption is necessary or exploration will stop. It always was a specious argument. Gas Facts has pointed out that the important fact is that the annual increase in proved reserves should exceed the total production for that year; if it does so, then our natural gas reserves are continuing in good shape. Even in 1954, this was the case, and in 1955, the total increase in proved reserves was the greatest in history—22 trillion cubic feet.

Now that the argument about falling reserves has been conclusively destroyed, there is no reason left to enact exemption legislation except that reason which was always the real one—to provide a gigantic bonanza or giveaway to the producers of natural gas, at the expense of consumers.

Mr. President, I now desire to discuss another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ILLINOIS FARM BUREAU FARM MANAGEMENT SERVICE, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have before me the 1955 annual report of the Illinois Farm Bureau Farm Management Service. This report is the 31st annual report and covers the returns from the books which farmers themselves keep of their expenses and income. I shall introduce into the RECORD certain tables I have prepared from the information which is contained in the report and I would introduce the entire report except that it is exceedingly voluminous and would take several pages in the RECORD.

1955 INCOME FIGURES ARE ALARMING

This 1955 report was prepared at the University of Illinois, department of agricultural economics, College of Agriculture, in cooperation with 88 county farm bureaus in Illinois. The facts and figures which are contained in this year's report of 1955 farm records are alarming. They are especially alarming when it is recalled that the farmers who participate in this program, as a group, are probably the most prosperous farmers in the State of Illinois. They keep accurate records. They run their farms as a business. By various methods they calculate their expenses and their returns from labor, interest, capital livestock, feed, seeds and crops, taxes, and all the other items which proper business management and accounting deem essential and appropriate.

Further, Mr. President, it should be recalled that Illinois contains some of the richest land in America, if not in the world. The information which I shall put in the RECORD is taken from the accounts of farms in northern Illinois, which is probably the richest part of the State. Thus, the figures I shall give, Mr. President, are from the farms in the richest farm area in the country, that is, the Corn Belt, in the richest land in the State of Illinois, and from the best farms and the most prosperous farmers on what is probably the best farmland in America. Therefore, these figures are not selected from the poorest farms or from the marginal farmers, but are from those who really make an effort to farm efficiently, who have had training in keeping accurate farm records, and from farmers who run their farms as well as modern scientific agriculture and business procedures allow.

I say the figures are alarming. I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD at this point, a table showing the 1955 net management returns per farm and per acre for 947 northern Illinois farms in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service for 1955.

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

TABLE I.—*947 northern Illinois farms in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service, 1955*

Type of farm	Size of farm (acres)	Number of farms	1955 net management returns	
			Per farm	Per acre
Poultry farms	Under 180	33	−$1,326	−$10.12
Do	180 to 259	20	−1,280	−5.74
Dairy-hog farms	Under 180	21	−4,049	−24.69
Do	180 to 259	17	−3,638	−19.15
Beef cattle	Under 180	81	−4,673	−30.53
Do	180 to 259	120	−5,566	−24.84
Do	260 to 339	99	−6,182	−20.67
Do	340 to 499	91	−7,037	−17.42
Do	500 plus	47	−7,517	−11.86
	Soil rating 76 to 100:			
Hog farms	Under 180	77	−4,050	−26.83
Do	180 to 259	78	−3,893	−17.85
Do	260 to 339	47	−5,350	−18.07
Do	340 to 499	31	−5,231	−12.92
Do	500 plus	10	−8,198	−14.18
	Soil rating 56 to 75:			
Do	Under 180	47	−3,589	−25.28
Do	180 to 259	45	−4,104	−18.08
Do	260 to 339	31	−4,990	−16.91
Do	340 to 499	39	−4,479	−10.97
Do	500 plus	13	−9,391	−14.39
Total		947		

1955 LOSSES WERE LARGE

Mr. DOUGLAS. These figures show that beef-cattle farms in this group lost from $4,673 to $7,517 per farm in 1955, depending on the size of the farm. It will be noted that it was not only the smaller farms—those under 180 acres—which lost money in 1955, but also the farms of 500 acres and above which lost money in 1955.

The hog farmers were even harder hit. Depending upon the size of their farms and the soil ratings of their farms, as a group they lost from $3,589 per farm to as much as $9,391 per farm in 1955.

I hope that Members of the Senate, Secretary Benson, President Eisenhower, and the press and public in general will take note of these figures, whose accuracy is virtually unchallengable, and which were prepared on a factual and academic basis by highly competent people with no political ax to grind.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to introduce a second table, table II, which gives the net management returns for 1955 per farm and per acre for 808 northern Illinois farms which are predominately mixed livestock, dairy, and grain farms.

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

TABLE II.—*808 northern Illinois farms in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service, 1955*

Type of farm	Size of farm (acres)	Number of farms	1955 net management returns	
			Per farm	Per acre
Mixed livestock	Under 180	41	−$2,776	−$19.02
Do	180 to 259	68	−4,147	−19.02
Do	260 to 339	46	−4,430	−14.96
Dairy farms	Under 180:			
	Soil rating 56 to 75	51	−2,957	−21.27
	Soil rating 76 to 100	34	−2,007	−14.44
Do	180 to 259:			
	Soil rating 56 to 75	36	−3,106	−14.51
	Soil rating 76 to 100	16	−3,799	−16.52
Do	260 to 399	25	−3,665	−12.64
Do	340 to 499	19	−4,725	−11.64
Grain farms	Soil rating 76 to 100:			
Do	Under 180	48	−1,161	−7.90
Do	180 to 259	83	−724	−3.19
Do	260 to 339	70	−771	−2.58
Do	340 to 499	103	+1,386	+3.36
Do	500 plus	63	+2,923	+4.52
Do	Soil rating 56 to 75:			
Do	Under 180	16	−2,625	−17.62
Do	180 to 259	20	−1,220	−5.43
Do	260 to 339	20	−2,485	−8.17
Do	340 to 499	32	+318	+.76
Do	500 plus	17	+2,859	+4.34
Total		808		

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mixed livestock farms lost from $2,776 to $4,430 in 1955. Dairy farms lost from $2,007 to $4,725 per farm in 1955. The grain farms below 340 acres in size lost from $724 per farm to $2,625 per farm in 1955. Only those grain farms above 340 acres in size showed any profit whatsoever, and their profits on the average were from $318 to $2,923 in 1955. Thus, of all the types of farms in northern Illinois—some 1,755 which participated in the Farm Bureau Farm Management Service in 1955—only a group of 215 farms classified as grain farms which

were 340 acres in size or above, showed any net management returns for 1955. Meanwhile the remaining groups, which included some 1,540 farms, and which included all the mixed livestock, dairy, poultry, dairy-hog, beef cattle, and hog farms of all sizes, plus all the grain farm groups below 340 acres, showed losses for 1955—and these losses ranged as high as an average of $9,391 per farm for some classifications.

1955 LOSSES GREATEST IN PERIOD 1951–55

I now wish to introduce one more table—table III. This table compares the net management returns for 398 farms of 180 to 259 acres in size for 1955 with the returns for the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Further, the farms are broken down by type of farm—grain, hog, dairy, and beef cattle.

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

TABLE III.—*Net management returns, northern Illinois farms, 180 to 259 acres in size, 1951–55*

	Grain farms		Hog farms		Dairy farms		Beef cattle farms	
	Number	Net management returns	Number	Net management returns	Number	Net management returns	Number	Net management returns
1951	118	$6,119	169	$5,128	40	$4,364	68	$5,582
1952	105	1,667	157	168	47	710	92	−1,764
1953	112	1,054	125	3,562	61	243	121	−436
1954	112	2,314	145	3,458	48	−224	103	+3,320
1955	103	−821	123	−3,970	52	−3,319	120	−5,563

Mr. DOUGLAS. These figures show that 103 grain farms lost an average of $921 in 1955, that 123 hog farms in the group lost an average of $3,970 in 1955, that 52 dairy farms lost an average of $3,319 in 1955, and that 120 beef-cattle farms lost an average of $5,566 in 1955.

These figures show that the grain farmers had made as much as $6,119 per farm in 1951, that the hog farmers had made $5,128 in 1951, that the dairy farmers had made $4,364 in 1951, and that the beef-cattle farmers had made $5,582 in 1951. Only the beef-cattle farms in 1952 and 1953, of these farms, had previously lost money in this period, and only the dairy farms in 1954 had previously lost money in the period 1951–55. All the other groups had received profits which varied from year to year in this 5-year period.

NOT ONLY THE MARGINAL FARMERS WERE IN TROUBLE

Mr. President, some people have glossed over the difficulties of the farmers in very recent times. The Department of Agriculture, at times, seems almost heartless in its administration of the agricultural laws to help farmers. But this situation is serious and it appears to have become more serious in 1955 than at any previous time in recent history.

The figures I have introduced show that it is not only the marginal farmers, and not only the farmers on relatively small farms, who are in serious difficulties. These figures show that some of the best farms in the country, run by some of our most efficient farmers, on the best land in the Corn Belt, which is the richest land in the world, have been in grave financial difficulties this past year.

I hope these figures will be useful. I hope Secretary of Agriculture Benson will look at them and have second thoughts about his sliding-scale programs, which have meant lower prices and greater production year after year.

I hope the President, when he is able to do so, will look at these figures and recall his pledges in 1952 when, as a candidate, he promised to support the 90-percent program without any if's, and's, or but's.

Our farmers are in real trouble. Too many of them have already gone through the wringer. We have tried, here in Congress, to do something about that, only to have our efforts vetoed by the President. But let him take note of this situation which affects not only the marginal farmer but the whole farming industry. We should do our best to preserve farming as a way of life in America, and if we continue with the sliding-scale program, there may soon be almost no profitable farms in America.

METHOD OF CALCULATION

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be inserted in the RECORD a short memorandum giving certain details on the method by which these figures I have given on the net management returns for 1955 were calculated by the Illinois Farm Bureau farm management service. I think it will be seen that the computation of labor costs and the return on land and on capital are very conservatively calculated.

For example, hired labor was computed at its actual cost and the labor rate for the operator and his family in 1955 was computed at $200 per month for the 8 northeastern counties of the State—those counties near Chicago—and at $185 per month for the remaining counties in northern Illinois. These certainly are not excessive charges.

The land value, on which a 4 percent interest rate was figured as a cost, was based on a price given to the soil rating assigned to the land. Under the soil-rating index, which was established by the University of Illinois' department of agronomy, land with a productivity rating of 90—100 is the best land—was valued at $300 per acre as of 1950. When one considers that this land would sell at prices of $500 to $600 per acre, one can see that the capital charges on land are not excessive and may, in fact, be quite conservative.

The capital charge on buildings of 5 percent was based not on their replacement value, but on their remaining undepreciated value. As many buildings are older buildings they are shown at a relatively low value on the depreciation schedule.

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

THE CALCULATION OF NET MANAGEMENT RETURNS IN THE ILLINOIS FARM BUREAU FARM MANAGEMENT SERVICE REPORT FOR 1955

The figures for net management returns in the Illinois Farm Bureau farm management service report, are arrived at by subtracting the total farm returns from the total farm costs or inputs.

A. The dollar inputs per farm include the following items:

1. Soil fertility: This item includes the cost of the annual application of fertilizer plus the depreciation of applied limestone and rock phosphate.
2. Buildings and fences.
3. Machinery and equipment.
4. Labor: Hired labor is computed at its actual cost. In addition, there is a labor rate for unpaid operator labor and his family which is computed at $200 per month in the 8 northeastern counties of the State, $170 per month for counties in the southern one-third of the State, and $185 per month for the remaining counties in the State.
5. Taxes: This item includes the actual real-estate taxes paid and the farm share of the personal property taxes.
6. Seed and crop expense.
7. Livestock and miscellaneous expense.
8. Capital charge: This charge is at 4 percent for land and at 5 percent for machinery, buildings, soil fertility, breeding stock, and inventory as of January 1, 1955.

The land value is based on a price given to the soil rating which has been assigned to the land. The soil rating is an index from 5 to 100 (100 is the best land) which indicates a given soil's ability to grow crops. The index was established by the Department of Agronomy, University of Illinois. Under the index, bare land with a productivity rating of 90, for example, was valued at $300 per acre as of 1950. An adjustment factor of 1.23 has been used for increased prices since that time. Given the $500-$600 prices paid for the best farmland in Illinois, this index is a conservative one. The interest charge is 4 percent because of the long-term rate of loans for farmland.

Buildings have a 5-percent interest charge placed on the remaining undepreciated value. In many cases, these are older buildings constructed when costs were low and they are shown at a relatively low value on the depreciation schedule.

Machinery and soil fertility have a 5-percent interest charge on their remaining undepreciated value as of January 1, 1955. The schedules, in most cases, are the same schedules used in reporting income tax.

Inventories as of January 1 are rated at approximately the market value and a 5-percent interest charge is placed on that value.

Total farm inputs: This includes the total nonfeed inputs (items 1–8 above) and the total feed inputs.

B. The dollar returns per farm were calculated by adding the following items:

1. Miscellaneous returns.
2. Feed and grain returns.
3. All livestock returns.

C. Net management returns represent the difference between total farm inputs and total farm returns.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time charged to either side.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, with that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Federal-aid road bill or that the time for its consideration be not charged to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. 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. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; 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 26, 1956, pp. 10984–10997, 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. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the authorizations agreed upon by the conferees represent a good compromise between the bills adopted by the two respective Houses. We think it is a good bill, a much better bill than the one passed by either House.

Briefly, the conference agreement provides for a total additional amount of $24.825 billion for the Interstate System over a 13-year period—fiscal years 1957 through 1969—and an additional amount of $1.85 billion for fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, for the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Under the present law the authorizations are $700 million annually for the regular systems and $175 million annually for the Interstate System.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative list showing the authorization amounts as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate, and as agreed upon in conference, and tables showing the apportionments to States under the conference agreement.

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

Federal-aid systems—Authorizations in H. R. 10660

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
1957 (already apportioned)	700	700	
1957 (additional)	25	200	125
1958	750	900	850
1959	775	900	875
1960		900	
1961		900	
Total (additional)	1,550	3,800	1,850

System allocations—Additional amount

HOUSE BILL

[Millions of dollars]

	Primary system	Secondary system	Urban system	Total
1957	11.25	7.50	6.25	25
1958	337.50	225.00	187.50	750
1959	348.75	232.50	193.75	775
Total	697.50	465.00	387.50	1,550

System allocations—Additional amount—Continued

SENATE BILL

[Millions of dollars]

	Primary system	Secondary system	Urban system	Total
1957	90	60	50	200
1958	400	300	200	900
1959	400	300	200	900
1960	400	300	200	900
1961	400	300	200	900
Total	1,690	1,260	850	3,800
CONFERENCE AGREEMENT				
1957	56.25	37.50	31.25	125
1958	382.50	255.00	212.50	850
1959	393.75	262.50	218.75	875
Total	832.50	555.00	462.50	1,850

Interstate System—Authorizations

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement
1957 [1]	1,025	1,000	1,000
1958	1,700	1,750	1,700
1959	2,000	2,000	2,000
1960	2,200	2,000	2,200
1961	2,200	2,000	2,200
1962	2,200	2,000	2,200
1963	2,200	2,000	2,200
1964	2,300	2,000	2,200
1965	2,300	2,000	2,200
1966	2,200	2,000	2,200
1967	2,000	2,000	2,200
1968	1,500	2,000	1,500
1969	1,000	2,000	1,025
Total	24,825	24,750	24,825

[1] Does not include $175 million authorized and already apportioned for fiscal year 1957.

Federally built roads on or to federally owned or controlled lands

[Millions of dollars]

Types	House bill (1958–59)	Senate bill (1958–61)	Conference agreement (1958–59)
Forest highways	25	33.75	30
Forest roads and trails	27	27	27
Park roads and trails	16	18	16
Parkways	16	16	16
Indian roads	10	12.5	12
Public lands	1	[1] 2	[2] 2
Total for each fiscal year	95	82	103
Total for period	190	330	208

[1] Authorization for 1957–62.
[2] Authorization for 1957, 1958, 1959.

Apportionment of funds, existing law

[Millions]

State	1954 act					State	1954 act				
	Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)		Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)
Alabama	$6.7	$5.2	$2.3	$3.5	$17.7	Maryland	$2.8	$1.7	$2.9	$2.0	$9.4
Arizona	4.7	3.2	.7	2.0	10.6	Massachusetts	4.0	1.5	7.2	3.7	16.4
Arkansas	5.3	4.2	1.0	2.5	13.0	Michigan	9.9	6.0	8.1	6.2	30.2
California	14.5	7.5	15.4	9.8	47.2	Minnesota	8.3	5.9	2.8	4.0	21.0
Colorado	5.7	3.8	1.5	2.3	13.3	Mississippi	5.6	4.7	1.0	2.8	14.1
Connecticut	2.0	1.0	3.4	1.7	8.1	Missouri	9.2	6.2	4.3	4.7	24.4
Delaware	1.6	1.0	.4	1.1	4.1	Montana	6.3	4.3	.4	2.4	13.8
Florida	5.1	3.4	3.1	2.9	14.5	Nebraska	6.1	4.3	1.0	2.4	13.4
Georgia	7.8	6.0	2.5	4.1	20.4	Nevada	4.1	2.7	.2	1.8	8.8
Idaho	3.9	2.7	.3	1.7	8.6	New Hampshire	1.6	1.0	.5	1.1	4.2
Illinois	12.2	6.6	12.1	8.1	39.0	New Jersey	4.1	1.4	7.6	3.8	16.9
Indiana	7.5	5.2	4.2	4.2	21.1	New Mexico	5.1	3.5	.6	2.1	11.3
Iowa	7.6	5.6	2.1	3.5	18.8	New York	14.9	6.0	23.2	12.2	56.3
Kansas	7.6	5.4	1.6	3.2	17.8	North Carolina	7.9	6.7	2.2	4.4	21.2
Kentucky	5.9	4.9	1.8	3.2	15.8	North Dakota	4.6	3.4	.3	1.9	10.2
Louisiana	4.9	3.6	2.5	2.8	13.8	Ohio	11.0	6.7	10.0	7.4	35.1
Maine	2.7	1.9	.7	1.4	6.7	Oklahoma	6.8	4.9	1.9	3.1	16.7

Apportionment of funds, existing law—Continued

[Millions]

State	1954 act					State	1954 act				
	Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)		Primary ($315)	Secondary ($210)	Urban ($175)	Interstate ($175)	Total ($875)
Oregon	5.4	3.8	1.4	2.3	12.9	Virginia	6.0	4.7	2.7	3.5	16.9
Pennsylvania	12.4	7.4	13.1	9.2	42.1	Washington	5.2	3.5	2.6	2.8	14.1
Rhode Island	1.6	1.0	1.2	1.1	4.9	West Virginia	3.5	3.0	1.1	2.1	9.7
South Carolina	4.3	3.6	1.2	2.3	11.4	Wisconsin	7.5	5.2	3.4	3.9	20.0
South Dakota	5.0	3.6	.3	2.0	10.9	Wyoming	3.9	2.7	.2	1.7	8.5
Tennessee	6.9	5.3	2.5	3.7	18.4	Hawaii	1.6	1.0	.6	----------	3.2
Texas	20.6	13.8	8.3	9.9	52.6	District of Columbia	1.6	1.0	1.5	1.1	5.2
Utah	3.6	2.4	.7	1.7	8.4	Puerto Rico	1.6	1.7	1.5	----------	4.8
Vermont	1.6	1.0	.3	1.1	4.0						

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1957 (ADDITIONAL)

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($56.3)	Secondary or feeder roads ($37.5)	Urban highways ($31.2)	Subtotal ($125.0)	Interstate system ($1,000.0)	Total ($1,125.0)	State	Primary highway system ($56.3)	Secondary or feeder roads ($37.5)	Urban highways ($31.2)	Subtotal ($125.0)	Interstate system ($1,000.0)	Total ($1,125.0)
Alabama	1.2	0.9	0.4	2.5	20.3	22.8	New Hampshire	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9
Arizona	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.5	13.0	New Jersey	.8	.3	1.4	2.5	21.9	24.4
Arkansas	.9	.8	.2	1.9	14.5	16.4	New Mexico	.9	.6	.1	1.6	12.1	13.7
California	2.6	1.3	2.8	6.7	57.0	63.7	New York	2.7	1.1	4.2	8.0	70.9	78.9
Colorado	1.0	.7	.3	2.0	13.7	15.7	North Carolina	1.4	1.2	.4	3.0	25.5	28.5
Connecticut	.4	.2	.6	1.2	9.6	10.8	North Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.1	12.6
Delaware	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9	Ohio	2.0	1.2	1.8	5.0	42.8	47.8
Florida	.9	.6	.6	2.1	17.0	19.1	Oklahoma	1.2	.8	.3	2.3	17.9	20.2
Georgia	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	23.3	26.1	Oregon	.9	.7	.2	1.8	13.6	15.4
Idaho	.7	.5	.1	1.3	10.1	11.4	Pennsylvania	2.3	1.4	2.4	6.1	53.6	59.7
Illinois	2.2	1.2	2.2	5.6	47.1	52.7	Rhode Island	.3	.2	.2	.7	6.3	7.0
Indiana	1.3	.9	.7	2.9	24.3	27.2	South Carolina	.8	.6	.2	1.6	13.4	15.0
Iowa	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	20.4	23.2	South Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.6	13.1
Kansas	1.3	.9	.3	2.5	18.1	20.6	Tennessee	1.2	.9	.4	2.5	21.4	23.9
Kentucky	1.0	.9	.3	2.2	18.8	21.0	Texas	3.6	2.4	1.5	7.5	57.5	65.0
Louisiana	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.5	18.5	Utah	.6	.4	.1	1.1	9.7	10.8
Maine	.5	.3	.1	.9	8.0	8.9	Vermont	.3	.2	(1)	.5	6.3	6.8
Maryland	.5	.3	.5	1.3	12.0	13.3	Virginia	1.1	.8	.5	2.4	20.2	22.6
Massachusetts	.7	.3	1.3	2.3	21.3	23.6	Washington	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.1	18.1
Michigan	1.8	1.1	1.5	4.4	36.0	40.4	West Virginia	.6	.5	.2	1.3	11.9	13.2
Minnesota	1.5	1.0	.5	3.0	22.5	25.5	Wisconsin	1.3	.9	.6	2.8	22.8	25.6
Mississippi	1.0	.8	.2	2.0	15.9	17.9	Wyoming	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.6
Missouri	1.6	1.1	.8	3.5	27.1	30.6	Hawaii	.3	.2	.1	.6	----------	.6
Montana	1.1	.8	.1	2.0	14.4	16.4	District of Columbia	.3	.2	.3	.8	6.3	7.1
Nebraska	1.1	.8	.2	2.1	14.3	16.4	Puerto Rico	.3	.3	.3	.9	----------	.9
Nevada	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.6	Alaska	1.1	.8	(1)	1.9	----------	1.9

[1] States with apportionments less than $50,000: Nevada $24,000, Vermont $48,000, Wyoming $34,000, and Alaska $10,000.

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1958

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)
Alabama	8.0	6.2	2.8	17.0	34.5	51.5	New Hampshire	1.9	1.3	.6	3.8	10.6	14.4
Arizona	5.6	3.8	.8	10.2	19.5	29.7	New Jersey	5.1	1.7	9.4	16.2	37.2	53.4
Arkansas	6.3	5.1	1.2	12.6	24.7	37.3	New Mexico	6.1	4.2	.7	11.0	20.6	31.6
California	17.7	9.0	19.0	45.7	96.9	142.6	New York	18.3	7.3	28.6	54.2	120.5	174.7
Colorado	7.0	4.6	1.8	13.4	23.2	36.6	North Carolina	9.5	8.2	2.8	20.5	43.3	63.8
Connecticut	2.5	1.3	4.1	7.9	16.4	24.3	North Dakota	5.4	3.9	.4	9.7	18.8	28.5
Delaware	1.9	1.3	.4	3.6	10.6	14.2	Ohio	13.5	8.2	12.4	34.1	72.8	106.9
Florida	6.2	4.0	3.8	14.0	28.9	42.9	Oklahoma	8.1	5.8	2.3	16.2	30.4	46.6
Georgia	9.3	7.2	3.1	19.6	39.6	59.2	Oregon	6.4	4.5	1.7	12.6	23.1	35.7
Idaho	4.6	3.3	.4	8.3	17.2	25.5	Pennsylvania	15.6	9.3	16.2	41.1	91.1	132.2
Illinois	14.9	8.1	15.0	38.0	80.2	118.2	Rhode Island	1.9	1.3	1.5	4.7	10.6	15.3
Indiana	9.0	6.2	5.1	20.3	41.4	61.7	South Carolina	5.1	4.2	1.5	10.8	22.9	33.7
Iowa	9.1	6.7	2.5	18.3	34.7	53.0	South Dakota	5.7	4.1	.4	10.2	19.7	29.9
Kansas	9.0	6.3	2.0	17.3	30.9	48.2	Tennessee	8.3	6.5	3.1	17.9	36.4	54.3
Kentucky	7.1	5.9	2.2	15.2	31.9	47.1	Texas	24.6	16.5	10.2	51.3	97.7	149.0
Louisiana	6.0	4.4	3.1	13.5	28.1	41.6	Utah	4.3	2.9	.9	8.1	16.6	24.7
Maine	3.2	2.3	.9	6.4	13.7	20.1	Vermont	1.9	1.3	.3	3.5	10.6	14.1
Maryland	3.5	2.1	3.6	9.2	20.4	29.6	Virginia	7.4	5.7	3.3	16.4	34.4	50.8
Massachusetts	5.0	1.9	8.9	15.8	36.3	52.1	Washington	6.4	4.2	3.2	13.8	27.3	41.1
Michigan	12.0	7.3	10.0	29.3	61.1	90.4	West Virginia	4.2	3.7	1.4	9.3	20.3	29.6
Minnesota	9.8	6.9	3.5	20.2	38.3	58.5	Wisconsin	9.0	6.3	4.2	19.5	38.7	58.2
Mississippi	6.7	5.6	1.2	13.5	27.0	40.5	Wyoming	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.7	25.9
Missouri	11.0	7.4	5.3	23.7	46.0	69.7	Hawaii	1.9	1.3	.7	3.9	----------	3.9
Montana	7.7	5.3	.5	13.5	24.4	37.9	District of Columbia	1.9	1.3	1.9	5.1	10.6	15.7
Nebraska	7.5	5.3	1.3	14.1	24.4	38.5	Puerto Rico	2.0	2.1	1.8	5.9	----------	5.9
Nevada	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.8	26.0	Alaska	7.8	5.3	.1	13.2	----------	13.2

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1959

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)	State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)
Alabama	8.2	6.4	2.9	17.5	40.6	58.1	New Hampshire	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	12.5	16.5
Arizona	5.7	3.9	.9	10.5	22.9	33.4	New Jersey	5.2	1.8	9.6	16.6	43.8	60.4
Arkansas	6.5	5.3	1.2	13.0	29.1	42.1	New Mexico	6.2	4.3	.7	11.2	24.3	35.5
California	18.2	9.3	19.6	47.1	114.1	161.2	New York	18.9	7.6	29.4	55.9	141.8	197.7
Colorado	7.2	4.8	1.8	13.8	27.3	41.1	North Carolina	9.8	8.4	2.8	21.0	51.0	72.0
Connecticut	2.6	1.3	4.3	8.2	19.3	27.5	North Dakota	5.6	4.0	.4	10.0	22.2	32.2
Delaware	2.0	1.3	.5	3.8	12.5	16.3	Ohio	13.8	8.4	12.7	34.9	85.6	120.5
Florida	6.3	4.1	4.0	14.4	34.0	48.4	Oklahoma	8.3	6.0	2.4	16.7	35.8	52.5
Georgia	9.6	7.4	3.2	20.2	46.6	66.8	Oregon	6.6	4.6	1.8	13.0	27.2	40.2
Idaho	4.8	3.4	.4	8.6	20.2	28.8	Pennsylvania	16.0	9.5	16.7	42.2	107.2	149.4
Illinois	15.3	8.3	15.4	39.0	94.3	133.3	Rhode Island	2.0	1.3	1.6	4.9	12.5	17.4
Indiana	9.3	6.4	5.3	21.0	48.6	69.6	South Carolina	5.2	4.4	1.5	11.1	26 9	38.0
Iowa	9.4	6.9	2.6	18.9	40.8	59.7	South Dakota	5.9	4.2	.4	10.5	23.2	33.7
Kansas	9.3	6.5	2.1	17.9	36.3	54.2	Tennessee	8.5	6.7	3.2	18.4	42.8	61.2
Kentucky	7.3	6.1	2.3	15.7	37.5	53.2	Texas	25.3	17.0	10.6	52.9	114.9	167.8
Louisiana	6.2	4.5	3.2	13.9	33.0	46.9	Utah	4.5	3.0	.9	8.4	19.5	27.9
Maine	3.3	2.3	.9	6.5	16.1	22.6	Vermont	2.0	1.3	.3	3.6	12.5	16.1
Maryland	3.6	2.2	3.7	9.5	24.0	33.5	Virginia	7.6	5.9	3.4	16.9	40.5	57.4
Massachusetts	5.2	1.9	9.2	16.3	42.7	59.0	Washington	6.5	4.4	3.3	14.2	32.1	46.3
Michigan	12.3	7.5	10.2	30.0	71.9	101.9	West Virginia	4.3	3.8	1.4	9.5	23.8	33.3
Minnesota	10.1	7.1	3.6	20.8	45.1	65.9	Wisconsin	9.2	6.4	4.3	19.9	45.5	65.4
Mississippi	6.9	5.8	1.2	13.9	31.7	45.6	Wyoming	4.9	3.4	.2	8.5	20.8	29.3
Missouri	11.3	7.6	5.4	24.3	54.2	78.5	Hawaii	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	----------	4.0
Montana	7.9	5.5	.5	13.9	28.7	42.6	District of Columbia	2.0	1.3	1.9	5.2	12.5	17.7
Nebraska	7.8	5.5	1.3	14.6	28.7	43.3	Puerto Rico	2.1	2.2	1.9	6.2	----------	6.2
Nevada	5.0	3.3	.2	8.5	20.9	29.4	Alaska	8.0	5.4	.1	13.5	----------	13.5

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

SUMMARY, FISCAL YEARS 1957 TO 1959, INCLUSIVE

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)
Alabama	17.4	13.5	6.1	37.0	95.4	132.4	New Hampshire	4.2	2.8	1.4	8.4	29.4	37.8
Arizona	12.1	8.3	1.8	22.2	53.9	76.1	New Jersey	11.1	3.8	20.4	35.3	102.9	138.2
Arkansas	13.7	11.2	2.6	27.5	68.3	95.8	New Mexico	13.2	9.1	1.5	23.8	57.0	80.8
California	38.5	19.6	41.4	99.5	268.0	367.5	New York	39.9	16.0	62.2	118.1	333.2	451.3
Colorado	15.2	10.1	3.9	29.2	64.2	93.4	North Carolina	20.7	17.8	6.0	44.5	119.8	164.3
Connecticut	5.5	2.8	9.0	17.3	45.3	62.6	North Dakota	11.8	8.5	.9	21.2	52.1	73.3
Delaware	4.2	2.8	1.0	8.0	29.4	37.4	Ohio	29.3	17.8	26.9	74.0	201.2	275.2
Florida	13.4	8.7	8.4	30.5	79.9	110.4	Oklahoma	17.6	12.6	5.0	35.2	84.1	119.3
Georgia	20.3	15.6	6.7	42.6	109.5	152.1	Oregon	13.9	9.8	3.7	27.4	63.9	91.3
Idaho	10.1	7.2	.9	18.2	47.5	65.7	Pennsylvania	33.9	20.2	35.3	89.4	251.9	341.3
Illinois	32.4	17.6	32.6	82.6	221.6	304.2	Rhode Island	4.2	2.8	3.3	10.3	29.4	39.7
Indiana	19.6	13.5	11.1	44.2	114.3	158.5	South Carolina	11.1	9.2	3.2	23.5	63.2	86.7
Iowa	19.9	14.6	5.5	40.0	95.9	135.9	South Dakota	12.4	8.9	.9	22.2	54.5	76.7
Kansas	19.6	13.7	4.4	37.7	85.3	123.0	Tennessee	18.0	14.1	6.7	38.8	100.6	139.4
Kentucky	15.4	12.9	4.8	33.1	88.2	121.3	Texas	53.5	35.9	22.3	111.7	270.1	381.8
Louisiana	13.1	9.5	6.8	29.4	77.6	107.0	Utah	9.4	6.3	1.9	17.6	45.8	63.4
Maine	7.0	4.9	1.9	13.8	37.8	51.6	Vermont	4.2	2.8	.6	7.6	29.4	37.0
Maryland	7.6	4.6	7.8	20.0	56.4	76.4	Virginia	16.1	12.4	7.2	35.7	95.1	130.8
Massachusetts	10.9	4.1	19.4	34.4	100.3	134.9	Washington	13.8	9.2	7.0	30.0	75.5	105.5
Michigan	26.1	15.9	21.7	63.7	169.0	232.7	West Virginia	9.1	8.0	3.0	20.1	56.0	76.1
Minnesota	21.4	15.0	7.6	44.0	105.9	149.9	Wisconsin	19.5	13.6	9.1	42.2	107.0	149.2
Mississippi	14.6	12.2	2.6	29.4	74.6	104.0	Wyoming	10.4	7.1	.4	17.9	48.9	66.8
Missouri	23.9	16.1	11.5	51.5	127.3	178.8	Hawaii	4.2	2.8	1.5	8.5	----------	8.5
Montana	16.7	11.6	1.1	29.4	67.5	96.9	District of Columbia	4.2	2.8	4.1	11.1	29.4	40.5
Nebraska	16.4	11.6	2.8	30.8	67.4	98.2	Puerto Rico	4.4	4.6	4.0	13.0	----------	13.0
Nevada	10.5	7.0	.4	17.9	49.1	67.0	Alaska	16.9	11.5	.2	28.6	----------	28.6

Apportionment of interstate funds for 1960 to 1969, inclusive, to be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the sum of the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it should be noted that the authorizations for the regular systems as agreed upon by the conferees covers an additional amount for fiscal year 1957, and funds for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The Senate bill carried the authorizations through 2 additional years. It is contemplated that the existing practice of considering a highway bill for these categories of roads every 2 years will be continued.

Allocation of these funds to the primary, secondary, and urban systems on the historic percentage ratio of 45, 30, and 25 percent, will be continued. The conference agreement includes authorization for transfer of funds of not to exceed 20 percent between these systems, which will provide the flexibility needed in certain States to meet the varying conditions.

Funds for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, roads and trails in national parks, parkways, Indian roads, and roads through public lands, were included in about the same amounts as approved by the Senate. The conference agreement provides that these funds shall be available for contract authorization not earlier than 1 year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized.

The bill provides for participation by the Territory of Alaska in the Federal-aid highway program, the same as Hawaii and Puerto Rico, except that only one-third of the area of Alaska will be used as the area factor in the formula now in effect for apportionment purposes, and the Territory will contribute not less than 10 percent of the Federal funds apportioned to it for any fiscal year. The bill also provides for transfer of all highway functions and personnel from other Federal agencies to the Department of Commerce, which will administer the program in Alaska.

The name for the National System of Interstate Highways was changed to the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." The conference agreement expresses the intent of Congress to complete the Interstate System

as presently designated over a 13-year period as nearly as practicable, and to bring the entire system in all the States to simultaneous completion.

The total amount authorized for the 13-year period for the Interstate System is $24,825,000,000, about the same as was included in both the Senate and House bills. The sums authorized for the first 3 years, fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, will be apportioned to the States in the manner now provided by existing law, one-half on population, and one-half on population, area, and mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes.

For the remaining 10 years of the program, the funds will be apportioned to the States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all the States. The language of the bill makes it clear that the estimates of cost on which the apportionments are to be based shall be subject to review and approval by the Congress, prior to making the apportionments. Thus over the 13-year period no State should receive aggregate apportionments which are greater than the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State.

The Federal share of projects on the Interstate System is to be 90 percent of the total cost of such projects, with an increase in the Federal share in States having public lands as now provided in existing law, but not above 95 percent of the total cost of the project. The funds will be available for expenditure for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized. Any amount apportioned to the States and unexpended at the end of the period shall lapse, and be immediately available for reapportionment among the other States.

The conferees agreed on language that would permit a State which has obligated all funds apportioned to it and proceeds to construct projects on the Interstate System without the aid of Federal funds, to be reimbursed from later apportionments for the Federal share of such projects. Such projects must conform to the necessary standards, the plans and specifications must be approved by the Secretary of Commerce, and the remaining usual requirements of Federal-aid projects must be complied with. This procedure will permit States which receive smaller apportionments during the first 3 years of the program to go ahead with their highway work and later receive reimbursement for the Federal share of the cost of such work.

The conferees adopted the Senate language on the maximum weight and width limitations, which are 18,000 pounds on a single axle, 32,000 pounds on a tandem axle, and an overall gross weight of 73,280 pounds, and a width of 96 inches, or the maximum corresponding weights or widths permitted for vehicles using the public highways of any particular State on July 1, 1956, whichever is greater. This does not affect any vehicle that could lawfully operate within a State on July 1, 1956.

The Senate bill included authorization for an increase of 2,500 miles in the Interstate System. The conferees agreed on an increase in such mileage of 1,000 miles, with a provision that the cost of completing any mileage designated from the additional 1,000 miles would be excluded from the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System on which the apportionment to the States is made. This means that by reason of this additional 1,000 miles, no additional cost has been added to the 40,000-mile program on which the tax provisions of title II of the bill are based.

The conference agreement includes provisions for Federal acquisition of rights-of-way for the Interstate System, when requested to do so by a State, and authorizes advancement of funds for this purpose, and also authorizes advances to the States to pay for construction as the work proceeds.

The conferees agreed to the House language providing for reimbursement to the States for utility relocation costs which they have paid for under their own laws or practices. The limitation of no more than 2 percent of the sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year was deleted by the conferees.

The conferees adopted the provisions of the House bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to include as a part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, heretofore or hereafter constructed, which meets the standards established for such system and is located on a route designated as a part of the system. The use of Federal funds for expenditure on projects approaching toll roads on the Interstate System was agreed to.

The conference agreement authorizes a study by the Secretary of Commerce and a report thereon relative to reimbursement to States for any toll or free highways on the Interstate System which have been constructed during a specified period and to required standards.

The conference agreement includes the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act as included in the Senate bill, with the further provision for cooperation between the Secretary of Labor and the State highway departments. The provisions in the Senate bill providing for an appeal and judicial review were deleted from the bill.

The conference agreement authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study of highway safety, and requires him to submit a report with recommendations to Congress.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator recalls the discussion in the conference committee with respect to the addition of 1,000 miles to the Interstate System.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do.

Mr. GORE. It was the consensus and understanding of the conferees, as I recall, that if a State which had received a portion of the 1,000-mile additional designation wished to improve it and to delay improving an existing section of the Interstate System, it would have the latitude and privilege so to do. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. What the Senator has stated is what I understand happened in arriving at an agreement in the conference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What the Senator from Tennessee has stated and what the chairman has agreed to, is my understanding also.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is so far as the extra mileage is concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. That is, the cost of the original 40,000 miles is determined by the total estimated costs on which the apportionment is based under the language of the bill, but the amount allocated to a State may be expended upon any part of the 40,000 miles which may be designated in a State.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator recall, also, that the estimated cost of completing the 40,000-mile system to which the Senator has just referred comes into play under section 108 (d) and does not affect the apportionment for the first 3 years of the program?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That certainly is correct. In fact, it could not, because the estimate of cost will not be submitted to the Congress at that time.

Mr. GORE. In fact, the apportionment under the first 3 years will be made, irrespective of the interstate mileage, new or old, within a State, and the State will, upon the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, be free to use its apportionment for any part of the system.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to add a word or two, if the chairman will indulge me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have served on many conference committees, both as a Member of the House and as a Member of the Senate, and I have never served on a conference committee which was confronted with problems which seemed at times to be so nearly irreconcilable as was the case with some of the questions before the conference committee on the roads bill. It was because of the good spirit and cooperation of the conferees on both sides and the skillful and patient handling of the conference by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the conference, that this very notable result was achieved.

Sometimes during the conference the suggestion was made that perhaps it would be better to report an amendment in disagreement, but every member of the conference desired to get the job done, and as a result the conferees are able today to present to the Congress and to the country a completed report, signed by every member of the conference committee, which establishes the interstate system on a basis that looks toward its completion within 13 years. A remarkable job has been done on the part of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and, of course, I really should name all the conferees, excluding myself, because everyone made a contribution to the outstanding result.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from South Dakota will permit me at this point, I have been attending conferences for many, many years, and I may say that there has not been a piece of legislation presented which is more important to the American people than is the road bill. I should like to say that I received the cooperation of Senators on both sides of the aisle and the cooperation of Representatives on both sides of the aisle of the House. Among the conferees was the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and I received just as fine cooperation from them as I received from the conferees on this side of the aisle. I want to make that statement of appreciation.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I should like to say that the road bill is the biggest undertaking the United States has ever attempted, outside of a war. It has been possible to get the bill through because of the patience of the Senator from New Mexico, our chairman, and the patience of the Members of the House, because there were great differences of opinion between the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate. But we have now a workable bill. As the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has done so much work with reference to roads, has said, the task will be completed within a 13-year period. When it is completed, the United States will have the finest system of roads of any nation in all history.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will promptly adopt the conference report.

I may also say, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and myself are on both conference committees, the conference on title I and the conference on title II. The same fine spirit was exhibited with reference to title II as with reference to title I.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico one question. Before I do so, however, I wish to express my own appreciation of the fact that the conference committee was able to retain an item of $30 million for forest highways. I think that will be of great benefit to all the States in the West.

The question which occurs to me is with reference to the increase in the interstate mileage. The point I have specifically in mind is this: Assume that an interstate highway traverses a good part of the country, approximately 1,800 miles. Would a State have the privilege of disregarding work on a part of that great interstate highway and transfer the work to some other highway in the State which it was desired to have designated on another Interstate System?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the chairman of the subcommittee who held the hearings would answer the Senator's question.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Wyoming, understands, I am sure, that we reached a compromise with the other body on this particular item. In reaching the compromise it was discussed around the table, and I believe it is fair to say that it was agreed that in the event a State received a new designation of interstate mileage from the 1,000-mile addition to the system, and wished to improve that new designation in substitution for the improvement of some segment of the existing Interstate System which was reasonably adequate for present needs, the State would be privileged to do so, provided it received the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. BARRETT. Would the State be in position to take a relatively small mileage, such as 10 or 20 miles, out of an existing interstate highway system and transfer it to another road which was not on an interstate system?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. BARRETT. Would the new stretch of road have to be designated as a part of a complete Interstate System?

Mr. GORE. It would have to be designated as a part of the Interstate System. I believe it is fair to say that it was also agreed that the additional mileage to be designated from the 1,000 miles of overall addition must contribute to and be a part of an integrated interstate highway system. In other words, it was not the intent to permit the Bureau of Public Roads to designate 10 miles of a road which would not connect with another segment of the Interstate System. In the bill we are looking toward the goal of an integrated Interstate Highway System of 41,000 miles.

Mr. BARRETT. To be specific, assume that a State should want to have a designation from one city to another, consisting of about 400 miles. Would it be possible for that State to take 25 or 50 miles from an existing Interstate System and transfer it to the new system, without having the whole 400 miles designated as a part of the Interstate System?

Mr. GORE. I do not think it was ever contemplated or even discussed that a State would have a right in and of itself to change a designation or to reduce the present designation in any way. I was referring only to the latitude of a State to improve a new segment and to defer the improvement of an existing segment which is reasonably adequate to serve the needs.

I have in mind a segment of the Interstate System in my State, a segment which has just been resurfaced, in a rather sparsely populated section. It may not be adequate for the needs of 1975, but it may be reasonably adequate for the needs of the next 5 or 8 years.

If the State received an additional designation of 5 miles for a circumferential route at Memphis, Tenn., which was more acutely needed, then the State would have the latitude, provided it secured the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads to apply the funds to the improvement of the 5 additional miles more acutely needed, and to defer the improvement of the 10 miles of the newly improved section of the existing Interstate System.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. In that case, the 5 miles would be designated as a part of the Interstate Highway System.

Mr. GORE. It must be an integral part of the Interstate System.

Mr. BARRETT. The question I had in mind was this: Assume the State wanted to designate a new stretch of road of about 400 or 500 miles as a part of the Interstate System, but was able to transfer only as much as 25 or 50 miles. Could the State have the entire 400 miles designated as a part of the Interstate System, with a transfer of only a relatively small mileage?

Mr. GORE. The Senator understands, I feel certain, that no State highway department or State government can designate an Interstate System.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand that.

Mr. GORE. That designation must come from the Department of Commerce. Any State can apply for an addition to the Interstate System within its borders. The application for an additional designation is subject, however, to the decision and action of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand that. As I understand what the Senator from Tennessee has said, the only transfer permissible under the conference report is of such mileage——

Mr. GORE. I do not believe any transfer is involved in the conference report.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I thought if I might make a statement, the situation might be clarified.

Mr. BARRETT. I should be delighted to have the Senator from Oklahoma express his views.

Mr. KERR. Under the bill, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Defense are the agencies having the authority to make the designation of the additional thousand miles over and above the 40,000 miles.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. The bill gives them a mandate to determine what roads shall be included in the thousand-mile designation.

But should an additional amount of mileage in the Senator's State be designated as a part of the Interstate System, it would not change the estimate of the cost of completion of what would be a part of the interstate system during the period of authorization provided in the bill.

However, if the Wyoming State Highway Department wanted to improve a newly designated section of the Interstate System, and if the Federal Bureau of Public Roads agreed to it, the newly designated section could be approved and the improvement made. But in so doing, some other part of the Interstate System previously designated would not then be taken care of, because the funds apportioned to the Senator's State, and to each State, would be in accordance with the estimate of the cost to complete that part of the Interstate System in the Senator's State which was not completed under the apportionments of the first 3

years, but which is a part of 40,000 miles of interstate roads now designated.

Mr. BARRETT. To that extent, the designation would be tantamount to a transfer.

Mr. KERR. It would amount to a transfer. It would mean that the State would have a certain amount of money which would not be increased by reason of the increase in the State's mileage, but which could be used on this or other mileage if the State so desired and the Bureau of Public Roads agreed.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the regular committees of the two Houses have done good work and that the committee of conference has brought forth a good bill, so far as the roads features are concerned. However, I wish to state for the RECORD that I do not agree with the taxing features of the bill.

It is my judgment that the highway users are already paying more than enough taxes for all the roads which the Federal Government expects to assist in building and for all the roads authorized by the proposed legislation.

To state the figures roughly, I believe it will be found that about $1 billion a year is being paid in gasoline taxes at this time. Another billion dollars is being paid annually in taxes on new automobiles. Another $500 million is being paid in taxes on parts, accessories, diesel fuel, and various other highway items. This makes a total of more than $2,500,000,000 a year at present rates of taxation.

No one is proposing that the Federal Government at any time in the foreseeable future should spend as much as $2,500,000,000 to aid highway construction, even when the bill shall have been passed. Therefore, it is my judgment that the highway users are already paying enough in taxes for the building of highways. Even if the argument were to be made that the highway users should balance the budget, the Federal Government is predicting for this year a $2 billion surplus; indeed, some persons predict that there will be a $3 billion surplus.

Therefore, it appears to me that all that was needed was a bill to authorize expanded Federal aid for highway construction purposes, particularly in the Interstate System. That is what the Senate originally passed in the Gore bill. I voted for that bill because it provided the answer to our problem.

I should be glad to vote for a highway bill, but it is my judgment that the taxing features, in the last analysis, will mean nothing more or less than that we shall be shifting the burden to the highway users, in order to afford tax relief for persons who are better able to pay.

I make this statement because I understand that within a year proposals will be made for tax reductions, in view of the fact that there will be a Government surplus. I would anticipate that the tax reductions may come in the form of income-tax reductions. Therefore, in the last analysis, much of the reduction in the income taxes will be financed by additional taxes on highway users. There are many persons who will be paying additional taxes on gasoline, but who do not earn enough to cause them to pay the income tax.

For that reason, although I appreciate the good work of the Senators who serve on the Committee on Public Works, and the good work of the committee of conference, I must express my judgment that the passage of the conference bill will result in an unnecessary increase in taxes. Therefore, I desire to state for the RECORD that I shall be compelled to vote against the conference report because I disagree with the provisions relating to taxes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared respecting the conference report.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

The Congress has now approved the biggest highway construction program ever to be undertaken by the American people.

This means that better, safer roads for Connecticut will be built, and better, safer roads throughout the Nation which we can use in traveling for pleasure or business.

For the first time, the Federal Government will make posssible the construction of a national system of highways—interstate and defense highways linking all the principal cities of the United States.

As one of the conferees on the bill, I fought for the principle that no State should receive less, nor more, than the Federal Government's 90-percent share of the cost of constructing the interstate highways within the State's borders.

I'm happy to report that the bill just enacted accepts that principle. This means that Connecticut, under present estimates, and over the 13-year construction period, will receive almost $600 million in Federal funds for building these modern, divided-lane highways which we so urgently need for reasons of traffic safety, economic development, and defense.

This is more than twice as much as the Senate bill, to which I was strongly opposed, proposed to give us.

Other provisions of the bill will also help us in Connecticut—in the development of our toll roads and bridges, and in the repair and replacement of flood-damaged highways and bridges on the Federal-aid systems.

It's a good highway program—good for Connecticut and good for the Nation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in addition to having my statement printed in the RECORD, I should like to pay tribute to my colleagues on the conference committee, both on the Democratic and the Republican sides of the aisle in the Senate. They have labored very hard with a very difficult situation. I especially wish to pay tribute to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and my very dear friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who has contributed tremendously—indeed, all of them have contributed tremendously—to the success of this enterprise. I am glad we have a bill which, over the next 13 years, is designed to give our country an Interstate System of highways which is so sorely needed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I compliment the members of the conference committee and all concerned who have worked on this final draft of the bill. I think it is a vast improvement over the original legislation on the subject. I think certainly it is a workable bill which can be used with good effect in improving our entire Federal-Aid Highway System, and particularly the construction of the Interstate System.

I have some questions relative to the Interstate System, and particularly relative to subsection (d) of section 108, which I should like to address to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico or the distinguished Senator from Tennessee or the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, whoever may be the proper one to state for the RECORD what will happen at the end of the first 3 years, when the construction period which will be based on the Senate formula of apportionment for the Interstate System will be completed—when, in short, we shall go to a cost basis for the remainder of the program, so as to complete, under the program, the entire Interstate System in all the States within the period of 13 years. I shall be very happy to address my questions to whichever of the distinguished Senators will reply.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I shall be glad to reply. I wish first to be sure I understand the question of the distinguished Senator from Florida. As I understand the question, the Senator wants to know how the authorization for the 10 years, beginning with the 4th of the 13 years authorized, will be arrived at for the individual States.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. I note from the conference report—and if I am mistaken I ask that the distinguished Senator correct me—that for the first 3 years of the 13 years, the basis of distribution of funds among the States for the construction of the Interstate System is identical with that which was in the Senate bill. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct, and the apportionment in the Senate bill, as the Senator knows, is identical with that which was enacted in the 1954 highway bill. So that for the first 3 fiscal years subsequent to this date—that is the year beginning on July 1 of 1956, designated as fiscal 1957, and fiscal 1958, and fiscal 1959—the apportionment of the interstate funds will be on the basis of the formula in the existing law.

Prior to the expiration of that time, the Bureau of Public Roads will conduct a survey in conjunction with the highway departments of each of the States, for the purpose of determining the cost of completing the Interstate System of 40,000 miles, as now comprised, but giving effect to what the spending of the funds apportioned for these first 3 fiscal years will amount to.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I understand the situation, then, for the first 3 fiscal years, 1957, 1958, and 1959, apportionment among the States will be on the basis prescribed by the Senate bill.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is with reference to the last 10 years that I am particularly interested, and the apportioning for that period is covered, as I understand, by subsection (d) of section 108.

Mr. KERR. As I explained, the Bureau of Public Roads is directed to make

a survey of the cost of completing the 40,000-mile Interstate System as now authorized, and is designated as the agency to give effect to the completion of the expenditure of the funds apportioned the first 3 years. When that survey is made, the Bureau of Roads, or the Secretary of Commerce, will submit the estimates of cost to the Congress, and the Congress will approve, not the apportionment, but the cost, as estimated by the Department of Commerce through its Bureau of Roads.

The apportionment for the 10 years of this period beyond 1957, 1958, and 1959 will be on the basis of the need of each individual State as it relates to the total cost of the completion of the 40,000 miles in all of the States for each of the fiscal years thereafter. So that, for instance, if a State should get 60 percent of the total cost of completing its part of the presently designated Interstate System in the first 3 years, it would have 40 percent remaining. It would be the intention of the act that the State should get an amount, proportionate to that received by the other States, in 10 years thereafter instead of the shorter period.

By the same token, if a State got less than three-thirteenths of the cost of completing its part of the Interstate System during the first part of the period, then after the 3 fiscal years, on the basis of its greater proportionate cost, it would receive proportionally a greater amount each year than what ordinarily would be apportioned to it in the 10-year period.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I should like to proceed a little further with my questions, if I may. As I read subsection (d) of section 108, it provides clearly that after the first 3 years the apportionment among the several States shall be on the basis of estimated cost. So that even if the Congress should not agree on the estimates which would be collected and reported to it by the Bureau of Public Roads, the basis of apportionment which would prevail in those first 3 years would not automatically be carried over and on into the last 10 years. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The basis of apportionment as presently provided terminates after the first 3 fiscal years. The basis of apportionment thereafter is the need, but the estimated cost of meeting the need is to be submitted to the Congress and approved by the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill as reported from the conference committee makes it completely clear that it is the basis of estimated cost among the States which will prevail after the first 3 years in the apportionment for the last 10 years of the program.

Mr. KERR. That is, giving implementation to the apportionment after the first 3 years for the amount that may not have been completely used up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, the only thing that will be left for Congress to do would be to approve the——

Mr. KERR. Estimates of cost submitted by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HOLLAND. Estimates of cost which, presumably, after checking by the Secretary of Commerce, will be on an approximately uniform basis among the several States.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask one more question, if I may. Will the Senator state for the RECORD just what would occur if, after the first 3 years' apportionment had been made, and if, after the estimates of cost had been collected by the Secretary of Commerce and reported to Congress, Congress took no action upon the estimates of cost? Just what would be the effect upon this program?

Mr. KERR. I cannot conceive of such a situation arising. As I understand the law, it will be the duty of the Congress to approve the estimate of cost as submitted by the Department of Commerce, or, upon hearings of its own, determine what amendments should be made, because, under the bill, the function of the Congress is to continue the authority to approve the estimates of cost. The basis of apportionment is fixed in the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I am particularly concerned with this feature because, as I understand now, if the Congress fails to carry out its duty to approve the estimate of cost, either that reported by the Secretary of Commerce, or its own figures as developed by it, then the program will be stymied. It will come to a halt. Funds will continue to accumulate, because the taxes will continue to be collected, but until Congress takes affirmative action in fixing or approving the estimate of cost, the program cannot move ahead. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I wish to address these remarks to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I have stated the opinion that it will be necessary for the Congress either to approve the estimate of cost as submitted by the Secretary of Commerce, after he has received it from the Bureau of Roads, or amend it and state the correct estimate of cost for each State and all the States.

Mr. GORE. I believe that is correct. The estimates of cost cannot be used as a basis for apportionment until they are approved by both Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. But a continuation of apportionment on the basis which prevails during the first 3 years may not continue automatically in succeeding years, even though Congress fails to act. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct on that point.

Mr. GORE. For those 3 years the apportionment is made according to present law, and will not be affected by the cost estimates or the approval or lack of approval thereof.

Mr. KERR. Under this bill that method of apportionment terminates with those 3 years.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And the new method of apportionment becomes self-executing, under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oklahoma. Is it now their statement that the purpose of the conference report is to make sure that the 40,000-mile system is completed in each and all of the States——

Mr. KERR. Within 13 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Within 13 years.

Mr. KERR. Unless a State under the authorization for an additional thousand miles should choose to use a part of its apportionment and have it approved by the Bureau of Roads, in the case of the newly designated mileage it received. It would then thereby automatically be deprived of that much money in connection with the rest of its Interstate System, as I presently designated.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, the added 1,000 miles which is to be distributed hereafter and become a part of the Interstate System, does not have equality of treatment with the 40,000 miles, in having the estimate for its completed construction included in the compilation of estimates which the Secretary of Commerce is required to make. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Florida is correct; but it is the hope of the junior Senator from Tennessee that that error will be corrected the next time a road bill is before the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the two Senators, and I also congratulate particularly my friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the committee, on this generally constructive accomplishment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a brief question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to yield to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD]; but first I ask his indulgence so that I may yield briefly to another member of the committee. Therefore, Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the chairman of the committee.

My question is asked only in order to make the RECORD clear.

In section 115, subsection (a), entitled "Application of Davis-Bacon Act," we find the following:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work—

And so forth. My question is this: Do the words "on the initial construction work" describe the character of employment for the laborers and mechanics?

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the initial construction place only. That provision does not apply to a place 60 miles away which might furnish some material for the initial construction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The provision applies to the construction, not to the materials; is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; not to materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WOFFORD. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico. My question relates to section 115, providing for payment of the prevailing wage. I should like to know what the conference committee's real meaning was in connection with the portion of subsection (a) of section 115, which states that—

All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 108 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act.

I should like to know the meaning of the words "immediate locality." Is their application limited to the city, the county, the section, the district, or the State in which the prevailing wage is to be determined? Just what is meant?

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina realizes that this particular section was not before the conference committee, because it was approved in identical language in both the Senate version of the bill and the House version of the bill.

In reference to the meaning of the language concerning the prevailing wages, I suggest that the Senator from South Carolina inquire of the Department of Labor and consider the experience throughout the country and of the Department of Labor in the application of the prevailing-wage provisions of law. I believe the definition is rather clearly known in practice.

Mr. WOFFORD. Yes; that is my very point. In South Carolina we have had too much experience with that very plan. When the H-bomb plant in Aiken, S. C., was built, the Secretary of Labor, although acting under the Davis-Bacon Act, paid those who were working in the State of South Carolina the wages prevailing in Atlanta, Ga., 300 miles away. That procedure disrupted the entire economic schedule in that section of the State.

I also call attention to the fact that this section of the conference report does not say it shall be the prevailing rate as determined in that locality. Instead, the words used are "shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing", and so forth. It does not say how much higher the wages can be. That is the point I am discussing. In short, just what does that language mean?

Mr. GORE. The conferees did not undertake to define that, because both the Senate and the House had acted on that matter, and the conferees were powerless to deal with that subject.

Mr. WOFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I should say that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was in conference; and the conferees strengthened the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. I should like to yield now to the Senator from South Dakota, so that he can point out how the conferees strengthened the amendment, and how that amendment places additional requirements on the Secretary of Labor in the performance of this duty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think this amendment is germane to the question raised by the Senator from South Carolina. I invite attention to paragraph (b) of section 115, as it appears on page 13 of the conference report:

(b) Consultation with State highway departments; predetermination of rates: In carrying out the duties of the foregoing subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the highway department of the State in which a project on the Interstate System is to be performed.

The following is a clause which was added by the conferees:

After giving due regard to the information thus obtained, he shall make a predetermination of the minimum wages to be paid laborers and mechanics—

And so forth. In other words, the conferees placed upon the Secretary of Labor the responsibility for giving due regard to the information obtained from the highway department of the State concerned.

Mr. WOFFORD. In that connection let me ask this question: Who is to determine what "due regard" means? What protection are we to have in South Carolina, after one man says he has consulted with our highway department and has given "due regard" to the information he has received from that department? He then goes off to Atlanta to fix the prevailing wage. What protection have we?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The junior Senator from South Dakota invites the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to the language of the report, in which it is pointed out that—

It is recognized that there must be the utmost cooperation between the several State highway departments and the Secretary of Labor in order to carry out the intent of the provisions of section 115 (b).

We inserted the following language to clarify the intent:

It is emphasized that when the Secretary consults with these State agencies, such agencies should furnish the desired information as fully and promptly as possible.

Further, we say:

It is believed that cooperation in good faith between State and Federal officials in this matter will insure satisfactory results.

So, to the extent to which the conferees found it possible, they nailed the provision down, so as to insure that there would be good faith between the Secretary of Labor and the State highway departments.

Mr. WOFFORD. As a matter of fact, we have no actual protection, have we, other than the good faith of the Secretary of Labor, who may change tomorrow? That is all we have, is it not?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the yeas and nays having been ordered, the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an explanation of title II of House bill 10660.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

EXPLANATION OF TITLE II OF H. R. 10660

The Senate adopted 25 amendments to the House bill. Of these, all but 7 are technical or conforming amendments.

Of the seven, Senate amendment No. 19, with conforming amendments 2, 3, and 14, related to the increased 1-cent tax on gasoline, diesel fuel and special motor fuels. Under these amendments the additional increase in tax of 1 cent applied only to such fuels when used in a highway vehicle which was registered or required to be registered under the laws of a State or foreign country (or in the case of a vehicle owned by the United States which is used on the highway). The House conferees agreed to this amendment.

I was sorry we were unable to get the House conferees to agree to another part of these amendments which was offered by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and which was also sponsored by Senator MAGNUSON of Washington. This amendment would have permitted a refund of the 1-cent increase in the fuel taxes for use in registered vehicles to the extent that the vehicles were used off the highway. The House conferees were adamant in rejecting this amendment and it was vigorously opposed by the Treasury because of the difficulty of determining when a highway vehicle was used on and off the highway.

The House conferees agreed to that part of Senate amendment No. 3, which limits the 1-cent increase in the case of special motor fuels to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a registered highway vehicle. This conforms to the treatment applied to gasoline and diesel fuel.

The House conferees also agreed to the Senate amendments requiring the nonhighway user to file a claim for refund directly with the Internal Revenue Service in a manner similar to that now provided in the case of gasoline purchased for use on a farm for farming purposes. However, in order to make the procedure conform more nearly with that provided for farmers, your conferees accepted a House amendment to

require the refund claims to be filed on an annual basis. Under the original Senate version provision was made for the filing of quarterly refund claims where the claim covered at least 100,000 gallons of such fuels.

We had considerable difficulty over the special use tax on heavy trucks and buses. The House bill provided a tax rate of $1.50 per year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight in excess of 26,000 pounds. The Senate amendment increased the tax rate to $2.50 but applied the tax to that part of the excess weight over 26,000 pounds. The House conferees refused to compromise on this amendment and we were forced to recede and to accept the House provision.

Senate amendment No. 10 struck out the exemption granted under the House bill to local transit systems from the use tax on heavy trucks and buses. Senate amendment No. 16 also struck out the exemption in the House bill from the increased 1-cent tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels where such fuel was used in the operation of local transportation systems. The House conferees refused to accept these Senate amendments and we were forced to recede on such amendments.

The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment No. 22, which placed a limitation on apportionments to be made under the interstate system. This amendment was designed to give assurance that no deficit would develop in the highway trust fund and that the Federal aid highway program would be financed on a pay-as-you-build basis.

The House conferees also agreed to Senate amendment No. 13, which provides that the increased floor stock taxes would not be required to be paid until such time after September 30, 1956, as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulation prescribe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays, 1, as follows:

YEAS—89

Aiken	Chavez	George
Allott	Clements	Goldwater
Anderson	Cotton	Gore
Barrett	Curtis	Green
Beall	Daniel	Hayden
Bennett	Dirksen	Hennings
Bible	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bricker	Duff	Hill
Bridges	Dworshak	Holland
Bush	Eastland	Hruska
Butler	Ellender	Humphrey, Minn.
Byrd	Ervin	Humphreys, Ky.
Carlson	Flanders	Ives
Case, N. J.	Frear	Jackson
Case, S. Dak.	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Kefauver	McClellan	Schoeppel
Kennedy	McNamara	Scott
Kerr	Millikin	Smathers
Knowland	Monroney	Smith, Maine
Kuchel	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Laird	Mundt	Sparkman
Langer	Murray	Stennis
Lehman	Neuberger	Symington
Magnuson	O'Mahoney	Thye
Malone	Pastore	Watkins
Mansfield	Payne	Welker
Martin, Iowa	Potter	Williams
Martin, Pa.	Purtell	Wofford
	Robertson	
	Russell	

NAYS—1

Long

NOT VOTING—6

Bender	Jenner	Wiley
Capehart	Neely	Young

So the report was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. NORIGE PINAR, MEMBER OF TURKISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, there is present in the Chamber a distinguished guest. She is Dr. Norige Pinar, a member of the Turkish Parliament. She is in the United States attending an international conference on earthquakes. Dr. Pinar is a geologist and an expert on earthquakes. I am sure all the Members of the Senate are happy to welcome her. [Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understanad, the pending question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and other Senators, as to which there is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the vote, then, will come on the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to certain committee amendments. A "yea" vote will be in favor of the three proposals of the Bridges amendment at one time. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays on the Bridges amendments?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, the author of the amendments, will have 45 minutes in favor of the amendments, and the time in opposition to the amendments will be controlled by the majority leader. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I do not contemplate that we shall use all our time on this side of the aisle. I do not know how much time the Senator from New Hampshire plans to use of his 45 minutes, but I should like to have every Member of the Senate to be on notice that when the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], or any other Senator on the other side of the aisle, and 1 or 2 Senators on this side of the aisle, have concluded, we shall have a yea-and-nay vote. I think the yeas and nays will be within an hour and a half from now, and possibly a good deal earlier.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the statement of the Senator from Texas is accurate. It is my intention to take only a part of the time allotted. But it will also depend upon Senators on the other side of the aisle. If Senators on the other side indulge in a long argument, we may wish to reply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order that we may have a clear picture of the Bridges amendments and the committee amendments, I should like to make a brief statement.

The committee will have no objection to rejection of the amendment on page 29, lines 14 to 19, inclusive, which is the military construction item. I should like to withdraw it because of the action taken by the Armed Services Committee this morning in reporting the military construction bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, I understand he accepts the last of my amendments, namely, the one on page 29, to strike out lines 14 to 19, inclusive, containing an item of $200 million for military construction for the Air Force. So, in effect, by accepting the last line of my amendment, he thereby narrows the amount between the committee amendment and my amendment by $200 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if that is done by unanimous consent, or however the Senator proposes to have it done, should we not have the same consent so that the Senator from New Hampshire can modify his amendments by striking out the final amendment? Otherwise, we will be taking action on something the Senate has already done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico has withdrawn the committee amendment. Thus, the amendment striking out lines 14 to 19, on page 29, would automatically be withdrawn.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I simply wanted to clarify the parliamentary situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to withdrawing the committee amendment? The Chair hears none. The committee amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me a minute or two?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that the item of $200 million for construction has been withdrawn. The committee amendment increases the appropriation for the item "Aircraft and related procurement" by $800 million. The Senator's amendment would reduce it to $350 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. For "Research and development," my amendment as adopted by the committee provides an increase of $100 million, and the Senator's amendment provides an increase of $100 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So, there is no difference there. For "Operation and maintenance," my amendment which the committee adopted provides an increase of $40 million, and the Senator's amendment provides $30 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Which will make a difference of $10 million.

For "Personnel," my amendment as adopted by the committee provides an increase of $20 million, and the Senator's amendment also provides an increase of $20 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So there is no difference except the $450 million for "Aircraft procurement," and for "Maintenance and operation," $10 million.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct. In view of the withdrawal of the committee amendment, which eliminates my last amendment, the question now before the Senate is whether the committee amendments which have been reduced from $1,160,000,000 to $960 million, shall be adopted, or the amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire, providing for $500 million.

Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the issue is clear to the Members of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee, acting in good faith, increased the appropriation in the amount of $1,160,000,000, by specific amendments. Of this amount $800 million is for aircraft and related procurement, which is found on line 17, on page 23. The sum of $100 million is for research and development, found on line 5, page 24. The sum of $40 million is for operation and maintenance, found on line 4, page 26. The amount of $20 million is for personnel, found on lines 18 and 19, page 27; also the amount of $200 million for construction, which has just been eliminated from the bill.

The amendments which we are offering provide for $500 million in total. Instead of $800 million for aircraft and aircraft procurement, it provides for $350 million. It is the same as the committee bill in the $100 million item for research and development, and provides $30 million for operation and maintenance, and $20 million for personnel.

Frankly, as the Senate well knows, that is a compromise figure arrived at, after the Senate committee voted, by resurveying the needs of the Department and the ability to use the funds.

It seems to be a reasonable conclusion after considered judgment that the Department of the Air Force could and would proceed in good faith and good conscience to use this amount of funds. The issue is clear. Much has been said about it during the past few days. It has been intensified by personalities. The issue is so well known I do not think there is any need for me or for anyone else to take a great deal of time to go into it extensively. For that reason, I conclude my remarks, and I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire because I believe it will give the Air Force a little more flexibility, but not too much more money. If we give the Air Force too much money, we shall simply be advancing their program with respect to weapons which may become obsolescent or obsolete, in view of the new weapons which are constantly coming into use.

The question we must ask ourselves is, Will what we do make it more certain that we will have sufficient armed strength so that no nation will dare to attack us because of our ability to retaliate in a totally destructive way? Only by maintaining our Armed Services in such a manner can we maintain the security of our country. If we try to match numbers with our most powerful possible enemy, we may well defeat ourselves in the process. That is the question we must ask ourselves.

President Eisenhower, whose whole life has been spent in the Armed Forces, has answered the question by giving Congress his administrative budget. The question is, Shall we increase the amount of funds for aircraft procurement beyond what the President asked for in the administrative budget this year?

Mr. Quarles, the Secretary of the Air Force, and General Twining have said, and have made it clear, that they have sufficient funds to meet the present needs of the Air Force, as they see them, in order to provide the United States with the best possible Air Force this year, and to build it up, as Mr. Quarles said, in open testimony this morning, in 1958, 1959, and 1960.

In my opinion, the Air Force can use a little more money in order to make its aircraft procurement a little more flexible. That is something which Congress must decide. If we provide the Air Force with too much money or too large a fund this year, then what they may be able to do is to buy or to place on order planes for the advancement of their program, not into 1958, but possibly into 1959 and 1960.

But if we wait and do not give them too much money now, then next year they can take another look at the picture and see what research and development have been done with respect to aircraft in that time.

Mr. Quarles in his testimony in the form of a prepared statement this morning, stated in conclusion as follows:

> By what standard shall the adequacy of the Air Force program be judged? I think we should set as our standard the ability to perform the Air Force mission. Primarily, that mission is to prevent war by convincing any potential aggressor that the consequences of aggression against us would be unacceptable to him. In my opinion, the ability of the Air Force, together with other free world forces, to do this is solidly sufficient today, and our fiscal year 1957 program is designed to keep it that way.

So the program is designed to keep the Air Force that way, and to build it up to what may be proper in 1958, 1959, and 1960.

For these reasons, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have time remaining, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has referred to some testimony given this morning by the Secretary of the Air Force. I believe testimony of commanders in the Air Force, to which he did not refer, will show opposition to statements made by Secretary Quarles.

I believe that picking up the Secretary's testimony as given this morning, before the witness had even finished his testimony, and before he had been fully questioned, does not, in my opinion, give the Senate an accurate or fair presentation of the matter in question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I resent that statement completely. What I read from, I may say to my friend from Missouri, was the finished prepared statement of Secretary of the Air Force Quarles. What I read was the testimony of Secretary Quarles before the Committee on Appropriations.

Whatever the questions may have been, and whatever evidence may have been given, I do not believe for one minute that Mr. Quarles was telling us a falsehood or was making any statement he did not believe to be true.

I resent the Senator's statement very much, because I would not give false testimony to the Senate. I hope I would be the last man to do that.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes for the purpose of concluding the colloquy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Missouri regrets the Senator from Massachusetts feels he was being criticized personally.

I said the Senator from Massachusetts read from a statement given by Mr. Quarles this morning prior to the time Mr. Quarles was to be interrogated. In

my opinion, the statement made by Mr. Quarles, which was referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, did not conform to testimony previously given the subcommittee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Missouri for what he has said.

I agree that Mr. Quarles testified this morning in answer, I think, to questions asked by the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], that General Twining agreed with the Secretary, that the Deputy Chief of Staff, General White, agreed with the Secretary, but that some of the generals in the field, such as General LeMay, General Putt, and General Partridge, did not agree with him. With that statement, I agree with the Senator from Missouri. It is true that the testimony of certain officers does not agree with that of the Secretary. But I say that the words of Mr. Quarles, as the administrative head of the Air Force, and of General Twining, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are words of weight, even though the words of the other officers be given weight.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again, I say that testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force, in my opinion, was not in accordance with General Twining's testimony before the committee; nor was it in accordance with some testimony of General White.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The Senator from Massachusetts is not only the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, but he is one of the senior or ranking members of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the subcommittee dealing with military appropriations.

Not only is Senator SALTONSTALL a student of military questions, but he has been a student of military history throughout the years. I have every confidence in the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts when he referred to the testimony given by the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Quarles, this morning.

I have been present at many of the sessions of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Therefore, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, because he is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations and also is the ranking member of the legislative military committee, the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, a case has not been made which would justify any vast increase in military appropriations, based on the testimony which has been given to Senators at the sessions of the Committee on Appropriations. It is true that some of the officers in the field have advocated a larger sum of money; but the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not.

There is no greater military expert than President Eisenhower himself. The budget recommendations which have come to Congress have had the full and complete support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson.

I think the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts were an accurate statement of the facts. If anyone wishes to question that statement of facts, I am willing to debate the question with him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to no Member of the Senate in my determination to support for the United States the most powerful and the most effective Air Force in the world. I do not agree with those who say our Air Force at present is second class or will ever become second class.

I am opposing the amendment adopted by the Appropriations Committee, adding another billion dollars to the Air Force appropriation, for the simple reason that there are ample funds unexpended for aircraft procurement.

This additional appropriation is opposed by the President. It has not been requested by the armed services, nor has it been requested by any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have never known the military to be bashful in asking for appropriations.

The facts are these:

At the end of the current fiscal year, next Saturday, the Air Force will have unexpended, in old appropriations, an amount totaling $13,600 million for aircraft procurement. The new appropriation requested for the fiscal year beginning July 1 for aircraft procurement totals $5,800 million. Therefore, if the appropriations requested are approved, plus the unexpended balances, the Air Force will have available for the year beginning July 1, 1956, $19,400 million for aircraft procurement.

According to the best estimates I have been able to secure, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, the Air Force will spend $6,400 million for procurement of aircraft. This will leave an unexpended balance, at the end of the coming fiscal year, of $13 billion. To add another billion dollars to appropriations in this bill for this purpose would simply mean increasing balances in carryover appropriations, which cannot possibly be spent in the foreseeable future. It would not, in my judgment, bring a single additional aircraft off the production line next year or the year after next.

As of July 1, 1956, there will remain unobligated nearly $4,600 million for aircraft and related procurement. To increase these huge unexpended balances would merely increase funds available to spending agencies for expenditure in subsequent years, with virtually no control by either the Appropriations Committees or by Congress. Extravagance inevitably is the result of unnecessary appropriated balances.

The figures I have just given are for aircraft procurement alone. As a whole, the Department of the Air Force will enter the new fiscal year, which will start next Sunday, with unexpended balances totaling $20.1 billion. Assuming the President's request for new appropriations totaling $15.4 billion will be granted, the Air Force will go into the new fiscal year with funds available totaling $35.5 billion. Best estimates of expenditures to be made during the year indicate they will total $17.3 billion, leaving a balance at the end of the year of $18.3 billion. Additional appropriations would only increase this balance.

As for the Department of Defense as a whole—Army, Navy, and Air Force—it will start the new year, next Sunday, with unexpended balances in old appropriations totaling $42.2 billion. Assuming there will be granted $35 billion in new appropriations as requested by the President, the Defense Department will have available for expenditure funds totaling more than $77 billion. It is estimated that expenditures in the coming year will total $36.7 billion, leaving unexpended balances a year from now totaling more than $40 billion. Additional appropriations would only increase this balance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there can be no doubt that every Member of the Senate is interested in the question of national defense. If there is any issue before the American people that should be dealt with on a nonpartisan basis, without regard to any political party, it is the security of this country and the protection of the freedoms of the American people and the preservation of our way of life. All of us have a common interest in this problem.

In the course of my duties, Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I have strictly sought to follow a nonpartisan course. I have never thought of any party in any question I have ever asked a witness that has been before the committee. No party line has ever prompted or directed my vote on any matter, either in committee or on the floor of the United States Senate. I shall continue to follow that course, whether the President of the United States may be a Republican or a Democrat.

Mr. President, there have been times when my patience has been sorely tried by the attitude of the present Secretary of Defense in his appearances before the Committee on Armed Services. Had he been a member of my own political party, I would have felt free—indeed, I would have felt compelled—to have expressed my resentment of his attitude. Because, Mr. President, I feared someone might think politics had dictated my remarks, I have held my peace, and I have exercised my forbearance and such patience as I have. But, Mr. President, the recent actions and statements of the Secretary of Defense have caused patience to cease to be a virtue. I say it more in sorrow than in anger. I say it is dangerout, at this time in the life of our Nation,

to have a man so completely inept and unequipped for this responsible position occupy the office of the Secretary of Defense.

The present Secretary of Defense has treated the Congress with disdain—yea, at times almost with contempt. He seems to be of the opinion that the matter of national defense is one that shall be dictated solely by the Secretary of Defense, without regard to law—indeed, without regard to the fundamental charter of American liberties, our Constitution. His vanity and his arrogance in his committee appearances have been excelled only by his lack of understanding of the genius of American government and our system of government and division of powers.

It is unfortunate that we do not require a short course in the American Constitution for those who are to occupy such positions, in order that they might learn that among the powers and responsibilities of the Congress is that of providing for the common defense, of raising and supporting armies, of providing and maintaining a Navy, of providing rules and regulations for the guidance of our armed services, and laws for the government of the militia when it is called into the Federal service.

Just to give an illustration of some of the things that have transpired in committee, on one occasion the present Secretary of Defense roundly denounced the committee for having incorporated in a bill a recommendation of the President's Commission on Military Service, which was discussed fully with his representative, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, when he appeared before the committee. I sought with complete patience to explain to the Secretary of Defense that the President's Committee had reported it to the President and to the Congress, requesting its recommendation; that it had been explained to the Assistant Secretary of Defense whom the Secretary of Defense had sent before the committee to discuss the proposed legislation; and that at least part of the responsibility rested with the Department of Defense. But the Secretary of Defense continued to blame the committee and the Congress.

He has sought to intimidate the officers of the armed services from fully expressing their opinions to, and advising with, the Congress of the United States on the all-important matter of national defense, by stating something to the effect—I do not have the newspaper clipping before me—"Let's see who the next is to stick up his head and make a statement that does not conform to the policy that I, Charles E. Wilson, have laid down."

These officers deserve better at the hands of the Secretary of Defense than such threats as that and such attempts to gag them. I pay tribute to the courage and the patriotism of some of the officers of the armed services who, despite the club that hangs over their heads, have had the temerity—from the standpoint of the Secretary of Defense—and the courage and the patriotism, from my standpoint, to come forward and advise with the Congress of the United States as to what steps we should take to defend our country.

The Secretary of Defense has on occasion reduced the size of the Armed Forces. Of course, men of understanding and knowledge may disagree as to how much we may safely reduce the size of our Armed Forces. But it has been amusing to me that almost every time the Secretary of Defense has announced a reduction in the Air Force or in the firepower of several regiments of infantry or Marines, he has requested three additional Assistant Secretaries of Defense or Assistant Secretaries of various divisions of the Department of Defense, apparently doing so on the theory that he would repair the damage done to our national defense, and would intimidate those who might destroy us, by increasing the number of Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Defense from a total of 17, when he came into office, to a total of 33, if the last reorganization plan to be submitted happens to be approved.

I disagree, Mr. President, with the order of the Secretary of Defense forbidding the wearing of the uniform by the men in the armed services who are on duty here in Washington. Of course, such an order might be understandable, because the present Secretary of Defense happens to be one who has never worn the uniform of his country. But I would not be critical of him on that score, for in time of war it is necessary to have men at work in the shipyards and in the industrial plants; and many of those who were physically qualified to serve in the Armed Forces during World War I or World War II did serve their country while in the industrial plants or in the shipyards.

But, Mr. President, those who wear the uniform of the armed services are entitled to have a Secretary of Defense who has some understanding of the importance of increasing the pride of the men in the armed services in the uniform of their organizations, instead of one who says to them, "Take off your uniform," as if it were some indicium or badge which reflected upon them. I get scant comfort from the fact that it is said that such an order was issued at one time during a Democratic administration. Of course Democratic administrations have made mistakes. I would feel better, however, if, instead of emulating such mistakes, those now serving in positions of authority would emulate some of the constructive parts of the programs of Democratic administrations.

Mr. President, now I turn to the pending amendments. It seems to be rather generally agreed that the air arm of our national defense should be strengthened and increased. There is a question as to how much the increase should be. We are told by all that there is no lessening of the danger from the Soviets. Indeed, Kipling's well-known poem about the Russian bear shows that he should be watched more carefully when he wears his present mask than we would watch him if he showed the teeth of Josef Stalin.

I have before me statements made within the past 24 hours by General Gruenther, in a speech to an organization in the East. He said:

> There has never been any more danger than there is today.

We are told that by all those who have studied, and are in a position to understand, the nature of the Soviet Government and the motivations of the men who direct that government. In the report of the Foreign Relations Committee on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, we find these words, written after the committee heard the testimony of the many witnesses who appeared before it:

> So far as our own military programs are concerned, however, the important point is that Soviet military capabilities have not been significantly weakened. Military programs must be concerned with military realities. They can not be tailored to fit a facade of smiles and sweet talk.

So, Mr. President, inasmuch as all the witnesses told us that the danger today is as great as it has ever been, the only question which can enter the minds of those who serve their country is how much national defense we need to have and what steps the Congress should take and what steps we who serve in this body should take, under our oath and under our constitutional responsibilities to assure the security of these United States.

Mr. President, what has maintained peace on earth in this uneasy period that we call the cold war? What has protected the freedoms of all peoples since the Russian Government revealed its true nature in 1946 and 1947? What has been guarding the American way of life during a time when great areas and vast numbers of people have been falling into the orbit and under the direction of the rulers in the Kremlin? Mr. President, the greatest single factor in maintaining the peace and preserving this Nation—and I challenge anyone to deny it successfully—has been the Strategic Air Command of the United States. The knowledge that we had bombers capable of delivering the atomic bomb anywhere on the face of the earth has maintained the peace. It has been the greatest single factor in preserving the free world and preventing war and preventing all peoples everywhere from coming under the domination of the Communists.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is humanly possible, and I know it is not financially possible at the rates of pay received by our men in the Armed Services, for us to build up a military machine on the ground that the Russians would fear.

I do not wish here to get into a discussion of our foreign-aid program, which this year is increased by $2 billion over that of last year; but I will say that in my judgment no plan or program which has been designed or will be before the Congress can substitute for the strongest strategic Air Force on earth in protecting the American people and the people of the rest of the free world in the days that are to come.

Mr. President, the nations associated with us in all the various agreements we have signed to combine all the strength of the free world, in my opinion look to

the United States Air Force before they even look to their own divisions, for the defense of the rest of the free world and for their own defense. Mr. President, no one can convince me to the contrary. I do not wish to be invidious by referring to any particular nation; but I will say that even though Italy, for instance, might expect to have three divisions equipped by means of the foreign aid we give, those in charge of the Italian Government would not feel so happy about those three divisions, and would not depend upon them, if in their minds there was any doubt regarding the striking power of the United States Air Force. That is the one instrument to which all the free world looks for its defense.

We are confronted with a number of arguments as to why the proposed increase should not be granted. We are told that there is a large carryover of funds. I freely agree that there is a large carryover of funds. In my opinion they should be expended more rapidly. But I cannot direct the executive branch of the Government. I can, under my oath, live up to my responsibility to afford the sinews to the executive department to build an Air Force which is adequate, by providing the appropriations necessary for that purpose.

We are told that there is a great carryover, and therefore we should not increase the appropriation. With the full knowledge of the carryover, the administration came to us within the past few months, offering a supplemental estimate, and asking us to increase the appropriation by $400 million. Senators who complain about the carryover, when the Congress undertakes to exercise its constitutional functions, have said nothing about the fact that the carryover was increased by the request of the administration for an additional $400 million within the past few months.

It is a question of what is necessary. The administration said it was in error in its original estimate, in the amount of $400 million. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], by his amendment, says that the amendment was in error in its original estimate by $900 million. The Senate committee says that, in its opinion, the administration was in error in its estimates by a minimum of $1,200,000,000. All those figures include the $400 million by which the administration admitted it was in error. May God forbid that General LeMay is absolutely correct in his estimate that they needed $4,200,000,000.

I try to pay attention to dollars in government. I do not think I have earned a reputation as a spendthrift or wastrel in the appropriation of public funds. Those who have worked with me in the Appropriations Committee know how often I ask, "Can we not take a little off here, or can we not take a little off there?" But when I deal with the security of America, I want to see planes first, and then consider the cost in dollars. The security of this country and of all we love cannot be valued in dollars, but I do not believe that the American people are going to cry out against paying for a reasonable insurance policy that will not only assure that we shall not be destroyed, but that we shall be spared the horrors of war.

In the last analysis, what we seek to do is to have a striking force so formidable that it will prevent a war. If we have war, not only our economy, but our civilization, will be destroyed. The only way to prevent a war is to maintain our leadership in the field of long-range bombers and hydrogen bombs to such a degree that not even a madman will think of attacking us.

If we occupy a secondary position in respect to airpower, it will perhaps not be necessary for an enemy to attack us. If our Air Force is secondary, particularly in the field of long-range bombers, we shall see this country, that country, and the other country falling off from their alliances with this country and going over to the Communists. We shall wind up an easy victim, perhaps without even being able to fight, because if we did we would be destroyed, and there would be nothing but ruins where our wonderful civilization now flourishes.

Every nation of the free world looks to the United States Air Force for its defense. Do the French depend on their divisions which we are arming and equipping? They take the 300,000 troops which we have armed and trained away from a position facing the Russians in Europe and use them to run down 30,000 rebels in Algeria. Would they do so if they felt that the motherland of France was about to be overrun? They say, "We can do this with impunity because America has the greatest striking force ever seen in her long-range bombers."

The most remarkable argument that has been made on this floor is that if we make B-52's too fast, they will become obsolete, and we shall have nothing but obsolete weapons on our hands. We have had experience in that field. We have a plane which is now passing into obsolescence, namely, the B-36. Those planes were tremendously expensive. As I recall, they cost $6 million apiece. We have a great many of them. But they served their purpose, because the shadow of that B-36 in the skies is what kept the Russians behind the Iron Curtain. It is the best money we ever spent, even though they are now obsolete. We cannot build an airplane which is not obsolescent, because before the first one is completed, a new and better one is going on the drawing board. God forbid that the Russians should have better ones on the drawing board than we have. We cannot match them in numbers, but we have tried to stay ahead of them in quality. I pray that we will not let the number become so great that they will feel that they can take over the earth with impunity.

It is said that the Air Force is extravagant and wasteful. It is; but must we abolish it because the executives of that department have not been able to eliminate all the waste? It seems to me that would be the height of folly.

The B-52's will become obsolete. If we were satisfied with getting them at the rate of four a month, as indicated by the evidence, I would vote against this amendment. I shall not gamble the security of this country on the basis of any such tenuous program.

It is said that we have not the personnel with which to operate these planes, when we are getting four a month. I have before me an unclassified letter from the Secretary of the Air Force to the committee stating:

> I have recently approved the disposal of the first 26 B-36's.

They are being junked. They have served their purpose. There are 26 of the best trained crews of airmen the world has ever seen, ready to take over the B-52's, if we provide the money and the Department of Defense will spend it to give us a first class Air Force, instead of having to rely on the old B-36's.

The letter further states:

> I have under consideration the disposal of an additional 48 B-36's during the first quarter of fiscal year 1957.

That is 16 a month which will be retired. The crews will be standing by, ready to man the B-52's. We should give the Air Force the best planes that can possibly be manufactured in this country.

I am not satisfied with the small number of planes we are getting. We were told last year, when the Russians unveiled the Bison at the Moscow air show, that this program would be stepped up to 17 or 20 a month, but we are still limping along on 4 a month. I think we should at least double that number. I would be much better satisfied if I thought we were getting as many as it has been estimated the Russians are producing.

We were told by the Air Force—and no man will challenge this statement—that this budget was very austere, and that it would be necessary greatly to increase it next year. What experience have we had in that field? In 1953, the Air Force budget was cut back $5 billion, which had to be added to the 1955 appropriation bill, but we lost money in the process, because of the starting and stopping, starting and stopping of production. The committee amendment would give us a level program, and I venture to say would save the American taxpayer money in the long run.

We were told that this was an unusually austere budget. I will not go into the political implications of the statement that it will be necessary greatly to increase the appropriation next year. That was the testimony of the Secretary of the Air Force, and of General Twinning.

Let us not shirk our responsibility as Members of Congress to provide for the defense of this country and to maintain and support our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the strength that is adequate for the protection of the American people.

Mr. President, I, for one, believe that the committee amendment is an exceedingly modest one. If I were directing the defense of this Nation, I would provide more money, even it it were necessary to take it from other items in the budget, because I know how important this is.

Mr. President, after the committee has seriously considered this subject and by a nonpartisan vote has made its recommendation to the Senate and has placed

this very minimum amount in the bill, I hope the Members of the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], although, of course, it is better than what we have in the bill without the committee amendment. Let us give the entire amount to the Air Force. That is still one-third of what General LeMay said he thought was necessary to meet his responsibility in preventing war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With reference to the last statement made by the Senator from Georgia, I understood him to say that the amount was one-third less than what General LeMay had recommended.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was actually one-fourth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. That is what we had cut it down by already. Does not the Senator from Georgia agree with me that the only justification for the committee amendment is national security, not dollars and cents?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, all we seek to do is provide what we believe is the very minimum that is necessary to avoid the tragic consequences of atomic war and to defend this country in case a madman should unleash on the world the dread forces of hydrogen energy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California. Then I shall be happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], on behalf of himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment which has been recommended to the Senate by the committee by a vote of 13 to 12.

I do not wish to commence my remarks without paying tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. It was my privilege before becoming a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to serve under his chairmanship on the Committee on Armed Services.

Certainly there is no man in the Senate who over the years has been more devoted to the interest of the national defense of our country than has the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia. In all the deliberations through which I sat, both as a member of that committee and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he always approached the question of national defense as an American, not as a partisan.

However, there are some facts of which I believe the Senate should be mindful and from which it should not be diverted by what was an ill-considered response by the Secretary of Defense at a press conference.

The first basic fact we should consider is that the budget, which was presented to Congress under the constitutional responsibility of the President of the United States, went through the normal budgetary processes, including studies by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, consideration by the National Security Council, and consideration by the President of the United States.

Men may honestly differ, and they do honestly differ on great public questions. Under our constitutional form of government that is as it should be. However, there is one thing about President Eisenhower, and that is that from the very conception of his term as President he has made it clear that he is a firm believer in our constitutional system, and that he recognizes that Congress, under the Constitution, is a great coordinate, coequal branch of the Government, not subordinate to the executive branch. As President of the United States, he does have a serious responsibility in making recommendations, and he makes them according to his best lights and in accordance with studies made by responsible officials of the Government.

We have generally believed that in our Government the military arm should be subordinate to the civilian arm. That is one of the admirable concepts of our Constitution. Certainly it is entirely proper and fitting that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are in turn supported by the field commanders, should make their recommendations; but the final responsibility rests in the civilian heads of the Government. Of course, we are not trespassing on a foreign field, because, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has properly pointed out, we have the constitutional responsibility in this regard to support the Army and Navy and—although the Constitution was adopted before the advent of the airplane—the Air Force. Nevertheless, if we are to have orderly procedures, whether it be in national defense or in any other aspect of our Government, we must look for guidance to the responsible heads of the agencies involved.

Certainly the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the highest responsible agency, so far as the military arm itself is concerned, under the civilian executives of our Government. They have, I submit, a broader understanding of the total national-defense needs of the Nation than does any field commander. It is entirely logical that a man who is in command of ground forces in Europe, for example, should be closer to that particular picture and that perhaps his views should be somewhat influenced by the situation in that area of the world. Likewise a commander who has an assignment in Asia may give greater emphasis to the situation in that area of the world. A man who is in charge of the Strategic Air Command, as is our great General LeMay, for whom we have the highest respect, may give undue emphasis, although perhaps entirely proper emphasis, to the Air Force.

I submit, however, that President Eisenhower, who perhaps more than any other living American, and certainly as much as any other living American, knows the horrors of war, and who led American forces and Allied forces in World War II, would not knowingly recommend to Congress anything which would adversely affect the security of the American people for our survival as a part of the free world of free men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The President has taken an oath of office to support the Constitution. He has had more personal experience in leading men in a mighty and successful effort to destroy a great totalitarian power than has any other living American. When the facts are presented to him, he goes over them with great care, and very seriously considers all the recommendations which are made. He does not have a closed mind. Instead of being critical—and I do not believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] meant to be critical because the administration had come forward with an additional recommendation for funds——

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I commended that action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That in itself, I believe, shows that the whole question of defense is under constant review. But, as one who from the time he became a Member of the Senate has been interested in this subject, I submit that we should have an Air Force which is second to none.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] was Secretary of the Air Force, when, on my return from one of my trips to Europe, I told him that I wanted to do everything possible to strengthen the Air Force, and that I wished to be prepared as a Republican to support every request the Secretary or the administration might make in that behalf, because I felt it was vital to the interests of our country.

I commend the Senator from Missouri for the great interest he has taken in our national defense. But I think there can be reasonable and honest differences of opinion. There are in the budget recommendations of the President of the United States, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the National Security Council. In their judgment they believe the amount requested is adequate to protect the vital intersts of our country. Of course, we have the right to say that they ought to have a billion dollars more or that they ought to have $4 billion more, or that they ought to have $500 million more, or that we think the estimates of the Budget Bureau represented an adequate amount. But I believe the weight of the evidence sustains the position of the President, so far as his normal budgetary requests are concerned. I believe there is room for differences of opinion. I should be quite willing to lean over a little further, over and beyond that judgment, if necessary.

I am, for that reason, supporting the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, but I wish to say to the Senate that in face of the figures presented by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and in the face of the evidence, I believe the amendment

offered by the Senator from New Hampshire goes as far as it is advisable for us to go.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader very much for his remarks concerning my interest in airpower. I will never forget, back in 1946, when the Senator from California returned from a trip around the world and visited with the Air Force, his statement that he would always be interested in the United States having the finest Air Force in the world.

This budget is not approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Chief of Staff recommended $19.3 billion to the Secretary of the Air Force, who cut it some $511 million. It was then cut over $2 billion more in the Offices of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore, this budget is nearly $3 billion less for the Air Force than the amount recommended by its Chief of Staff.

Of course, as the distinguished minority leader well knows, when the word goes down, "This is it," all the Chiefs, separately representing their services before the Congress, support the budget on instructions from higher authority.

I do not question the system. I simply state the facts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Missouri has served in a high capacity in a civilian office of the Government and has rendered distinguished service in this body. In my judgment, it is not a question of the Army alone, the Navy alone, the Air Force alone; it is more than the three of them in combination, far more than the atomic program, important as that may be. It also relates to the overall of the national solvency and the national economy.

The reason why I am a great believer in our system of government, as I know all the other Members of this body are, is that no one person lays down the line which any official of the executive arm of the Government must follow. The very fact that generals have come before the Senator's committee, as they have come before other committees, and have expressed their honest judgment, has shown that no one has attempted to intimidate or coerce them. They have been neither intimidated nor coerced. I believe Congress is entitled to information in order to perform its constitutional responsibility.

With reference to whether we are going to be able adequately to prepare this year or next year or 10 or 20 years in the future, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that the Soviet rulers may be far more dangerous to the people of the world when they smile than when they frown.

So, Mr. President, the question is, Can we preserve a solvent Federal Government, a sound national economy, during this period of time? We must weigh the requests made by the various services in arriving at a satisfactory answer to that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield back the remainder of my time, provided the Senator from New Hampshire will do likewise; that I may then suggest the absence of a quorum; and that, at the conclusion of the quorum call, the Senate may vote on the Bridges amendment.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for order, so that the clerk may hear the responses of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, prior to the yea-and-nay vote, a statement by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENDER

I favor the proposal to increase the appropriation for our Air Forces by $500 million. In my judgment, this is a realistic figure which will achieve a goal of assuring America of the world's best Air Force. All of us are agreed that we cannot afford the second best. We recognize that, in this field, research, development and the retention of skilled personnel are of equal importance with construction of large numbers of planes. I believe that we must devote our attention at once to perfecting the best Air Force rather than the largest Air Force. In this field quality is sometimes more important that quantity. We want both. I believe that this appropriation will assure them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the question is on agreeing to the Bridges amendments to certain committee amendments. Senators desiring to vote for the Bridges amendments will vote "yea," and those opposing it will vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

All time having been yielded back, and the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention, and his pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Curtis	Martin, Iowa
Allott	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Barrett	Duff	Millikin
Beall	Dworshak	Mundt
Bennett	Flanders	Payne
Bricker	Goldwater	Potter
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bush	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Hruska	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Thye
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Watkins
Cotton	Long	Williams

NAYS—47

Anderson	Humphrey, Minn.	McNamara
Bible	Humphreys, Ky.	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kennedy	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Laird	Russell
Frear	Lehman	Scott
Fulbright	Magnuson	Sparkman
George	Malone	Stennis
Gore	Mansfield	Symington
Green	McCarthy	Welker
Hayden	McClellan	Wofford
Hennings		
Hill		

NOT VOTING—7

Bender	Neely	Young
Capehart	Smathers	
Jenner	Wiley	

So, Mr. BRIDGES' amendments to certain committee amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment on page 23, line 7, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. Under the heading "Aircraft and Related Procurement," on page 23, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$6,048,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,848,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment which has just been stated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and to the opposition, and if no Senator desires to speak, while so many Senators are present, we can yield back the time and proceed with the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator desire to speak in opposition to the committee amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, I desire to speak in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. How much time does the Senator from Florida desire?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think 10 minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I realize that this is a highly debatable question, and for that reason I think each Senator should have the right and the opportunity to state for the RECORD the reasons which animate his vote. I voted adversely to the committee amendment in the committee, where the amendment prevailed by the vote of 13 to 12 of the 25 members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. No other standing committee of the Senate has a comparable number of members, so the very vote within the committee itself indicates how thoroughly controversial is this amendment.

Mr. President, that does not mean there is any bitterness in connection with it, or that there is any desire on the part of any Senator, I am sure, to question either the motives or the high patriotism of any other Senator; but it indicates how close a division there is in the Senate as to the wisdom of the amendments, which propose to add more than $1 billion to the budget estimate, $800 million of which would be added to the appropriation for the procurement of aircraft.

Mr. President, no one would speak more gladly and more fully than I about the very high patriotism and the distinguished service of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and yet I think that perhaps one of the clearest illustrations of how differences of opinion may arise was shown in the matter which the Senator from Georgia argued in some detail during his most able and most patriotic argument.

As I understood the Senator from Georgia, he deplored the fact that only four B-52's a month were being accepted for delivery at this time, and he wanted that figure sharply increased. Of course, all Senators who have read the record know there has been some delay in acceptance because of some gadgets, in connection with the plane, which had to be replaced. They know also we are moving rapidly toward a rate of delivery of 20 of those big bombers a month. So that the question is, How can we speed up that rate of production, that rate of delivery of B-52's?

Much as I respect the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I do not think we can step up the rate of delivery by merely providing more money to be spent by the Air Force, when it clearly appears from an inspection of the budget that the Air Force is not suffering from lack of money at all, but, to the contrary, will have at the end of this fiscal year a large amount of unexpended funds, and even a large amount of unobligated funds, for use in the acquisition of aircraft.

The figures as they are shown by the latest report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures are substantially these: In uncommitted and unobligated appropriations there is nearly $3 billion for the acquisition of aircraft. In addition, for this objective, a little more than $9 billion are committed but not expended. They will be expended during the year which is ahead of us, and for some time thereafter, but such great sums cannot be expended overnight, or in any one month, or in a brief period of time. So the figures before our committee showed with complete clarity that more than $12 billion of carryover are in the hands of the Air Force for the acquisition of aircraft.

So, to my mind—and each of us has the responsibility of having an opinion upon this matter—if we are trying to get aircraft delivered more speedily, it is not the answer to say we will pour out more money, because the money is there in great amounts, unexpended, and much of it unobligated. No Senator recognizing that fact can say with too great a conviction that he is speeding up the delivery of B-52 bombers merely by adding to the appropriation which the Bureau of the Budget and the Chiefs of Staff say can be spent judiciously in the year that lies ahead.

Mr. President, the next point I wish to make is this: When we appropriate funds which are not going to be expended—and no Senator thinks the whole $12 billion carryover can be expended in this year, much less the $6 billion-plus in the budget, bringing the total to more than $18 billion, for the acquisition of aircraft—and thus build up backlogs, we are doing two things: First, we are bringing, or tending to bring, our budget out of balance, as a matter of paper balance. Next, from my point of view, we are encouraging a more careless attitude rather than a more careful one in the expenditure of Federal funds, in that we provide for an agency more funds than it requests for a specific purpose, although it already has on hand vast amounts for that purpose. In this instance the agency has told us that it cannot possibly use for the next year more than the $6 billion-plus now in its budget. In effect, we approve the policy the agency has been following, namely, not to spend all the funds we have been appropriating to it for a purpose, which is no more vital today than it was last month, although it is definitely a vital national-defense purpose. Mr. President, I do not think it is sound finance, and I do not think it is good government, merely just as a gesture, to pour more money onto the pile of funds already available to any agency of the Government, no matter how important its purpose—and this agency has one of the most vital purposes—when the funds thus poured out are to be added to funds which the agency already has on hand but which it has not been able to commit. We simply add to the confusion by piling more money and more money and more money onto the funds already available to an agency which does not now need more money, but which tells us that, first, it needs more personnel and better and larger amounts of housing and more bases and various other things, before it needs more aircraft or the procurement of aircraft more quickly than they are now coming off the assembly lines.

Mr. President, I do not question either the motives or the high patriotism of any other Member of the Senate; but I claim the right to reach my own conclusion, based upon the careful reading of the record and a careful inspection of the financial picture. Therefore, I say I do not believe that the proposal of the committe represents sound government; I do not believe it is the best way to run the country; and, above all, I do not believe it is the way to get the best results from one of the defense agencies which all of us know is new and is manned in large degree by young men, who are excellent flyers, wonderful performers, and fine Americans, but who have shown rather clearly a need for more experience in administraiton and in the executive handling of large funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield 4 more minutes to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 4 additional minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 4 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I do not believe we serve best the Air Force when we give it more funds than it needs and more funds than it can spend; and neither do I think we serve our country well when we do that.

My final point is that if anything is clear from the many reports of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and from the many reports of the CIA, and from the many reports we have received from various other sources, including the incautious utterances of the Soviet leaders themselves, it is that one of the things the Soviets are trying to do is to make us spend ourselves white. I wonder whether it is only a coincidence that while we are debating and voting, the chief of our Air Force is in Moscow. I wonder whether it is only a coincidence that on yesterday or the day before the Soviet leaders showed him an airplane—he did not see it fly—and said to him, "This is our latest bomber, and it is faster than your B-52, because it can crack the sound barrier, and the B-52 cannot."

In short, Mr. President, are we playing into the hands of the Soviet leaders and the policy they are following in the cold war if we allow our judgment to be affected by unsubstantiated claims, and if we allow ourselves to become so excited as to consider making—on the theory that it is necessary for us to do so—an addition of $1 billion to the budget estimate, $800,000,000 of which will be added to the $18 billion already available for the procurement of aircraft during the next fiscal year, when those who know best about the matter say it is not necessary to do so.

Mr. President, other Senators may vote as they wish, of course. I love the Air Force, and I think my colleagues know the reason why I do. I shall not discuss that at this time. But I state here and now that although other Senators may vote for the proposed increase, insofar as I am concerned, it will be wrong for us to do so. Instead, I think it is no crime for us to try to balance the budget, particularly when a large item such as this is not in compliance with the requests of those who should know a great deal more about these matters than we do.

Mr. President, as I take my seat, I wish to say that I yield to no one in my interest in the Air Force and in the national defense of our country, but there is a group in whom I place great confidence as regards knowledge of the equipment and the funds needed for the Air Force and for our national defense. That group, composed of our most capable and experienced military leaders, tell us stoutheartedly that $6 billion is all the Air Force needs, and that that amount will more than enable the Air Force to take care of its problems. I do not believe our love of our country and of the Air Force should replace the experience, the knowledge, and the conviction in the minds of those who advise us, and whose very standing in the future will be dependent upon how successful they are in estimating the needs of the country and in giving us their advice. I think they are well equipped properly to advise us about this problem, and we should not ignore their judgment. Let it be remembered that in the past they have been amply generous in their requests, as is evidenced by the fact that year after year the Air Force has had to carry forward very large amounts of funds unexpended and very large amounts of funds unobligated, as is now the case.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I make four brief points.

First, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not approved this budget. Yesterday and today there has been indication the Joint Chiefs approved it. That is not right.

Second, I have gone over these much discussed figures. Although contracts may not be actually let, what one wants in good business is good programing. If the Senate votes today for this proposed increase, it will enable the Air Force to carry out that programing which is in line with good business practice.

Third, what we are talking about today may well be theoretical; because last year the President impounded the money Congress appropriated to maintain the strength of the Marines at the level the Congress felt they should be maintained. The President could well impound the funds now being proposed in this amendment. In fact, only last week the Secretary of Defense himself said he would "take a look" at these funds and decide whether he needed them.

Fourth, in my opinion the vote about to be taken is not merely a vote for an appropriation of some $1 billion. Rather, it is a vote as to whether the United States wants to have an Air Force superior to the Communist air force, or whether the United States is willing to have the Communists surpass us in airpower.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if we were to try to take care of the national defense of the United States with dollars and cents, the argument of my good friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would be a correct one. However, we cannot evaluate our national security or national defense with dollars and cents. Only today the headlines in the local press tell us what General Twining, the Chief of Staff of our Air Force, has seen in Moscow. Should we be concerned, or should we not? It is true that aircraft alone will not do the job. The statement made by the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] clearly presents the case. The question before us is not one of dollars and cents, rather it is one of the security of the American people.

Therefore, Mr. President, what are we arguing about?

We have agreed to eliminate the $200 million for military construction which is contained in the pending bill.

By direct action, the Senate rejected the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Therefore, the only question remaining before the Senate is on agreeing to or rejecting the committee's recommendations—made by it in good faith—that an additional $800 millon be appropriated for the procurement of aircraft and related procurement, and $40 million for "Operation and maintenance."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there is no controversy about research and development, because the Bridges amendment would have provided an additional $100 million over the House figure, so there is no difference there.

There is a difference with respect to operation and maintenance. The bill contains an increase of $40 million for that purpose. The Bridges amendment, which was defeated, provided for a $30 million increase. For personnel, the amounts are the same—$20 million. So all we are concerned about is a difference of $460 million.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield back the remainder of my time, on condition that the other side do likewise, with the understanding that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that when the quorum is obtained, or the order for the quorum call is rescinded, the Senate may proceed to vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, speaking for the minority, acquiesces in that request, and yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. 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.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 23, line 17. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. All time has been exhausted or yielded back. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who is now ill. If present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention, and his pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—48

Anderson	Humphrey, Minn.	McNamara
Bible	Humphreys, Ky.	Monroney
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Neuberger
Daniel	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kennedy	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Ervin	Laird	Russell
Frear	Lehman	Scott
Fulbright	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
George	Malone	Sparkman
Gore	Mansfield	Stennis
Green	McCarthy	Symington
Hayden	McClellan	Welker
Hennings		Wofford
Hill		

NAYS—40

Aiken	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Duff	Millikin
Barrett	Dworshak	Mundt
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bennett	Goldwater	Potter
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Carlson	Kuchel	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Langer	Williams
Cotton	Long	
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—8

Bender	Jenner	Wiley
Capehart	Neely	Young
Ellender	Smathers	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the subhead "Operation and Maintenance," on page 26, line 4, to strike out "$3,684,-185,000" and insert "$3,780,185,000."

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I had intended to offer 1 or 2 amendments to the naval part of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order? We cannot hear what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have one or two amendments which I had intended to offer to the naval part of the bill. However, in discussions with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I have been informed that they would like to keep the bill in the form in which it now is, and that there would be objection to my amendments. I should like to inquire of the Senators whether I have correctly stated the situation.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, and I am inclined to be rather sympathetic with the position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire. However, we have had very little information given us on the subject which the Senator from New Hampshire has in mind. Inasmuch as the Senate will soon consider a bill dealing directly with that subject, I wish the Senator would not press his amendment at this time.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. The Navy accepted the House version of the appropriation bill. The Senate made only two very minor changes in it. No hearings were held on the subject, because there was no difference of opinion between the Navy and the House. Therefore, I hope the Senator will come forward when the supplemental bill is under consideration, because we will have an opportunity to hold hearings on the supplemental bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it would be better if the Senator from New Hampshire would do that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the wishes of the ranking members of the subcommittee.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Is all time for debate on the bill yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on the bill, on condition that the acting minority leader will do likewise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President may we have the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is: Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senators from Wisconsin (Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY) would each vote "yea".

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—88

Aiken	George	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Goldwater	McClellan
Anderson	Gore	McNamara
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Holland	Neuberger
Bush	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Butler	Humphrey, Minn.	Pastore
Byrd	Humphreys, Ky.	Payne
Carlson	Jackson	Potter
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kerr	Schoeppel
Curtis	Knowland	Scott
Daniel	Kuchel	Smathers
Dirksen	Laird	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Lehman	Sparkman
Dworshak	Long	Stennis
Eastland	Magnuson	Symington
Ellender	Malone	Thye
Ervin	Mansfield	Watkins
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Wofford

NOT VOTING—8

Bender	Jenner	Wiley
Capehart	McCarthy	Young
Ives	Neely	

So the bill (H. R. 10986) was passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. FLANDERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2296, H. R. 11356.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

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 Foreign Relations with an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, although the mutual-security authorization bill has been made the unfinished business, it may become necessary to ask the Senate to lay it aside temporarily in order that we may consider the Military Public Works authorization bill tomorrow, provided prompt action may be had on that bill. There will be discussion on the Mutual Security authorization bill tomorrow, and it is hoped that perhaps a vote may be had on it either late Thursday or, at the latest, on Friday.

THE AMERICAN LEGION AND HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to include in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of letters which show that the American Legion does not endorse the misleading advertisements against the Hells Canyon project which have been placed by private utility companies in the American Legion magazine, along with other periodicals. These are the advertisements which misstate the cost figures of the project and, by obscuring the fact that the project will fully pay for itself with interest, seek to give a wholly false impression of its tax consequences.

There had been brought to my attention, by Legion members, a letter from the publisher of the American Legion magazine to commanders of Legion posts, asking them to display this anti-Hells Canyon advertisement on post bulletin boards. I wrote to Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, to inquire whether such display on post bulletin boards, of privately financed political advertising, on a highly controversial issue of vital importance to the State I help to represent in the Senate, represented Legion policy.

As I wrote to Mr. Wagner, I wish to make it clear that I am in no way criticizing the American Legion magazine—or any other periodical—for the contents of this or any other advertisement. We want no censorship in this respect. I only questioned the manner in which this particular advertisement had apparently been sponsored by the American Legion magazine for presentation on the bulletin board of Legion posts throughout the land. This is a very different situation, Mr. President, from merely printing and publishing a paid advertisement.

National Commander Wagner very promptly and very courteously replied to my questions. He wrote that the publisher's action "does not represent the policy of the American Legion"; that "the American Legion has never taken a position with respect to Hells Canyon project or the overall issue of private power versus public power"; and the Legion's publications commission and the publisher of the Legion magazine would be advised accordingly.

I am grateful to the national commander for his statement of Legion policy in this respect, Mr. President, and I believe the information will be of interest to legionnaires in Oregon and elsewhere throughout the country, who may have wondered about the placing of this advertising on Legion post bulletin boards.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have printed in the RECORD my letter of June 7, 1956, to the national commander of the American Legion; the letter of the publisher of the American Legion magazine to post commanders, National Commander Wagner's answer to me, dated June 18, 1956, and my reply to him.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 7, 1956.

Mr. J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, the American Legion, care of Washington Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: A commander of one of the posts of our organization has sent me a copy of a form letter which is apparently being sent to post commanders throughout the Nation by Mr. James F. O'Neil, publisher of the American Legion magazine. This letter enclosed a large reproduction of an advertisement in the American Legion magazine, paid for by a group of private electric utility companies, which opposes Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project on the Snake River—a project of vital importance to the people of Oregon, whom I represent in the United States Senate.

In transmitting the reproduction of this advertisement to post commanders, Mr. O'Neil writes:

"We are happy to have these companies explain their functions to our vitally interested American Legion audience through a schedule of advertising messages in our American Legion magazine.

"The attached reprint is typical of this informative ad series. If it fits into your schedule of operations, we would appreciate the display of the reprint upon your bulletin board as an additional service to our advertisers in reminding you and post members of how these companies are providing power today, and how they are preparing for America's future."

As you undoubtedly know, the subject matter of the advertising message which Mr. O'Neil asks to have displayed on Legion post bulletin boards is not only of vast economic significance to the Pacific Northwest but is also the central political controversy in our region.

As a member of the American Legion, I have always taken for granted that our organization of veterans is impartial in economic and political controversies of this kind. I also understand that technically, the American Legion magazine is not published by the Legion itself, but in its behalf by an independent legal entity. Let me emphasize that I suggest no censorship of the magazine or the advertising it may carry; but whatever may be the dissociation of the magazine from the Legion can certainly not be said of Legion post bulletin boards.

I wonder, therefore, whether you would be so kind as to confirm my understanding on the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between the American Legion and the American Legion magazine?

2. Does advertising in the Legion magazine customarily carry with it display of the ad on post bulletin boards?

In other words, do commercial advertisers obtain this additional display along with their space in the magazine, or is Mr. O'Neil's suggestion that this particular political advertising be so displayed an unusual instance?

3. Has the American Legion ever taken a position with respect to Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project, currently before the United States Senate in a bill sponsored by 30 Senators?

4. Is the use of Legion post bulletin boards for the dissemination of private utility advertising opposing Hells Canyon consistent with Legion policy toward legislative controversies of this kind?

5. Does the American Legion endorse or does it reject Mr. O'Neil's suggestion that such advertising be displayed on post bulletin boards?

I am sure you will appreciate my concern, as a lifelong resident of the region affected and as an Oregon Legionnaire, about the role of our organization in a legislative matter of this kind; and I would appreciate your early attention and reply to the questions which are raised by Mr. O'Neil's letter to post commanders.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

THE AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMMANDER: Electrical power facilities in the United States today are extremely important in our Nation's tremendous production system, and in the daily lives of all of us.

America's independent electric light and power companies are playing a major role in producing and distributing electrical energy, and we are happy to have these companies explain their functions to our vitally interested American Legion audience through a schedule of advertising messages in our American Legion magazine.

The attached reprint is typical of this informative ad series. If it fits into your schedule of operations, we would appreciate the display of the reprint upon your bulletin board as an additional service to our advertiser in reminding you and post members of how these companies are providing power today, and how they are preparing for America's future.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. O'NEIL,
Publisher.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: In response to your communication concerning the distribution of material by James F. O'Neil, publisher of the American Legion Magazine, to post commanders, I wish to state at the outset that the action does not represent the policy of the American Legion.

In this instance, as in others, the American Legion Magazine was providing a service to an advertiser. That was the only intention of the publisher in transmitting a reprint of one of the ads for possible display on the post bulletin board.

As you know, posts have autonomous powers as it relates to such matters; and while some post bulletin boards are used for general display material, others follow very restrictive policies. As regards to your specific questions:

1. The American Legion Magazine is not a separate entity but is operated within the framework of the American Legion, under the aegis of a publications commission of 21 members who are appointed by the national commander with the approval of the national executive committee.

2. Advertising in the American Legion Magazine does not customarily carry with it display of an advertisement on post bulletin boards, except in such instances as the advertiser makes a special request. There

have been several such instances in the past where there has been distribution of advertising copy as was done in the case of the electric utility company's advertisement. In every case it was by request, with the advertiser paying the costs of the reprint, the stuffing and the mailing, with all lists being protected.

3. The American Legion has never taken a position with respect to the Hells Canyon project or the overall issue of private power versus public power. Certainly there never has been any editorial support in the American Legion Magazine for the opponents of public power.

4. Posts have full control as to the use of their bulletin boards.

5. It would be up to the individual post to make its decision as to the display of any material.

I will advise the publications commission and the publisher of the American Legion Magazine, Mr. O'Neil, to make sure that in the distribution of advertising copy for material to posts, the position of the American Legion is completely stated and that no inferences can be drawn to indicate endorsement of any advertising copy unless it is in support of an American Legion mandate.

Sincerely yours,

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
June 25, 1956.

Mr. J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander,
The American Legion,
1608 K Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: Thank you very much for your prompt and courteous reply to my letter of June 7. I am glad to learn from you that Mr. O'Neil's request to Legion post commanders to display the anti-Hells Canyon advertisement on post bulletin boards does not represent the policy of the American Legion, and that Mr. O'Neill will be so advised.

I know you appreciate the importance of the Hells Canyon issue in the State I help to represent in the Senate and that I am, therefore, concerned that there be no misunderstanding of the American Legion's position in this respect. I am grateful to you for setting the record straight.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

PRESERVATION OF THE WILDERNESS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard of June 18, 1956, setting forth cogent and sound reasons for approval of the national wilderness preservation bill, sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and a considerable number of other Senators, among whom I am proud to be included.

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

THE NEW WILDERNESS PRESERVATION BILL

We note with approval that the long-awaited "wilderness bill" has been introduced into the Senate. The bill, calling for a national wilderness preservation system, was introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, with the backing of Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER of Oregon, SMITH of Maine, LEHMAN of New York, DOUGLAS of Illinois, KUCHEL of California, MUNDT of South Dakota, LAIRD of West Virginia, and DUFF of Pennsylvania.

The bill does not set up a new land administering agency. The National Park Service will continue to administer the parks and monuments, the Forest Service will continue to administer its wilderness and wild areas, the Bureau of Indian Affairs will keep its functions, etc. A new agency, however, would be created under terms of the bill. It would be called the National Wilderness Preservation Council. Its duties would include the filing of maps and official papers regarding the system, the study of proposals for changes in the system, the serving as a clearinghouse for information, the surveying of wilderness needs and conditions, the gathering of information, including maps, and consultation with old-line agencies on wilderness matters.

The Council would have 15 members— the chairman and ranking minority members of House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, the directors of the Park Service, Forest Service, Indian Bureau, and Fish and Wildlife Service, the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and six citizens serving staggered 6-year terms. The Smithsonian secretary would be chairman.

Offhand and tentatively we question the membership of the four Congressmen on the Council. We wonder if legislators should be on such a board. We don't exactly oppose the idea. Nor do we endorse it. But we wonder.

The bill does not call for wholesale reform of the present nonunified wilderness systems, but it would work to keep the wilderness areas we have. It would give the force of statute to the executive regulations that have established some of them. The areas to be included would be approximately those now designated as wildernesses. The only "reform" element in the bill is a provision that would prohibit mining. Presumably this would bar oil and gas extraction from wildlife refuges—a pretty hot issue in conservation circles.

Oregon areas spelled out in the bill are wilderness and wild areas at Gearhart Mountain, Kalmiopsis, Mount Hood, Eagle Cap, Mountain Lakes, and Strawberry Mountain; Crater Lake National Park, and the portion of the Mount Jefferson wild area within the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. Another paragraph of the bill permits inclusion of the Three Sisters area and that part of the Mount Jefferson area that is not within the Indian reservation.

And once again we point out that more than a year has passed since hearings were conducted on the boundaries of the Three Sisters wilderness area. The latest information we have is that representatives of the Department of Agriculture (which supervises the Forest Service) will be in the Northwest this summer to look at the region themselves before they stick their necks out and make a decision that is bound to please nobody.

Another point should be made. Because Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER are cosponsors of this bill, some of our friends and neighbors are likely to be, automatically, against it. This would be silly. The bill has nothing to do with partisan politics, and its sponsorship is bipartisan. Witness the sponsoring names of SMITH, DUFF, KUCHEL, and MUNDT.

We don't see this bill as the be-all and end-all of conservation. There will always be the need for review and adjustment, and those things are provided for in the bill. The wilderness system, no matter what Congress does to it, will always be under fire from those who see in the forest nothing but board-feet and kilowatts. And conservationists of the string-saving type will always scream bloody murder every time somebody wants to adjust a wilderness boundary. But we do see the bill as a step toward making raids on the wilderness more difficult. And it will give us a chance to get information and to tailor the wilderness system to the needs of a growing population. Those two reasons are enough to justify the passage, this year, of this long-awaited measure.

ATTAINMENT OF SUBSIDY-FREE OPERATION BY TRANS WORLD AIRLINES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on June 14, 1956, in discussing S. 3449, a bill proposing to change the existing formula for subsidies paid to airlines, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report prepared by the Department of Commerce showing the amount of increased subsidies which would have been paid to the various subsidized companies had the bill been in effect for the past 5 years.

The report of the Department of Commerce was prepared on the basis of the amount of the subsidy which had been paid to the respective companies under the old law during the same period.

Since that time a director of the Trans World Airlines, Inc., has called my attention to the fact that while his company had been the recipient of subsidies in the past, it had attained as of June 1, 1955, the goal where both its domestic and international systems were now subsidy-free operations and that, therefore, since the company was no longer subsidized it would not be affected in any manner by the enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Trans World Airlines letter of June 15, 1956, together with a copy of the citation given to the company by the Postmaster General under date of June 1, 1955, commending them on their attainment of subsidy-free operations, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have noticed with interest your discussion on June 14, on the floor of the Senate, of Senate bill 3449, and your statement that Trans World Airlines is one of the four major companies interested in the passage of this measure.

Permit me to call to your attention the fact that Trans World Airlines does not receive subsidy on either its domestic or international operations. Attached is a citation presented to TWA by the Postmaster General in commemoration of this achievement. TWA is the first major international operator to attain this position.

Because we are entirely off of subsidy, the bill would not apply to TWA. Should you have occasion to refer to this matter again in the future, it would be appreciated if you would make this plain.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. HUFF,
Assistant Director, Civic Affairs.

A CITATION TO TRANS WORLD AIRLINES, INC.

Whereas the United States Post Office Department appreciates the services rendered by the United States air transport industry in delivering the mails, and

Whereas it has long been the goal of the United States scheduled airlines to maintain

their service without Federal subsidies, the Post Office Department presents this citation to Trans World Airlines, Inc., on the happy occasion of its completion of 30 years of service and its attainment of a subsidy-free operation over both its domestic and international systems.

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

JUNE 1, 1955.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice to the Senate that the conferees on the District of Columbia appropriations bill have agreed ,and their report has been filed. Action is expected to be taken in the other House shortly.

As soon as action has been completed in the House, the Senate will take up both the District of Columbia appropriations conference report and the public works conference report.

In addition, there may be sandwiched in sometime during the week, when it is possible, Calendar No. 2168, H. R. 10285, and Senate bill 3773.

If it is possible to complete action on the military public works appropriation bill in a short time tomorrow, the bill may be considered after the completion of the morning business. So far as I know, there is very little controversy about that bill.

But there may be some yea-and-nay votes on the mutual security authorization bill both tomorrow and on Thursday, and I should like all Senators to be on notice of that fact.

It may be that the Senate will meet early and stay late, because if action on the very important mutual security bill can be concluded on Thursday, it is possible that the minority leader will agree with the majority leader to have the Senate go over until Monday. So I wish to hold out that prospect as an inducement to all Senators to be present and to expect to vote on the mutual security bill, so that action can be expedited on that important measure.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Since Monday and Tuesday come immediately before the Fourth of July, does the Senator from Texas expect any yea-and-nay votes on those days?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is possible. I do not know.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Texas know what bills they might be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. This morning I read into the RECORD the list of bills and conference reports which may possibly be considered in the next week or so. If the Senator will refer to the RECORD, he will see the announcement.

Mr. WELKER. I shall read the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know the bill from the committee of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman, the survivors' insurance bill, will be up for consideration. The debt limit bill will likely be considered. It is possible the Fryingpan-Arkansas bill, now on the calendar, will be considered. Calendar No. 2313, Senate bill 3903, amending the Trade Development Assistance Act, will be considered. If the military public works bill is not acted on tomorrow, it will fall in that category.

If the Senator desires any assurance concerning the Hells Canyon bill, I have announced it may be considered sometime during the next week or the following week, but I shall be glad to give him assurance that it will not be considered on either Monday or Tuesday, if that suits his convenience.

Mr. WELKER. I am mindful of the fact that many Senators will be away.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to give the Senator assurance that the Hells Canyon bill will not be brought up by motion on either Monday or Tuesday of next week. I ask the acting minority leader to take notice of that assurance.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator give assurance that the Hells Canyon bill will not be taken up on the 5th or 6th of July, following the 4th of July?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I prefer not to do that now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, there is a possibility that the Hells Canyon bill may be brought up on the 5th or 6th of July?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

SPEECH BY HON. LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN, GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a speech delivered on April 7, 1956, by the Honorable Luis Muñoz Marín, Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, at the annual convention of the Associated Harvard Clubs held in Coral Gables, Fla.

It is a thought provoking, able, and timely speech, delivered by one of Latin America's most intelligent minds, and most distinguished sons, I highly recommend its reading by the Members of both Houses of the Congress.

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

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATED HARVARD CLUBS HELD IN CORAL GABLES, FLA., APRIL 7, 1956.

I am thankful to the Associated Harvard Clubs for this invitation to express my views on the future of inter-American relations and Puerto Rico's contribution to it. It is fitting that we should meet here in Florida. No federated State in the Union so much as Florida realizes the need for understanding between the United States and Latin America. No section of the United States can realize better than Florida what we are trying to do in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Associated State of Puerto Rico, as we call it in Spanish, to further that understanding. We are sharply aware of the stakes involved for the Americas. The United States realizes the ever-increasing need of bringing together the two basic streams of Western civilization which have given the New World such a commanding place in the struggle for freedom and human betterment. Latin Americans also realize it. But neither are quite sure that the other does. It is a most worthy task to correct this misapprehension.

Two variations of a way of life, two manners of a common cultural heritage come into contact in Puerto Rico and have the opportunity of influencing each other for better or for worse. It is the job of all of us to make it be for better, to see that this interaction of cultural forces, while minimizing clashes and frictions, does constantly enrich the social and economic well-being, the standard of values, the mores, and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere.

I should like to speak, in the course of this talk, of how we are trying to contribute to that end in Puerto Rico. First, however, it may be appropriate to give you, in a nutshell, the very recent story of our island Commonwealth. Since July 25, 1952, Puerto Rico is a self-governing Commonwealth, associated with the American Union through a voluntary compact. It represents a novel, flexible, imaginative relationship within the American constitutional tradition. As Chief Justice Earl Warren has recently said, on the occasion of the inauguration of the new Commonwealth Supreme Court Building: "In the sense that our American system is not static, in the sense that it is not an end but the means to an end—in the sense that it is an organism intended to grow and expand to meet varying conditions and times in a large country—in the sense that every governmental effort of ours is an experiment—so the new institutions of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico represent an experiment—the newest experiment and perhaps the most notable of American governmental experiments in our lifetimes." It is as well an experiment in nonnationalistic political freedom for a Latin American people. Puerto Rico, we know, is not a republic. Neither is it, under its new status, a United States possession or Territory, nor is it in any way a colony. It is a new kind of state, both in the sense of the United States federal system and in the general sense of a people organized to govern themselves.

The compact, governing the relationship with the Federal Government, is founded on Public Law 600, which the people of Puerto Rico proposed to the United States Congress, providing for the organization of a government by the people of Puerto Rico under a constitution of their own adoption. Public Law 600 stated that the principle of government by consent was thereby fully recognized and that the act was adopted in the nature of a compact. It could not go into effect unless approved by the people of Puerto Rico in a free referendum. The terms of the relationships between Puerto Rico and the United States were determined in the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act—a part of Public Law 600—that is, a part of the compact. The Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act contains, among others, the provisions referring to the common citizenship, free trade, common coinage, a customs union, the Federal judiciary, and the applicability of Federal laws, with the exception of the internal revenue legislation.

Public Law 600 was approved by the Congress almost unanimously. It was overwhelmingly ratified by the people of Puerto Rico at the polls thus starting a complex and highly democratic constitutional process which finally led to the proclamation of the new Commonwealth status on July 25, 1952. On November 3, 1953, the Commonwealth was solemnly recognized as a self-governing political body in a historic resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

What is the meaning of this constitutional process, and of the economic and social effort that runs parallel with it, in terms

of inter-American relations? What contribution to United States policies and United States prestige in this vital area of the world is being thus made? I think the answer to these questions can be better understood if placed within the context of the great problems which the United States is facing in its unavoidable and dramatic responsibility to champion the cause of free government and democratic values in this tense, war-weary world.

The Western World, with the American Union in the leadership, is facing the military challenge of communism. It is facing it by preparedness and vigilance and by a constant and sincere search for agreement on disarmament. But we know that the conflict with Communist totalitarianism is not just an attempt to guarantee survival by military means, or even by disarmament. In a way, the armament race, gigantic and ominous as it is, gives one a feeling of anachronism, that it is a symbol of a world ailing because of its own physical strength and seeking for its cure a great wisdom that constantly eludes it.

Disarmament, if it comes, will not by itself stop the challenge to freedom. It would, however, make it a creative challenge. The struggle would then increasingly shape itself, I believe, as the ideological clash between the attempt to defeat economic poverty by political slavery and the purpose to enhance political and human freedom by economic productivity and social justice.

As it stands today, both struggles are going on, the military and the ideological. Within recent months we have witnessed an intensification of the ideological fight. We have all observed the moves of the Soviet Union into the field of technical assistance and economic aid to the underdeveloped areas, as well as of Russian support for old grievances against Western Powers. In a world still bedeviled by undernourishment, evil housing conditions, scant protection against disease, little economic security, the Soviet thrust is more challenging to the Western World, that believes in fighting these evils through freedom, than a stockpile of hydrogen bombs.

The Soviet Prime Minister has announced Russia's intention of offering technical assistance to Latin America and to find better trade channels for its commerce. One of the top men of the Soviet is about to initiate a tour through Latin America offering manna. No doubt a vigorous offensive shall follow by the Communists and their friends in Latin America to picture the Soviet pattern of life as most enticing to the underdeveloped economies of the Western Hemisphere and to unfold before their eyes a vision of a swift industrial revolution that may bring, in a generation, the abolition of poverty. They will speak of freedom as well as of economic salvation.

They will probably not be believed as to freedom but they need not be, because many of the peoples are living under governments that are not democratic. The peoples are unfree and miserably poor. Even if only half of the Russian picture is accepted, the vision would be one of the unfamiliar surcease of extreme poverty even if under the familiar absence of democratic freedom. All such governments in Latin America claim to be anti-Communist, and there is no reason to believe that they are not. There is, however, no doubt that in practice, in relation to the lives of their own peoples, they are also antidemocratic. The dealings of the United States with such regimes present a most delicate problem. There is no question that the United States must be on friendly official terms with all governments of the hemisphere. But there should be no question either that the United States must assure the peoples of the hemisphere of its genuine concern for their political freedom and human rights. And it is called upon to do this difficult feat while keeping its skirts clear of any suspicion of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries. It is a dilemma. But I believe there are ways for the United States to make a sufficiently clear distinction between its friends who are democrats and anti-Communist and its friends who are only anti-Communists.

In this respect, we should convince ourselves, and so become strongly convincing, that the answer to the Communist challenge lies in the ability of the Western Powers, and especially the United States, to show to the less fortunate countries of the world that a greater transformation can be achieved, at an even faster rate and on sounder economic foundations, without shattering, or ignoring, as the Russians and the Red Chinese have done, the fabric of political and individual liberties—and that the transformation need not be patterned after the capitalist mores that have been successful in the United States.

It is urgent that this answer be ready and available in dealing with Latin America.

Latin America, generally, is still an underdeveloped area; its per capita income is grievously too low; housing is a problem of the first magnitude; it is basically dependent on world trade, and particularly United States trade, for its cash and credits and for the purchase of the essential consumer goods and the capital goods its industrial growth requires. The United States uses in maintaining a high standard of living 53 percent of the natural resources of the free world—with which indispensable contribution it maintains a civilization for 8 percent of the free world's people. This creates a relationship that cannot be considered merely in commercial terms. It cannot be a simple question of payment in money according to market. It would seem that the relationship could be better conceived as one of interdependent peoples working together toward a rough but substantial equality in the minimums of civilized living.

Too great is the disparity between the wealth and industrial might of the United States and the economic insufficiency of Latin America. Even with a great fund of good will it imperils long-range understanding. To bridge that gap in the least possible time, with the most efficient techniques available, with the most effective partnership of governments and peoples is, in my opinion, the task of the inter-American system in this generation.

How to help the powerful emerging stream of Latin American aspirations to a future rooted in economic security and democratic freedom is an acid test of United States statesmanship, of American statesmanship in the widest sense of the word "American" and in the deepest sense of the word "statesmanship."

I think we all would have in mind not only a more productive but a finer social order, where there is more nourishment and more adequate shelter for the body, more of the modest good things of life, more opportunities for a general education stressing the values of our common heritage and the contributions of the individual cultures, as well as the search for scientific knowledge and its technological application—an order evolving into a democratic union of free peoples, where the human spirit, more clearly perhaps than today is served by the economic process.

It is in this connection that the Puerto Rican experience can be clarifying. For it demonstrates a joint political creativeness of the United States and a people of Latin American origin. In the economic, social, and cultural field, it reveals the United States at its undogmatic best: the helping hand guided by the undoctrinaire spirit, so forgetful of its bigness that it fully reveals its greatness. For if the commonwealth idea is a tangible proof of the possibility of original political thinking in the Americas, a dramatc refutation of the Communist claim that the United States position is narrow, colonialistic and reactionary, the social and economic surge in Puerto Rico clearly demonstrates that a people of different historical background can find a way out of their former anguish and despair, in close association with the United States.

We have called this surge Operation Bootstrap, an effort to lead the people out of extreme poverty, if possible; Operation Serenity, not into extreme wealth; and to do this, Operation Commonwealth, in an association with the American Union so close as that of common citizenship. We have been healthily undoctrinaire, with no fixed taboos, no immutable sacred cows, in the use of instruments to achieve a better standard of living, caring only that all instruments used conformed to the democratic process and could be tested periodically by approval of the public will at the polls. The Commonwealth government pioneered in building and operating factories when there was need to do so, because private capital was hesitant to do it. It socialistically established and managed industries, and then capitalistically sold them to private enterprise and used the money in further stimulation of economic development by some more private enterprise. It has pioneered in attracting United States and foreign capital, in stimulating private initiative and investment, to promote prompt and effective industrialization. It has used United States techniques and ideas, adapting and rejecting them with a frank experimental temper. It has engaged in land reform without destroying the basic unit of production and without unfair expropriation. It has launched an educational program for young and adults which consumes nearly one-third of our budget.

A few figures may tell the tale of what the people of Puerto Rico have tried to accomplish in the last 15 years. In 1940, our net income was $230 million. It is today nearly a billion, with a real increase of 107 percent. Production has been doubled and our income per capita is now $435, higher than all of the Latin American countries, with the exception of Venezuela. We had 300,000 students in 1940; now we have more than 600,000 and illiteracy has been reduced from 32 percent to 20 percent in the same period, while an active campaign is under way to wipe out this curse altogether.

As former Ambassador Chester Bowles has written, "More than most Americans, those who live in Puerto Rico share the hopes and heartaches of that two-thirds of mankind who remain ill clad, ill housed and ill fed. Yet nowhere, except perhaps in the agricultural settlements of Israel or in some of the industrial and village projects of India, have there been pioneering efforts at economic development which match in promise the techniques recently evolved in Puerto Rico." And he later adds, "Thus a decade ago Puerto Ricans learned a lesson which should now be a truism: that if a people are to be saved from whatever danger threatens them, whether it be the militant aggression of communism or the social scourge of poverty and disease, they will in the last analysis save themselves through their own indigenous power, pride and responsibility. If outsiders are to be helpful, their help must take the form of friendly and unobstrusive support."

Because the people of our Commonwealth are fired with a vision of what human energies can do to overcome man-created or nature-created misery, we have insisted in making Puerto Rico a training center for technical assistance, a laboratory for visitors from the New World and even Africa and Asia, so that they may see for themselves our unrelenting and peaceful war on colonialism, poverty, disease, ignorance, and hopelessness—carried out in terms of a deep sense of friendship, of brotherhood with the United States. Even before Congress appropriated money for the point 4 program, our Govern-

ment established an office and offered its services and cooperation. We have received over 2,700 visitors and trainees—the vast majority from Latin America, who have acquired firsthand knowledge of how the two great cultures of America can work together in terms of freedom, respect, and economic achievement. We have had of late in Puerto Rico eminent visitors like the wise President of Haiti, Paul Magloire, and that stanch defender of hemispheric solidarity through freedom, President José Figueres of Costa Rica. We have held numerous inter-American conferences, seminars, workshops, and meetings, always aiming at making our island a place where people of good faith from this hemisphere can meet to discuss their common problems and aspirations in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual trust. We are a Latin American country composed of citizens of the United States. But that does not quite express it. It is not only that the citizenship is United States period, and the culture Latin American period. It is more than just the addition of those two concepts. It is an emerging new manner in the Americas, an example, perhaps a still dimly realized preview, of what a grand hemispheric union might look like to our children. In saying this, I am not referring to political institutions. Democratic peoples have to be constantly creative, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the people of it, are naturally by no means pretending to offer a pattern of political union. They believe that their experience may be a stimulant to imaginative search—political, cultural, social, economic. We are seeking serenity through an efficiency placed at the service of understanding.

This is a job in which we want to participate more and more. As we scan the social, economic, and political horizon, as we shape the course of the future generation in terms of a fuller and richer society, conducted with freedom and order, with more education than conspicuous consumption, with more imagination than acquisitiveness, we feel the deep spiritual urge to link our experience and hope to the wider search for hemispheric unity. The dream we dream is a realistic dream. Hard study, cool reasoning, unremitting labor, and unfailing dedication can make it possible.

Let us urgently devise the basic objectives in housing, in health, in education, in economic productivity, in communications, which may be attainable by different areas of the hemisphere, according to their human and material resources. Let us solemnly declare that our essential goal—the goal of all Americans, North and South—is the abolition of extreme poverty, in the areas of misery remaining in regions of the United States and in the altiplano of Bolivia, the plains of Venezuela, the coffee lands of Puerto Rico and Central America, the sierras of Mexico—to wipe out extreme poverty in this hemisphere within the lifetime of children already born. Let us encourage Government and private initiative to share in a good partnership with a view to better distributive justice for all; and let's not be doctrinaire about it. Let us not be doctrinaire either as to socialism or capitalism, but only as to freedom and human dignity. Let us give friendly support to all groups thinking in terms of a greater, truly hemispheric America, not merely Latin, not merely Anglo-Saxon, and not merely temporary while a Russian danger lasts. An America to serve the world.

SENATOR HOLLAND, OF FLORIDA—BIOGRAPHY AND HONORARY DEGREE CITATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on June 7 the University of Tampa, on the occasion of its 37th commencement, conferred upon my colleague, the very able and distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities, for his leadership and service to our country.

We in Florida are justly proud of his meritorious and outstanding service, not only on behalf of the people of his State, but of the Nation as well. Recognition of this record of public service by the University of Tampa is a well-deserved honor.

At the time of the conferring of the honorary degree, Mr. David E. Smiley, chairman of the board of trustees of the University of Tampa, and publisher of the Tampa Daily Times read a biography of Senator HOLLAND prior to presenting him to Dr. Ellwood C. Nance, president of the university, who conferred the honorary degree on him.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the biography as read by Mr. Smiley, together with the honorary degree citation.

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

PRESENTATION OF THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM FLORIDA SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND FOR THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES AT THE ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA, JUNE 7, 1956, BY DAVID E. SMILEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. SMILEY. There is a rather ancient joke about the lady who was presented to a senator at a party and said: "Senator, I've heard a great deal about you."

Somewhat absently the Senator replied: "Possibly, but you can't prove it."

Over the years I have heard a great deal about Senator SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND—and I am delighted to say that I've heard many things about him and I can prove them.

The proof of his far-ranging activities is recorded with distinction in many areas of endeavor but nowhere is it recorded with such conviction as in the halls of the United States Senate where he holds the esteem of Democrat and Republican alike.

Senator HOLLAND was born in Bartow, July 10, 1892.

His father, Benjamin, a Georgian and Confederate veteran, came to Florida in 1881; his mother, Fannie Virginia, came to Florida in 1888.

Now what can I prove about the Senator?

I can prove that he was the first president of the student body at the University of Florida where he received his legal training; I can prove that he was an honor student at Emory University.

I can cite a string of honorary scholastic honors he earned during his college years.

I can further prove that despite his success in the academic halls he was no stranger to the world of sports.

The Senator won letters in track, football, basketball, and baseball.

And I suspect that while he must enjoy tremendous personal satisfaction for the many solid contributions he has made to Florida and the Federal Government, he must still take a real secret pride in the fact that once he was offered a contract as a major league pitcher by Connie Mack.

What else can I prove?

The Senator qualified for a Rhodes scholarship but was prevented by the outbreak of World War I from accepting the appointment.

He volunteered for military service. The records will show a gallant period as a soldier in the artillery and as an airman. He asked for transfer to the Air Service and saw action as an observer.

The Senator was honorably discharged as a captain and a holder of the Distinguished Service Cross.

As you see, even by then the Senator has a worthy list of achievements to his credit—but those were only the beginning.

Frankly, in the time I have it is difficult to do justice to the multitude of matters I can prove about Senator Holland.

Upon resigning his commission he resumed the practice of law. In 1920 he was elected county judge and held that office for 8 years.

In 1932 he was elected to the State senate where he served for 8 years and concerned himself with progressive measures to improve the schools, helped raise teachers' pay, authored needed citrus legislation born of personal knowledge; supported old-age assistance bills, and other important legislation.

He was elected Governor in 1940. And though weighted with problems brought by the war, his administration was marked by many accomplishments which helped Florida grow and strengthened the basic structure of State government.

Just to mention a few major ones I cite the improvement of the property tax structure; the gasoline tax amendment; increased grants to the needy aged; creation of a nonpolitical fresh-water fish and game commission; firming up the financial condition of our school systems.

In 1946 he brought his great talents to the United States Senate where in a 10-year period the Senator has carved out a notable reputation both as a spokesman for the South and a man deeply concerned with problems vital to all of the Nation. Another distinction is the fact that he is the only native of Florida to serve in both high offices as Governor and Senator. I know he has given enormous service to his two standing committees, Agriculture, and Appropriations.

I know he is a champion of States rights and successfully led the passage of the tidelands bill. He is an active supporter of antisubversive legislation. His name is linked to many other significant congressional measures.

And with all these activities he still manages to concern himself with educational problems.

And here is something else I know about Senator HOLLAND: As I have enumerated, he has served his county, his State, and his Nation as a public servant for 36 years. And in all of these decades there has never been a breath of scandal about this distinguished Floridian.

That is not all I know about the Senator. I know he is a devoted family man who has managed time for his children; who has a charming wife. I know he likes to hunt and fish. And he believes in going regularly to church.

Yes, Dr. Nance, all these things I know and can prove about this man. And that is why it is my privilege and honor as chairman of the board of trustees, to present to you Senator SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND, a unanimously approved candidate of our trustees for the honorary doctorate of humanities.

UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA,
Tampa, Fla.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA HONORARY DEGREE CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY TO THE HONORABLE SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES [1]

Senator SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND, because of your distinguished services to our

[1] Presented by Dr. Ellwood C. Nance, president of the University of Tampa on the occasion of the conferring upon Senator HOLLAND the doctor of humanities degree at the 37th commencement ceremonies of the university, June 7, 1956, at which ceremony Senator HOLLAND was the commencement speaker.

country and our State as a teacher, scholar, officer in our Armed Forces, attorney at law, State senator and Governor of Florida, United States Senator, civic, fraternal, and religious leader, and because of your active interest and aggressive leadership in both public and private education, and in many civic, cultural, and veterans' organizations which are devoted to the welfare and security of our State and Nation, I, as president of the University of Tampa, with the enthusiastic and unanimous approval of the trustees of the university, bestow on you the honorary doctorate in the humanities, and with this degree all the rights and privileges appertaining thereto. We are honored to claim you as an honorary alumnus.

E. C. NANCE,
President.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following appointments to the National Memorial Stadium Commission authorized by Public Law 523, 78th Congress, as follows: The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to speak, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26, 1956:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Frederick Blake Payne, of New York, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who art daily seeking to reveal Thy way and Thy will unto us, we pray that we may be delivered from all cold and callous tempers of mind and heart.

Grant that we may now feel the touch of Thy divine spirit, cleansing and transforming our human spirit into the likeness of the Son of God and leading all humanity in the path of truth and righteousness.

Help us to appreciate and understand more clearly that mankind is one family and that without striving for the common good, no race, no country, no individual can attain unto fullness of life and blessedness.

Show us how the nations of the earth may live and labor together in harmony and honor; and may our own beloved country have a great and glorious part in mobilizing those moral and spiritual forces which will banish forever the bitter hatreds, the cruel enmities, the antipathies, the suspicions, the prejudices, and the age-old rancors.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H. R. 6782.

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

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution requesting the return of enrolled bill S. 3581 to the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6243) entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. DUFF to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9052) entitled "An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BUSH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9852) entitled "An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BUSH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND HIGHWAY REVENUE ACTS OF 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses, and for other purposes; and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2436)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

TITLE I

The managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate as to title I of the bill having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

"SEC. 101. Short title for title I.

"This title may be cited as the 'Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956'.

"SEC. 102. Federal-aid highways.

"(a) (1) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, $125,000,000 in addition to any sums heretofore authorized for such fiscal year; the sum of $850,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; and the sum of $875,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The sums herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(B) 30 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

"(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

"(2) Apportionments: The sums authorized by this section shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838): *Provided*, That the additional amount herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this Act.

"(b) Availability for expenditure: Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of specific projects as provided in this title and prior Acts: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *And provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of Commerce of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project. Any Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the same class of funds, primary, secondary, or urban, previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure.

"(c) Transfers of appointments: Not more than 20 per centum of the respective amounts apportioned to a State for any fiscal year from funds made available for expenditure under clause (A), clause (B), or clause (C) of subsection (a) (1) of this section, may be transferred to the apportionment made to such State under any other of such clauses, except that no such apportionment may be increased by more than 20 per centum by reason of transfers to it under this subsection: *Provided*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of such State and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds which may be hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

"SEC. 103. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails.

"(a) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $27,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest highways and forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and for sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *And provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

"(b) Repeal of certain apportionment procedures: The provision of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, requiring apportionment of funds authorized for forest development roads and trails among the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 104 Roads and Trails in National Parks, etc.

"(a) National parks, etc.: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"(b) Parkways: For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"(c) Indian reservations and lands: For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 105. Public lands highways.

"For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the additional sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and the sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

"SEC. 106. Special provisions for Federal domain roads, etc.

"Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract upon apportionment, or a date not earlier than one year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended two years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations, and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof, and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated. Any funds heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized for any fiscal year for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums authorized for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years since and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, shall have been obligated. Any of such funds released by payment of final voucher or modification of project authorizations shall be credited to the balance of unobligated authorizations and be immediately available for expenditure.

"Sec. 107. Highways for Alaska.

"(a) Apportionment; matching; selection of systems: The Territory of Alaska shall be entitled to share in funds herein or hereafter authorized for expenditure for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems, and extensions thereof within urban areas, under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as the several States and Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and the Territory of Alaska shall be included in the calculations to determine the basis of apportionment of such funds, except that one-third only of the area of Alaska shall be used in the calculations to determine the area factor in the apportionment of such funds: *Provided*, That the Territory of Alaska shall contribute funds each fiscal year in an amount that shall be not less than 10 per centum of the Federal funds apportioned to it for such fiscal year, such contribution to be deposited in a special account in the Federal Treasury for use in conjunction with the Federal funds apportioned to the Territory. The system or systems of roads on which Federal-aid apportionments to the Territory of Alaska are to be expended shall be determined and agreed upon by the Governor of Alaska, the Territorial Highway Engineer of Alaska, and the Secretary of Commerce, without regard to the limitations contained in section 6 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented. The Federal funds apportioned to the Territory of Alaska and the funds contributed by such Territory in accordance herewith may be expended by the Secretary of Commerce either directly or in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners of Alaska, and may

be so expended separately or in combination and without regard to the matching provisions of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212); and both such funds may be expended for the maintenance of roads within the system or systems of roads agreed upon under the same terms and conditions as for the construction of such roads.

"(b) Transfer of functions: Effective not more than ninety days after the approval of this Act, the functions, duties, and authority pertaining to the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works in Alaska, conferred upon the Department of the Interior and heretofore administered by the Secretary of the Interior under the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 446; 48 U. S. C., sec. 321a and following), are hereby transferred to the Department of Commerce, and thereafter shall be administered by the Secretary of Commerce, or under his direction, by such officer, or officers, as may be designated by him.

"(c) Transfer of personnel, etc.: There are hereby transferred to the Department of Commerce, to be employed and expended in connection with the functions, duties, and authority transferred to said Department by subsection (b) hereof, all personnel employed in connection with any such functions, duties, or authority, and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds now available, or that hereafter may be made available, for use in connection with such functions, duties, or authority; and the Department of the Interior is directed to turn over to the Secretary of Commerce all equipment, materials, supplies, papers, maps, and documents, or other property (real or personal, and including office equipment and records) used or held in connection with such functions, duties, and authority.

"(d) Effectuation of transfer: The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary or appropriate to effect the transfer from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce of the functions, duties, and authority, and the funds and property, as herein provided for.

"(e) Distribution of functions: The Secretary of Commerce shall have power, by order or regulations, to distribute the functions, duties, and authority hereby transferred, and appropriations pertaining thereto, as he may deem proper to accomplish the economical and effective organization and administration thereof.

"SEC. 108. National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

"(a) Interstate System: It is hereby declared to be essential to the national interest to provide for the early completion of the 'National System of Interstate Highways', as authorized and designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). It is the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a thirteen-year period and that the entire System in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion. Because of its primary importance to the national defense, the name of such system is hereby changed to the 'National System of Interstate and Defense Highways'. Such National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Interstate System'.

"(b) Authorization of appropriations: For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the additional sum of $1,025,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"(c) Apportionments for 1957, 1958, and 1959: The additional sums herein authorized for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 per centum of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system. The additional sum herein authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, shall be apportioned immediately upon enactment of this Act. The additional sums herein authorized for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958, and June 30, 1959, shall be apportioned on a date not less than six months and not more than twelve months in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized.

"(d) Apportionments for subsequent years based upon revised estimates of cost: All sums authorized by this section to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1960 through 1969, inclusive, shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, as determined and approved in the manner provided in this subsection, bears to the sum of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. Each apportionment herein authorized for the fiscal years 1960 through 1969, inclusive, shall be made on a date as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized as practicable but in no case more than eighteen months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized. As soon as the standards provided for in subsection (i) have been adopted, the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System as then designated, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, based upon such standards and in accordance with rules and regulations adopted by him and applied uniformly to all of the States. The Secretary of Commerce shall transmit such estimate to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1958. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1960, June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1962. Upon approval of such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System, after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section, in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1966, and annually thereafter through and including January 2, 1968. Upon approval of any such estimate by the Congress by concurrent resolution, the Secretary of Commerce shall use such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal year which begins next following the fiscal year in which such report is transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives. Whenever the Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to this subsection, requests and receives estimates of cost from the State highway departments, he shall furnish copies of such estimates at the same time to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"(e) Federal share: The Federal share payable on account of any project on the Interstate System provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 per centum of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *Provided*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 per centum of the total cost of such project.

"(f) Availability for expenditure: Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State specifically for the Interstate System for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of specific projects under this section.

"(g) Lapse of amounts apportioned: Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (f) of this section shall lapse, and shall immediately be reapportioned among the other States in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section: *Provided*, That any Interstate System funds released by the payment of the final voucher or by the modification of the formal project agreement shall be credited to the Interstate System funds previously apportioned to the State and be immediately available for expenditure.

"(h) Construction by States in advance of apportionment: In any case in which a State has obligated all funds apportioned to it under this section and proceeds, subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, to construct (without the aid of Federal funds) any project (including one or more parts of any project) on the Interstate System, as designated at that time, in accordance with all procedures and all requirements applicable to projects financed under the provisions of

this section (except insofar as such procedures and requirements limit a State to the construction of projects with the aid of Federal funds previously apportioned to it), the Secretary of Commerce, upon application by such State and his approval of such application, is authorized, whenever additional funds are apportioned to such State under this section, to pay to such State from such funds the Federal share of the costs of construction of such project: *Provided*, That prior to construction of any such project, the plans and specifications therefor shall have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce in the same manner as other projects on the Interstate System: *Provided further*, That any such project shall conform to the standards adopted under subsection (i). In determining the apportionment for any fiscal year under the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, any such project constructed by a State without the aid of Federal funds shall not be considered completed until an application under the provisions of this subsection with respect to such project has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

"(i) Standards: The geometric and construction standards to be adopted for the Interstate System shall be those approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments. Such standards shall be adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. The right-of-way width of the Interstate System shall be adequate to permit construction of projects on the Interstate System up to such standards. The Secretary of Commerce shall apply such standards uniformly throughout the States. Such standards shall be adopted by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act.

"(j) Maximum weight and width limitation: No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the Interstate System may lawfully be used by vehicles with weight in excess of eighteen thousand pounds carried on any one axle, or with a tandem-axle weight in excess of thirty-two thousand pounds, or with an overall gross weight in excess of 73,280 pounds, or with a width in excess of 96 inches, or the corresponding maximum weights or maximum widths permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions shall lapse: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the operation within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be lawfully operated within such State on July 1, 1956.

"(k) Tests to determine maximum desirable dimensions and weights: The Secretary of Commerce is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1959, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights.

"(l) Increase in mileage: Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), relating to the Interstate System, is hereby amended by striking out 'forty thousand', and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-one thousand': *Provided*, That the cost of completing any mileage designated from the one thousand additional miles authorized by this subsection shall be excluded in making the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"SEC. 109. Acquisition of rights-of-way for Interstate System.

"(a) Federal acquisition for States: In any case in which the Secretary of Commerce is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including within the term 'interests in lands', the control of access thereto from adjoining lands) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the Interstate System, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the Act of February 26, 1931, 46 Stat. 1421), if—

"(1) the Secretary of Commerce has determined either that such State is unable to acquire necessary lands or interests in lands, or is unable to acquire such lands or interests in lands with sufficient promptness; and

"(2) such State has agreed with the Secretary of Commerce to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary of Commerce, an amount equal to 10 per centum of the costs incurred by the Secretary of Commerce, in acquiring such lands or interests in lands, or such lesser percentage which represents the State's pro rata share of project costs as determined in accordance with section 108 (e) of this title.

"The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interests in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations.

"(b) Costs of acquisition: The costs incurred by the Secretary of Commerce in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary of Commerce in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the Interstate System apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired, and any sums paid to the Secretary of Commerce by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the Interstate System, or shall be deducted from other moneys due the State for reimbursement under section 108 of this title.

"(c) Conveyance of acquired lands to the States: The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside five feet of any such right-of-way in any State which does not provide control of access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivisions thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to such lands or interests in lands as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway department or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State makes provision for control of access satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce, the outside five feet then shall be conveyed to the State by the Secretary of Commerce, as herein provided.

"(d) Rights-of-way over public lands: Whenever rights-of-way, including control of access, on the Interstate System are required over public lands or reservations of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce in this connection.

"SEC. 110. Availability of funds to acquire rights-of-way and to make advances to the States.

"(a) Advance right-of-way acquisitions: For the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of rights-of-way on any of the Federal-aid highway system, including the Interstate System, in the most expeditious and economical manner, and recognizing that the acquisition of rights-of-way requires lengthy planning and negotiations if it is to be done at a reasonable cost, the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized, upon request of a State highway department, to make available to such State for acquisition of rights-of-way, in anticipation of construction and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe, the funds apportioned to such State for expenditure on any of the Federal-aid highway system, including the Interstate System: *Provided*, That the agreement between the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway department for the reimbursement of the cost of such rights-of-way shall provide for the actual construction of a road on such rights-of-way within a period not exceeding five years following the fiscal year in which such request is made: *Provided further*, That Federal participation in the cost of rights-of-way so acquired shall not exceed the Federal pro rata share applicable to the class of funds from which Federal reimbursement is made.

"(b) Advances to States: Section 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. If the Secretary of Commerce shall determine that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, he may advance to any State out of any existing appropriations the Federal share of the cost of construction thereof to enable the State highway department to make prompt payments for acquisition of rights-of-way, and for construction as it progresses. The sums so advanced shall be deposited in a special revolving trust fund, by the State official authorized under the laws of the State to receive Federal-aid highway funds, to be disbursed solely upon vouchers approved by the State highway department for rights-of-way which have been or are being acquired, and for construction which has been actually performed and approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Upon determination by the Secretary of Commerce that any part of the funds advanced to any State under the provisions of this section are no longer required, the amount of the advance which is determined to be in excess of current requirements of the State shall be repaid upon his demand, and such repayments shall be returned to the credit of the appropriation from which the funds were advanced. Any sums advanced and not repaid on demand shall be deducted from sums due the State for the Federal pro rata share of the cost of construction of Federal-aid projects.'

"SEC. 111. Relocation of utility facilities.

"(a) Availability of Federal funds for reimbursement to States: Subject to the conditions contained in this section, whenever a State shall pay for the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems or on the Interstate System, including extensions thereof within urban areas, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such cost in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project: *Provided*, That Federal funds shall not be apportioned to the States under this section when the payment to the utility violates the law of the State or violates a legal contract between the utility and the State.

"(b) Utility defined: For the purposes of this section, the term 'utility' shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

"(c) Cost of relocation defined: For the purposes of this section, the term 'cost of relocation' shall include the entire amount paid by such utility properly attributable to such relocation after deducting therefrom any increase in the value of the new facility and any salvage value derived from the old facility.

"SEC. 112. Agreements relating to use of and access to rights-of-way.

"All agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the Interstate System shall contain a clause providing that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary. Such agreements shall also contain a clause providing that the State will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments for serving motor vehicle users to be constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System. Such agreements may, however, authorize a State or political subdivision thereof to use the air space above and below the established grade line of the highway pavement for the parking of motor vehicles provided such use does not interfere in any way with the free flow of traffic on the Interstate System.

"SEC. 113. Toll roads, bridges, and tunnels.

"(a) Approval as part of Interstate System: Upon a finding by the Secretary of Commerce that such action will promote the development of an integrated Interstate System, the Secretary is authorized to approve as part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on the Interstate System, whenever such toll road, bridge, or tunnel is located on a route heretofore or hereafter designated as a part of the Interstate System: *Provided*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll road except to the extent hereafter permitted by law: *Provided further*, That no Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any such toll bridge or tunnel except to the extent now or hereafter permitted by law.

"(b) Approaches having other use: The funds authorized under this title, or under prior acts, shall be available for expenditure on projects approaching any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to a point where such project will have some use irrespective of its use for such toll road, bridge, or tunnel.

"(c) Approaches having no other use: The funds authorized under section 108 (b) of this title, or under prior Acts, shall be available for expenditure on Interstate System projects approaching any toll road on the Interstate System, even though the project has no use other than as an approach to such toll road: *Provided*, That agreement satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce has been reached with the State prior to approval of any such project (1) that the section of toll road will become free to the public upon the collection of tolls sufficient to liquidate the cost of the toll road or any bonds outstanding at the time constituting a valid lien against said section of toll road covered in the agreement and their maintenance and operation and debt service during the period of toll collections, and (2) that there is one or more reasonably satisfactory alternate free routes available to traffic by which the toll section of the System may be bypassed.

"(d) Effect on certain prior acts: Nothing in this title shall be deemed to repeal the Act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1398), or subsection (g) of section 204 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 200), and such Acts are hereby amended to include tunnels as well as bridges.

"SEC. 114. Determination of policy with respect to reimbursement for certain highways.

"It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for a portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement, if any, shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the Interstate System measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1958.

"SEC. 115. Prevailing rate of wage.

"(a) Application of Davis-Bacon Act: The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 108 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276–a).

"(b) Consultation with State highway departments; predetermination of rates: In carrying out the duties of the foregoing subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the highway department of the State in which a project on the Interstate System is to be performed. After giving due regard to the information thus obtained, he shall make a predetermination of the minimum wages to be paid laborers and mechanics in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing subsection which shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project.

"SEC. 116. Declarations of policy with respect to Federal-aid highway program.

"(a) Acceleration of program: It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense.

"(b) Completion of Interstate System; progress report on Federal-aid highway program: It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this Act is the prompt completion of the Interstate System. Insofar as possible in consonance with this objective, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the progress made in attaining the objectives set forth in this subsection and in subsection (a), together with recommendations.

"(c) Public hearings: Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of, or going through, any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location: *Provided*, That, if such hearings have been held, a copy of the transcript of said hearings shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Roads, together with the certification.

"(d) Participation by small business enterprises: It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to encourage and develop the actual and potential capacity of small business and to utilize this important segment of our economy to the fullest practicable extent in construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System. In order to carry out that intent and encourage full and free competition, the Secretary of Commerce should assist, insofar as feasible, small business enterprises in obtaining contracts in connection with the prosecution of the highway program.

"SEC. 117. Highway safety study.

"The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States. In making such investigation and study the Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to—

"(1) the need for Federal assistance to State and local governments in the enforcement of necessary highway safety and speed requirements and the forms such assistance should take;

"(2) the advisability and practicability of uniform State and local highway safety and speed laws and what steps should be taken by the Federal Government to promote the adoption of such uniform laws;

"(3) possible means of promoting highway safety in the manufacture of the various types of vehicles used on the highways;

"(4) educational programs to promote highway safety;

"(5) the design and physical characteristics of highways; and

"(6) such other matters as it may deem advisable and appropriate.

"The Secretary of Commerce shall report his findings, together with such recommendations as he may deem advisable, to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959. The Secretary of Commerce shall conduct such study and investigation under the general authority contained in section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954; except that the amount expended for the purposes of this section shall not exceed $200,000.

"SEC. 118. Emergency fund.

"Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $30,000,000 for expenditure by the Secretary of Commerce, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the establishment of the fund in accordance with the provisions of this section and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of such sum, or its replenishment, the Secretary of Commerce may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof: *And provided further*, That the funds herein authorized shall be available for use on any projects programed and approved at any time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and thereafter, which meet the provisions of this section, including projects which may have been previously approved during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, from any other category of funds under the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented.'

"SEC. 119. Definition of construction.

"The definition of the term 'construction' in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is hereby amended by inserting after 'mapping' the following: '(including the establishment of temporary and permanent geodetic markers in accordance with specifications of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce)'.

"SEC. 120. Archeological and paleontological salvage.

"Funds authorized by this title to be appropriated, to the extent approved as necessary by the highway department of any State, may be used for archeological and paleontological salvage in that State in compliance with the Act entitled 'An Act for the preservation of American antiquities', approved June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), and State laws where applicable.

"SEC. 121. Mapping.

"In carrying out the provisions of this title the Secretary of Commerce may, wherever practicable, authorize the use of photogrammetric methods in mapping, and the utilization of commercial enterprise for such services.

"SEC. 122. Relationship of this title to other acts; effective date.

"All provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, together with all Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this title, shall remain in full force and effect and be applicable hereto. All Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed. This title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT S. KERR,
ALBERT GORE,
PAT MCNAMARA,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANCIS CASE,
PRESCOTT BUSH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TITLE II

The managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate as to title II of the bill having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 17, and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 24, and 25 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", and by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

"'In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such sale or use) is not registered, and is not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is not used on the highway, the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "'In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such sale or use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, a tax of 1 cent a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 29, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Department or agency" and in lieu thereof insert "agency or instrumentality"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 41, line 2, of the House engrossed bill strike out "6416 (b) (2) (L) (i)" and in lieu thereof insert "6421 (b) (2)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(J) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (a) (1) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle (i) which (at the time of such use or resale) is not registered, and is not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (ii) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is not used on the highway; except that the amount of any overpayment by reason of this subparagraph shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon;

"(K) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (b) (1) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of a highway vehicle (i) which (at the time of such use or resale) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (ii) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway; except that the amount of any overpayment by reason of this subparagraph shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(L) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used during any calendar quarter in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes; except that (i) this subparagraph shall apply only if the 60 percent passenger fare revenue test set forth in section 6421 (b) (2) is met with respect to such quarter, and (ii) the amount of such overpayment for such quarter shall be an amount determined by multiplying 1 cent for each gallon of liquid so used by the percentage which such person's tax-exempt passenger fare revenue (as defined in section 6421 (d) (2)) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter was of his total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax

imposed by section 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter";

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) Payments to ultimate purchasers: Subchapter B of chapter 65 (relating to rules of special application for abatements, credits, and refunds) is amended by renumbering section 6421 as 6422 and by inserting after section 6420 the following new section:

"'SEC. 6421. Gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems.

"'(a) Nonhighway uses: If gasoline is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle (1) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (2) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used.

"'(b) Local transit systems:

"'(1) Allowance: If gasoline is used during any calendar quarter in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes, the Secretary or his delegate shall, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline the amount determined by multiplying—

"'(A) 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used, by

"'(B) the percentage which the ultimate purchaser's tax-exempt passenger fare revenue derived from such scheduled service during such quarter was of his total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by section 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter.

"'(2) Limitation: Paragraph (1) shall apply in respect of gasoline used during any calendar quarter only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by section 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived during such quarter from scheduled service described in paragraph (1) by the person filing the claim was attributable to tax-exempt passenger fare revenue derived during such quarter by such person from such scheduled service.

"'(c) Time for filing claim; period covered: Not more than one claim may be filed under subsection (a), and not more than one claim may be filed under subsection (b), by any person with respect to gasoline used during the 1-year period ending on June 30 of any year. No claim shall be allowed under this section with respect to any 1-year period unless filed on or before September 30 of the year in which such 1-year period ends.

"'(d) Definitions: For purposes of this section:

"'(1) Gasoline: The term "gasoline" has the meaning given to such term by section 4082 (b).

"'(2) Tax-exempt passenger fare revenue: The term "tax-exempt passenger fair revenue" means revenue attributable to fares which were exempt from the tax imposed by section 4261 by reason of section 4262 (b) (relating to the exemption for commutation travel, etc.).

"'(e) Exempt sales; other payments or refunds available:

"'(1) Exempt sales: No amount shall be paid under this section with respect to any gasoline which the Secretary or his delegate determines was exempt from the tax imposed by section 4081. The amount which (but for this sentence) would be payable under this section with respect to any gasoline shall be reduced by any other amount which the Secretary or his delegate determines is payable under this section, or is refundable under any provision of this title, to any person with respect to such gasoline.

"'(2) Gasoline used on farms: This section shall not apply in respect of gasoline which was (within the meaning of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 6420 (c)) used on a farm for farming purposes.

"'(f) Applicable laws:

"'(1) In general: All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable in respect of the tax imposed by section 4081 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with this section, apply in respect of the payments provided for in this section to the same extent as if such payments constituted refunds of overpayments of the tax so imposed.

"'(2) Examination of books and witnesses: For the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any claim made under this section, or the correctness of any payment made in respect of any such claim, the Secretary or his delegate shall have the authority granted by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 7602 (relating to examination of books and witnesses) as if the claimant were the person liable for tax.

"'(g) Regulations: The Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe the conditions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, under which payments may be made under this section.

"'(h) Effective date: This section shall apply only with respect to gasoline purchased after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972.

"'(i) Cross references:

"'(1) For reduced rate of tax in case of diesel fuel and special motor fuels used for certain nonhighway purposes, see subsections (a) and (b) of section 4041.

"'(2) For partial refund of tax in case of diesel fuel and special motor fuels used for certain nonhighway purposes, see section 6416 (b) (2) (J) and (K).

"'(3) For partial refund of tax in case of diesel fuel and special motor fuels used by local transit systems, see section 6416 (b) (2) (L).

"'(4) For civil penalty for excessive claims under this section, see section 6675.

"'(5) For fraud penalties, etc., see chapter 75 (section 7201 and following, relating to crimes, other offenses, and forfeitures).'

"(d) Technical amendments:

"(1) Section 6206 (relating to special rules applicable to excessive claims) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'Section 6420' in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'Sections 6420 and 6421';

"(B) by inserting after '6420' in the first sentence thereof 'or 6421'; and

"(C) by inserting after '6420' in the second sentence thereof 'or 6421, as the case may be'.

"(2) Section 6675 (relating to excessive claims for gasoline used on farms) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'For gasoline used on farms' in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof 'With respect to the use of certain gasoline';

"(B) by inserting after '6420 (relating to gasoline used on farms)' in subsection (a) thereof 'or 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems)'; and

"(C) by inserting after '6420' in subsection (b) thereof 'or 6421, as the case may be,'.

"(3) Section 7210 (relating to failure to obey summons) is amended by inserting after 'sections 6420 (e) (2),' the following: '6421 (f) (2),'.

"(4) Section 7603 (relating to service of summons) and 7604 (relating to enforcement of summons) and the first sentence of section 7605 (relating to time and place of examination) are each amended by inserting after 'section 6420 (e) (2)' wherever it appears a comma and the following: '6421 (f) (2),'. The second sentence of section 7605 is amended by inserting after 'section 6420 (e) (2)' the following: 'or 6421 (f) (2)'.

"(e) Clerical amendments:

"(1) Section 4084 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4084. Cross references.

"'(1) For provisions to relieve farmers from excise tax in the case of gasoline used on the farm for farming purposes, see section 6420.

"'(2) For provisions to relieve purchasers of gasoline from excise tax in the case of gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems, see section 6421.'

"(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part III of subchapter A of chapter 32 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 4084. Relief of farmers from tax in case of gasoline used on the farm.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 4084. Cross references.'

"(3) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 63 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 6206. Special rules applicable to excessive claims under section 6420.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 6206. Special rules applicable to excessive claims under sections 6420 and 6421.'

"(4) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 6421. Cross references.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 6421. Gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems.'

"'Sec. 6422. Cross references.'

"(5) Section 6504 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(14) Assessments to recover excessive amounts paid under section 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems) and assessments of civil penalties under section 6675 for excessive claims under section 6421, see section 6206.'

"(6) Section 6511 (f) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(6) For limitations in case of payments under section 6421 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems), see section 6421 (c).'

"(7) Section 6612 (c) is amended by striking out 'and' before '6420' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and 6421 (relating to payments in the case of gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems)'.

"(8) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 68 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 6675. Excessive claims for gasoline used on farms.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 6675. Excessive claims with respect to the use of certain gasoline.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and for certain other purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 39, line 2, of the Senate engrossed

amendments strike out "purposes)" and in lieu thereof insert "purposes or by local transit systems)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 39, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "National System of Interstate Highways" and in lieu thereof insert "Interstate System".

On page 40, line 1, lines 5 and 6, line 9, and lines 19 and 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "National System of Interstate Highways" each place it appears and in lieu thereof insert "Interstate System".

On page 41, lines 1 and 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "National System of Interstate Highways" and in lieu thereof insert "Interstate System".

And the Senate agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBT. S. KERR,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I

The managers on the part of the House as to title I of the bill submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to title I of the bill and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment, relating to the authorization for the Federal-aid highway program, contained a substitute for the provisions of title I of the bill as it passed the House. The House recedes and agrees to the Senate amendment No. 1 with an amendment containing a substitute for both the language of title I as it passed the House and the language of title I as it passed the Senate. Except for technical, clerical, and conforming changes, the provisions of title I, as proposed under the accompanying conference report, are the same as the provisions of title I as it passed the House, with the following changes:

Section 101. Citation of title I

Section 101 of the House bill provided that title I of the bill might be cited as the "Federal Highway Act of 1956." Section 126 of the Senate amendment provided that title I of the bill might be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956." Under the conference agreement, the citation provided by the Senate amendment is followed.

Section 102. Primary and secondary systems and extensions in urban areas

(a) Amounts authorized: Section 102 (a) (1) of the House bill contained the authorization of appropriations for the primary and secondary systems and extensions thereof in urban areas. This authorization was for an additional $25 million for fiscal 1957 (making a total of $725 million), $750 million for fiscal 1958, and $775 million for fiscal 1959.

Section 101 of the Senate amendment contained the authorization of appropriations for these Federal-aid highways. Under the Senate amendment, the authorization for fiscal 1957 was increased by $200 million (making a total of $900 million), and an authorization of $900 million was provided for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958.

Under the conference agreement, the additional authorization for fiscal 1957 is $125 million (making a total of $825 million). In addition, an authorization of $850 million is provided for fiscal 1958 and an authorization of $875 million is provided for fiscal 1959. The conference agreement contains no authorizations for fiscal years beyond fiscal 1959.

(b) Ratio: Under the House bill the funds authorized for each fiscal year were to be available for expenditure for the 3 categories in the ratio which has prevailed for a number of years, namely, 45 percent for the primary system, 30 percent for the secondary system, and 25 percent for the extensions of these systems within urban areas.

The Senate amendment provided that the additional sum authorized for fiscal 1957, and the sums authorized for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958, were to be available for expenditure for the 3 categories in accordance with specified dollar amounts. In effect, this would have changed the existing ratio so as to provide 44.4 percent for the primary system, 33.3 percent for the secondary system, and 22.2 percent for extensions within urban areas.

Under the conference agreement, the existing 45–30–25 ratio is retained.

(c) Provisions relating to approval of projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system: The Senate amendment (in sec. 101) contained provisions relating to the approval of projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system which are now set forth in the first section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954. The House bill did not repeat these provisions, relying instead on the provisions of the 1954 act. The conference agreement follows the Senate amendment in expressly setting forth these provisions.

(d) Declaration with respect to future authorizations: The House bill (in sec. 102 (c)) contained a policy statement that progressive increases for the 3 categories of highways of not less than $25 million per year (covering the total for all 3 categories) should continue through fiscal 1969, and that the relative ratio between the 3 categories should continue during that period of time. The Senate amendment contained no similar policy statements.

The conference agreement does not contain any policy statement with respect to the amount of, or relative ratio for, future authorizations for the 3 categories. It is contemplated that the existing practice of considering authorizing legislation for these 3 categories every 2 years will be continued.

(e) Transfers of apportionments: The House bill (in sec. 102 (d)) authorized the transfer of not to exceed 20 percent of the primary, secondary, or urban funds authorized by section 102 to either of the other categories of funds (primary, secondary, or urban), with the limitation that the total of such transfers did not increase the original apportionment for the category to which transferred by more than 20 percent. Under the House bill, this transfer provision did not apply to funds for the Interstate System.

Section 103 of the Senate amendment contained a similar 20-percent transfer provision, except that it would also have permitted transfer of funds between the Interstate System and the primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions.

The conference agreement follows the House provision and does not apply to funds for the Interstate System. Under this 20-percent transfer provision, flexibility will be provided to meet the varying needs of the States for higher relative amounts with respect to 1 or 2 of the 3 categories.

Section 103. Forest highways and forest development roads and trails

(a) Amounts authorized: Section 103 (a) of the House bill authorized the appropriation (1) for forest highways, $25 million for fiscal 1958 and $25 million for fiscal 1959, and (2) for forest development roads and trails, $27 million for fiscal 1958 and $27 million for fiscal 1959.

Section 106 of the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation (1) for forest highways, $33,750,000 for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958, and (2) for forest development roads and trails, $27 million for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958.

Under the conference agreement the authorization for each of these 2 categories is limited to the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The amount authorized for each of these years is (1) $30 million for forest highways, and (2) $27 million for forest development roads and trails.

(b) Availability of funds for parking areas and for sanitary, water, and fire-control facilities: Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that hereafter funds available for forest highways and for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas. The Senate amendment added the requirement that these vehicular parking areas be "adjacent." In addition, the Senate amendment provided that hereafter such funds should also be available for sanitary, water, and fire-control facilities.

Under the conference agreement, which follows the Senate amendment, these funds will be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas, for sanitary facilities, for water facilities, for fire-control facilities, or for any combination thereof.

(c) Repeal of certain apportionment language: Section 23 (a) of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, as amended and supplemented, provides that funds authorized for forest development roads shall be "apportioned" among the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico according to the relative needs of the various national forests. Section 103 (b) of the House bill repealed this requirement. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

The conference agreement follows the House bill in repealing this apportionment requirement. Since expenditures are made on the basis of relative needs, the apportionment procedure, and the accounting necessary in connection therewith, serve no useful purpose. As a result of such procedure, in the past a large number of allotments were created, too small in amount to be economically converted into road improvements. As a result, the apportionments remained idle over a number of years while accumulating sufficiently to be put to use, or they had to be transferred and consolidated into one larger apportionment. The repeal provided by section 103 (b) of the conference agreement will remedy this situation.

Section 104. Roads and trails in national parks, etc.

(a) Amounts authorized: Section 104 of the House bill authorized the appropriation for each of the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959 (1) for park roads and trails, $16 million; (2) for parkways, $16 million; and (3) for Indian roads, $10 million.

Section 107 of the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for each of the 4 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958 (1) for park roads and trails, $18 million; (2)

for parkways, $16 million; and (3) for Indian roads, $12,500,000.

Under the conference agreement the authorizations are limited to the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The amounts authorized for each of these years for these 3 categories are as follows: (1) For park roads and trails, $16 million; (2) for parkways, $16 million; and (3) for Indian roads, $12 million.

(b) Access roads to mines: Section 107 (a) of the Senate amendment included within the authorization of appropriations for park roads and trails the phrase "and for access roads to mines on public lands." The House bill contained no comparable provision.

In this respect, the conference agreement follows the House bill and does not include authorization of appropriations for access roads to mines on public lands.

Section 105. Public lands highways

Section 105 of the House bill authorized the appropriation of $1 million, for each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959, for roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations. Section 109 of the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for this category of $2 million for fiscal 1957 (in addition to the $1 million for fiscal 1957 previously authorized), and of $2 million for each of the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal 1958.

Under the conference agreement there is authorized to be appropriated for this category (1) for the fiscal year 1957 an additional $2 million (making a total of $3 million), and (2) for each of the 2 fiscal years 1958 and 1959, $2 million.

Section 106. Special provisions for Federal domain roads, etc.

(a) Provisions relating to contract authorization: Section 106 (a) of the House bill provided that funds authorized for the various categories of Federal domain roads would be available for contract on apportionment, or a date not earlier than 6 months preceding the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required. Section 110 of the Senate amendment provided that these funds would be available for contract for one year in advance of the year for which authorized.

The conference agreement provides that these funds will be available for contract on apportionment, or a date not earlier than one year preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which authorized if no apportionment is required.

(b) Declaration of intent with respect to future authorizations: The House bill (in sec. 106 (b)) declared it to be the intent of Congress to continue the authorizations for the various categories of Federal domain roads at annual rates not less than those contained in the House bill. The Senate amendment contained no comparable declaration of intent.

The conference agreement omits any declaration of intent with respect to future authorizations for the various categories of Federal domain roads. As in the case of the regular Federal-aid highway authorizations, it is contemplated that authorizations for these categories of highways will be considered every 2 years by the Congress.

Section 107. Highways for Alaska

Section 108 of the Senate amendment provided for participation by Alaska in the apportionments of funds authorized in H. R. 10660, or hereafter authorized, for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions. Provision for such participation has already been made for Hawaii and Puerto Rico. The House bill contained no provision with respect to Alaska.

The conference agreement contains the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to Alaska. Under these provisions, the inclusion of Alaska in the Federal-aid highway program will be made subject to the following provisions:

(1) Only one-third of the area of Alaska will be used as the area factor in the formula now in effect for purposes of apportionment of funds;

(2) Alaska is to contribute for each fiscal year funds in an amount not less than 10 percent of the Federal funds apportioned to it for that year;

(3) The system or systems of roads on which the apportionments are to be expended are to be determined and agreed upon by the Governor of Alaska, the Territorial highway engineer of Alaska, and the Secretary of Commerce;

(4) The Federal funds and the funds contributed by Alaska may be expended by the Secretary of Commerce either directly or in cooperation with the Territorial Board of Road Commissioners of Alaska, and may be expended separately or in combination and without regard to the matching provisions of the Federal Highway Act of 1921; and

(5) The funds may be expended for both the construction and the maintenance of roads within the systems agreed upon.

These provisions relating to Alaska provide for the transfer of the functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the construction, repair, and maintenance of roads, tramways, ferries, bridges, trails, and other works in Alaska, to the Department of Commerce. Under the conference agreement, the transfer is to take place on such date as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, as is not later than 90 days after the approval of the act. With the transfer of functions, there is to be transferred the personnel, funds, and property used or held in connection with those functions. Under the conference agreement the Secretary of Commerce is granted authority to distribute the functions transferred to him under this section and the appropriations which pertain thereto.

Section 108. National system of interstate and defense highways

(a) Interstate System: Section 108 (a) of the House bill changed the name of the Interstate System from the "National System of Interstate Highways" to the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways"; and further provided that in the bill the system was to be referred to as the "Interstate System." The Senate amendment contained no comparable provisions. The conference agreement follows the House bill in this respect.

Under the conference agreement, it is declared to be the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a 13-year period and that the entire system in all States be brought to simultaneous completion. The phrase "as nearly as practicable" was included because of the fact it is contemplated that some of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1969 will not be expended until fiscal 1970 and fiscal 1971. The phrase "that the entire system in all the States be brought into simultaneous completion" was inserted to emphasize the expectation of the Congress that, at the end of the 13-year program, all States will have reached the same relative degree of completion and will be in the final stage of completing their respective portions of the Interstate System.

(b) Amounts authorized for Interstate System: Section 108 (b) of the House bill, and section 102 (a) of the Senate amendment, contained authorizations of appropriations for the Interstate System for the 13-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1969. Under the conference agreement, the aggregate amount of the authorizations contained in the bill for this period is the same as in the House bill (namely, $24,825 million). In addition, the authorization for each fiscal year is the same as in the House bill, with the following exceptions: (1) the additional sum authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1957 has been decreased from $1,025 million to $1 billion, (2) the sum authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 has been decreased from $2,300 million to $2,200 million, (3) the sum authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1967 has been increased from $2 billion to $2,200 million, and (4) the sum authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1969 has been increased from $1 billion to $1,025 million. The following table shows the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Interstate System by the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement:

Authorizations

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal years	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
1957	[1] 1,025	[1] 1,000	[1] 1,000
1958	1,700	1,750	1,700
1959	2,000	2,000	2,000
1960	2,200	2,000	2,200
1961	2,200	2,000	2,200
1962	2,200	2,000	2,200
1963	2,200	2,000	2,200
1964	2,300	2,000	2,200
1965	2,300	2,000	2,200
1966	2,200	2,000	2,200
1967	2,000	2,000	2,200
1968	1,500	2,000	1,500
1969	1,000	2,000	1,025
Total	[1] 24,825	[1] 24,750	[1] 24,825

[1] These amounts are in addition to the $175 million authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957 by sec. 2 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954.

(c) and (d) formulas for apportionment: Section 108 (c) of the House bill provided that the sums authorized for fiscal 1957 and 1958 were to be apportioned on the basis of the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, as set forth in House Document No. 120 of the 84th Congress. Section 108 (d) of the House bill provided that sums authorized for fiscal 1959 and subsequent years through fiscal 1969 were to be apportioned on the basis of revised estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System in each State. Section 108 (f) of the House bill provided the method of, and the time for, making these revised estimates and required that they be approved by affirmative resolution of the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives to which referred before being used in making apportionments.

Section 102 (a) of the Senate amendment continued, for the 13-year period, the formula of apportionment contained in section 2 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, namely, (1) one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census (with the proviso that no State is to receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned), and (2) one-half in the manner provided by law for the apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system (that is, one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes).

Under the conference agreement, the formula of apportionment contained in the Senate amendment will be followed for the first 3 years (fiscal 1957, 1958, and 1959). For the remaining 10 years of the program, the formula of apportionment contained in the House bill will be followed. That is to say, the funds will be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. However, new language has been inserted in the bill to make it clear that the estimates of cost on which the apportionments are to be

based shall be subject to review by the Congress. No apportionment for a fiscal year shall be made until the estimate of costs applicable to the group of fiscal years in which that particular year is included (as set forth in sec. 108 (d)) has been approved by the Senate and House of Representatives by concurrent resolution.

It is to be emphasized that for the first 3 years of the program the existing system of apportionment (as explained above) will be followed. For the remaining 10 years of the program, the formula of apportionment is the cost of completion formula. Over the 13-year period, no State should receive aggregate apportionments which are greater or less than the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State.

Consonant with this objective, the phrase "after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section" has been inserted to provide the necessary mechanism for transferring from the existing-law formula to the cost formula. Thus, if a State receives more or less than its proportionate share (based on respective estimated costs of completion) of the funds apportioned for the first 3 years, that fact will be taken into account when the estimate of cost is submitted for congressional approval in 1958. It is the intent of the conferees that any adjustment necessary will be spread over all of the remaining 10 years rather than being distributed solely over the 3 fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962 covered by the first estimate. Similarly, each time thereafter that a revised estimate of the costs of completion is submitted to the Congress for its approval, there will automatically occur adjustments in the estimate with respect to each State by reason of the fact that, under the newest estimate, the State might have received more, or less, than its proportionate share (based on cost of completion) of the funds theretofore apportioned.

As will be explained below (in connection with sec. 108 (l) of the conference agreement), the estimated costs of completion shall be made without regard to the 1,000 additional miles authorized to be designated by the bill.

(e) Federal share: The conference agreement retains the provision contained in both the House bill and the Senate amendment that the Federal share of projects on the Interstate System is to be 90 percent of the total cost thereof. In States having certain public lands and Indian lands, the Federal share is increased in a manner similar to that provided in existing law for the so-called public-land States, but not above 95 percent of the total cost of the project.

(f) Availability for expenditure: The language of the House bill (sec. 108 (h)) and the conference agreement (sec. 108 (f)) are identical in this respect. The conferees took note of the fact that some States have not yet obligated all of the funds previously apportioned to them under the authorizations contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, wherein the matching ratio is 60–40 instead of the more liberal 90–10 ratio provided in the conference agreement. It is intended by the conferees that the Secretary of Commerce will take such steps as may be necessary to insure that each State shall utilize all 60–40 funds apportioned to it before the lapse period and that no State will be permitted to deliberately lapse any of the 60–40 funds in order to substitute therefor the more favorable 90–10 funds and thereby increase the total Federal funds going into any State for the Interstate System.

(g) Lapse of amounts apportioned: The conference agreement retains the provisions of the House bill with respect to lapse of any apportionment which is unexpended at the end of the 2-year period during which such apportionment is available for expenditure. However, new language has been inserted in the conference agreement to provide that when the apportionment of any State or States so lapse, the lapsed amounts shall immediately be reapportioned among the other States in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 108 (that is to say, on the basis of the estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System, as such estimates have been approved by the Congress).

(h) Construction by States in advance of apportionment: As explained above, the retention for 3 years of the formula of apportionment contained in existing law will result in some States receiving less funds for that period than they would have received if the cost of completion formula had become immediately effective. To make it possible for these States to proceed with the construction of projects on the Interstate System, and in general to offer the opportunity to all States to speed up the rate of completion, subsection (h) has been inserted in section 108.

Under this subsection, if a State has obligated all of its section 108 funds, and, after this bill becomes law, proceeds to construct any project (or part of a project) on the Interstate System without the use of Federal funds, then the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to pay to such State, whenever additional funds are apportioned to that State under section 108, the Federal share of the project (as computed under sec. 108 (e) of the conference agreement).

However, no such payment may be made with respect to any project unless all procedures and all requirements applicable to other Interstate System projects have been satisfied with respect to the construction of that project (other than the prior availability of apportioned funds). The conference agreement contains two provisos to make it clear (1) that the plans and specifications for the project must have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce in the same manner as other Interstate System projects, and (2) that the project must conform to the geometric and construction standards adopted under section 108 (i) of the conference agreement. The fact that the matters contained in the two provisos have been expressly set forth does not in any way lessen the provision in the subsection that the project must be constructed in accordance with all procedures and all requirements applicable to other Interstate System projects (other than the prior availability of Federal apportionments). For example, the usual requirements with respect to approval of contract awards, inspection of construction, and subsequent maintenance, and other items, will all apply.

It is to be emphasized that this subsection does not in any way increase the amounts apportioned to any State. It merely provides a method whereby, on full compliance with the subsection, the State may be paid for the completed work out of future apportionments when and if made to that State.

The last sentence of section 108 (h) of the conference agreement is inserted to make sure that no State which proceeds in accordance with the provision will be penalized in computing its apportionments under the cost of completion formula. For purposes of the cost formula, any project (or part of a project) so constructed without Federal funds shall not be considered completed until the State's application has been approved by the Secretary of Commerce for payment out of apportionments which have become available to the State.

(i) Geometric and construction standards: The House bill (in sec. 108 (e)) provided that the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State highway departments, was to adopt the geometric standards for the Interstate System. There was no similar provision in the Senate amendment.

Under the conference agreement, the language of the House bill with respect to geometric standards is retained, but the subsection is amended so that it applies to construction standards as well as to geometric standards.

(j) Maximum weight and width limitations: The House bill (sec. 108 (j)) prohibited the apportionment of Interstate System funds to any State where the Interstate System might lawfully be used by vehicles having axle weights in excess of 18,000 pounds on any one axle or 32,000 pounds on a tandem axle, or the maximum corresponding axle weight permitted by laws or regulations of such State in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. This limitation would not affect any vehicles that could lawfully operate in the State on July 1, 1956. The House bill contained no maximum limitations on overall weight or on width.

The Senate amendment (sec. 102 (d)), while retaining the substance of the House provision, included a width limitation of 96 inches and an overall gross weight limitation of 73,280 pounds.

The conference agreement (sec. 108 (j)) adopts the language of the Senate amendment. Under the conference agreement, any vehicle that could lawfully operate within a State on July 1, 1956, will not be affected.

(k) Tests to determine maximum desirable dimensions and weights: The House bill (sec. 108 (k)) directed the Secretary of Commerce to expedite a series of tests being planned and conducted for the purpose of determining maximum dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway systems and to submit a report, with recommendations, to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959. The Senate amendment was similar to the House provision except for requiring that the report to Congress be made as promptly as possible. The conference agreement contains the language of the House provision.

(l) Increase in mileage: Under the House bill, no change was made in the 40,000-mile limit applicable to the Interstate System, as provided in section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. Under section 112 of the Senate amendment, the mileage authorized to be designated would have been increased from 40,000 to 42,500.

Under section 108 (l) of the conference agreement, the limit on the mileage which may be designated on the Interstate System is increased by 1,000 (from 40,000 to 41,000). However, the conference agreement contains a proviso that the cost of completing any mileage from any of the 1,000 newly authorized miles is to be excluded in making the estimates of costs of completion under section 108 (d). The designation of additional mileage in any State will, of course, in no way increase the apportionment to any State during the first 3 years (for which the existing law method of apportionment is in effect). The proviso insures that during the ensuing 10-year program the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State will be made by estimating that cost for mileage designated from the 40,000 miles provided by law before the enactment of this bill. In making such estimates, the costs of completing mileage designated from the additional 1,000 miles will be excluded. This means that no additional cost has been added, by reason of the additional 1,000 miles, to the 40,000-mile program on which the tax provisions of title II of the bill were based.

Section 109. Acquisition of rights-of-way for Interstate System

Both the House bill (sec. 110) and the Senate amendment (sec. 104) contained a similar provision under which the Secretary of Commerce, at the request of a State, could acquire rights-of-way for the Interstate System, under certain prescribed conditions. Since both accomplished the same purpose and the House bill contained some minor perfecting language, the conference agreement adopts the House provision on the subject.

Section 110. Availability of funds to acquire rights-of-way and to make advances to the States

The House bill (sec. 111) authorized the Secretary of Commerce to make any of the apportioned Federal-aid highway funds, including Interstate System funds, available for advance acquisition of rights-of-way. It also authorized the Secretary of Commerce to advance funds to the States for such purposes. The operation of this provision will undoubtedly save large amounts of funds by permitting the right-of-way to be acquired at the most favorable time, and without the pressures created in rush acquisition procedures. It will also permit more orderly acquisition with a minimum of dislocation and hardship to occupants and businesses located in the path of the right-of-way required. The Senate amendment contained no such provisions, although section 105 of the Senate amendment granted contract authority of not to exceed $100 million for the fiscal year 1956 for right-of-way acquisition. Since the 1956 fiscal year is already virtually over and the 1957 fiscal year funds are to become available immediately upon enactment of the act, the Senate provision is not needed and the conference agreement therefore adopts the House provision.

The House bill (in sec. 111 (b)) also amended section 6 of the 1944 Federal-Aid Highway Act, under which the States could apply for and receive a working fund with which to finance the Federal share of the cost of projects pending the receipt of reimbursement from the Secretary of Commerce. Since the Federal share is increased to 90 percent of project cost in the case of the Interstate System, more States will probably require an advance of funds from the Secretary in order to provide a revolving or working fund with which to pay construction contractors as work progresses or to purchase the needed rights-of-way. The conferees feel that this is a desirable feature but intend that the Secretary of Commerce will establish appropriate procedures to safeguard the advance and to insure that no more funds than are needed are advanced to a State and that at no time will the amount advanced to a State exceed one-fourth of the amount apportioned to such State for the year in which the advance is operative.

Section 111. Relocation of utility facilities

The House bill (sec. 113) and the Senate amendment (sec. 111) contained similar provisions which would have permitted Federal funds to be used to reimburse a State for utility relocation costs which the State had paid for under its own laws or practices. Both the House and Senate provisions would have denied apportionment of Federal funds for this purpose to any State when the payment to the utility violated the law of the State or a legal contract between the utility and the State. The Senate amendment differed from the House bill, however, in that it provided that no more than 2 percent of any sum apportioned to any State for any fiscal year might be expended under the section. The House bill contained no such limitation.

This 2-percent limitation would have resulted in administrative difficulties. It could have caused inequities particularly to small utilities and municipalities and in some instances resulted in failure to fully reimburse States which would otherwise have been reimbursed under the policy which the Bureau of Public Roads has followed of reimbursing States that pay relocation costs. Section 113 of the bill as passed by the House and recommended and accepted by the conferees recognizes the equity of reimbursing utilities for the cost of relocating facilities when required for Federal-aid highway projects. Further, this section makes it clear that it is the intention of the Federal Government to assume its proportionate share of utility relocation costs whenever a State allows such costs.

Under the existing practice of the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal funds may participate in utility relocation costs to the same extent as other construction costs without any percentage limitation based on the State's apportionment.

In adopting the House language, the conference agreement intends that the section will be applicable to the amount paid by the State.

Section 112. Agreements relating to the use of and access to rights-of-way

The House bill (sec. 115) and the Senate amendment (sec. 115) contained similar provisions to insure retention of control of access on the Interstate System and to insure that automotive service stations or other commercial establishments are not constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System. The House provision contained language to insure that the users of the Interstate System would receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at or adjacent to highways on the Interstate System, which provision did not appear in the Senate amendment. Section 112 of the conference agreement in general follows the language of the Senate amendment with respect to these agreements rather than the language of the House bill.

The conferees emphasize that these provisions are to be applied to future construction and do not operate to require the cancellation of valid agreements made by State toll-road authorities with service station or other concessionaires occupying toll-road rights-of-way whenever such toll roads may be integrated into the Interstate System under the provisions of section 113 of the conference agreement.

Section 113. Toll roads, bridges, and tunnels

The House bill (sec. 116) contained a provision to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to include as part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed, which meets the required standards and forms a logical segment of the Interstate System. It authorized Federal funds to be expended on projects approaching any toll road on the Interstate System under certain prescribed conditions. This provision was intended to clarify the Secretary's authority in such matters. The Senate amendment contained no such provision. The conference report adopts the House language with the modifications described in the following paragraph.

With respect to the language in the House bill which would permit any toll road, bridge, or tunnel to be included in the Interstate System, the conferees have inserted language to require the Secretary of Commerce to find that such action will promote the development of an integrated Interstate System. The requirement in the House provision that such toll road, bridge, or tunnel form a logical segment of the Interstate System has been eliminated and in lieu thereof there is inserted the requirement that such toll road, bridge, or tunnel be located on a route heretofore or hereafter designated as a part of the Interstate System. The conference agreement (in sec. 113 (c)) also contains certain perfecting changes in the provisions relating to eligibility of Federal funds for expenditure on projects approaching toll roads on the Interstate System.

Section 114. Determination of policy with respect to reimbursement for certain highways

The House bill (sec. 109) declared the intent and policy of Congress to equitably reimburse the States for any toll or free highway on the Interstate System which had been constructed during a specified period to the required standards and would require a report to be made to Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958, in order to provide Congress with the information it would need in determining the time, methods, and amounts of such reimbursement. The House provision also declared the policy and intent of Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements. The Senate amendment contained no provision on this subject.

The conference agreement contains a modification of the House provision. Under this modified provision, there is a declaration of intent and policy on the part of Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for such construction, rather than to commit the Federal Government in advance of the study to make such reimbursement and to provide funds therefor as provided in the House bill.

Section 115. Prevailing rate of wage

The House bill (in sec. 112) and the Senate amendment (in sec. 118) both required the Secretary of Commerce to take such action as may be necessary to insure that the Davis-Bacon Act is applied to Interstate System projects authorized under title I. Under this provision the wages shall be not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

The Senate amendment, however, provided (in sec. 119), that in so carrying out the Davis-Bacon Act, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the highway authority of the State in which the project is located and after giving due regard to the information thus obtained shall make a predetermination of minimum wage rates which shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and be made a part of the contract covering the project. This latter provision was not contained in the House bill. The conference agreement (in sec. 115 (b)) contains the language of section 119 of the Senate amendment, with certain minor perfecting changes.

It is recognized that there must be the utmost cooperation between the several State highway departments and the Secretary of Labor in order to carry out the intent of the provisions of section 115 (b). It is emphasized that when the Secretary consults with these State agencies, such agencies should furnish the desired information as fully and promptly as possible. In order that the projects occasion no delay because of the determination of prevailing wages, the Secretary should be kept advised well in advance of pending Interstate System projects, with sufficient data and information to make the necessary predetermination of wages promptly and satisfactorily.

The conferees rejected a provision in the Senate amendment (in sec. 124) that would provide for an appeal and judicial review by any aggrieved party, as it was feared that court proceedings might delay prosecution of projects in the Federal-aid highway program, and it was believed that cooperation in good faith between State and Federal officials in this matter will insure satisfactory results.

Section 116. Declarations of policy with respect to Federal-aid highway program

(a) Acceleration of program—completion of Interstate System—and progress report: The House bill (in sec. 114) and the Senate amendment (in sec. 113 (a), (b), and (c)) contained somewhat similar declarations of policy regarding acceleration of the Federal-aid highway program and completion of the Interstate System. The conference agreement substantially follows the language of the Senate amendment with changes in

phraseology. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to submit a report to Congress by February 1, 1959, on the progress made toward attaining the objectives.

(b) Public hearings: The Senate amendment (in sec. 113 (d)) required any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of any city, town, village, or community, either incorporated or unincorporated, to certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings and considered the economic effects of such location. It would also require a transcript of said hearings to be sent to the Commissioner of Public Roads together with the certification. This provision would continue and broaden existing requirements contained in section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Under the House bill, which contained no provision on this subject, the existing requirements of section 13 of the 1950 act would continue without change and be applicable to all Federal-aid and Interstate projects.

The conference agreement (in sec. 116 (c)) contains the language of the Senate amendment after modifying the language so as to make the public hearing requirement also applicable to a Federal-aid highway project "going through" any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated. The word "community" appearing in the Senate amendment is eliminated in the conference report.

Participation by small business enterprises: The House bill (in sec. 102 (c)) included a policy statement to encourage small business and to assure that a fair proportion of the Federal-aid contracts would be awarded to small-business enterprises. The Senate amendment contained no provision on this matter. The conference agreement (in sec. 116 (b)) adopts language somewhat similar to the House provision, with changes in phraseology to extend the application of the provision to the Interstate System. In adopting this provision, the conferees recognize that the Federal-aid contracts are not awarded by the Federal Government but are awarded by the States on the basis of competitive bids.

Section 117. Highway safety study

The Senate amendment (in sec. 123) authorized and directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote public welfare by increasing highway safety, and required him to submit a report, with recommendations, to Congress by June 30, 1957. The House bill contained no such provision.

The conference agreement (in sec. 117) contains the language of the Senate amendment, but adds a provision that such study and investigation shall be conducted under the general authority of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, and that the amount expended for such purposes shall not exceed $200,000. The conference agreement also changes the reporting date to "not later than March 1, 1959."

Section 118. Emergency fund

The House bill (in sec. 107) amended section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 so as to increase the present $10 million annual emergency fund authorization to $30 million for the repair and reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid systems which are damaged as a result of disaster. The funds authorized would be available for use on any projects programed and approved any time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and thereafter, which meet the provisions of this section. The Senate amendment contained no such provision, although the Senate had previously passed a bill in the present session (S. 2861) which would have increased the emergency relief authorization from $10 million to $30 million. The conference agreement contains the provisions of the House bill in this respect.

Section 119. Definition of construction

The House bill (in sec. 117) broadened the definition of the term "construction" contained in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to include the cost of the establishment of temporary and permanent goedetic markers in accordance with specifications of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and also the cost of relocation of building tenants and demolition of structures or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites. The Senate amendment contained no such provision.

The conference agreement adopts that portion of the House provision which relates to temporary and permanent geodetic markers.

Section 120. Archeological and paleontological salvage

The House bill (in sec. 118) provided that any portion of the funds authorized by title I, as deemed necessary by the governor or the duly authorized highway officials of any State, might be used for the purpose of archeological salvage in accordance with the act approved June 8, 1906, and State laws where applicable. The Senate amendment (in sec. 120) contained a similar provision except that it also included paleontological salvage and omitted any requirement for the governor's approval.

The conference agreement contains the language of the Senate amendment except for substituting "highway department" for "highway authority."

Section 121. Mapping

The House bill (in sec. 119) provided that the Secretary of Commerce, in carrying out the provisions of title I, should, to the fullest extent practicable, authorize the use of photogrammetric methods in mapping, and the utilization of commercial enterprise for such service. No such provision was contained in the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement adopts the substance of the House provision but modifies it to make it clear that the Secretary of Commerce would have the authority to administer the provision on a discretionary basis.

Section 122. Relationship of this title to other acts; effective date

The conference agreement provides that all provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, not inconsistent with title I of the bill, shall remain in full force and effect, and that all inconsistent provisions are repealed. It also provides that title I shall take effect on the date of the enactment of the act. This provision consolidates and is similar to the language in section 121 of the House bill and sections 122 and 125 of the Senate amendment.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TITLE II

The managers on the part of the House as to title II of the bill submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to title II of the bill and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 2: Section 4041 (a) of the 1954 Code imposes a tax of 2 cents a gallon on any liquid sold for use, or used, as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle. Under section 202 (a) of the House bill, this tax is increased from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon effective July 1, 1956. In general, the effect of Senate amendment No. 2 would be to provide (1) that the 1-cent increase shall apply only if the liquid is used in a vehicle registered, or required to be registered, for highway use (or, in the case of vehicles owned by the United States, used on the highway), and (2) that in no case shall the increase apply with respect to any liquid used as a fuel in a vehicle while such vehicle is not being used on a highway.

The House recedes with an amendment which provides that in the case of a liquid taxable under section 4041 (a) of the 1954 Code sold for use or used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle—

(A) which (at the time of such sale or use) is not registered, and is not required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or

(B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is not used on the highway,

the tax shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon. Under the conference agreement, if a liquid on which tax was imposed after June 30, 1956, at the rate of 2 cents a gallon is used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle—

(A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or

(B) which, in the case of a diesel-powered highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway,

a tax of 1 cent a gallon is imposed on such use. Under the conference agreement the 3-cent-a-gallon rate will apply (in the case of use in the specified vehicles) without regard to whether the liquid is used on or off the highway.

Amendment No. 3: Section 4041 (b) of the 1954 Code imposes a tax of 2 cents a gallon on special motor fuel (i. e., benzol, benzene, naphtha, liquefied petroleum gas, and other liquid fuels except gasoline, diesel fuel, kerosene, gas oil, or fuel oil) sold for use, or used, as a fuel for the propulsion of a motor vehicle, motorboat, or airplane. Under section 202 (b) of the House bill this tax is increased effective July 1, 1956, from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon in the case of a special motor fuel sold for use, or used, as a fuel for the propulsion of a motor vehicle. Senate amendment No. 3 would provide the same treatment for the use of special motor fuels in a nonregistered vehicle or a vehicle used off a highway as Senate amendment No. 2 would have provided for diesel fuel, and, in addition, would limit the 1-cent increase to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a "highway vehicle."

The House recedes with an amendment which conforms to the conference agreement with respect to amendment No. 2, and, in addition, conforms to the Senate amendment in limiting the 1-cent increase to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a highway vehicle.

Amendment No. 4: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: Section 205 of the bill, as passed by the House and the Senate, provides for an increase in tax from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon effective July 1, 1956, in the case of gasoline sold by the producer or importer thereof. Section 4081 (b) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended

by section 205 of the House bill, provided that under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate the tax on gasoline shall be 2 cents a gallon in lieu of 3 cents a gallon in the case of gasoline sold by the producer or importer thereof to any person for use by such person otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. This provision did not apply to gasoline which (within the meaning of sec. 6420 (c) of the 1954 Code) is sold for use on a farm for farming purposes.

Senate amendment No. 6 strikes out section 4081 (b) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended by the House bill. Senate amendment No. 19, explained below, adds a new provision to the bill as a substitute for the exemption provision of the House bill stricken out by amendment No. 6. In conformity with the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, the House recedes on amendment No. 6.

Amendment No. 7: This is a technical conforming amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: Section 206 of the bill adds a new subchapter D to chapter 36 of the 1954 Code to provide a tax on the use of certain highway motor vehicles, effective July 1, 1956. Under the House bill, there would be imposed on the use of any highway motor vehicle which has a taxable gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds a tax at the rate of $1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof. Under Senate amendment No. 8 the tax would be at the rate of $2.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof in excess of 26,000 pounds of taxable gross weight. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 9: This is a technical amendment relating to payment of the tax on the use of highway motor vehicles owned by the United States. The House recedes with a technical amendment to conform the language to other provisions of the 1954 Code.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment struck out of the House bill a provision that the new tax on the use of highway motor vehicles shall not apply to the use of any bus which is of the transit type (rather than of the intercity type) by a person who (for the period prescribed by the bill) met the 60 percent passenger fare revenue test prescribed by the bill. Under the conference agreement the provision of the House bill is restored with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 11: This is a technical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 13: This amendment provides that the floor stocks taxes imposed by the bill on articles held on July 1, 1956, shall be paid at such time after September 30, 1956, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. The amendment does not limit or restrict in any way the provisions of section 6862 of the 1954 Code (relating to jeopardy assessments). There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment makes changes with respect to credits or refunds in the case of special motor fuels and provides credits or refunds in the case of diesel fuel. This is in conformity with Senate amendments Nos. 2 and 3. The House recedes with an amendment which conforms to the conference action on amendments Nos. 2 and 3.

Amendment No. 15: Section 6416 (b) (2) (K) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended by section 208 (b) of the House bill, provided in general for a credit or refund to the producer or importer at the rate of 1 cent a gallon if gasoline, in respect of which tax was paid under section 4081 of the 1954 Code at 3 cents a gallon, is used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. This provision did not apply to gasoline which (within the meaning of sec. 6420 (c) of the 1954 Code) is sold for use on a farm for farming purposes.

Senate amendment No. 15 strikes out section 6416 (b) (2) (K) of the 1954 Code, as proposed to be amended by the House bill. Senate amendment No. 19, explained below, adds a new provision to the bill as a substitute for the refund provisions stricken out of the bill by Senate amendment No. 15. In conformity with the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, the House recedes.

Amendment No. 16: Section 208 (b) of the House bill added a new subparagraph (L) to section 6416 (b) (2) of the 1954 Code. Under the new subparagraph, credit or refund would be allowed in the case of a liquid, in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041 (tax on diesel fuel and special motor fuels) or 4081 (tax on gasoline) at the rate of 3 cents a gallon, used in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes. Credit or refund would be allowed in respect of any liquid used during any calendar quarter only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived by the person using the vehicles during such quarter from scheduled service along such regular routes was attributable to fares which were exempt from the tax imposed by section 4261 by reason of section 4262 (b) (relating to the exemption for commutation, travel, etc.). The amount of credit or refund for any calendar quarter would not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon as the passenger fare revenue derived during such quarter from such fares exempt from tax for such scheduled service bears to the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261) derived during such calendar quarter for such scheduled service.

Senate amendment No. 16 struck out this provision of the House bill. Under the conference agreement the substance of this provision is restored to the bill. The part relating to credit or refund of taxes paid under section 4041 of the 1954 Code (relating to diesel fuel and special motor fuels) is covered by section 6416 (b) (2) (L) of the 1954 Code which is restored by the conference action on amendment No. 16. The part relating to gasoline is covered by a new section 6421 (b) added to the 1954 Code by the conference action on Senate amendment No. 19, explained below.

Amendment No. 17: This is a clerical amendment. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 18: This is a technical clarifying amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: This amendment would add a new section 6421 to the 1954 Code as a substitute for the provisions of the House bill stricken out by Senate amendments Nos. 6 and 15. In general, the new section 6421 would provide a procedure under which the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate would pay an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon directly to the ultimate purchaser of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes as provided in the section. The procedure, in general, would be the same as under section 6420 (relating to gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes) except that under the Senate amendment quarterly claims would be permitted where the claim is filed for at least 100,000 gallons of gasoline. Payments under the section would, in general, be made in respect of gasoline which (1) is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle which (at the time of such use) is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country (or, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, which is used on the highway), or (2) is used as a fuel in any such highway vehicle while such highway vehicle is not being used on a highway. Payments would not be made, or would be appropriately reduced, in the case of gasoline exempt from tax or with respect to which a refund or payment is payable under this or any other provision of the 1954 Code.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the conference agreement, if gasoline is used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle (1) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (2) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used. The effect of this provision is to relieve the ultimate purchaser of gasoline from the 1 cent increase in the tax on gasoline imposed by the bill if he uses such gasoline otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle or if he uses such gasoline as a fuel in a highway vehicle which (at the time of the use) is not registered for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, and is not required to be so registered under the laws of any State or foreign country in which it is operated. While there are, of course, variations in State laws with respect to technical registration requirements for motor vehicles for highway use, it should be made clear that the registration requirements of the bill are not intended to relieve the operator of a highway vehicle of the 1 cent increase in the tax on gasoline used as a fuel in a highway vehicle which, for example, is operated on the highway under a dealer's license or permit.

In conformity with the action explained in the preceding paragraph and the action with respect to amendment No. 16, the conference agreement also provides that if gasoline is used during any calendar quarter in vehicles while engaged in furnishing scheduled common carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes, the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall (subject to the 60-percent passenger fare test explained below) pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline the amount determined by multiplying (A) 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used, by (B) the percentage which the ultimate purchaser's tax-exempt passenger fare revenue (as defined in the new sec. 6421 (d) (2) of the Code) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter was of his total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261 of the 1954 Code, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived from such scheduled service during such quarter.

Under the conference agreement, the payments may be made in respect of gasoline used during any calendar quarter in transit vehicles only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue (not including the tax imposed by sec. 4261 of the 1954 Code, relating to the tax on transportation of persons) derived, during such quarter from scheduled service described in the preceding paragraph, by the person filing the claim was attributable to tax-exempt passenger fare revenue derived during such quarter by such person from such scheduled service.

Under the conference agreement, not more than 1 claim may be filed with respect to

gasoline used otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle, and not more than 1 claim may be filed with respect to gasoline used in transit vehicles, by any person with respect to gasoline used during the 1-year period ending on June 30 of any year. No claim shall be allowed under this section with respect to any 1-year period unless filed on or before September 30 of the year in which such 1-year period ends.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21: These are technical conforming amendments. The House recedes with conforming amendments.

Amendment No. 22: Section 209 of the bill establishes a highway trust fund. In general, the receipts of the trust fund are equivalent to designated percentages of the specified taxes received after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, and the amounts in the trust fund are made available (as provided by appropriation acts) for expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways.

Subsection (g) of section 209 of the House bill provided that nothing in section 209 of the bill shall limit the amount of the apportionments made under any authorization in title I of the bill or in any Act heretofore or hereafter enacted which amends or supplements the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916.

Senate amendment No. 22 strikes out subsection (g) of section 209 of the House bill and inserts in lieu thereof a new subsection (g). This subsection requires the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to estimate the amounts which will be available in the highway trust fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund. In any case in which the Secretary of the Treasury determines that, after all other expenditures required to be made from the highway trust fund have been defrayed, the amounts which will be available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) will be insufficient to defray the expenditures which will be required as a result of the apportionment to the States of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways, Senate amendment No. 22 requires him (1) to so advise the Secretary of Commerce, and (2) to further advise the Secretary of Commerce as to the amount which, after all other expenditures required to be made from such fund have been defrayed, will be available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray the expenditures required as a result of apportionment to the States of Federal-aid highway funds for the National System of Interstate Highways for such fiscal year. The Secretary of Commerce is then required to determine the percentage which such amount is of the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, is required thereafter to apportion to the States for such fiscal year for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways (in lieu of the amount which but for the provisions of Senate amendment No. 22 would be so apportioned) the amount obtained by multiplying the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year by such percentage. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that there will be available in the highway trust fund (excluding repayable advances) amounts which, after all other expenditures required to be made from such fund have been defrayed, will be available to defray the expenditures required as a result of the apportionment of any Federal-aid highway funds for the National System of Interstate Highways previously withheld from apportionment for any fiscal year, he is required to so advise the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Commerce is then required to apportion to the States such portion of the funds so withheld from apportionment as the Secretary of the Treasury has advised him may be so apportioned without causing expenditures from the highway trust fund for the National System of Interstate Highways to exceed amounts available in such fund (excluding repayable advances) to defray such expenditures. Any funds apportioned pursuant to the provisions of the preceding sentence are to remain available for expenditure until the close of the third fiscal year following that in which apportioned.

The House recedes with amendments to change references to the "National System of Interstate Highways" to references to the "Interstate System". The change in references is necessary to conform with the action of the conferees on title I of the bill (see the explanation above with respect to section 108 (a) of the conference agreement).

Amendment No. 23: This is a clerical amendment. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25: These are technical conforming amendments. The House recedes.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the agreement reached by the conferees on H. R. 10660, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, provides that the funds authorized for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959 are to be apportioned to the States as provided in present law and that thereafter funds authorized for the Interstate System are to be apportioned to the States on the basis of costs as approved by the Congress for completing the presently authorized 40,000 mile system.

I submit for the RECORD a tabulation showing the approximate amounts which each State would receive under the conference agreement during the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959 for projects on the primary and secondary highway systems, together with their urban extensions, and the Interstate System:

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive

FISCAL YEAR 1957

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($56.3)	Secondary or feeder roads ($37.5)	Urban highways ($31.2)	Subtotal ($125.0)	Interstate system ($1,000.0)	Total ($1,125.0)
Alabama	1.2	0.9	0.4	2.5	20.3	22.8
Arizona	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.5	13.0
Arkansas	.9	.8	.2	1.9	14.5	16.4
California	2.6	1.3	2.8	6.7	57.0	63.7
Colorado	1.0	.7	.3	2.0	13.7	15.7
Connecticut	.4	.2	.6	1.2	9.6	10.8
Delaware	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9
Florida	.9	.6	.6	2.1	17.0	19.1
Georgia	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	23.3	26.1
Idaho	.7	.5	.1	1.3	10.1	11.4
Illinois	2.2	1.2	2.2	5.6	47.1	52.7
Indiana	1.3	.9	.7	2.9	24.3	27.2
Iowa	1.4	1.0	.4	2.8	20.4	23.2
Kansas	1.3	.9	.3	2.5	18.1	20.6
Kentucky	1.0	.9	.3	2.2	18.8	21.0
Louisiana	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.5	18.5
Maine	.5	.3	.1	.9	8.0	8.9
Maryland	.5	.3	.5	1.3	12.0	13.3
Massachusetts	.7	.3	1.3	2.3	21.3	23.6
Michigan	1.8	1.1	1.5	4.4	36.0	40.4
Minnesota	1.5	1.0	.5	3.0	22.5	25.5
Mississippi	1.0	.8	.2	2.0	15.9	17.9
Missouri	1.6	1.1	.8	3.5	27.1	30.6
Montana	1.1	.8	.1	2.0	14.4	16.4
Nebraska	1.1	.8	.2	2.1	14.3	16.6
Nevada	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.4
New Hampshire	.3	.2	.1	.6	6.3	6.9
New Jersey	.8	.3	1.4	2.5	21.9	24.4
New Mexico	.9	.6	.1	1.6	12.1	13.7
New York	2.7	1.1	4.2	8.0	70.9	78.9
North Carolina	1.4	1.2	.4	3.0	25.5	28.5
North Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.1	12.6
Ohio	2.0	1.2	1.8	5.0	42.8	47.8
Oklahoma	1.2	.8	.3	2.3	17.9	20.2
Oregon	.9	.7	.2	1.8	13.6	15.4
Pennsylvania	2.3	1.4	2.4	6.1	53.6	59.7
Rhode Island	.3	.2	.2	.7	6.3	7.0
South Carolina	.8	.6	.2	1.6	13.4	15.0
South Dakota	.8	.6	.1	1.5	11.6	13.1
Tennessee	1.2	.9	.4	2.5	21.4	23.9
Texas	3.6	2.4	1.5	7.5	57.5	65.0
Utah	.6	.4	.1	1.1	9.7	10.8
Vermont	.3	.2	(1)	.5	6.3	6.8
Virginia	1.1	.8	.5	2.4	20.2	22.6
Washington	.9	.6	.5	2.0	16.1	18.1
West Virginia	.6	.5	.2	1.3	11.9	13.2
Wisconsin	1.3	.9	.6	2.8	22.8	25.6
Wyoming	.7	.5	(1)	1.2	10.4	11.6
Hawaii	.3	.2	.1	.6		.6
District of Columbia	.3	.2	.3	.8	6.3	7.1
Puerto Rico	.3	.3	.3	.9		.9
Alaska	1.1	.8	(1)	1.9		1.9

[1] States with apportionments less than $50,000: Nevada $24,000, Vermont $48,000, Wyoming $34,000, and Alaska $10,000.

Table of approximate apportionments of Federal-aid highway funds under H. R. 10660 for fiscal years 1957–59, inclusive—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1958

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($382.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($255.0)	Urban highways ($212.5)	Subtotal ($850.0)	Interstate system ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,550.0)
Alabama	8.0	6.2	2.8	17.0	34.5	51.5	New Hampshire	1.9	1.3	.6	3.8	10.6	14.4
Arizona	5.6	3.8	.8	10.2	19.5	29.7	New Jersey	5.1	1.7	9.4	16.2	37.2	53.4
Arkansas	6.3	5.1	1.2	12.6	24.7	37.3	New Mexico	6.1	4.2	.7	11.0	20.6	31.6
California	17.7	9.0	19.0	45.7	96.9	142.6	New York	18.3	7.3	28.6	54.2	120.5	174.7
Colorado	7.0	4.6	1.8	13.4	23.2	36.6	North Carolina	9.5	8.2	2.8	20.5	43.3	63.8
Connecticut	2.5	1.3	4.1	7.9	16.4	24.3	North Dakota	5.4	3.9	.4	9.7	18.8	28.5
Delaware	1.9	1.3	.4	3.6	10.6	14.2	Ohio	13.5	8.2	12.4	34.1	72.8	106.9
Florida	6.2	4.0	3.8	14.0	28.9	42.9	Oklahoma	8.1	5.8	2.3	16.2	30.4	46.6
Georgia	9.3	7.2	3.1	19.6	39.6	59.2	Oregon	6.4	4.5	1.7	12.6	23.1	35.7
Idaho	4.6	3.3	.4	8.3	17.2	25.5	Pennsylvania	15.6	9.3	16.2	41.1	91.1	132.2
Illinois	14.9	8.1	15.0	38.0	80.2	118.2	Rhode Island	1.9	1.3	1.5	4.7	10.6	15.3
Indiana	9.0	6.2	5.1	20.3	41.4	61.7	South Carolina	5.1	4.2	1.5	10.8	22.9	33.7
Iowa	9.1	6.7	2.5	18.3	34.7	53.0	South Dakota	5.7	4.1	.4	10.2	19.7	29.9
Kansas	9.0	6.3	2.0	17.3	30.9	48.2	Tennessee	8.3	6.5	3.1	17.9	36.4	54.3
Kentucky	7.1	5.9	2.2	15.2	31.9	47.1	Texas	24.6	16.5	10.2	51.3	97.7	149.0
Louisiana	6.0	4.4	3.1	13.5	28.1	41.6	Utah	4.3	2.9	.9	8.1	16.6	24.7
Maine	3.2	2.3	.9	6.4	13.7	20.1	Vermont	1.9	1.3	.3	3.5	10.6	14.1
Maryland	3.5	2.1	3.6	9.2	20.4	29.6	Virginia	7.4	5.7	3.3	16.4	34.4	50.8
Massachusetts	5.0	1.9	8.9	15.8	36.3	52.1	Washington	6.4	4.2	3.2	13.8	27.3	41.1
Michigan	12.0	7.3	10.0	29.3	61.1	90.4	West Virginia	4.2	3.7	1.4	9.3	20.3	29.6
Minnesota	9.8	6.9	3.5	20.2	38.3	58.5	Wisconsin	9.0	6.3	4.2	19.5	38.7	58.2
Mississippi	6.7	5.6	1.2	13.5	27.0	40.5	Wyoming	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.7	25.9
Missouri	11.0	7.4	5.3	23.7	46.0	69.7	Hawaii	1.9	1.3	.7	3.9	----------	3.9
Montana	7.7	5.3	.5	13.5	24.4	37.9	District of Columbia	1.9	1.3	1.9	5.1	10.6	15.7
Nebraska	7.5	5.3	1.3	14.1	24.4	38.5	Puerto Rico	2.0	2.1	1.8	5.9	----------	5.9
Nevada	4.8	3.2	.2	8.2	17.8	26.0	Alaska	7.8	5.3	.1	13.2	----------	13.2

FISCAL YEAR 1959

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)	State	Primary highway system ($393.7)	Secondary or feeder roads ($262.5)	Urban highways ($218.8)	Subtotal ($875.0)	Interstate system ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,875.0)
Alabama	8.2	6.4	2.9	17.5	40.6	58.1	New Hampshire	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	12.5	16.5
Arizona	5.7	3.9	.9	10.5	22.9	33.4	New Jersey	5.2	1.8	9.6	16.6	43.8	60.4
Arkansas	6.5	5.3	1.2	13.0	29.1	42.1	New Mexico	6.2	4.3	.7	11.2	24.3	35.5
California	18.2	9.3	19.6	47.1	114.1	161.2	New York	18.9	7.6	29.4	55.9	141.8	197.7
Colorado	7.2	4.8	1.8	13.8	27.3	41.1	North Carolina	9.8	8.4	2.8	21.0	51.0	72.0
Connecticut	2.6	1.3	4.3	8.2	19.3	27.5	North Dakota	5.6	4.0	.4	10.0	22.2	32.2
Delaware	2.0	1.3	.5	3.8	12.5	16.3	Ohio	13.8	8.4	12.7	34.9	85.6	120.5
Florida	6.3	4.1	4.0	14.4	34.0	48.4	Oklahoma	8.3	6.0	2.4	16.7	35.8	52.5
Georgia	9.6	7.4	3.2	20.2	46.6	66.8	Oregon	6.6	4.6	1.8	13.0	27.2	40.2
Idaho	4.8	3.4	.4	8.6	20.2	28.8	Pennsylvania	16.0	9.5	16.7	42.2	107.2	149.4
Illinois	15.3	8.3	15.4	39.0	94.3	133.3	Rhode Island	2.0	1.3	1.6	4.9	12.5	17.4
Indiana	9.3	6.4	5.3	21.0	48.6	69.6	South Carolina	5.2	4.4	1.5	11.1	26.9	38.0
Iowa	9.4	6.9	2.6	18.9	40.8	59.7	South Dakota	5.9	4.2	.4	10.5	23.2	33.7
Kansas	9.3	6.5	2.1	17.9	36.3	54.2	Tennessee	8.5	6.7	3.2	18.4	42.8	61.2
Kentucky	7.3	6.1	2.3	15.7	37.5	53.2	Texas	25.3	17.0	10.6	52.9	114.9	167.8
Louisiana	6.2	4.5	3.2	13.9	33.0	46.9	Utah	4.5	3.0	.9	8.4	19.5	27.9
Maine	3.3	2.3	.9	6.5	16.1	22.6	Vermont	2.0	1.3	.3	3.6	12.5	16.1
Maryland	3.6	2.2	3.7	9.5	24.0	33.5	Virginia	7.6	5.9	3.4	16.9	40.5	57.4
Massachusetts	5.2	1.9	9.2	16.3	42.7	59.0	Washington	6.5	4.4	3.3	14.2	32.1	46.3
Michigan	12.3	7.5	10.2	30.0	71.9	101.9	West Virginia	4.3	3.8	1.4	9.5	23.8	33.3
Minnesota	10.1	7.1	3.6	20.8	45.1	65.9	Wisconsin	9.2	6.4	4.3	19.9	45.5	65.4
Mississippi	6.9	5.8	1.2	13.9	31.7	45.6	Wyoming	4.9	3.4	.2	8.5	20.8	29.3
Missouri	11.3	7.6	5.4	24.3	54.2	78.5	Hawaii	2.0	1.3	.7	4.0	----------	4.0
Montana	7.9	5.5	.5	13.9	28.7	42.6	District of Columbia	2.0	1.3	1.9	5.2	12.5	17.7
Nebraska	7.8	5.5	1.3	14.6	28.7	43.3	Puerto Rico	2.1	2.2	1.9	6.2	----------	6.2
Nevada	5.0	3.3	.2	8.5	20.9	29.4	Alaska	8.0	5.4	.1	13.5	----------	13.5

SUMMARY, FISCAL YEARS 1957 TO 1959, INCLUSIVE

[Millions of dollars]

State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)	State	Primary highway system ($832.5)	Secondary or feeder roads ($555.0)	Urban highways ($462.5)	Subtotal ($1,850.0)	Interstate system ($4,700.0)	Total ($6,550.0)
Alabama	17.4	13.5	6.1	37.0	95.4	132.4	New Hampshire	4.2	2.8	1.4	8.4	29.4	37.8
Arizona	12.1	8.3	1.8	22.2	53.9	76.1	New Jersey	11.1	3.8	20.4	35.3	102.9	138.2
Arkansas	13.7	11.2	2.6	27.5	68.3	95.8	New Mexico	13.2	9.1	1.5	23.8	57.0	80.8
California	38.5	19.6	41.4	99.5	268.0	367.5	New York	39.9	16.0	62.2	118.1	333.2	451.3
Colorado	15.2	10.1	3.9	29.2	64.2	93.4	North Carolina	20.7	17.8	6.0	44.5	119.8	164.3
Connecticut	5.5	2.8	9.0	17.3	45.3	62.6	North Dakota	11.8	8.5	.9	21.2	52.1	73.3
Delaware	4.2	2.8	1.0	8.0	29.4	37.4	Ohio	29.3	17.8	26.9	74.0	201.2	275.2
Florida	13.4	8.7	8.4	30.5	79.9	110.4	Oklahoma	17.6	12.6	5.0	35.2	84.1	119.3
Georgia	20.3	15.6	6.7	42.6	109.5	152.1	Oregon	13.9	9.8	3.7	27.4	63.9	91.3
Idaho	10.1	7.2	.9	18.2	47.5	65.7	Pennsylvania	33.9	20.2	35.3	89.4	251.9	341.3
Illinois	32.4	17.6	32.6	82.6	221.6	304.2	Rhode Island	4.2	2.8	3.3	10.3	29.4	39.7
Indiana	19.6	13.5	11.1	44.2	114.3	158.5	South Carolina	11.1	9.2	3.2	23.5	63.2	86.7
Iowa	19.9	14.6	5.5	40.0	95.9	135.9	South Dakota	12.4	8.9	.9	22.2	54.5	76.7
Kansas	19.6	13.7	4.4	37.7	85.3	123.0	Tennessee	18.0	14.1	6.7	38.8	100.6	139.4
Kentucky	15.4	12.9	4.8	33.1	88.2	121.3	Texas	53.5	35.9	22.3	111.7	270.1	381.8
Louisiana	13.1	9.5	6.8	29.4	77.6	107.0	Utah	9.4	6.3	1.9	17.6	45.8	63.4
Maine	7.0	4.9	1.9	13.8	37.8	51.6	Vermont	4.2	2.8	.6	7.6	29.4	37.0
Maryland	7.6	4.6	7.8	20.0	56.4	76.4	Virginia	16.1	12.4	7.2	35.7	95.1	130.8
Massachusetts	10.9	4.1	19.4	34.4	100.3	134.7	Washington	13.8	9.2	7.0	30.0	75.5	105.5
Michigan	26.1	15.9	21.7	63.7	169.0	232.7	West Virginia	9.1	8.0	3.0	20.1	56.0	76.1
Minnesota	21.4	15.0	7.6	44.0	105.9	149.9	Wisconsin	19.5	13.6	9.1	42.2	107.0	149.2
Mississippi	14.6	12.2	2.6	29.4	74.6	104.0	Wyoming	10.4	7.1	.4	17.9	48.9	66.8
Missouri	23.9	16.1	11.5	51.5	127.3	178.8	Hawaii	4.2	2.8	1.5	8.5	----------	8.5
Montana	16.7	11.6	1.1	29.4	67.5	96.9	District of Columbia	4.2	2.8	4.1	11.1	29.4	40.5
Nebraska	16.4	11.6	2.8	30.8	67.4	98.2	Puerto Rico	4.4	4.6	4.0	13.0	----------	13.0
Nevada	10.5	7.0	.4	17.9	49.1	67.0	Alaska	16.9	11.5	.2	28.6	----------	28.6

Apportionment of interstate funds for 1960 to 1969, inclusive, to be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the sum of the revised estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the House-Senate conferees on title II of H. R. 10660, the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, have reached the agreement indicated in the conference report filed with respect to this legislation.

Before undertaking to explain the agreement reached by the House-Senate conferees on title II, I would like to commend the work of the conferees on title I of the legislation. The work of the distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], and the other members of the House Public Works Committee who served as conferees on this legislation will do much to provide safety for the American motorist and an adequate highway system for our Nation's national defense and commercial needs. Although I feel there are some additions that should and must be made to the system, the House conferees on title I have worked long and hard and deserve the commendation of their colleagues in the House for the results of their efforts.

It will be recalled that title II of H. R. 10660 contains the financing provisions of our Federal highway program so that the program can be self-financed on a pay-as-we-build basis.

There were 24 Senate amendments affecting title II of the bill. Of these, the House conferees receded without amendment to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 24, and 25, and agreed to the Senate amendments. The Senate conferees receded without amendment from its amendments Nos. 8, 17, and 23. The House conferees receded, with amendment, to the Senate amendment Nos. 2, 3, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 22. The Senate conferees receded, with amendment, to the Senate amendments Nos. 10 and 16.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to proceed to a discussion of the individual Senate amendments and describe briefly the House version and Senate version and the action of the conferees with respect to these amendments.

Senate amendment No. 2 was the first amendment in title II. It relates to the tax imposed on diesel fuel. Under present law a tax of 2 cents a gallon is imposed on fuel sold for use, or used, in a diesel-powered highway vehicle. The House bill would have increased this tax from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon, effective July 1, 1956. The Senate amendment would have continued this increase in tax but provided that it would apply only to diesel fuel used in a vehicle registered, or required to be registered, for use on the highways. The Senate amendment also provided that the increased tax would apply only to diesel fuel actually used while the vehicle was being used on a highway. The House conferees receded, with an amendment. The House conferees accepted the principle of not applying the increased diesel fuel tax to fuel used in a vehicle not registered or required to be registered, but deleted the Senate provision applying the increase tax only to that used on the highways. The conferees were informed by technical experts from the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service that the prorating which would be required by this provision of the Senate passed bill would have imposed very difficult administrative problems.

Senate amendment No. 3 relates to the excise tax imposed on special motor fuels, such as benzol, benzene, and naphtha, and low-price gas. Present law imposes a tax of 2 cents a gallon on these special motor fuels sold for use or used to propel a motor vehicle, motorboat, or airplane. The House-passed version of H. R. 10660 would have increased the rate of tax to 3 cents a gallon, effective July 1, 1956, in the case of special motor fuel sold for use or used in a motor vehicle. The Senate amendment to this provision would have made three changes. First, it would have made the additional 1-cent tax applicable only to fuel used in highway vehicles instead of motor vehicles. Second, it would have provided the same treatment for special motor fuels as far as registered and nonregistered vehicles are concerned, as I have described under Senate amendment No. 2 in connection with the diesel-fuel tax. Third, as in the case of the diesel-fuel tax, it would also have made the increased tax apply only to special motor fuels actually used on the highways. The House conferees receded with an amendment to the Senate amendment, which accepts the concept of registration of the vehicle as determining the applicability of the 1-cent increase in tax and applies it to highway vehicles instead of motor vehicles, but which deletes the use test provided in the Senate-passed bill. Thus, the House amendment to the Senate amendment conforms to the conference agreement with respect to amendment No. 2 and, in addition, conforms to the Senate amendment in limiting the 1-cent increase to fuel used in a motor vehicle which is a highway vehicle.

Senate amendments Nos. 4 and 5 are technical amendments, and the House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 6 proposed to strike out a House provision providing for sales by a gasoline producer free of the additional 1-cent tax on gasoline. H. R. 10660, as it passed the House, would have provided that under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate the tax on gasoline would be 2 cents a gallon instead of 3 cents a gallon in the case of gasoline sold by a producer or importer for use other than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. To conform the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, which I will describe later in my remarks, the House conferees receded on Senate amendment No. 6.

The House conferees receded on Senate amendment No. 7, which was a technical, conforming amendment.

Senate amendment No. 8 relates to the special use tax on heavy trucks and buses. It will be recalled that under the House bill any highway motor vehicle which has a taxable gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds was taxed at the rate of $1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof. The Senate amendment would have modified this House provision so that the tax would be at a rate of $2.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight—or fraction thereof—in excess of 26,000 pounds. The Senate conferees receded on this amendment. This saved $396 million in revenue for the highway program.

Senate amendment No. 9 provided a technical amendment relating to payment of the tax on the use of highway motor vehicles owned by the United States. The House conferees receded with a technical amendment.

Senate amendment No. 10 deleted a provision contained in the House passed bill to the effect that the new tax on the use of heavy trucks and buses would not apply to the use of buses of the transit type which obtain 60 percent or more of their passenger fare revenue from commutation fares or those for 35 cents or less. Under the conference agreement, the provision of the House bill is restored with a clerical amendment.

Senate amendments Nos. 11 and 12 are technical and clerical, respectively, and the House conferees recedes on each.

Senate amendment No. 13 provides that the floor stock taxes imposed by H. R. 10660 on articles held on July 1, 1956, the effective date of the rate increases provided in the bill are to be paid at such time after September 30, 1956, as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate may prescribe. There was no fixed date prior to which these taxes would not have to be paid under the corresponding provision in the House bill although one would have been fixed by regulations. The House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 14 relates to credits and refunds in the case of the special motor fuels tax and also provides credits or refunds in the case of the diesel fuel tax. The House conferees receded, with an amendment, to conform to the conference action on Senate amendments Nos. 2 and 3.

Senate amendment No. 15 deleted the refund and credit provisions of the House bill provided in connection with the 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the tax on gasoline where the gasoline is used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel in a highway vehicle. In conformity with the conference agreement with respect to Senate amendment No. 19, which I will explain later, the House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 16 deleted the provision in the House bill, relating to credits or refunds allowed in the case of gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels used in vehicles engaged in furnishing scheduled common-carrier public passenger land transportation service along regular routes. Under the conference agreement, the substance of the House provision is restored to the bill. The part relating to credit or refund of taxes on diesel fuel and special motor

fuels is restored by the conference action on this amendment. The part relating to gasoline is added by the conference action on Senate amendment No. 19.

Senate amendment No. 17 was clerical in nature, and the Senate conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 18 is a technical, clarifying amendment, and the House conferees receded.

Senate amendment No. 19 added a new section to the 1954 Code as a substitute for the provisions of the House bill deleted by Senate amendments Nos. 6 and 15. Under the new section a procedure would be provided under which the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate would pay an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon to the ultimate purchaser of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes. The procedure, in general, would be the same as that provided for gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes, except that the Senate provided for quarterly claims instead of annual claims where the claim was for at least 100,000 gallons of gasoline. The House conferees receded, accepting the substance of the Senate amendment which provides for direct refunds instead of sales free of the additional tax and refunds processed up through the producer. However, the provisions in the Senate amendment permitting quarterly returns where the claim was for at least 100,000 gallons was deleted by the conferees with the result that all claims will be made annually. The registration requirement for gasoline, previously explained in connection with diesel fuel, was accepted by the House conferees while the Senate conferees agreed to the omission of the use test.

Senate amendments Nos. 20 and 21 are technical, conforming amendments on which the House conferees recedes.

Senate amendment No. 22 deleted a provision of the House bill providing that nothing in the highway trust fund provision was to be construed as limiting the amount of apportionments made under any authorization in title I of the bill or in any previous or subsequent act which amends or supplements the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916. The Senate amendment requires the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, to estimate from time to time the amounts which will be available in the highway trust fund—excluding repayable advances—to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from the trust fund. Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the amounts which will be available in the trust fund—excluding repayable advances—will be insufficient to defray expenditures resulting from apportionments to the States, he is required to so notify the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is then required to reduce the apportionments to the States he otherwise would make by an amount sufficient in size so that no deficit will occur in the trust fund. The Secretary of the Treasury is required to notify the Secretary of Commerce when the trust fund balance will permit the apportionment of funds previously withheld from the States and the funds so withheld will then be made available. The effect of the Senate amendment is to require that tax collections under title II of the bill will be sufficient on a year-to-year basis to offset annual expenditures under title I of the bill. The House conferees receded with a conforming amendment.

Senate amendment No. 23 is a clerical amendment on which the Senate conferees receded.

Senate amendments Nos. 24 and 25 are technical, conforming amendments on which the House conferees receded.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that House Resolution 10660, providing a modern network of roads and highways in our Nation, is one of the most important bills to come before the Congress in recent years. Approximately $50 billion will be spent by the Federal and State Governments to accomplish this program. Seven hundred and fifty thousand miles of highways and streets will be affected. The fact that this program is self-financing is, in my judgment, one of its most meritorious features. While the American motorist will pay more in highway taxes, he will save even more in operating costs. It is estimated that these increased taxes will cost the average motorist $8.80 a year more than he pays now. However, when the new roads are completed, the cost of driving for the average motorist will be reduced by a penny a mile.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to support the conference report on House Resolution 10660 in the interest of public safety, national defense, and the economic growth of our Nation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the technical provisions of the conference agreement with regard to title II of H. R. 10660 have already been explained in great detail and at considerable length. I would simply like to emphasize at this time three major aspects of the conference agreement because of their particular importance.

First, the conference agreement restores the provision of the House bill which imposes a tax of $1.50 per thousand pounds of gross weight on use of any highway motor vehicle which has a taxable gross weight of more than 26,000 pounds. I personally had sponsored this amendment which the Committee on Ways and Means had adopted unanimously. The Senate had so amended this provision that its version would have produced about $350 million less than the House provision. Thus, restoration of the House provision in its original form constitutes not only a victory for the average motorist in that it results in heavy trucks paying a fairer share of the costs of this program but also it represents a victory for those who believe that this program should be financed as nearly on a pay-as-you-go method as possible.

Second, the Senate had eliminated the exemption from the increased fuel taxes which the House bill had provided with respect to certain urban transit vehicles. Your conferees succeeded in reinstating this exemption. In view of the fact that many of these transit systems are already in financial difficulties and also that any increased costs must be passed on to the users of these mass transportation facilities, this exemption is fully justified.

Finally, the conferees agreed to a Senate amendment designed to give assurance that no deficit will develop in the highway trust fund. This result is achieved by requiring the Secretary of the Treasury—in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce—from time to time to estimate the balance of the highway trust fund available to meet expenditures required to be made from the fund. Whenever he determines that the fund balance will be insufficient to meet the expenditures required as a result of the apportionment to the States of Federal aid highway funds, he is to advise the Secretary of Commerce as to the amount of the expected deficiency. The Secretary of Commerce is then to reduce the funds available for apportionment to the States with respect to the interstate system so as to forestall the estimated deficiency. This reduction in the apportionments for the interstate system is to be made among the States on a pro rata basis. Subsequently, as the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that highway trust fund balances will become available to meet these apportionments to the States for the interstate highway system, the amounts previously withheld are to be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce to the various States. Because the bill provides for the withholding of apportionments only with respect to the interstate system, this provision will not in any way affect the regular Federal aid highway program. It will, however, give specific and definite assurance that the Federal aid highway program will be paid for on a pay-as-you-build basis. This will give assurance of congressional reconsideration of the highway program at any time in the future that revenues appear to be inadequate to meet the highway program presently planned, since either new revenues will have to be raised at such a time or the expenditure program will have to be curtailed or postponed.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as one of the managers on the part of the House, I am most happy to bring to the attention of the Congress the report of the conferees on H. R. 10660, which is known as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of many months of study and hard work by the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee and Public Works Committee of the Senate. I certainly want to pay my respects to the Ways and

Means Committee and its chairman, Congressman COOPER, as well as the senior minority member, Congressman REED. Also to the Public Works Committee of the House, Chairman BUCKLEY, of the full committee, and especially Congressman GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland, who so ably presided during weeks of hearings as chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, and Congressman DONDERO, the senior minority member of the Public Works Committee. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that as time goes on the splendid work that these gentlemen did will become more recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I think this conference report carries forward to a large extent the recommendations of this House when we originally passed H. R. 10660 by Mr. FALLON. This legislation represents a compromise by many units of our economy and those various units have been very helpful in aiding us to submit to you legislation for better highways.

I might say that in my opinion this bill is divided into three categories; the Intrastate System, the Interstate System and title II of the bill which establishes taxes to approximately cover the expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I will only attempt to discuss the title I section which is the authorization section which comes under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. I am certain a full explanation will be made of title II, the taxing section, by the Ways and Means Committee.

INTRASTATE

The intrastate section covers Federal aid primary, Federal aid secondary, and extension of these systems in urban areas. The same formula of distribution is retained, Mr. Speaker, as was in the 1954 Highway Act which is now known as Public Law 350. Forty-five percent of the total appropriated for the intrastate system is to be used on Federal aid primary system, 30 percent on Federal aid secondary system and 25 percent for projects of these systems within urban areas.

The total amount per year for the intrastate system Federal funds will be $825 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957; $850 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and the sum of $875 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. This means that the intrastate system will have a base increase of $100 million plus the escalator clause of $25 million each year.

FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS

The bill retains the provision that gives permission to the State highway departments and the local authorities to use Federal funds on farm-to-market roads. The specifications covering these roads can be drawn by local county engineers with the approval of the highway department and need only to meet the needs of the local communities. This means that Federal highway funds can be used on farm-to-market roads without rigid adherence to Federal specifications which often in the past, because of the exorbitant cost, has prevented the construction of needed roads in many sections of rural areas.

TRANSFER FUNDS

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, allows a transfer of 20 percent from one segment of the intrastate system to another provided that the transfers are requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of such State and the Secretary of Commerce.

INTENT

The bill declares it to be essential to the national interest to provide for an early completion of the National System of Interstate Highways. It clearly sets forth the intent of the Congress that the Interstate System be completed as early as practical over a 13-year period and that the entire system in all the States be brought to simultaneous completion.

The expenditures, Mr. Speaker, covering the appropriations are set forth on page 13 of the bill and the final date of authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

FORMULA OF DISTRIBUTION—INTERSTATE

The House conferees yielded to the Senate version that the formula of distribution for the Interstate System will be based on the existing law for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959. For the remaining 10 years of the program, 1959 to 1969, the formula of apportionment contained in the House bill will be followed. This is to say, the funds will be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the Interstate System in all of the States. It is to be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that the last 10 years of the program the formula of apportionment is the cost of completion formula over the 13-year period based on costs and needs. No State should receive aggregate apportionments which are greater or less than the cost of completing the Interstate System within that State.

FEDERAL SHARE

The conferees have definitely agreed, Mr. Speaker, to retain the provision, both in the House and the Senate, that the Federal share on the Interstate System is to be 90 percent of the total cost.

MAXIMUM WEIGHT AND WIDTH LIMITATIONS

Mr. Speaker, there seemingly has been a great deal of misinformation relative to maximum weight, length, and width limitations as they affect motor vehicles using the highways. In a general statement, any truck that is now lawfully operating on the highways as of July 1, 1956, can continue to operate. When the bill was passed by the House it prohibited the apportionment of Interstate System funds to any State where the Interstate System might lawfully be used by vehicles having axle weights in excess of 18,000 pounds on any one axle or 32,000 pounds on a tandem axle or the maximum corresponding axle weight permitted by laws or regulations of such State in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. The conferees further agreed to accept the Senate amendment, while retaining the substance of the House provision, including a width limitation of 96 inches and an overall gross weight limitation of 73,280 pounds. Under the conference agreement any vehicle that could lawfully operate within a State on July 1, 1956, will not be affected.

Mr. Speaker, the bill directed the Secretary of Commerce to expedite a series of tests being planned and conducted for the purpose of determining maximum dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal aid highway system and to submit a report, with recommendations, to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959. The Senate agreed to the House version.

MAXIMUM MILEAGE

When the bill left the House it carried a 40,000-mile limit applicable to the Interstate System. Under section 108 of the conference agreement, the limit on mileage, which may be designated on the Interstate System, was increased by 1,000 miles, from 40,000 to 41,000. However, the conference agreement maintains a proviso that the cost of completing any mileage from any of the 1,000 newly authorized miles is to be excluded in making the estimate of costs of completion under the section 108 (d). The designation of additional mileage in any State will of course in no way increase the apportionment to the State during the first 3 years, for which the existing low method of apportionment is in effect. The proviso insures that during the ensuing 10-year program the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State will be made by estimating that cost for mileage designated from the 40,000 miles provided by law before the enactment of this bill. This means that no additional cost has been added, by reason of the additional 1,000 miles, to the 40,000-mile program on which the tax provisions of title II of the bill were based.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO ACQUIRE RIGHTS-OF-WAY

The bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce may make available to the States money for advanced acquisition of rights-of-way. At no time, however, will the amount advanced to a State exceed one-fourth of the amount apportioned to such State for the year in which the advance is operative.

RELOCATION OF UTILITY FACILITIES

Section 113 makes it permissible for Federal funds to be used to reimburse a State for additional relocation costs which the State had paid for under its own laws. Section 113 is the same as the bill as passed by the House. This section has been recommended and accepted by the conferees recognizing the equity of reimbursing utilities for the cost of relocating facilities when required for Federal aid highway projects.

After lengthy discussion the conferees have endeavored that this section makes it clear that it is the intention of the Federal Government to assume its apportionate share of utility relocation costs whenever a State allows such costs. Under the existing practice, Mr. Speaker, of the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal funds may participate in utility relocation costs to the same extent as other construction costs without percentage limitations based on the State's apportionment. This legislation encourages the States to review their contemporary status and take objective action in accordance with such review. Mr. Speaker,

this section will be of great assistance to small utilities, both public and private, especially including the REA, small telephone companies and small villages through which highway systems run and now have storm sewers, water sewage, and lighting utilities which do not bring in the revenue necessary to relocate if compelled to do so by new highway alinement.

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

The bill establishes a provision which is a declaration of intent and policy on the part of Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for such construction, rather than to commit the Federal Government in advance of the study to make such reimbursement and to provide funds therefor.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE

It is recognized that there must be the utmost cooperation between the several State Highway Departments and the Secretary of Labor in order to carry out the intent of provisions of section 115 (b). This section sets forth that the Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized in section 108 of this title, shall be paid wages at not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor. In carrying out the duties of the foregoing subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with the Highway Department of the State in which a project on an Interstate System is to be performed. After giving due regard to the information thus obtained, he shall make a predetermination of the minimum wages to be paid laborers and mechanics in accordance with the provision of the foregoing section which shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that it is the intent of this Congress that this program can be worked satisfactorily for all parties concerned if we have the cooperative effort that the conferees have attempted to specify. This particular section is certainly not intended to hinder the existing economy of any section of our country, nor is it applicable to anyone other than those employed by the contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work, and it goes no further in its scope than that which is set forth in the law.

PROGRESS REPORT

The Secretary of Commerce is to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the program made in attaining the completion of the Interstate System and at that time to submit his recommendations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The bill provides that when any State highway department submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of, or going through, any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, it shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location.

EMERGENCY FUND

There is established an emergency fund in the amount of $30 million to be used in the repairing or construction of highways and bridges when the Federal-aid highway system which have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not perfect. It will require the cooperative effort of all to achieve the goal that the people of this country want, namely, better roads. I sincerely hope that the conference report will be accepted.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on and pass a very important piece of legislation. Practically every American citizen, men, women, and children, rich or poor, educated or uneducated, are vitally interested in the new road bill which this House is about to pass. I am quite convinced that this bill will become a law by being approved by this House and the Senate and also by the President.

There are several very significant facts connected with this proposed legislation, which, when taken together, have made it very popular.

First. Every American citizen is interested in and will no doubt directly or indirectly use these new proposed highways.

Second. The roads will be paid for by reason of the provisions of this law, which provisions will apply to all American citizens justly, and to all who use the roads. This will be done through taxation and through other fair methods.

Third. There is so much more travel on the highways of the country than formerly, and the amount of travel is bound to increase because of the increase in the population of the country and because of the increase in production of fast, useful automobiles. People now travel many times more every day than in the past.

Fourth. Practically every business now requires the use of new and more speedy implements of travel and the highways that once were mere mud roads are now concrete boulevards built to carry thousands of tons hundreds of miles in a comparatively short time.

I have watched the progress of this new highway construction program with a great deal of interest. Having been brought up on a farm and in a rural section, I understand exactly what you mean when you say "horse and buggy days." I know how much fuller will be the life of all our people when they get the benefit of this big countrywide road program.

Mr. Speaker, I watched the growth of this program ever since my childhood days when the horse and buggy were our fastest means of transportation. I remember well how the bicycle came into wide use. But now, with the program that will follow the passage of this legislation, there is no question but that the transportation of people and commodities will be increased greatly, and all to the benefit of civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that during the past 30 or 40 years, people who traveled the roads were constantly looking forward to better, safer, and faster means of transportation. I know that that was my feeling and I was constantly wishing for a better day in that respect. I read with interest and approved the articles written by those who were taking the leadership in hastening the day when transportation would be faster, safer, and cheaper. For years, I argued that the national authorities should call together the leaders in the States that were planning for better, safer, and faster means of transportation. I mean the governors and highway engineers. And I was very much pleased when just a short time ago, our President and others encouraged and arranged for a meeting here in Washington of the transportation authorities of the States. They came because they could see that the people were demanding safer and more satisfactory transportation. This included the farmer, the country merchant, the city businessman, and practically everybody who understood the problem.

From these meetings came a movement that had its results in causing the Congressmen of the country to prepare legislation that would give the people of our great country—faster, safer, and better means and methods of transportation.

This was a hard colossal job that the Congress undertook, but the Members of Congress, always feeling a sense of responsibility to do what the people want done, took up the task of drawing legislation that would do two important things—

First. It would provide for the construction of thousands of miles of paved roads in those parts of the United States where they were most needed and would produce the greatest benefits. These should be selected without political preference, but purely on the basis of need and usefulness. These should be selected by men who knew roadbuilding thoroughly and knew where the roads were most needed and would bring the most benefits.

Second. It would provide the method of securing the tremendous sums of money that would be needed to pay for these great nationwide public improvements.

The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, which has the legislative authority to draw up legislation in cases such as this case of nationwide road building, undertook to draw up this legislation This committee did a very fine job, as long as they applied themselves to deciding where the roads should be built and how they should be built. But when that committee assumed to provide the means and methods of paying for these roads, it found itself encroaching on the legislative rights of

that king of all committees—the Ways and Means Committee. Of course, I am sure that all of you will bear with me when I praise the Ways and Means Committee, for I have been a member of this great committee for about 25 years. I should like very much to make a statement at this point giving a report as to how we expect to pay for these tremendous expenses by taxation on gasoline and on trucks and other heavy vehicles that travel on these roads and in many other ways which I cannot set forth here now.

At any rate, the Public Works Committee confined its activity to planning for the construction of the roads in this great program and gave up the task of providing the finances necessary to the carrying out of this program. The Ways and Means Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, applied themselves most assiduously and brought out a plan of taxation that seems to be fair and sufficient. The plan of the Ways and Means Committee was considered carefully by the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the Senate itself. And the House members of the Ways and Means Committee, sitting as conferees with the Senate members as conferees, agreed on the many important provisions of this bill. Therefore, the report of the conference committee of the Senate and the conference committee of the House is now before the House for consideration.

I feel sure that this House will approve the conference committee's report and the Senate will do likewise, and that the President will then approve this legislation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, when this all shall have been accomplished, we, the Congress of the United States, working together with the Senate and with the President, shall have given to the country what I think is a wonderful piece of work and I hope that future generations will rise up and call us blessed for having given to the country a fine piece of legislation.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the Roads Committee of the House, also the members of the Ways and Means Committee, for the splendid cooperation and the hard work they have put in in order to bring this bill to a successful conclusion.

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

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the statement just made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and to pay my respects to him. The gentleman has had the patience of Job, has done an excellent job and I congratulate him as well as the members of the Ways and Means Committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report now being considered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to commend the Senate and House conferees on the highway bill conference report. Their work manifests a tremendous exercise of energy, patience, and compromise.

In view of the fact that the adoption of this legislation at this time is imperative because of the national crisis on our highways, it becomes incumbent upon every Member to withhold any reservations he may have and support the conference report.

It is indeed regrettable that initial allocation among the States for the Interstate System will be under the Senate formula which is based upon area, population, and post road mileage. To allocate construction on any other basis than need is unwise and shortsighted. This may have the effect of unduly delaying needed improvements to the Interstate System and increasing the paralysis that exists in and about large urban areas.

It is also regrettable that the conference report struck out the provision expressing the intent of Congress to reimburse States for toll roads designated as part of the Interstate System. In effect, the omission of this provision penalizes the effort of several progressive States to lift themselves from the highway dilemma by the bold construction of modern up-to-date toll roads.

The elimination of any chance for reimbursement for toll roads has the immediate effect of canceling out any proposed toll highways. Plans in Ohio for a north-south turnpike have been shelved. Instead, plans will be made to establish partial constructions as free highways. If Ohio and other States with turnpike authorities could be reimbursed for toll roads designated as a part of the Interstate System, it would provide a very sorely needed incentive for speedy development of the highway system. Delays will only result in increased costs and piecemeal construction.

The successful development of the Interstate Highway System which America needs will now be the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Roads and the participating State and local authorities. It is my sincere hope that piecemeal improvements will be completely frowned upon; that plans be carried through for entire units of development. It is my further hope that highway right-of-way plans be developed as rapidly as possible so that needed rights-of-way be acquired as a matter of priority before they become unavailable because of immovable obstructions or before it becomes costly because of local planning which does not anticipate the Interstate Highway System.

It is also my hope that the Federal Bureau of Public Roads will insist upon the wider use of limited access highways and further insist that local subdivisions zone out business activities along the highways which detract from highway use and increase highway hazards.

In the decade ahead the Nation must expect the greatest use of America's highways by the greatest number of automobiles. The increase in highway traffic will not be accompanied by the same proportion of driver integrity. Driving habits must be better developed, and qualifications for motor-vehicle operators' licenses must be increased. The motorist must be made to realize that he does not have an inalienable right to drive a car in any manner upon our highways. He must learn that he has a permit which can be suspended or revoked upon a finding that he does not have the ability, the temperament, or the capacity to drive. This will require rigid enforcement of the traffic laws and a uniform but certain application in the administration of highway justice. This field of jurisprudence is one which must be brought home to every motorist.

My appreciation again to the members of the committee who have worked so hard for this day and for the conferees who spent many hours in negotiation and compromise. The legislation is not perfect, but it provides the basis upon which perfection may be achieved.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed, and it is understood that Senate approval will be immediately forthcoming, the greatest public works program in the history of the world, a program estimated at a total cost of $51 billion to improve the highway system of this Nation. From a standpoint of defense as well as the economy of the country, the merits of this legislation will undoubtedly be proven as work progresses and as this 40,000-mile Interstate System is completed within a 15-year period. Nearly 2 years of study and effort has been put in on this bill on the part of the Public Works Committee of the House, and lengthy hearings in the Senate have ensued in addition to the great effort put forth by the Clay Committee in initially studying the matter. Eisenhower's report to Congress on the matter and his request for legislation started the ball rolling this session.

Included in the bill as passed is section 110 providing for advance purchase of rights-of-way which is the same provision as made in a bill which I introduced, H. R. 8829, this provision being accepted on my motion by the Roads Subcommittee unanimously and by the full Public Works Committee thereafter and by the House. This provision was deleted by the Senate but reinstated in conference.

It is estimated that this provision alone, if used properly can save as much as $1,500 million in the overall cost of this gigantic road program.

This is a new provision in highway legislation and permits States to use any Federal matching funds on any of the systems of highways provided for in the bill for purchase of rights-of-way up to the 5 years in advance from construction.

The conference report changes the House version of the road bill principally by using the allocation formula under the present law for a period of 3 years and thereafter providing for the institution of the needs formula which the House felt so essential to guarantee the completion of the entire 40,000-mile system, this system having been increased to 41,000 miles in conference.

This means for the first 3 years under the present formula of allocation that Florida will receive in Federal contributions a total of $110,300,000, of which $79.9 million is for the Interstate System and $30.5 million for the other systems, the latter including $13.4 million for primary, $8.7 million for secondary, and $8.4 million for urban. This provides a substantial increase over fiscal 1956 for Federal participation, 1956 being in the amount of $14,559,885 for all systems in Florida. This further provides that the Interstate System shall be on a 90 percent Federal matching basis as compared to 60 percent under previous law, meaning that a large portion of funds previously spent by the State in matching interstate money on a 40 percent State contribution basis will be available for expenditure for additional State highways.

This overall program assures the completion in the near future of the third bay bridge across Tampa Bay as well as the full 1,173 miles of the Interstate System in Florida within the 15-year construction period, providing for two 4-lane routes into the central west coast area on the Interstate System, one coming south through Ocala and the other southwest through Orlando and Lakeland. It also provides for four-laning of U. S. 1 on the west coast and an east-west highway from Jacksonville to Pensacola. The bill provides that under the needs formula beginning in fiscal 1960 that a report should be made to Congress for approval on the allocation basis on the ratio that the total number of miles and the number of miles within the State of Florida has to the total funds available for that year. This is roughly estimated, it means, at approximately $50 million for all systems in Florida per year starting in 1960 and for a 10-year period.

This bill, in other words, provides for nearly 3 times as much money per year for the first 3 years as under the present road legislation and nearly 4 times as much as for the balance of 10 years per year to complete the Interstate System and for the improvement of other roads. This undoubtedly will be one of the greatest boosts to not only the continued but the accelerated economic growth of Florida.

The 40,000-mile Interstate System connects 90 percent of all cities in America where the population is in excess of 50,000 and 42 of the 48 State capitals, thus providing for the first time a comprehensive network of interstate roads while at the same time providing for the accelerated improvement of the other systems.

I cite Florida as an example as to what this bill will mean to the entire country and I am sure history will show that the judgment of all of us in supporting this measure was well founded. I believe that this will be considered the greatest accomplishment of this session of Congress.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BILL S. 890

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 890.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO COOPERATE WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES IN THE PREVENTION OF WATERFOWL DEPREDATIONS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7641) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purpose of preventing crop damage by migratory waterfowl, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the Secretary of the Interior such wheat, corn, or other grains, acquired through price support operations and certified by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be available for purposes of this act or in such condition through spoilage or deterioration as not to be desirable for human consumption, as the Secretary of the Interior shall requisition pursuant to section 2 hereof. With respect to any grain thus made available, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay packaging, transporting, handling, and other charges up to the time of delivery to one or more designated locations in each State.

"SEC. 2. Upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that any area in the United States is threatened with damage to farmers' crops by migratory waterfowl, whether or not during the open season for such migratory waterfowl, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to requisition from the Commodity Credit Corporation and to make available to Federal, State, or local governmental bodies or officials, or to private organizations or persons, such grains acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price-support operations in such quantities and subject to such regulations as the Secretary determines will most effectively lure migratory waterfowl away from crop depredations and at the same time not expose such migratory waterfowl to shooting over areas to which the waterfowl have been lured by such feeding programs.

"SEC. 3. With respect to all grain made available pursuant to section 2, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for its expenses in packaging and transporting such grain for purposes of this act.

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its investment in the grain transferred pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 5. No grain shall be made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation under this act after the expiration of 3 years following its enactment."

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is making the request to take up a Senate bill and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, has this matter been taken up with the gentleman's committee? In other words, I know nothing about what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I did not think the bill was important enough to be taken up with Members on both sides of the aisle. It simply provides that some of the surplus grain owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to beguile the ducks away from the farmers' fields. The bill passed the House, and the Senate limited it to a period of 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN. It is just extending the time.

Mr. SPENCE. Extending the time. There was no limit on the time in the House bill, and the Senate limited the time to 3 years.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11926) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to permit the negotiation of commercial leases at atomic energy communities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I understand this is a unanimous report.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is a unanimous report from the committee; yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 161 e. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom the words "section 174;" and substituting in lieu thereof the words: "section 174: *Provided, however*, That in the communities owned by the Commission, the Commission is authorized to grant privileges, leases and permits upon adjusted terms which are fair and reasonable to responsible persons to operate commercial businesses without advertising and

without securing competitive bids, but taking into consideration, in addition to the price, and among other things (1) the quality and type of services required by the residents of the community, (2) the experience of each concession applicant in the community and its surrounding area, (3) the ability of the concession applicant to meet the needs of the community, and (4) the contribution the concession applicant has made or will make to the other activities and general welfare of the community;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEVENTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to authorize an appropriation of $400,000 to defray the added expenses incident to the holding of the 11th Annual Assembly, World Health Organization, in the United States in 1958.

Several of us from the House have served on American delegations to past assemblies and consequently have had an opportunity to obtain firsthand knowledge of the World Health Organization activities.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Appropriations Committee have recently held hearings and learned in detail of the work of the World Health Organization.

I believe it is a fair statement that the dividends to the United States from our participation in the World Health Organization are more readily appreciated than those derived from our participation in perhaps any other international endeavor.

The World Health Assembly is the annual meeting of the legislative body of the World Health Organization attended by delegations from almost 80 member countries. It generally lasts about 3 weeks. Serving in the delegations are the health leaders of the world, including ministers and directors of health, parliamentary leaders, and persons prominent in the medical and scientific professions of these countries.

A meeting in the United States would have far-reaching effects in affording opportunities for American physicians to meet with their counterparts from abroad, and for these important visitors to observe our own health services at municipal, State, and national levels; to visit our fine teaching and research institutions; and to see United States democratic processes at work.

The resolution is introduced because the World Health Organization some years ago adopted a policy, with United States concurrence, that assemblies would not be held away from the Organization's headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, unless the inviting government paid the additional expenses, which it is estimated will amount to not more than $400,000. Only two assemblies have been held outside Geneva; the 1949 meeting in Rome and the 1955 meeting in Mexico City.

Mr. Speaker, the United States played a leading role in organizing and developing WHO, one international organization about whose activities I have never heard any complaint or criticism.

An assembly in our country can make great contributions to the knowledge and experience of these leaders in health work throughout the whole world.

There will be great benefits to ourselves from the meeting here. The most effective form of building genuine understanding of our country is to allow people to see us as we are, here in our homeland.

Considering all these advantages, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution will be acted upon favorably. It should be passed at this session of the Congress, so that the invitation can be extended this year, allowing the responsible officials of WHO to prepare their plans for 1958 for submission to the next assembly.

1958 will mark the 10th year of the Organization's existence and will be a very appropriate anniversary on which for the first time to hold the assembly in the United States where WHO was born.

FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 11802, H. R. 6997, H. R. 9038, and H. R. 10111.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LIBERATION STAMP

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced House Joint Resolution 658 to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the national liberation stamp.

This resolution has special significance. It marks, in a sense, the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Woodrow Wilson, whose devotion to the political principle of national self-determination inspired all the people of the world and caused the rebirth of many nations which had been submerged for many years by alien occupation and foreign tyranny.

It emphasizes the uninterrupted determination of the American people to support the rights of all nations, large and small, and their hopes that all nations and people of the world will enjoy man's inalienable rights to individual liberty and the basic freedoms which form the foundation for a just and lasting peace.

The intent of this resolution is to encourage the issuance of a special series of postage stamps which will tell the people of the world of the determination of the American people to see the restoration of liberty and freedom to all the captive nations in the Communist colonial empire. In order that there would be no misunderstanding concerning the nations held in colonial bondage by the Russian Communists, they are spelled out in detail.

It is fitting that this series of stamps be called the national liberation stamp. It is a fact of history that all nations held in colonial bondage by one means or another, have sought their national liberation. Today, throughout all of Asia and Africa, nations have recently won their independence or are engaged in the struggle for their national independence. The United States has used its good offices to bring about the national liberation of many of these countries. All the newly independent nations of the world can look with confidence to the United States as a friend, a partner, and if needs be, a defender against those who would steal their hard-won national independence. To the many nations enslaved within the Russian Communist empire, such a series of stamps will serve as an inspiration, as a reassurance that the people of the United States are standing firmly by their time honored moral and political principles so well enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence.

It is my hope that this resolution will be adopted before this session of Congress adjourns. Such action will encourage the Post Office Department to complete a project which they have had under consideration for the past several weeks. Moreover, such action by Congress will give hope to all the people of the world at a time when it appears that the initiative of the West has been submerged by the Russian propaganda campaign of peaceful coexistence. My resolution reads as follows:

House Joint Resolution 658

Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the National Liberation Stamp

Whereas the year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Woodrow Wilson, who will always be remembered for his devotion to the principle of national self-determination; and

Whereas in our time this principle has immediate application to the vast Communist empire, which includes Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Poland, East Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Albania, Rumania, Bulgaria, North Caucasia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Tibet, North Vietnam, China, Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, North Korea, and federated Russia; and

Whereas one of the goals of American foreign policy is the restoration of liberty and freedom to captive nations in the Communist Colonial empire; and

Whereas the 1st session of the 84th Congress expressed its opposition to Communist colonialism and imperialism by unanimous adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 149; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper to remind the world and our own people of the state of captivity of these enslaved nations and of the hopes and aspirations of their peoples for self-determination and independent sovereignty: Now therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issue on as early a date as practicable during the year 1956 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps to serve as a reminder of the present state of captivity of the nations in the Communist Colonial Empire and of the aspirations of the peoples of such nations for self-determination and independence, such stamps to be in appropriate design and to be known as the National Liberation Stamp.

INCREASING RATES OF, AND LIBERALIZING THE BASIS FOR PAYMENT OF, NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION AND SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue throughout the day, to be confined to the bill and to be equally divided and controlled by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and myself.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think he will need all day for general debate?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. From the requests that have come to me, it would take most of the afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN. Most of the afternoon does not mean necessarily all day.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is impossible to tell exactly how much time Members will request. There has been a considerable number of requests.

Mr. MARTIN. Immediately upon the termination of general debate is the gentleman going to ask to start reading the bill today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No more than the first section. There will be no amendments offered today.

Mr. MARTIN. How does that interfere with the program for tomorrow?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I presume we shall begin reading the bill for amendment tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN. I thought the school-construction bill was scheduled for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] drew a natural deduction from the program announced, but we could not commit the House exactly to the program as I announced it last week. I announced that the school-construction bill would follow disposition of the bill we are about to take up. We were hopeful that it would be disposed of today. On the other hand there was the possibility that the school-construction bill might not be brought up until Thursday, due to the fact that two of the Members involved were abroad. Of course, at that time we did not know whether they would be able to get back in time to be here on Wednesday. I understand they have returned.

So that after the disposition of this bill, that will be the next order of business.

I agree with the gentleman; I should like to have the time for general debate shortened to, perhaps, 3 hours, if that could be agreed upon. Then we could proceed to read the bill under the 5-minute rule and have some part of it disposed of without leaving all of the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule for tomorrow.

Of course, we all appreciate the predicament of the chairman of the committee. If he cannot arrange it that way, we shall cooperate with him. On the other hand, if it is possible for him to get an agreement on limitation of general debate to, say, 3 hours, then we could continue after that in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I may say that members of the committee have already asked for more than 3 hours of time, and I am sure there are other Members of the House who desire to speak on the bill, although they have not yet contacted me.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the difficulty about continuing with reading the bill after general debate has concluded, on the assumption, perhaps, that all of the time that may be requested will not be used?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is perfectly agreeable to the chairman of the committee to read the bill after concluding general debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, after general debate has been disposed of, if it is not too late, we can go right into the reading of the bill for amendments?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is perfectly agreeable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, one further question. The school construction bill will follow this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. There are some conference reports that will be brought in tomorrow. There is the conference report on the public works appropriation bill; there is the conference report on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for tomorrow. But the next legislative business will be the school construction bill. There might also be a conference report on the water pollution bill. Of course, we are all anxious to dispose of these conference reports as soon as possible.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuing this matter just a little further, I am asking this information for the guidance of Members so that they may be able better to make their own plans.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts understands the purpose of the inquiry.

Mr. MARTIN. We are to take the school construction bill up after several conference reports are disposed of and after the veterans bill has been disposed of. Is the gentleman going to run Friday and Saturday, if necessary, on the school construction bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. However, I want to advise the House frankly that if the school construction bill is disposed of this week and it should happen on a Friday or Saturday there will be no votes taken until the following Monday, because there is a convention of the Republican Party in Indiana and, in accordance with our procedure, which I think is a proper one, I am going to protect all Members of all States who have problems of that kind, either conventions or primaries. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts feels as I do.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I desire to continue the discussion of the school construction bill for just 1 minute. As I understand, today we debate the veterans bill and read it for amendment tomorrow. I think we would have to be rather optimistic if we were to assume that we would get through with it before late tomorrow afternoon. Then we will enter the debate on the school construction bill after the conference reports the gentleman has mentioned; and I understand one or two of them are quite controversial.

Mr. McCORMACK. One at least.

Mr. BARDEN. Then we will take the rest of Thursday afternoon, with no votes on Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mean no roll-call votes. That does not mean votes in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARDEN. I want to say this to the gentleman, that the school construction bill is quite controversial, pro and con.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is aware of that fact.

Mr. BARDEN. I am not at all encouraged over disposing of it on a Saturday meeting, because I think the gentleman readily recognizes the difficulty we would be operating under on Saturday.

Mr. McCORMACK. What would the gentleman do if he were leader? We have to protect Members in their conventions and primaries. I know the gentleman from North Carolina is just as strong in thinking that as both gentlemen from Massachusetts. Let us go along. I am making this statement, that the next order of legislative business after the disposition of the pension bill is the school construction bill. I am in that position and I have to adhere to it, with all due respect to my friend.

Mr. BARDEN. I know the gentleman respects me just as I do him. I know that I have it at heart to consider the convenience of the Members as he does. I am not trying to arouse any controversy in that field. However, I do think I have more than just the normal responsibility for this piece of legislation. There is a lot of inquiry made of me requesting some degree of certainty. If the gentleman is not in a position to give that at this time, I will bear with him, and maybe this afternoon or in the morning we can discuss it further. I know the gentleman is cooperative and will cooperate with me, and the gentle-

man knows I will do the same with him. But what I interrupted the gentleman for is just to let the House membership know that at least the situation is not wholly firm at this moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will let the gentleman's statement stand without any further comment.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the time will be equally divided between the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the ranking minority member?

The SPEAKER. That is exactly the request the gentleman from Texas made.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentlewoman object to the vote, or what is she doing?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; I just make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I accept the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not desire to be sharp with the gentlewoman, but unless she objects to the vote the House is already in the Committee of the Whole, because that is the question the Chair put.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7886, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, during the war I went into France with a group of 1,000 men. Six months later 300 of that thousand had been killed and 500 had been wounded. Now, I am not attempting to inject any emotion in the consideration of a bill for veterans. But I certainly could not live with myself if I did not try to be honest with the men I served with during the war—and to be a part of bringing a bill to the floor of the House which I am convinced in my own mind has no chance of becoming law would not be treating those men right. When we had only a few veterans we could do a lot for them. Today we have approximately 22 million veterans. By 1985, according to the Census Bureau, we will have a population of approximately 221 million people, with 110 million being either veterans, their families, or dependents. For that reason, I believe it is time we take a new look at our whole veterans' program. I think everyone will agree that our basic program must deal with widows, orphans, disabled veterans, and dependent mothers and fathers, and those veterans who cannot take care of themselves. The veteran population is so large that when we try to go beyond that we are asking for trouble and will seriously jeopardize our entire veterans' program. I have tried as hard as I know how to work out some kind of honest, sincere veterans' program that our country can live with and accept, and which will deal fairly with all veterans. Each year veterans' groups come to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with anywhere from 50 to 200 mandates requesting passage by the Congress.

What legislation we pass, they take credit for it. What legislation we do not pass, they blame us for. There is no committee in the Congress that has had the membership turnover of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. In the 81st Congress there were 44 percent new members on the committee. In the 82d Congress, 55 percent. In the 83d and 84th Congresses 57 percent. That turnover should prove that it is not easy to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

We have a bill before this House, as I said before, that I do not think has a chance of becoming law. As far as I am personally concerned, it is a fraud upon the veterans to lead them to believe that there is a chance of its becoming law. A number of Members of this House have worked with me and tried to get a piece of legislation in shape that we can reasonably expect to become law. Before it is over with you will have a chance to vote for probably two substitutes. I can only speak for the one I prepared. That substitute will give a 10 percent across-the-board increase for every disabled veteran. It will give more of an increase than 10 percent to those veterans who are 100-percent disabled—that rate would be $225—and who do not receive a statutory award. It will give an increase to non-service-connected veterans who require aid and an attendant. Today that non-service-connected veteran who requires aid and an attendant receives $135.45. This substitute will increase that to $150.

This substitute will cost about $170 million. We have considerable assurance that this bill has a chance of becoming law. The bill before the Congress now, in my opinion, has no chance of becoming law; and, as I said, it is a fraud upon the veterans to attempt to pass it.

It is most important that you understand our present veterans' program. We have a very large, tremendous veterans' program today. I am going to spend some time running through this program to show you something of the size and scope of our present program.

Just as an example of the size of our Veterans' Administration program today, the Administration employs 177,000 people. They receive approximately 120 million pieces of mail a year. They maintain records of 230 million veterans and families.

We have a hospital program that provides daily 132,000 beds in 173 different hospitals and 17 domiciliaries.

The Administration of Veterans' Affairs is guardian for 237,000 children and 110,000 adults. Since the end of World War II, veterans and their families have made more than 130 million visits and 70 million telephone calls to the Veterans' Affairs contact offices.

I contend that we have a very fine veterans' program, but we have reached the point where we must decide which way we are going in the future and what we can afford to do in the best interests of the veteran and the Nation generally. In my opinion, every dollar we appropriate to non-service-connected cases, we take away from the service-connected disabled. We are spending 7 percent of the Nation's annual income on the veterans' program.

I want to run through a few charts and try to show you something of what our program is today.

First, from World War II we have 15,377,000 veterans in civilian life. From the Korean conflict we have 4,564,000. From World War I, 3,077,000. From prior wars, 128,000.

Today we have a non-service-connected program that gives a veteran who has had 90 days war service or more, with an honorable discharge, who, if single, has an income limitation of $1,400; and, if married, $2,700, and who is, first, less than 55 years of age, who has a single permanent disability of 60 percent, or 2 or more permanent disabilities, or, second, 1 of which is 40 percent, combined with other disabilities in a total of 70 percent, today can receive $66.15. If he is 60 and has a 50-percent rating, 2 or more disabilities and is unemployable, he can receive $66.15. When he is 65, if he has 10-percent disability and unemployment, he can receive $66.15, or $78.75.

On the pension roll as of April 30 this year we have 582,000 veterans; that is, non-service-connected.

The Veterans' Administration tells us that the present increase is 5,000 per month, and that by the year 1961 there will be one million veterans on the non-service-connected pension rolls.

Let me emphasize that I am not talking about the bill we are considering. I am referring to the existing program.

Last year the total appropriations for compensation of pensions amounted to $2,629,000,000. I want to say right here that there have been a lot of things said about these cost estimates. The national commander of the American Legion in articles in the paper have said that they were fantastic and that there was no basis of fact for them, yet I have been told that the American Legion head sent a private consultant, an actuary expert to check those figures at the Veterans' Administration and found them accurate and took no exception as to the figures or the accuracy and that there was nothing fantastic about them. So far as I know they are very accurate. If anyone has information otherwise I would like him to give it to me. I have questioned VA and they have no protests before them as to the accuracy of their estimates.

For service-connected compensation we expended $1,829,000,000; for disability $1,428,000,000; death $401 million in 1955.

For the non-service-connected there is a total of $800 million; for nonservice disability $537 million; for nonservice death $263 million expended in 1955.

Let us look at the year 2000. If we do not pass another bill, do not change the law as it is today, for the year 2000 the cost of the present program will be $4,768,000,000. I do not know what the economy of our country is going to be in

the year 2000. It may be double its present level; I do not know. I am not going to try to venture a guess. This is just the estimate of what the present compensation and pension programs will cost in the year 2000.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The figure of $4 billion the gentleman is giving us for the year 2000 is the annual cost of the present program at that time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, the annual cost of the present compensation and pension program at that time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman have also cumulative figures which show the cost of the present program up to the year 2000? There has been a great deal of publicity about cumulative costs. I wonder if the gentleman has the cumulative volume of cost by the year 2000? I think it would be helpful to have it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do not know exactly, but if we figure that it would be half of the cost of the present bill and if the cumulative cost under the present bill is estimated at $148 million, I would assume as a wild guess it would be something over $70 billions.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman would assume, then, in estimating the cumulative cost if the annual rate is $2,600,000,000 and it is going to cost $4 billion at the year 2000, the gentleman thinks the cumulative cost would be something over $70 billion?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That would be a wild guess.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This next chart shows the cost estimate of H. R. 7886. It was prepared by the Veterans' Administration. Section 1 for increased pensions for World War I, II, and Korean veterans the first year would cost $536,150,000; the fifth year's cost is $936,556,000; and the total cumulative cost by the year 2000 would be $86,267,000,000. Let me emphasize that this is for nonservice pensions alone and is additional cost.

Section 2 which gives the widows of World War II and Korea veterans the same pension rights as widows of World War I. Members should realize that today when a World War I veteran dies his wife if she has an income of less than $1,400 is eligible for pension. If a World War II or a Korean war veteran dies, the veteran must die with a service-connected disability or his widow receives nothing. If there is no service connection she is not entitled to a pension.

To equalize those pension rights would cost $126,335,000 the first year, $218,118,000 the fifth year and $36,481,000,000 total cumulative cost by the year 2000.

Section 3 which increases the pensions for widows of World War I and II veterans and Korean veterans from $50.40 to $75, also some increase for the children, would cost $106,133,000 the first year, $133,549,000 is the fifth year cost, and $6,507,000,000 is the cumulative cost by the year 2000.

Section 4 which increases the pensions of Spanish-American War veteran widows from $67.73 to $75 costs $19,473,000 the first year, the fifth-year cost is $19,500,000 and the year 2000 cumulative cost is $309 million.

So the total in the bill before the House, the total cumulative cost, by the year 2000 is $129,564,000,000. The total first year's cost on all non-service-connected pensions in the bill is $788,385,000, the fifth year cost is $1,307,723,000. The year 2000 cumulative cost is $129,564,000,000 for non-service-connected pensions.

Today our compensation rates run from 10 percent to 100 percent, which is added as Title II to the bill.

TITLE II. SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION

Title II relates exclusively, as I have already indicated, to compensation for service-connected disability or death for veterans and widows and/or children.

Section 5 increases the basic compensation structure now available to veterans of all wars who are suffering from service-connected disabilities. A veteran totally disabled today receives $181 monthly and this bill would increase the rate to $250, a 38 percent increase over the existing level. Appropriate increases are also granted to lesser disabilities. For example, a veteran 10 percent disabled today receives $17. The bill proposes to increase his rate to $20, or an increase of approximately 17 percent. The position of the administration is indicated by the following quotation from the Veterans' Administration report:

> It would appear that disability and death compensation rates were deemed to be appropriate and adequate by the Congress when it enacted the proposal which became Public Law 695, 83d Congress, on August 28, 1954. In this connection, it is noted that the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, for August 1954 was 115 points and for January 1956, 114.6 points (1947–49=100 points), a slight decrease. It is not believed that the increases proposed by the bill, which involve a first year's cost of over $183 million, can be justified under the available facts.

The first-year cost is estimated at $237,197,000. Fifth-year cost of $248,482,000 and a cumulative cost by the year 2000 of $9,280,000,000.

Section 6 increases the statutory award rates from the present level of $47 to $55 monthly. The rate for arrested tuberculosis increases from $67 to $75, and the overall ceiling on compensation is increased from $420 to $450 a month. These rates are for the more severely disabled—men who have lost arms and legs, blindness, suffered deafness and other disabilities which are considered so serious as to warrant a special rate above that provided for a veteran rated totally disabled. The first-year cost is estimated at $11,141,000, rising slightly at the fifth year to $13,979,000 with a cumulative cost of $482 million.

Sections 7, 8, 9, and 10 relate entirely and exclusively to veterans of World War I who are rated under the 1925 schedule of rating disabilities and who hold, in many instances, what are termed protected awards, awards which are under the 1925 schedule but cannot qualify at a liberal rate under the current schedule in use, namely, the one promulgated in 1945. These facts are consistent with the rates provided in sections 5 and 6.

Section 11 provides increases for, as well as liberalizing the basis of, additional compensation to veterans who have dependents. Under the provisions of Public Law 877 of the 80th Congress as amended, a veteran who is 50 percent or more disabled is entitled to additional compensation for his wife, child, or dependent parent. For example, a man rated 100 percent disabled today receives $181 a month. If he has a wife, he would receive $25 additional. If he is rated 50 percent disabled, however, he would receive 50 percent of $25, or $12.50 a month additional. Section 11 removes the 50 percent requirement in the present law and makes veterans with a disability as small as 10 percent eligible for this increased compensation. In addition it increases the basic rates for a wife and no child from $21 to $25 or an increase of approximately 19 percent, with appropriate increases for the other classifications. The position of the administration is set forth in the Veterans' Administration report which states:

> The legislative history of this legislation discloses that the basic reason for authorizing (the benefit) was to assist that group of seriously disabled veterans who are not generally in a position to supplement their compensation payments by other income. It is not believed that such a need for assistance exists in the case of less disabled veterans (rated 10 through 49 percent) to the extent that it would warrant the additional cost to the Government of over $100 million yearly.

Bureau of the Budget recommends against favorable consideration of the bill.

The first-year cost is estimated at $143,308,000, with a slight decrease in the fifth year to $140,029,000, and a cumulative cost in the year 2000 of $4,719,000,000.

Section 12 proposes to increase the rates provided for widows and/or children where veterans' deaths were due to service. The present rate for a childless widow is $87 a month. Section 12 would increase that rate to $125 monthly or an increase of 43 percent with appropriate increases for widows with children and for a child without a mother. The estimated cost in the first year of this section is $82,112,000, rising approximately $5 million at the fifth year to make that year cost $87,510,000, with a cumulative cost at the year 2000 of $3,528,000,000. This section is in direct conflict wtih the provisions of H. R. 7089, the so-called survivors benefits bill which passed the House of Representatives on July 13, 1955, and which has recently been reported by the Senate Finance Committee. This latter legislation seeks to set up an entirely new and comprehensive system of survivor benefits.

Section 13 is the only provision in the bill which is favored by the Veterans' Administration, and it increases the burial allowance from the present $150 to $200, or an increase of 33 percent. The first-year cost is estimated at $5,500,000, rising to $7,750,000 at the fifth year, with a cumulative cost of $638,000,000 by the year 2000.

The total cost for the first year is $1,282,985,000, $1,805,473,000 the fifth year,

with a cumulative cost of $148,211,000,000 by the year 2000. It is interesting to note that the pension costs for the first year are two-thirds of the total first-year cost of the bill. By the fifth year the pension costs triple the cost of service-connected compensation and for the cumulative cost to the year 2000 the pension costs are 6½ times that of the compensation. From the time of the Revolution until the end of 1955 this Government has spent, for all veterans' purposes, approximately $81 billion. This bill proposes it spend, in the next 45 years, only $15 billion less than double that amount. Out of the total cumulative cost of this bill service-connected veterans and their dependents would receive only one-sixth of what veterans and dependents of nonservice-connected cases would receive.

Title IV contains sections 14, 15, 16, and 17. These relate to repealers and amendments. Section 17 provides that this bill, should it be enacted, would take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask the gentleman, How many of these Spanish-American War widows will be living in the year 2000? The gentleman has increased it to $309 million. It is only $19,473,000 for the first year.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I believe there are 80,000 Spanish-American War widows living today. The cost estimates of VA are based on actuary tables of life expectancy. Of course this group is declining rapidly.

Mr. HOLLAND. You have it from 1956 to 2000.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is the cumulative cost for Spanish-American War widows.

Mr. HOLLAND. They will not be living in the year 2000.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This group will decline each year.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What is the average age of those 80,000 widows today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the Spanish-American War veteran is about 78 and the widow is something less than that, about 76 years.

Projected number of living Spanish-American War veterans,[1] by age group, 1955–75, as of June 30

[Thousands]

Age in years	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
All ages	72	35	13	3	(2)
65 to 69	(2)	------	------	------	------
70 to 74	8	(2)	------	------	------
75 to 79	44	5	(2)	------	------
80 to 84	17	23	3	(2)	------
85 to 89	3	6	8	1	(2)
90 to 94	(2)	1	2	2	(2)
95 and over	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Average age	78.2	82.4	86.6	90.3	------

[1] Service between Apr. 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902.
[2] Less than 500.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It can certainly be presumed that by the year 2,000 many of them are not going to be alive.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I do not think any of them will be living. That is the cumulative cost to the year 2,000.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would not interrupt the gentleman's fine presentation but for one thing. The question of cost is the primary concern before this House and the biggest question mark over this entire matter right now. Like the gentleman, I have been a member of a group that has been seeking to reduce that cost and we are seriously concerned at the cost items given by the Veterans' Administration which have been supplied on this bill. The gentleman a moment ago in response to my question about the cost of this present program by the year 2,000 stated that the $4 billion figure which he supplied was an annual cost figure at that time. He said the present cost is $2,629,000,000 and he estimated that the cumulative cost by the year 2,000 of the present program would be around $70 billion, and the gentleman very frankly admitted that was a wild guess. The gentleman will concede, I hope, if you take $2,600,000,000 and $4 billion and arrive at a rough average figure between those two figures for the 45-year period, you will get a figure of around $3,350,000,000, which is roughly the difference between the $2,629,000,000 and the $4 billion, is that not about right?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That sounds all right to me.

Mr. EDMONDSON. When you multiply $3,250,000,000, average annual cost, by 45, you get a total cumulative cost of the present program of $146,250,000,000 rather than the $70 billion cumulative cost which the chairman supplied a moment ago as an admitted guess on this subject. I only introduce this question to the gentleman for this purpose. I seriously question that you can rely at all upon a 20-year or a 45-year cumulative cost estimate on a program that has such imponderable factors as the level of the national economy, the level of the national income of the people, increasing rates of social security, which would operate to disqualify many veterans being eligible for these pension payments, and many other factors. I think the gentleman will concede that if there has been a 50 percent error in the estimated cumulative cost——

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Surely the gentleman from Oklahoma is not going to expect me in a minute and a half to make a guess and discuss it as an honest guess. These cost estimates have been checked and doublechecked, and if the gentleman has anybody down there to check them and can refute them, I would like to know it. We will give you the name of the company that the Legion hired to check the VA figures, who went away saying they could find nothing wrong with them. I do not know what it would cost some private firm to check the figures, but if the gentleman can get somebody, I think the committee could furnish some funds to get the cost checked. If the gentleman says the present program's cumulative cost is $146 billion and this bill will cost another $148 billion on top of that $146 billion, it seems to me worth checking into.

Veterans in civil life,[1] Apr. 30, 1956

World War II	15,377,000
Korean conflict	[2] 4,564,000
World War I	3,077,000
Prior wars	[3] 128,000
Total	22,291,000

[1] Estimated.
[2] Includes 855,000 who also served in World War II.
[3] Includes Indian wars, Civil War, Spanish-American War, and regular establishment disabled on VA compensation rolls.

Present pension program for World War I, II, and Korean veterans, compared with proposals contained in H. R. 7886 as reported

Existing law	*H. R. 7886 as reported*
Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Same.
Service of 90 days or more	Same.
Income limits of $1,400 and $2,700.	Same.
Less than age 55 (single permanent disability of 60 percent or 2 or more permanent disabilities, 1 of which is 40 percent in degree combined with other permanent disabilities to a total of 70 percent and unemployability attributable thereto).	Same.
Age 55 (single permanent disability or combination of permanent disabilities rated 60 percent and unemployability attributable thereto).	Same.
Age 60 (50 percent rating for single or 2 or more permanent disabilities and unemployability attributable thereto).	Same.
Age 65 (10 percent rating for single or 2 or more permanent disabilities and unemployability attributable thereto).	Presumed to be permanently and totally disabled; no unemployability finding required.
Rates:	
Under 65 years of age or on pension rolls less than 10 years, $6615.	$85
65 years of age or on pension rolls 10 years, $78.75.	$105
Including aid and attendance allowance, $135.45.	$150
Credit for overseas service, no provision.	Rates increased 20 percent for overseas service.
World War I, II, and Korean veterans on pension rolls:	
Number on rolls April 30, 1956	582,000
Average monthly increase during calendar year 1955	5,500
Estimated number on rolls fiscal year 1960 [1]	1,000,000

[1] Source: Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I share the gentleman's apprehension about the cost of the present program. As the gentleman

knows, I will be associated with the proposed substitute. It will reduce the cost of this present bill before the House by over $600 million a year. But, at the same time, I feel that these estimates over a cumulative period of time are subject to considerable question and point to the fact in the instance of the cumulative cost under the present program that there is certainly a wide range of difference in the estimate of the gentleman and the estimate which I have arrived at here by another method of calculation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Now, in today's program for our service-connected compensation cases we have a total of 2,076,026 veterans receiving service-connected compensation today. I am not going to run through all these figures. I believe everybody can see them. The present bill would increase from $17 for 10 percent to $20, and up to 90 percent disability from $163 to $180 and total disability from $181 to $250. I am not going to run through all of those figures and take up the time of the House, but you can see the number of veterans today on the compensation rolls. I am showing these charts merely for the sake of demonstrating that we have a veterans program today that is something to see.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you put those charts in the RECORD?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will be glad to.

Cost projection of existing pension and compensation laws [1]

	Actual 1955	Projected					
		1960	1965	1970	1975	1985	2000
Total compensation and pension	$2,629,000,000	$3,227,000,000	$3,601,000,000	$3,549,000,000	$3,724,000,000	$4,940,000,000	$4,768,000,000
Service-connected compensation, subtotal	1,829,000,000	1,887,000,000	1,897,000,000	1,829,000,000	1,753,000,000	1,498,000,000	1,116,000,000
Disability	1,428,000,000	1,434,000,000	1,394,000,000	1,347,000,000	1,295,000,000	1,133,000,000	859,000,000
Death	401,000,000	453,000,000	503,000,000	482,000,000	458,000,000	365,000,000	257,000,000
Non-service-connected pension, subtotal	800,000,000	1,340,000,000	1,704,000,000	1,720,000,000	1,971,000,000	3,442,000,000	3,652,000,000
Disability	537,000,000	1,024,000,000	1,371,000,000	1,367,000,000	1,633,000,000	3,106,000,000	3,416,000,000
Death	263,000,000	316,000,000	333,000,000	353,000,000	338,000,000	336,000,000	236,000,000

[1] Assumptions:
(1) No change in economic conditions affecting demand and eligibility for Veterans' Administration benefits.
(2) No change in benefit rates, eligibility conditions, or program characteristics.
(3) The Armed Forces to maintain a combined strength of about 3,000,000 men through an annual turnover of 700,000 (current rate).
(4) Persons who enter the Armed Forces after Jan. 31, 1955, to be eligible for only peacetime benefits.
(5) After 1960, that 50 percent of all veterans who are 65 or more years old will receive non-service-connected disability pensions.

Source: Bureau of Budget.

Cost estimate of H. R. 7886

	1st year	5th year	Cumulative cost, year 2000
Sec. 1. Increased pensions for World War I, II, and Korean veterans	[1] $536,150,000	[2] $936,556,000	[3] $86,267,000,000
Sec. 2. Giving World War II and Korean widows same pension rights as World War I widows	126,335,000	218,118,000	36,481,000,000
Sec. 3. Widows' pensions (World War I, II, and Korea) increased from $50.40 to $75; proportionate increase for children	106,427,000	133,549,000	6,507,000,000
Sec. 4. Increasing Spanish War widows' pensions from $54.18 or $67.73 to $75	19,473,000	19,500,000	309,000,000
Total for pension	788,385,000	1,307,723,000	129,564,000,000
Sec. 5. Increasing basic rates of compensation 10 percent, $20; 100 percent, $250	237,197,000	248,482,000	9,280,000,000
Sec. 7. Increases World War I basic rates	13,000,000		
Sec. 6. Increasing statutory awards; raises ceiling on compensation from $420 to $450	$11,141,000	$13,979,000	$482,000,000
Sec. 8. Increases World War I statutory awards	544,000		
Sec. 9. Increases World War I nurse allowance	26,000		
Sec. 10. Increases World War I arrested TB award	2,772,000		
Sec. 11. Increases compensation for veterans with dependents	142,308,000	140,029,000	4,719,000,000
Sec. 12. Increases rate for widows from $87 to $125 monthly; also children and parents' rates	82,112,000	87,510,000	3,528,000,000
Total for compensation	489,100,000	490,000,000	18,009,000,000
Sec. 13. Increases burial allowance from $150 to $200	5,500,000	7,750,000	638,000,000
Total cost	1,282,985,000	1,805,473,000	148,211,000,000

[1] $88,706,000 attributable to 20-percent differential for overseas service.
[2] $183,227,000 attributable to 20-percent differential for overseas service.
[3] $22,829 million attributable to 20-percent differential for overseas service.

Compensation rates for service-connected disabilities—existing law versus H. R. 7886

Type of disability	Rates under existing law	Rates under H. R. 7886 as reported	Service-connected veterans on rolls June 30, 1955
Total on rolls			2,076,026
(a) 10-percent disability	$17	$20	837,981
(b) 20-percent disability	33	40	319,095
(c) 30-percent disability	50	60	305,982
(d) 40-percent disability	66	80	163,803
(e) 50-percent disability	91	100	116,225
(f) 60-percent disability	109	120	88,813
(g) 70-percent disability	127	140	42,726
(h) 80-percent disability	145	160	26,458
(i) 90-percent disability	163	180	7,544
(j) Total disability	181	250	110,772
(k) Loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, rates (a) to (j) increased monthly by	$47	$55	[1] 67,247
Loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by	47	55	
(l) Loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes, or in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	279	300	3,757

[1] Also included in number shown by degree of disability above.

Compensation rates for service-connected disabilities—existing law versus H. R. 7886—Continued

Type of disability	Rates under existing law	Rates under H. R. 7886 as reported	Service-connected veterans on rolls June 30, 1955
(*m*) Loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him helpless, monthly compensation	$329	$350	$1,953
(*n*) Loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation	371	400	335
(*o*) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (*l*) to (*n*), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness, monthly compensation	$420	$450	$3,750
(*p*) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of	420	450	2,619
(*q*) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis	67	75	44,213

H. R. 7886, non-service-connected pension rates versus disability and death compensation rates

	Rates (dollars)
Non-service-connected pension (at age 65, with 90 days' service, no disability and incomes less than $1,400 and $2,700):	
Stateside service	105
Overseas service	125
Service-connected disability compensation:	
30-percent disability	60
40-percent disability	80
50-percent disability	100
60-percent disability	120
Service-connected death compensation—dependents of deceased veteran:	
Widow	125
1 child—mother also deceased	75
2 children—mother also deceased	100

Program for World War I veterans and their dependents

1. Adjusted compensation (bonus):	
Total cost	$3,873,000,000
Average amount	$937
2. Veterans receiving compensation or pension:	
Service-connected compensation ($17 to $420 per month)	231,500
Non-service-connected pension ($66.15, $78.75, or $135.45)	513,400
Current net average monthly additions to pension rolls	5,000
Estimated number on pension rolls fiscal year 1960	[1] 840,000
3. Dependents receiving compensation or pension:	
Compensation:	
Widows	33,800
Children	4,200
Parents	20,100
Pension:	
Widows	299,000
Children	96,000
Parents	----------
4. Medical care:	
In VA and private or State hospitals paid by VA	45,000
In VA domiciliaries and State homes [2]	21,000
5. Insurance:	
Term policies in force	21,100
Permanent policies in force	367,700
Receiving disability income of $5.75 per $1,000 of insurance	24,400

[1] Source: Bureau of the Budget.
[2] Number in State homes estimated.

Program for World War I veterans and their dependents—Continued

6. Rehabilitation:	
Total cost of vocational rehabilitation training program	$644,865,000
Number who received training	180,000
7. Burial allowance of $150.	
8. Preference in Federal employment.	

VA expenditures per serviceman in World Wars I and II (adjusted to 1955 dollars [1])

Item	World War I	World War II
Expenditures per serviceman: [2]		
In fiscal year 1955	$250	$130
Cumulative through June 30, 1955	$7,300	$3,100
Through the 1st 15 years of benefits	$1,900	$3,100
World War I bonus	$1,500	----------
Subtotal	$3,400	----------
Average length of service (months)	12	30
Average age, June 30, 1955 (years)	61.3	36.2

[1] As measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index of Consumer Prices (1947–49=100).
[2] Estimated average expenditures on behalf of World Wars I and II veterans from appropriated funds.

Now, in the present bill, as I said to begin with, my conscience requires me to direct my efforts toward doing something for service-connected before I even consider non-service-connected cases. Under the present bill a non-service-connected veteran age 65 with 90 days' service, not going overseas, meeting the income limit could receive $105, and yet the veteran who was in combat, who had part of his hand shot off, and who has a 50-percent disability would only get $100. We find that kind of disparity all the way through the bill. That is another reason why I could not support it.

Throughout this campaign to increase the non-service-connected pension, there has been the slogan of the World War I veterans that they were the forgotten men. I want to run through the figures to show what World War I veterans have received.

First, World War I veterans received a bonus which cost $3,873,000,000, which was an average of $937 apiece. There are 231,500 World War I veterans receiving service compensation of somewhere between $17 and $420 a month. There are 513,400 World War I veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions. There are 5,000 a month being added to this figure.

It is estimated that on the pension rolls alone by the year 1960 there will be 840,000. Today the World War I veteran's widow receives much better consideration than the World War II or Korean veteran's widow. According to the Veterans' Administration, the pension they receive was equivalent to about $13,806 insurance policy on the day the legislation was passed.

World War I veterans are receiving the same medical care in the domiciliary, State homes and hospitals as all the other veterans. There are 45,000 World War I veterans in the hospitals, 21,000 in the Veterans' Administration domiciliary and State homes.

Also, during the World War I period, we had a vocational rehabilitation training program which cost $644,885,000. And, of course, they receive a burial allowance of $150, and insurance.

There is one other chart to which I wish to call attention concerning how veterans of World War I and World War II veterans, have been treated. You are being told that the World War I veteran is the forgotten man. Statistics furnished by the VA do not substantiate this. In fiscal year 1955, the average per capita expenditure for World War I veterans was $250; for World War II veterans it was $130. The cumulative figures through June 30, 1955, were $7,300, total per capita expenditure for the World War I veteran, and $3,100 for the World War II veteran.

Of course, it has been many years since World War I was over. There is, of course, a great difference between the number of World War I and World War II veterans.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do the figures for World War II veterans include schooling and housing provisions passed by the Congress?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. They include the total cost, the total amount of money spent on World War II veterans.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Including the cost of the provisions of the GI bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes. Of course, you have more World War II veterans that have never received any benefits than you had total World War I veterans.

The next figure, to me, is important. The cumulative cost through the first 15 years of benefits for World War I veterans was $3,400; for World War II veterans, it was $3,100. The average length of service of World War I veterans was 12 months and of World War II veterans

30 months. The average ages are 61 years and 36 years. Viewed on any basis the World War I veteran has shared fully with the World War II veteran.

So far as I can find out, in an honest and sincere effort, that is the situation as far as World War I veterans are concerned. I do not feel they are the forgotten men. There is no question that the programs available for World War II men were certainly greater in number than those available to World War I veterans.

A great deal of the mail which I have received complains that the World War I veteran has not been treated fairly and that the World War II veteran has received a great deal more consideration. It is a fact that the benefits for each of our recent wars are not identical. On the other hand, it is not a fact that World War I veterans have received less consideration from a dollar standpoint than veterans of World War II. There are three primary ways in which the World War I veteran enjoys an advantage over the World War II veteran.

First. Every World War I veteran was paid a bonus which averaged over $900. The total cost of this bonus was $3,873,000,000.

Second. Widows of veterans of World War I may receive a pension upon the death of the veteran, while widows of World War II can receive a pension only if their husband had a service-connected disability at the time of his death. This means that only about 10 percent of World War II widows will be able to qualify for a pension under existing law, while all World War I widows qualify. This pension provision for World War I widows became effective January 1, 1945. Based on the average ages of World War I veterans and widows on the date of enactment, the passage of that legislation by Congress was the equivalent of handing to the World War I veteran a paid up life insurance policy for his widow for $13,806.40.

Third. World War I veterans were granted liberal presumptions of disability following World War I and are protected by a series of protected awards which are favorable to many of those drawing disability compensation.

The same general provisions concerning eligibility for most other benefits, such as insurance, medical and hospital care and burial allowances are available to all war veterans. The veterans of World War II and Korea have received readjustment benefits. It is a fact, however, that there are more veterans of World War II who have never received any readjustment benefit whatever than the total number of World War I veterans. It is a fact also that the average length of service for veterans of World War I was 12 months as compared with 30 months for veterans of World War II.

There are all kinds of inequities in our program today. There are many Members of the House who know I tried to stop the Bradley Commission. The reason I wanted to stop it is because I felt that our committee could work out those inequities and correct a great many of the things that were wrong with the program. I believe those inequities should be taken out of the program.

ABUSES OF THE PRESENT PART III PENSION SYSTEM

First. Pension is now paid to persons in State and Federal prisons. There are numerous cases of murderers, narcotics violators, rapists, and people who have forged Government checks, broken into post offices, or otherwise committed crimes against the Federal Government now drawing the part III pension. Their rate would be increased under H. R. 7886.

Second. There are over 20,000 veterans now in VA domiciliary homes and State soldiers' homes where the Federal Government pays an annual grant, drawing a non-service-connected pension. In the VA domiciliary homes, the Federal Government spends over $100 a month for food, shelter, medical care, and so forth, for the veteran, and then gives him a pension in addition. The veteran who lives outside, with a wife to support, gets only the pension, with no special allowance for dependency. This is not fair.

Third. We are sending about 9,000 non-service-connected pension checks a month to persons in foreign countries. This is about $8 million a year. Most of it goes to noncitizens of the United States or persons who were once citizens and who have given up their American citizenship. Examinations are generally conducted by foreign doctors.

Fourth. The pension system presently in use, based on an income limit, is susceptible to abuse. A veteran can claim his wife for the purpose of using the $2,700 rate for a dependent, yet he is not required to include her income. He may manipulate property and income into his wife's name with practically no control by VA.

Fifth. The sole test of means for a non-service-connected pension is income. We have found numerous cases of veterans who, although they meet the income limit, have very substantial resources. Typical cases are as follows:

World War I veterans (income limits of $1,400 single, $2,700 dependents)

Period of service (months)	Occupation	Amount of pension	Monthly income	Real property	Liquid assets	Other personal assets	Liability	Net worth
16	Retired doctor	$78	$177		$27,000	$1,000		$28,000
14	Retired	78	217		31,289	500		31,789
19	Retired farmer	78	140	$5,200	22,397	1,190		38,787
20	Retired salesman	66	146	16,500	22,448	1,000	$353	39,595
20	Office clerk	66	241	12,000	50,783	2,300		65,088

In these cases, the veteran is considered a needs case for pension purposes regardless of the fact that he has considerable sums of money in the bank.

There are many things about the veterans' program that need to be corrected, and we are trying to correct them. I hope the Members will give serious thought to passing legislation which can become law, and not just pass something for the sake of saying we passed something through this House.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not a fact that effort was made in the committee to bring a compensation bill similar to what the gentleman's substitute is before the House, without its being tied in with any non-service-connected pension program?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There was an attempt in committee to take up a compensation for service-connected disabled bill before we took up a non-service-connected bill, and that motion was voted down. The bill we proposed to take up was more liberal than is the substitute. The substitute is, from what I can find out, the only thing that has a chance on earth of becoming law. There is not as much in it as I would like to put in it. There are many things I think should go in there. But I could not get any kind of agreement or commitment that had a chance of becoming law if it went further than the substitute goes. I will not make myself a party to misleading veterans and dependents that a bill with tremendous costs will be enacted. I am interested in helping those we can and not in misleading others into believing they will get something that has no possible chance.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. In examining the gentleman's charts, and I ask this for information only, I believe there were some 840,000 World War I veterans on the rolls. That is approximately 1 out of every 5, is that about right? I believe the gentleman said there were 4 million World War veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. So 840,000 would be approximately 1 out of every 5 veterans of World War I who are now on the active pension rolls in one way or another.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Actually it is a higher figure than that, because the 4 million was the original figure. There are 3,077,000 living today.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is 1 in 4 instead of 1 in 5.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. The World War II veterans and the Korean veterans number approximately 20 million. What percentage of those men are on the active rolls at the present time?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have forgotten the figure. There were approximately 1,600,000 on the compensation rolls. There are 58,000 pensioners from World War II and Korea. Of course, their age is not nearly as high as that of the World War I veterans.

Mr. SPRINGER. About 10 or 12 percent are on the rolls in one way or another?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is right.

The point I was trying to make is that we have a veterans' program today that is very good, very comprehensive, and it costs about $4.9 billion a year. The committee staff asked the veterans' groups to send out to their service offices and ask them to send us the names of those whom they thought should be on the non-service-pension rolls. We received about 200 cases from the entire United States. That was all we received from all the veterans' groups. Just who are they or where are they?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the committee staff sent out a questionnaire to all of the posts in the United States?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, I did not say that. I said we called representatives from the different veterans' groups to the committee room and asked that they contact their service offices and that they give us the names of the people who they thought should be on the pension rolls and were not on there. From them we received about 200 names, somewhere between 150 and 200.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There was no direct inquiry of that type addressed to the individual posts or to the service organizations by the staff?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No, there was not.

THE POSITION OF VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS ON THE LIBERALIZED NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION (SEC. 1 OF THE BILL)

There is no agreement whatever among veterans organizations as to the merits of on expanded non-service-connected pension system. The Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion have advocated some sort of expanded pension system; however, they are in disagreement as to the provisions of the system and VFW insists that the pension program should apply only to World War I veterans, while the American Legion includes veterans of World War II and Korea. The American Legion has testified that they are opposed to the pension bill sponsored by VFW. The Disabled American Veterans, realizing that greatly expanded expenditures for non-service-connected pensions will, in the long run, adversely affect disabled veterans, have opposed expanded non-service-connected pensions on that basis. Their national commander, appearing before the committee, made the following statements:

Our great responsibility and our primary responsibility is to the veterans and their dependents who were disabled as a direct result of wars themselves. * * * If we go into a general pension plan, it is going to have to be taken away from the service-connected disabled veterans or their widows or orphans. * * * If we are to carry out our mandate, which is to protect the service-connected disabled and their dependents, then we cannot endorse general pension legislation. * * * But proposals now before you force us to protest any law which in effect offers greater consideration and benefits to the admittedly non-service-connected veteran.

AMVETS are in opposition to the non-service-connected pension features of the bill. Their national commander testified before the committee as follows:

These studies have embraced many facets: The present system of pension; the wisdom of the pending proposals; the economic justification; the economic possibility; the effect on the country; and the effect on other veterans benefits. Each of these facets considered separately leave the impression that these pension proposals are unwise. Considered together they leave the overpowering conviction that the proposals must be discarded by the Congress as ideas which appear on the surface to be beneficial but which by every yardstick are designed—in the final analysis—to defeat the very thing they purport to espouse.

* * * Its first-year cost almost approaches the entire amount to be expended this year on the Veterans' Administration hospital program. In future years, it would probably exceed the cost of the hospital program. It would be 10 times as much as the appropriation request for fiscal 1957 to remodel old hospitals and build new ones. It would cost more than 5 times as much as the outpatient program for the treatment of service-connected disabilities. Most important, however, it would increase the compensation and pension appropriation for the next fiscal year by approximately 18 percent without a single penny of the increase going to the veteran who receives compensation for service-connected disabilities. Because no other word is sufficient, we submit that such a proposal is preposterous.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has recognized that the bill before the House is highly questionable and made the following statement in the form of a letter to their national officers regarding its chances of passage:

It is difficult, however, for the VFW to be optimistic enough to believe that the omnibus veteran benefit bill identified as H. R. 7886 will win approval, in its present form, from the House, the Senate, and the President. If the bill, by some miracle, should clear both branches of the Congress it is almost certain to meet a Presidential veto.

H. R. 7886, no doubt, will suffer 1 of 2 alternatives. First, the bill will fail to win approval somewhere along the 3 hurdles previously mentioned or, second, it will be substantially amended or emasculated to the point where there will be little left for any of the intended beneficiaries.

Despite the fact that Members of Congress have received quite a few letters as a result of the letter-writing campaign stimulated by the American Legion, it is apparent that there is not agreement among veteran organizations or the rank and file of veterans regarding the non-service-connected features of this bill. There is certainly a great deal of justification for the position of the Disabled American Veterans that the bill does not deal equitably with service-connected and non-service-connected veterans.

The total cumulative cost of this legislation for the year 2000 has been estimated at $148 billion. Of this amount, $86 billion results from the liberalization features of section 1, the section providing non-service-connected liberalization. If this bill is enacted, a veteran at age 65 with no disability and only 90 days service, meeting the income limits, can receive $105 a month if he had stateside service and $125 if he had overseas service. This compares with the rate of $80 a month for a 40 percent disabled veteran, $100 a month for the 50 percent disabled, and $120 for the 60 percent disabled. A veteran must have a rather severe disability to be rated 50 percent or 60 percent disabled. For instance, if a veteran lost his thumb, index finger and middle finger of his right hand, he receives 50 percent, or, under the bill, $120 a month. If he had frozen feet and lost some of his toes and continues to suffer from persistent severe symptoms of both feet, he is rated 50 percent disabled and under the bill would receive $100. A veteran with a collapsed lung receives $100. These amounts for these severely disabled individuals compare with the $105 which the stateside 90-day soldier would receive under the bill simply by attaining age 65 and having no disability whatever.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE THIS SESSION FOR VETERANS

The way that the pension issue has developed and been placed before the Congress has cultivated the belief that Congress is not doing anything for veterans. That is absolutely not true and I want to review very briefly for you several major pieces of legislation which we have already enacted or will enact this session of Congress for veterans and their dependents.

First. H. R. 7089, the survivor benefit bill: The House has passed this bill and sent it to the Senate. The Senate committee has reported it favorably to the Senate and the President has indicated his approval of the legislation. Undoubtedly this bill will become law this session. It provides very substantial increases in death compensation for several hundred thousand widows and dependent children of all wars. The first year's additional cost of this legislation will probably exceed over $400 million. An example of the increases may be found in the basic rate increase for the widow without a dependent who lost her husband from a service-connected cause. This rate has been increased from $87 to $121.

Second. Public Law 7, the first piece of veterans' legislation passed by this Congress, preserved entitlement to education and training for about 1 million veterans who served during the Korean conflict. The total cost of this legislation is estimated at about $400 million in the first 5 years.

Third. The Congress has passed and has sent to the President H. R. 9824, the orphan scholarship bill, which will provide educational assistance to 156,000 orphaned children of veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea where the veteran died from a service-connected cause. This legislation is estimated to cost in excess of $250 million.

Fourth. The Veterans' Affairs Committee, with the cooperation of the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget and the White House, has developed a long-range renovation, repair and replacement program involving 50 VA hospitals which will extend over a period of about 8 years and ultimately will cost in excess of about a half billion

dollars. The House Appropriations Committee provided the first installment of this program in the appropriations bill this year in an amount in excess of $50 million.

Fifth. There are numerous other smaller pieces of legislation which have been passed by the House and are now pending in the Senate which will cost considerable amounts of money, such as—

H. R. 10542, the bill which will redefine the term "widow" and cost $5,887,000 in the first year.

H. R. 9841, the bill which will give widows consideration on burial costs for their husbands. Exact estimates of the cost of this legislation are not available.

H. R. 735, a bill which would increase the $10 payment now made to individuals awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor to $100. Exact estimates of the cost of this legislation are not available.

H. R. 4006, which is now Public Law 280, raised rates for Korea veterans in the veterans' farm training program at a cost of about $25 million.

H. R. 9922, which grants pensions to veterans suffering from tuberculosis under certain circumstances. Exact estimates of the cost of this legislation are not available.

The mail which I have been receiving urging passage of pension legislation implies that Congress is doing absolutely nothing for veterans. Regardless of the action which the Congress may ultimately take on the bill before us, we have already enacted this session a very generous, far-reaching and costly program of veterans' legislation.

Taxes and cumulative cost of H. R. 7886 as reported

States and Territories	Individual income tax returns filed	Individual income and employers tax collections[1]	Total internal revenue collections	Cost of $148 billion distributed 1st between total of col. B and (C-B) then each column distributed by State		Col. D (individual cost) divided by number of individual returns (col. A)
				Individual	Other taxes	
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F
		Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Alabama	725,908	$270,350	$378,308	$603,599	$241,033	$832
Alaska	(2)					
Arizona	294,134	131,113	167,739	292,730	81,773	995
Arkansas	413,692	121,766	165,901	271,862	98,538	657
California	4,887,393	3,456,777	5,184,128	7,717,802	3,856,585	1,579
Colorado	534,043	509,921	679,509	1,138,479	378,632	2,132
Connecticut	957,833	731,529	1,165,600	1,633,254	969,132	1,705
Delaware	144,356	257,248	779,010	574,347	1,164,916	3,979
Florida	1,136,897	529,431	736,528	1,182,038	462,377	1,040
Georgia	914,382	406,370	648,242	907,285	540,018	992
Hawaii	200,871	92,195	126,340	205,840	76,234	1,025
Idaho	204,435	80,172	108,708	178,997	63,711	876
Illinois	3,783,549	3,135,663	5,440,197	7,000,864	5,145,237	1,850
Indiana	1,558,010	813,443	1,392,666	1,793,814	1,315,534	1,151
Iowa	1,006,880	377,548	534,708	842,936	350,885	837
Kansas	751,375	319,184	485,949	712,629	372,329	948
Kentucky	880,819	294,250	1,342,125	656,960	2,339,547	746
Louisiana	747,379	346,114	547,459	772,754	449,535	1,034
Maine	347,112	111,569	163,374	249,095	115,663	718
Maryland[3]	1,533,958	1,342,004	1,885,606	2,996,236	1,213,678	1,953
Massachusetts	2,018,830	1,195,530	1,791,568	2,669,210	1,330,749	1,322
Michigan	2,599,977	2,340,594	5,672,460	5,225,746	7,438,919	2,010
Minnesota	1,169,722	636,593	1,028,543	1,421,294	875,090	1,215
Mississippi	356,448	107,905	138,671	240,915	68,690	676
Missouri	1,453,254	954,168	1,638,388	2,130,331	1,527,629	1,466
Montana	226,803	90,617	119,953	202,317	65,502	892
Nebraska	515,456	285,529	399,670	637,489	254,838	1,237
Nevada	92,008	63,708	86,831	142,238	51,626	1,546
New Hampshire	224,137	90,342	118,039	201,703	61,838	900
New Jersey	2,272,470	1,267,066	2,016,232	2,828,925	1,672,632	1,245
New Mexico	228,651	90,656	117,744	202,404	60,478	885
New York[3]	6,610,156	6,622,939	12,715,477	14,786,759	13,602,556	2,237
North Carolina	1,142,862	427,560	1,498,115	954,595	2,390,184	835
North Dakota	207,133	53,528	64,107	119,510	23,619	577
Ohio	3,340,069	2,443,280	4,227,591	5,455,009	3,983,757	1,633
Oklahoma	674,579	351,092	644,113	783,868	654,216	1,162
Oregon	598,797	331,503	429,231	740,133	218,193	1,236
Pennsylvania	4,229,668	2,814,694	4,657,505	6,284,250	4,114,374	1,486
Rhode Island	326,836	190,344	274,704	424,973	188,347	1,300
South Carolina	579,910	164,611	242,451	367,520	173,790	634
South Dakota	232,280	60,313	74,560	134,658	31,809	580
Tennessee	928,620	360,412	505,123	804,677	323,090	867
Texas	2,658,636	1,463,527	2,245,297	3,267,556	1,745,425	1,229
Utah	251,418	104,656	153,753	233,661	109,617	929
Vermont	134,234	46,794	64,950	104,475	40,536	778
Virginia	1,140,750	467,344	1,053,921	1,043,419	1,309,626	915
Washington[2]	1,005,152	598,444	846,661	1,336,121	554,184	1,329
West Virginia	579,928	188,391	266,696	420,613	174,828	725
Wisconsin	1,355,702	696,084	1,206,835	1,554,118	1,140,332	1,146
Wyoming	111,257	44,900	57,403	100,246	27,915	901
Total	58,288,769	37,869,770	66,288,692	84,550,254	63,449,746	1,451
Percent		57.12855				

[1] Includes employment taxes since the major portion of such taxes are not reported separately from income tax collections.

[2] Returns filed data for Alaska are included in the Washington figure.

[3] Maryland includes the District of Columbia and New York includes Puerto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield to someone on his side at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 7886, merely liberalizes existing law and increases certain veterans' and survivors' benefits. No new principle is involved.

What amounts to veterans' service-connected disability compensation was first authorized by the Congress on August 26, 1776. Our service pension policy, from which the Nation has never materially deviated, dates from March 18, 1818. Since that date, Mr. Chairman, a grateful Nation has diligently cared for him and his widow and orphans, who has answered his country's call.

The immediate purpose of the bill is to relieve the unemployable group of old disabled veterans of War I. The Congress has heretofore enacted such pension legislation for the veterans of all wars down through the war with Spain. Always the express purpose has been to provide for those unable to engage in gainful employment due to the disabilities and handicaps of advanced age, so that they may not be forced upon the local relief agencies.

Of 4 million veterans who returned from War I, only slightly more than 3 million are now living and they are dying off at an ever-increasing rate; but, Mr. Chairman, of that number, 690,000 now receive compensation of pension which means, of course, that the 690,000 will

benefit only by the reasonable increases provided in this bill.

Let us, however, avoid the ridiculous mistake of assuming that all or even a majority of the 2½ million World War I veterans will claim these benefits. In the first place a goodly number will have retired under various retirement plans. Still another large part will have accumulated enough of this world's goods to live independently during old age.

With these, the Congress need not be concerned. It is to the less fortunate veteran that our attention is now drawn.

Frequently we are asked if all aged veterans could not be covered by the Federal social-security system and retired under the old-age and survivors' insurance plan. The answer is an emphatic "No." In the first place, Mr. Chairman, not more than a majority have worked in covered employment. Since social security did not come into being until 1937, it is obvious that the War I veterans could not have sufficient credits for retirement. This bill, therefore, guarantees the needed reserve of which a distinguished Army general has recently spoken.

Then, of course, there is a philosophy to which, I am happy to say, the Congress has never subscribed. This philosophy holds that the old and indigent veterans be thrown back on the States as beneficiaries of public assistance.

Careful research discloses that there can be no desirable substitute for service-pension legislation. Negligence and indifference on the part of the Government has had much to do with the enactment of every service-pension law.

Over the years hundreds of thousands of service-connected disability claims have been rejected because the veteran could not prove his disabilities have been originated in service, because incomplete medical and casualty records, and frequently no records at all, were available. I doubt if there is a single Member of this House whose office files do not contain many cases denied because of no record.

Mindful of the great number of injustices, the Congress at various times has undertaken to deal with the problems of hardships, borderline cases, and missing records, by the enactment of special pension acts to worthy claimants. In recent years it simplified this program by the enactment of a non-service-connected disability law and certain presumptive legislation. The Reorganization Act of 1946, however, prohibits any further special pension legislation, and the non-service-connected disability law did not meet with public approval so it was abolished in 1933. Presumptive legislation is inadequate in that it is restricted, and perhaps reasonably so, to but a very few major disabilities which by their very nature and development must be presumed to be of service origin.

However, notwithstanding the desire of the Congress to bridge the gaps, presumptive legislation has met with vigorous opposition. In 1933 that opposition became so strong that 29,000 presumptive cases, such as tuberculosis, were dropped from the compensation rolls. I am told that many of those dropped finally died as objects of charity. Some were suicides. The most recent attacks upon the presumptive law were made by a Presidential Commission.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the only sure method of assuring equal justice for all World War I veterans is the enactment of this bill.

Most, if not all, of my colleagues, I am certain, know of the heroic deeds of Sgt. Alvin C. York in War I. The late Gen. John J. Pershing named Sergeant York the outstanding hero of that war, and I assure you there were many more heroes. Sergeant York was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; however, a few years ago, he was denied a pension because he could not establish a service-connected disability. During the war, of course, Sergeant York and thousands of others like him were too busy disposing of the enemy to report on sick call or to bother with military records. No doubt many of you in the House can cite similar cases. No, Mr. Chairman, the men who stood knee-deep in mud and water in the trenches during freezing weather did not have that service placed on their records. There was the little matter of making the world safe for democracy.

A committee amendment equalizes all widows pensions at $75 a month with additional allowances for dependent minor children. Truly this is a step, but only a step, in the right direction. Many of the widows, especially the Spanish War group, are very old and unemployable. They now receive from $54.18 to $67.73 a month. The need for this modest increase is so obvious, I think, as to require no further comment on my part.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is making a very fine speech. With parts of it I agree, with parts I do not agree. I had a letter the other day from a disabled veteran who said that under this bill he, having a service-connected disability rated at 50 percent would get only $100, yet a 90-day veteran with no service-connected disability was getting $105 a month. I know the gentleman, like myself, is anxious to take care of disabled veterans, but how can we justify paying the 90-day veteran $105 a month when the World War II veteran is getting only $100?

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I may say to my friend that what I am fighting for today is to take care of the World War I veterans. If the gentleman wants to bring in a bill correcting the discrimination to which he draws attention let him do so and by all means I will help him. If there are inequities I will help iron them out.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. In the gentleman's fight for the World War I veteran, he is not leaving the Committee with the impression this bill only covers the World War I veterans?

Mr. LONG. No, I am not leaving that impression. The gentleman will notice my speech. I am personally more concerned at this time with World War I veterans.

Mr. AYRES. Furthermore, I do not believe the gentleman intends to leave the impression that the bill, H. R. 7886, is a bill for World War I veterans only?

Mr. LONG. I did not say that. My speech speaks for itself.

Another committee amendment increases compensation payments and provides modest additional dependency allowances. These increases are realistic. Over the years there have been small percentage increases designed to help meet the increased cost of living; but there was no attempt to deal with the basic rates which for many years were known to be inadequate. Veterans' compensation is a sound practical proposition. Like workmen's compensation it is a contractual obligation. When young men and women enter the employ of the Armed Forces, whether voluntarily or otherwise, it is understood that the Government, as their employer, will compensate them for disabilities incurred in the line of duty, and, Mr. Chairman, that has been so since enactment of the first veterans' compensation law in 1776. If the Government is obligated by law to provide such compensation, then is not the Government morally obligated to provide adequate compensation? We have the committee report—Report No. 2302—which sets out both the present and the proposed new compensation rates.

We are not going to beat around the bush. This bill will cost money; but it will not cost anything like the amount some claim.

In keeping with their old habits, and before the ink was barely dry on the committee report, antiveteran propagandists about the country started to generate opposition to this bill. For the most part, they fell back on their same old time-worn high-cost propaganda. While the administration was moving heaven and earth to have some of the $1 billion foreign aid cut restored, their propagandists were voicing the high cost of this veterans' bill.

Billions for foreign aid, but not one dime for the veteran.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we don't have to worry about the cost of this bill. The 1,100,000,000 we cut off the foreign aid bill will more than carry this bill for the first year—but let us carefully consider the cost of this bill and the method of estimating the cost.

Now, it is said, the Veterans' Administration has estimated the first year's cost to be something over $1 billion—$1,282,000,000. While I am sure that figure is too high, I am willing to accept it. In fact, for my part, I am willing that this bill shall rise or fall upon that estimate. True to form, the Bureau of the Budget is against the bill. They say it will cost too much. They try to scare the daylights out of us with fantastic cost projections through the year 2000. Listen to this:

One estimate that I have seen assumes that the 3 million living World War I veterans will all be living in the year 2000 and that every one of them will be on the pension rolls. So the age of miracles has not entirely passed. No indeed. Although they will all be 106 years of age, according to the official prognosis, none

of the 3 million will have died. Mr. Chairman, if that prognosis is carried out to its logical conclusion, it means that in the year of 2000 there will be between 500 and 600 million people in the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, the official actuaries, and estimators are most careful to qualify their estimates and to warn us that they are likely to be off base. Mr. Page of the Veterans' Administration tells us that a long range cost estimate of this nature is subject to considerable question. We know a deviation in any one of these assumptions could have a substantial effect upon the cost of this bill during the coming years. Therefore, this estimate should be used as a very rough estimate only.

Mr. Chairman, it is time, I think, for the Congress to assert itself in no uncertain terms concerning these fantastic statements and forecasts. It has been well said, that a clever man with figures can prove that Hades is an icehouse, and with the same set of figures he can find 6 feet of snow at the Equator.

If the Congress ever starts running its business by such ridiculous charts, we are all likely to end up in a mental institution.

The Bureau of the Budget can always find all the money it wants for an administration project, regardless of the cost. We know that while the many adverse reports on this bill were being prepared, they came up with a 10-year foreign-aid program.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TUMULTY. Has any study been made or any projection been made of how much foreign aid will cost by the year 2000 or aid to Tito by the year 2000?

Mr. LONG. No, but I should say the cost would be in excess of $200 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LONG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for the fight that he has made over the last several years, since he has been in Congress, against this international give-away program that we have been indulging in. I realize that that has no bearing on the merits or demerits, the virtues or the shortcomings of the legislation before us at the moment.

However, I should like to point out for the edification of the House that I requested the Library of Congress some time ago to furnish me certain statistical information comparing the amount of money that we have given away in foreign aid over the last 10 years with the cost of veterans' programs. Amazingly enough I found that we had given away some $51 billion to foreign countries in the last 10 years. The cost of our entire veterans' pension and benefit programs from the Revolutionary War to the present amounted to a little over $93 billion. That means that we have given away to foreign countries in the last 10 years more than half as much as it has cost us to defray all of our veterans' benefit programs from the Revolutionary War to date.

Mr. LONG. I thank the gentleman; that is correct.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlemen 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG. I repeat: Billions for foreign aid, but not one dime for the veteran.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while the administration is engaged in pulling fantastic figures out of thin air, let us consider some actual and official figures, as they appear in the United States Treasury reports.

First—strange as it may seem—the United States has lavished $200 billion on foreign governments and international agencies in the past 42 years.

Second, the total expenditures for all veterans, from our beginning as a Nation to date, is less than $45 billion.

Thus: $200 billion in 42 years for what we now call foreign aid, and what I call giveaway, and $45 billion for veterans in all our history.

Let us examine the figures on foreign aid in broad detail:

Mr. Chairman, since World War II we have spent in round figures some $65 billion for foreign aid. That amount alone, let us note, would almost bear the entire cost of this bill to the year 2000, using the administration estimate. Now, I want everyone to know that these figures do not include any of the billions handed out to Communist Russia, and other countries, during World War II for lend-lease, and so forth; nor do they include the cost of the Korean conflict which we bought and paid for. But what about unpaid foreign loans?

As of this date, Mr. Chairman, 200 foreign countries, including Communist Russia, owe the United States a total of more than $23 billion. Yet I have only hit the high spots on foreign aid. I do not want to burden you further with figures. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] placed a detailed analysis of foreign spending in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time ago, and every Member of Congress, who can possibly do so, should read and study that revealing document.

In the face of these dramatic and overwhelming statistics, I ask how any Member of this House who has approved of this outpouring of America's wealth to foreign nations, can now take it upon his conscience to deny to a single veteran or a needy veteran's widow, the bounty of a grateful nation?

Mr. Chairman, it has been a solemn comfort to stand here today and reaffirm my eternal devotion to the glorious traditions of my country. May those traditions live on unspoiled and uninterrupted.

In 1818, they pensioned the heroic veterans of the American Revolution; in 1889 they remembered and pensioned the Civil War veterans. Just 11 years before they had pensioned the heroes of the War of 1812. In 1887 they likewise pensioned the survivors of the Mexican War. Then in 1920 a distinguished Congress, of which our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], were Members, pensioned the veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. So, Mr. Chairman, the long and unbroken chain of national tradition in this respect is unblemished and without fault.

Mr. Chairman, I shall never forget Pearl Harbor. I will always remember the dark days of Bataan. Where were the antiveteran propagandists while most of our Navy was lying on the bottom of the Pacific? When 12 million young men—the flower of American youth—marched off to put an end to brutal dictatorship, did we hear so much as a dissenting whisper? I can never forget the distressing times of 1917 and 1918 when a despotic emperor had practically brought Europe to her knees and had boasted that his armies and his submarines would conquer the world and that he would hang President Wilson on the highest tree in Washington. Ah, Mr. Chairman, those were frightful days. World morale was at the lowest ebb. But, in quick response to Europe's frantic pleas, and when the Kaiser was knocking at the gates of Paris, literally thousands of raw recruits were rushed to the front to save the day. More than 4 million of America's youth were called to the colors. They were idolized. We could not do enough for our boys.

I remember the awful influenza epidemic—soldiers dying like flies. I remember that these boys received $30 a month over there while war profiteers at home made billions. I remember them as they were demobilized—in a jobless economy. They did not come home to a GI bill; they did not receive unemployment compensation for 52 weeks; they could not attend college at Government expense, they could not get farm, business, and home loans, and their prewar jobs had not been protected.

Then I remember these boys during the dark days of the great economic depression when they came to Washington, hungry and in rags, to beg a few crumbs at the tables of the mighty, and I shall never forget that they were driven out of the city at the point of the Federal bayonet.

Nor shall I forget, Mr. Chairman, those boys as mature men at a much later time. I remember that although the majority of them were past 50, when World War II came, thousands of them entered the Armed Forces a second time to contribute their experience and shed their blood in winning that war.

But most of all, Mr. Chairman, I shall remember those boys today, when my help is most needed, by voting for this bill and, Mr. Chairman, on the final rollcall I hope there will not be a single nay.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana on his fine statement. I think he has been too modest. May I point out to the House that he is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Last sum-

mer between sessions he did a tremendous amount of work to improve the veterans' hospitals over the country. Because of his efforts and the contribution he has made, I wonder if he would like to tell the House in what amount we are supporting the veterans' hospitals and what portion of our Veterans' Administration budget that accounts for.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, at present our hospital program costs about three-quarters of a billion dollars. We have a number of new hospitals started this year. We have about $50 million for renovation and repair in our hospital program. We have a long-range agreed hospital program that will cost about three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Mr. LONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H. R. 7886.

It is my understanding the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans have agreed to a series of amendments that will retain the original intent of H. R. 7886, while at the same time reduce its annual cost from $1,287,000,000 to $679 million. When these amendments are offered, I will support them.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us is nothing unusual. Over a period of years the Congress has been considering legislation designed to provide benefits for the defenders of America in time of war. The only difference between this bill and previous bills is that the House Committee on Veterans Affairs wrapped up in one package a lot of amendments to existing law and sent to the floor of the House this omnibus bill, H. R. 7886.

When this bill was reported by the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, the critics of veterans benefits in general had a field day. They pointed to the annual cost of the legislation forgetting that we have been handing out annually in excess of $4 billion to people abroad, many of whom were on the opposite side of the battlelines when America's veterans were defending our Government and its ideals on farflung battlefronts.

In my opinion, the cost of veterans benefits represents nothing more than an additional cost of war and as long as we wage war, we incur these obligations to the defenders of the Nation.

Many of you know that I have been active in veterans affairs for many, many years. Like the majority of the veterans of the country, I realize that in some instances there may have been benefits received where the recipient should not have received them. In all fairness I think you will agree that in any vast program the human element enters and there are bound to be some mistakes. As lawmakers, we Members of Congress know that such mistakes are bound to occur. Yet, this is no blanket indictment of the program itself but rather an administrative error.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of H. R. 7886 is represented by title 1 and title 2 where the provisions affect non-service-connected and service-connected benefits. Both of these provisions will be fully explained during the course of the debate but I would like to describe the difference between non-service-connected benefits and the benefits paid to service-connected veterans under existing laws.

As an illustration, to be eligible for non-service-connected benefits the veteran must have served in active military or naval service for a period of 90 days or more during World War I and World War II. He must have received an honorable discharge. After meeting these service requirements, the veteran must be rated by the Veterans' Administration as suffering from non-service-connected permanent and total disability not incurred as a result of his own willful misconduct or vicious habits.

After being found permanently and totally disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation, the veteran is not eligible for a pension if his annual income exceeds $1,400 if unmarried, or $2,700 if married or having dependents. I want to emphasize this non-service-connected benefit can only be paid to a veteran of World War I or World War II if he meets the income limitations.

On the other hand, when a veteran draws benefits based on a service-connected disability he receives what is commonly called compensation and not a pension. It is intended to compensate the veteran for that portion of his income that he is unable to earn because of his service-connected disability. This monthly payment of compensation does not require him to be permanently and totally disabled nor does it require him to meet an income limitation. In other words the service-connected veteran can receive his compensation and earn another income at the same time. That is the difference between service-connected and non-service-connected disability.

Those who are making charges that the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, when advocating liberalization of non-service-connected benefits are forgetting the service-connected veteran of this country in plain words do not know what they are talking about.

It was these two great veteran organizations, together with the Disabled American Veterans, which are responsible for conceiving and helping to steer through Congress the schedule of service-connected benefits now in effect. They have never forgotten their obligation to our disabled veterans. I can truthfully say that a great percentage of the veterans today who are drawing benefits for service-connected disability are members of 1 or more of these 3 major veterans organizations. And let me add, they are active members and helped to formulate the program of veterans' benefits as exemplified by the provisions of H. R. 7886.

It might be of interest to state at this point that slightly over 2 million of the 22 million veterans in this country are entitled to service-connected benefits and an additional 600,000 having met the income limitation are receiving non-service-connected benefits based on total and permanent disability. Believe it or not, included among the 600,000 is the outstanding hero of World War I, Sgt. Alvin York, who a few weeks ago was awarded a non-service-connected pension because of the fact that he is permanently and totally disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation. There are many heroes like Sgt. Alvin York who have served their country honorably and who have never received a penny in the form of compensation from the Nation. However, in their declining years under the provisions of existing law, if they are permanently and totally disabled and can meet the income limitations, they are entitled to a non-service-connected pension of $66.15 monthly.

Mr. Chairman, I have been speaking about existing laws and I would like to comment now on H. R. 7886. If title I of H. R. 7886 becomes a law to be entitled to a pension of $85 monthly, a veteran of World War I, World War II, and Korea will have to be declared permanently and totally disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation. However, if he is 65 years or over he is deemed to be permanently and totally disabled. This is the major change in existing law.

Under title II of H. R. 7886, increases in the rates of service-connected compensation are provided, ranging from 10 percent to 15 percent. In addition to the liberalization of benefits to the service-connected and nonservice-connected veteran, the bill provides for increases in basic pension rates for widows and other dependents.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning of my statement I intended to support H. R. 7886 as it will be amended by the amendments proposed by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the United Spanish War Veterans who through their membership in excess of 5 million veterans and some 27,000 posts scattered throughout the Nation constitute a real voice for the veteran population of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to emphasize the sincerity of those who speak for the great veterans organizations who are supporting H. R. 7886. It is my fervent hope that the House of Representatives will accept their amendments to the bill so it may be approved and sent to the Senate without further delay.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman refers to the Dorn amendment, I assume.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that today men 65 years of age cannot readily get a job.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is true. We had a recent report submitted to the Congress which showed that three-quarters of those men over 65 had incomes of $1,500 and less annually.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not also true that this will take care of the many men who did not ask for service-connected disability earlier because they thought they could get along without it, and now they find they cannot,

and they cannot establish service connection because they cannot get the evidence? It will help out a great many very unhappy disabled men.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentlelady is correct. There are many veterans today who will receive non-service-connected benefits, who have had claims pending for years and years with the Veterans' Administration, attempting to establish service connection and have been unable to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also there are many who did not want to ask for service-connected disability although they had it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Today they cannot get the evidence. It is easy to say you will help men get compensation, but just try it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. People have died, the records have been destroyed. It will pick up those cases and it will fill a very great need of most deserving men.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think it might be well to add that the average age of the veteran of World War I today is about 62. Here it has been stated that 5,000 veterans of World War I are being added to the non-service-connected pension roll of the Veterans' Administration. We should also say that about 9,000 World War veterans are dying every month.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And World War II veterans are dying very fast.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to inform the House of the patriotic service of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers in providing 24,500 free recordings for distribution to radio stations and so forth of the song Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag as it was rendered in this Chamber on Flag Day last year by the Air Force Band and the Singing Sergeants, and this year, in a more lengthy arrangement, by the Marine Band and the Inter-Service Choral Group.

This distribution will be made through the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. Each Congressman will receive 50 records—each Senator 25.

I am today submitting a House concurrent resolution which would authorize accepting without cost to the United States copies of the recording Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. This measure further provides:

The copies of such recording shall be distributed by each Member of the House of Representatives and each Senator, for use for nonprofit purposes, to radio and television stations located within his constituency, and to such other persons, groups, organizations, and institutions as he deems appropriate for the purpose of providing the widest possible dissemination of this patriotic musical composition.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for instigating the very beautiful services on Flag Day this year and last year. I have never attended a more moving or beautiful service than the one this year marked by his fine speech, the beautiful singing of the Interchoral Group, and the thrilling playing of the military band. They are things to be remembered, and it seems particularly fitting that it should be brought up at this time when we are considering legislation to aid the men who have paid so dearly for their flag.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to pay tribute to the fine chairmanship capabilities of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. Although many of us may disagree at times, and in particular at this time, with programs he may suggest, nevertheless the fairness he shows in his committee, his outstanding leadership, his companionship, and comradeship are appreciated by all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I first became interested in veterans' matters in the year 1919 at the close of the First World War. Although I do not pretend to be an expert on any of these problems, nevertheless I have my responsibility in this legislation and have made studies as time has permitted, concerning the problems presented.

The first obligation of the veterans' organizations, to which I belong, is to the care for the disabled veterans and their dependents, and to the care of the dependent survivors of deceased veterans. If that policy were not followed in this legislation I would, of course, be most hesitant in supporting it. However, because of the failure of the recogoganized veterans' organizations to recommend priority of consideration of veterans' legislation it was necessary for us to report out a bill which was before the committee and then amend that bill so that the equities of the needy veterans and those dependent upon them could be properly considered. It is because of such situations that we have the omnibus bill before us and it is only fair to advise my colleagues at this time that I intend to support what is known as the Dorn proposal, provided it is offered during the consideration of this bill.

The principle that those who defended their community and Nation in time of war or emergency are entitled to special attention was first established in the days of the Plymouth Colony. Those hardy souls of yesterday decreed that anyone who defended the colony against hostile natives should be entitled to assistance from the colony in the event he became unable to provide for himself or for his dependents.

This principle of recognition by the community of those who defended the body politic has prevailed throughout the history of our Nation and has taken a variety of forms over the years—pensions, compensation, hospitalization, preference in land or jobs, and later, benefits like educational aid and job training and home and business loans.

Originally, there was little distinction between pensions and compensation. Payments to veterans were originally termed pensions whether based upon need or upon a service-connected disability. In recent years, a specific distinction has been made between these two terms. Compensation is defined as a payment for a disability having a service connection, while pension payments are for those disabled outside of the service by accident, disease, or old age.

The increasing number of veterans in the country has created some concern. Just 100 years ago, veterans constituted just about 1 percent of the population. Today the veterans constitute nearly 15 percent of the total population. Some thus think that the Nation can no longer afford pensions and that we must confine our rewards to those who suffered some service-connected disability, survivors of the service deceased, or of those who according to some statistics which have come to my attention, in 1890 the national income was $10,701,000,000. The veterans' benefits as of that year were $106 million or 99 one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total national income.

In 1953 the national income was $306 billion. The veterans' benefits at that time were 78 one-hundreds of 1 percent of the total national income for that year.

Here are some other figures. In 1890 the national income as published in Historical Statistics of the United States by the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, was $9,700,000,000. The total expenditure of appropriated funds, in that year, by the Bureau of Pensions, Department of the Interior and the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was $112,600,000 or 1.2 percent of the national income.

In 1953, the national income according to these statistics was $303,600,000,000 and the total expenditure of appropriated funds by the Veterans' Administration was $4,354,200,000 or 1.43 percent of the national income.

It may be noted that the figure first given as the amount spent in 1890 for veterans' benefits, $106 million, represents the approximate amount expended in that year for compensation and pensions, not taking into consideration the additional benefits which servicemen were entitled to in 1953.

Here is another figure that is more or less enlightening to those who say we cannot afford the cost of this program. The national income in 1900 was $14,550,000,000. The veterans' benefits in toto in 1900 were $141,912,000. The Federal appropriation in 1900 was $429,382,585, or, in other words, one-fourth of the

Federal appropriation in 1900 was spent for veterans' benefits.

The reason I have used the dates of 1890 and 1900, especially the latter, is because of the expiration of similar periods of time corresponding to those periods of time expiring since the ending of the recent war.

I posed this question recently to an old World War I friend, rather used by time and tide, and I liked his answer, which I will translate into parlor English. He said, "We cannot afford wars either—but we have them." As to cold economic measures, we can "afford" it, that is, veteran's benefits. We are spending no more presently percentagewise for pensions and compensation than we did 100 years ago when our veteran population was just barely 1 percent. We have to add our aid-to-schooling and our loan programs to make our present veteran benefits a greater percent of taxes collected than the amount of such benefits of yesterday. I am sure that we are all agreed that both our education and our loan programs are actually paying their own way.

There is also the assertion that only service-connected benefits should be paid because military service is stated by some to be an obligation of citizenship and should not be the basis for future benefits. This makes a more appealing argument than cost alone.

I agree that military service is an obligation of citizenship and that each citizen mentally and physically fit should serve as called. However, not all are called and of those called not all serve. It thus remains that those who are called and who do serve perform a service beyond the normal duties of the usual citizen. This clearly establishes their right to turn to the community in time of dire need as veterans and not as charity patients at the lowest level of bare bones existence. Unless and until we have in fact a universal service of not only men but of money, there will remain a clear and separate category of citizen and that will be composed of those who served his fellow citizens upon call in defense of the citizenship and freedom of all.

There is much confusion concerning the conditions for payment of pensions and the requirements contained in the pending bill. The term "general service pension" has been loosely used to describe the pensions of this bill and of existing law. I am sure that my colleagues know that H. R. 7886 is not a general service pension bill, but rather a reasonable liberalization of the existing part III non-service-connected pension program which applies to veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea. A general service pension would grant pensions to veterans at some given age so long as they met the minimum service time. Part III pensions, here proposed for liberalization, involve and require age, disability, employability, and income conditions before the veteran can qualify. H. R. 7886 continues all of these conditions with the exception of disability and employability at age 65. A low-income limitation is imposed at all times. No veteran in comfortable circumstances will be able to qualify for this pension except by use of fraud.

It is my judgment that the aging group of World War I veterans will be the last group requiring large-scale pension assistance, and that our expanding economy, with better pension and retirement programs for workers, including social security, will largely eliminate the need for pension assistance to veterans of World War II and Korea. With income limitations attached as a condition of payment, we need have no fear that the cost of the pension program will zoom to fantastic proportions.

Payment of compensation and pensions today requires approximately the same percentage of national tax receipts as it did 100 years ago—4.3 percent. It requires a smaller percentage than that of the thirties when such programs ran about 10 percent of Federal tax receipts. This reduced percentage of our tax receipts, going for compensation and pensions to veterans, is all the more significant when we note that veterans and the survivors of deceased veterans represent about 15 percent of the total population, compared to about 3.8 percent when the proportionate costs were higher.

I hope my colleagues will continue to honor our Nation's traditional policy of a return of consideration for those who have served the Nation in its hour of need. I feel that the modest revisions of this bill can be sustained by our economy, and I am convinced that our growing economy will bring a gradual lessening of the pension needs in the future. This legislation is worthy of our support.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to stress briefly a point which I feel to be of great importance.

I think we all agree that it is not only our duty, but our privilege to provide generous and liberal benefits for veterans who were disabled in the line of duty and for their widows and orphans. Furthermore, I am in full accord with the principle of an adequate assistance program in the matter of veterans loans and for educational benefits.

It seems to me that all of these benefits to which I have referred must be distinguished carefully from non-service-connected pensions. If we go too far in this latter category, our whole veterans benefit program will be threatened. We are involved with a basic consideration. That is, to what extent should an American citizen who served his country in the military service, but who was not injured, be considered as being in a special category apart and separate from other American citizens who for reasons of age, physical disability, or for some other cause did not serve their country in uniform. It is argued that there is an important distinction based upon the financial sacrifices which those in service made. It is asserted that this time spent in the service of his country had a serious detrimental effect on the veteran's future earning power and should entitle him to special privilege and consideration.

A study was made within the last year or two by the Bureau of the Census on this subject. A national sampling was made among veterans of all wars on a nationwide and scientific basis. Seven thousand one hundred veterans were asked this question: "Looking back, how has the time you spent in the Armed Forces and the training, skills, and the experience that you acquired there, affected your employment and progress in civilian life?"

The answers are quite illuminating. They were: First, 14.7 percent answered that they were helped considerably, second, 26.2 percent said that the military service had been of some benefit, third, 50.1 percent said there had not been much effect either way, fourth, 2.7 percent said that the military service was a temporary handicap but that what had been learned helped in later years, fifth, only 6.3 percent said that the military service had been a real handicap or disadvantage which had affected their employment and progress after return to civilian life.

To summarize, 50 percent of the veterans said that the military service had had no substantial effect on their later civilian lives. Approximately 41 percent said that they had actually been benefited by their military experience, and only 9 percent said that they had been handicapped either temporarily or permanently.

I feel that it is of great importance that we provide more adequate benefits for those who were disabled in defending our country. I am convinced that the great majority of our veterans do not feel that any general increase in non-service-connected pensions is desirable or necessary. To make such provision would not only threaten but in all probability would destroy any possibility for the types of compensation increases which have been recommended by all of the veteran's organizations.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I take this occasion to commend the gentleman on a very forthright, persuasive statement. I think in these times when we are in an election year it requires some degree of courage to make such a statement. The gentleman certainly should be commended for the stand he has taken.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have the deepest and the greatest respect and affection for the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas. I do not believe I have a closer or a dearer friend in the House of Representatives. It is not a pleasant thing to take issue with him at any time on any matter.

I do believe, however, that we have a situation before us in the House today in which two extreme positions are being taken, and in that there is the necessity for give and take on either side in order to achieve legislation worthy of this

House and adequate to meet the problems which we are called upon to deal with at this time.

I think one extreme poistion, one which is believed in ardently, firmly, and enthusiastically by its supporters, is the position in support of H. R. 7886 as it was originally presented to the House. H. R. 7886 has many fine features as it was originally presented, and it is capable of being defended eloquently, as was done by the gentleman from Louisiana.

I know my good friend, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, spoke ardently and eloquently for the bill as it was introduced in the committee. I know she believes fervently and with deep sincerity that it is fully justified as it was originally written.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, he knows I am very much in favor of doing something for our veterans. I cannot speak for anyone else here, but I for one could not possibly have voted for the Foreign Aid bill without doing something for our veterans in this country, the men and the women who make possible foreign aid for other countries.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I did not believe I was misrepresenting the gentlewoman on this point, and I appreciate her confirmation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I state how much I have appreciated working on the committee with the gentleman, and how helpful he was during the time I was chairman. He never failed to respond. I admire his integrity and his ability tremendously.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I appreciate the kind remarks of my colleague.

I think there is another extreme of opinion with regard to this legislation, an extreme believed in no less fervently, and with no less complete honesty, integrity, and conviction, and that is the position which has been taken almost from the start with regard to this legislation by my good friend, the gentleman from Texas. That is the position that we should proceed to enact legislation liberalizing and increasing the payments for service-connected disabled veterans—period.

The gentleman of course has also supported many other fine pieces of legislation regarding medical care, hospitalization, and many other things of great benefit to the veteran population of our country. I do not believe any single individual is a stronger champion of the veterans of this country or a stronger and more sincere believer in his convictions on the subject than my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. He represents a point of view that we should not take action at this time for the non-service-connected veterans, that we should not take action at this time for the widows and the orphans of the non-service-connected veterans who have died. He takes the position apparently, and I hope I am not misrepresenting his position, that before we do anything about these things, we must first of all see that we have an increase for service-connected disabled veterans. That is an honest position and I know he is sincere in taking that position and I know he is conscientious when he argues it and when he offers to this House the Teague substitute proposal, which will be offered before we are through.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Oklahoma. Of course, I am disturbed in many more ways than just the ways that the gentleman has mentioned. For example, today we are drafting young men and we send them to Okinawa and Korea and all over the world for 2 years. They come out with peacetime veterans' status and receive no pensions at all. Yet, we take millions of men from World War I and World War II, many with short periods of service, who did not make as much of a contribution and did not go overseas and have not done as much as some who are now eligible for pensions and all benefits that we have now. There are so many phases of our whole veterans' program that need to be straightened out before we pass any such bill as we are considering here today.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman makes a very good point and I would agree with him wholeheartedly that there is need for a reexamination of our present policy with regard to men in the service who served for long periods of time away from their families overseas. The plain fact of the matter is, as the gentleman knows, that some of those men are actually undergoing some of the hazards of war or of near war a this time. I do think that is a problem also that we will have to approach and deal with before we can wash our hands of the veterans' problem in this country. But the subject matter before us is the question of taking care of non-service-connected veterans, particularly of World War I and also of World War II and Korea who are qualified for this pension by reason of age or by reason of total disability.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Does not the gentleman from Oklahoma think that it might be fair to also say that the gentleman from Texas is somewhat disturbed about the cost of this program? We have had various estimates here ranging anywhere from $77 billion to approximately $300 billion. Do you not think the gentleman in fairness, should say that is one of the objections of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that is quite accurate. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Florida as well as the gentleman from Texas for the attention which they have given in committee, and in the committee report to that particular question.

For my own part, I am convinced that most of the Members of the Congress of the United States are in favor of some increases in rates of compensation and also in pensions for American veterans. I believe that most Members of the Congress are in favor of increases for widows and for children and that the Members are in favor of dealing fairly and equally with the veterans of all wars and with the widows and dependents of all veterans—something that is not being done under existing legislation and something that will not be done under the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Texas. I believe also that most Members are in favor of some liberalization of existing pension laws to take care of the needy veteran who is permanently and totally disabled either by reason of blindness or other physical or mental disability or advanced age.

I believe in conditions of blindness or conditions of mental or physical disability or at the present time where they are unable to carry on a gainful occupation to make a living for themselves and their family, it is the feeling of this Congress that the veteran should be provided for in some way by his Government. It has always been the feeling of the Congress of the United States that that should be done in previous wars and I, for one, see no reason why is should not be the feeling in this year of 1956.

All of these things are provided for in House Resolution 7886. They are also provided for in the substitute which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] will offer a little later in the proceedings on this bill. It is, perhaps, unfortunate from the standpoint of some features of this bill that they are so combined. I have heard some Members say that they would vote for a World War I pension provision, if it were alone, but they could not support other features of this bill. I have heard others say they would vote for a provision providing increases for those service-connected cases if they were standing alone, but they would not vote for other parts of this bill.

In the Veterans' Affairs Committee, as the chairman knows, there was a series of prolonged disputes on the question of priority for legislation, with some Members contending that this question of pension liberalization was much more acute from the standpoint of hundreds of thousands of World War veterans than any other question today. There were others who believed there should be no pension law change until the compensation for service-connected cases had been increased. It was this dispute on priority of legislation more than any other factor which led to a substantial amendment of House Resolution 7886 as it was originally introduced by the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Rightly or wrongly, it was the conclusion of some members on the committee, and I think I would safely say a majority of the committee, that the only solution to the roadblock that was present in the committee, a roadblock of priority and its determination, was to combine in one bill the most important provisions for increased pensions and modification laws.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If there was ever any roadblock in the committee I did not know where it was. There were 121 pension and compensation bills. We were attempting to decide which to consider, and it was finally decided by the

will of the committee. The committee voted to consider the nonservice-connected matter ahead of compensation. If there was any roadblock, I do not know where it was.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman interpreted my remarks as any criticism of him, it was not so intended, and my subsequent remarks will explain just what I mean.

An important factor in this conclusion about the roadblock in priority was the strong belief that any pension bill would be doomed to legislative death if we gave it priority over needed legislation for service-connected disabled veterans and their dependents. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I do not want to be in the position of coming to this floor and being compelled to justify that kind of priority against attacks which could be expected on this floor for giving it that kind of priority.

At this point I would like to set the record straight on one point with regard to responsibility for the amendments which were added to H. R. 7886. At least one well-known veterans' publication has charged that the chairman of our committee engineered those amendments in order to defeat H. R. 7886. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], is not a man who is in need of defenders from any quarter. His great war record, second to none among the membership of this House, is ample proof of his ability to fight his own battles, and to fight them well. Nevertheless, I cannot stand by as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, with some knowledge of the amendments in question, without challenging this unwarranted accusation against our chairman. The plain fact is that a majority of the amendments adopted in the committee were offered to the committee by members who are in favor of H. R. 7886 and who were seeking in the committee to help the bill rather than to harm it, and a majority of those amendments, in all fairness to him, were opposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who is chairman of our committee. I do not believe that "TIGER" TEAGUE had any more to do with engineering the present composition of H. R. 7886 than he had to do with the Battle of the Alamo down in Texas, and I feel sure that he would rather be associated with the latter event.

On the other hand, the chairman of our committee, and many other committee members, during the past week have participated in a series of conferences, seeking some kind of a reasonable compromise to this particular piece of legislation. The principal reason why a compromise was sought is rather self evident. The cost figures which were presented by our chairman, and on which I intend to comment further in a few minutes, were being given very wide publicity throughout the country. The cost figure, when you view the entire bill from section 1 through section 17, as it was reported out of the committee, was an alarming thing to contemplate, and I am sure many Members of Congress shared the feeling of alarm in connection with this overall cost picture; particularly when we were presented with a projection to the year 2000 which appeared to be astronomical in connection with this legislation.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I listened with great interest to the gentleman when he spoke a moment ago of certain suggestions that had been made that possibly in one form or another there might be a failure of this legislation to become law. As the gentleman well knows, of course, and we all know, any legislation that is passed here goes to the other body and must be acted upon there, and then if it is to become law it is subject to action by the President. I just want to say to the gentleman that I, speaking for myself only, and firmly convinced that if the original bill were to be enacted by this body, or even the substitute to which the gentleman has referred, I am quite convinced that it never would become law. So I think we ought to take a very good look at something that is realistic and that would do the things that need most to be done yet have a reasonable chance of finally becoming law.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman is certainly entitled to his opinion on that score, and I am quite sure that he will have some influence on whatever decision is made by the gentleman in the White House with regard to this piece of legislation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I think what the gentleman from Indiana is saying is that if we do not enact a reasonable bill we are then going to lose the features of this bill which would grant increased disability payments for service-connected disability and other good features of this legislation; and if the bill as presented is not amended we are going to wipe out the chances of having any kind of reasonable bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am in agreement with the gentleman that we need to have a reasonable bill, but we are not in agreement as to what is a reasonable bill or what the features may be that would provide a reasonable substitute.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I wonder if the gentleman is assuming that there is any possibility of the provision he intends to offer being considered by the other body? I realize that we do not agree on that, but we must remember that our committee has sent 15 bills to the other body and thus far none of them has been considered.

Bills pending in Senate

Bill No.	Subject	Passed House	Senate committee
H. R. 735	Pension—Medal of Honor	June 22, 1955	Finance.
H. R. 1614	Compensation—Statutory awards combined loss of eyes and limb	Jan. 16, 1956	Do.
H. R. 1821	VA checks forwarded to addressees	do	Do.
H. R. 2845	Compensation—Loss of buttocks	May 7, 1956	Do.
H. R. 5055	Cadets and midshipmen—Veterans' benefits	Jan. 17, 1956	Do.
H. R. 7144	Statutory awards—No application	May 7, 1956	Do.
H. R. 8458	Compensation—Eligibility—Spanish War widows	do	Do.
H. R. 9841	Pension—Income limitations	do	Do.
H. R. 9922	Pension—TB—Permanent—total	do	Do.
H. R. 10046	Uniformity in compensation	Apr. 16, 1956	Do.
H. R. 10441	Restriction of insurance application—Soliders' and sailors' civil relief.	May 7, 1956	Labor.
H. R. 10542	Widows' benefits—Eligibility	May 24, 1956	Finance.
H. J. Res. 110	Pension—Moro Province	Aug. 2, 1955	Do.

If they will not pass those, then it is impossible for me to believe that they would even consider what the gentleman is proposing that the House pass today.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman certainly is better informed as to what the Senate will do than I. I would not presume to say what the other body will do or what the President of the United States will do. I think, however, that our primary responsibilities in this House are discharged when we review the problem carefully and do that which we as Members of the House of Representatives think we should do with regard to the problem.

Of course there is speculation as to what will be done in the White House and in the other body, but I would still be interested in knowing if there is any communication from the President of the United States in which he indicates that he will not agree to a reasonable compromise of this bill with regard to non-service-connected pensions for veterans and their widows and their orphans. If the President is prepared to take a stand on that I think it could be most illuminating in connection with this debate and of great interest to all of us here in this House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the gentleman heard the letters I read from the President in committee which pointed out that he felt that all the veterans' problems need to be reviewed and that it should be done in the very near future. I think the President has taken a very firm position in this whole affair.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Am I right when I state that the Veterans' Administration, speaking for the executive department has entered its objection to practically all of the bills that have been before our committee?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is correct, and I think the gentleman from Texas, when he speaks of opposition from the administration to these

bills, will have no difficulty recalling that is correct; that is, that the administration, speaking through the Administrator or his various representatives, has taken a position against practically every bill in support of the veterans which has been passed in this Congress thus far.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. In view of the fact the matter has been brought up as to just where one of the greatest soldiers we ever had and a gentleman who is respected throughout the world stands on this matter, and I refer to the President of the United States, I have a copy of a letter sent to me which the President sent to the chairman of the committee. I would like to read it with the gentleman's kind permission.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman not wait until his own time?

Mr. AYRES. Time is unlimited for the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Unless the letter relates to the Dorn substitute specifically, I would like to request that he hold it for his own time. If it relates to the Dorn substitute I shall be glad to have the gentleman read it.

Mr. AYRES. It does not mention the Dorn substitute, but it does refer to the essence of the Dorn substitute. I will be glad to read it when I take the floor.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to remind the Members of the House that 2 years ago it was stated the President would veto the so-called pension bill. But the President did not veto that bill. He signed the bill and I am firmly of the conviction that today if the pension bill is passed by itself, the President would sign it. I do not believe for 1 minute he will veto this bill. I have not always agreed with the President, he does not agree with me oftentimes, but I am absolutely sure he will sign this bill. If passed separately, and, of course, with the compensation features, I think he would be more apt to sign it. We have proof of what he did in the past. I do not think we like his message very well. He said he did it reluctantly, but still he signed it and I am sure he will sign this.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, speaking of the conferences that have taken place in recent days in regard to arriving at some reasonable modification of the bill reported by the committee, may I say that in these conferences there was not only participation on behalf of a large number of the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee but there was also participation and exchange of views and information from the national commanders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and representatives of the national commanders of the Disabled Veterans and of the Spanish-American War Veterans. The proposal which will be offered by the chairman of the subcommittee on compensation and pensions has been given the support, somewhat reluctantly but nonetheless support—and I think you will see evidence in writing of that support before the day is ended—of the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and of the commander of the American Legion. We have also been assured that a telegram will be received expressing support for the proposal by the commander of the Spanish-American War Veterans. With regard to the section on compensation, we have been told that the figures contained in the compromise proposal are acceptable to the responsible leaders of the Disabled American Veterans. I am aware of the fact that the Disabled American Veterans are possibly a little bit more pleased by the provisions of the bill which will be offered as a substitute by the gentleman from Texas. It is slightly higher on 100 percent disability payments, by $5, than is the substitute proposal. Aside from that 1 difference the increases in the two bills for disabled veterans are substantially the same.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman states that the Disabled American Veterans are for the compensation portion of the bill. Is the gentleman saying they support the Dorn amendment or do not support the Dorn amendment?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am not saying they support the Dorn amendment or that they favor in any way the nonservice-connected pensions. When that matter was discussed they said they were interested only in the features of the amendment with regard to disabled veterans and they would give their opinion on those.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Has the Disabled American Veterans taken a position supporting the Dorn amendment?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would be very much surprised if they were taking a position in favor of nonservice benefits, and I am not aware of any position they have taken in the matter.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. You do not anticipate getting any approval from the AMVETS organization for the Dorn proposal?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, I am not prepared to discuss the AMVETS position. Perhaps the gentleman can enlighten us on the subject when his time comes along. But, I have not been in communication with AMVETS regarding this proposal.

Mr. AYRES. All Members of Congress have received a letter stating their position, and according to that letter they would be against the Dorn proposal.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, since the Dorn proposal was not finalized until this morning, I am a little amazed to hear that they were able to send a letter to every Member of Congress stating their position. But, if the gentleman says it has been done, I will accept it.

Mr. AYRES. I do not think it was quite as secret as you may believe.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman may remember that 2 years ago the Disabled American Veterans urged the President to sign the so-called pension bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentlewoman is possibly correct on that.

At this point I would like for a moment to discuss the principal provisions of the Dorn substitute to bring to your attention some facts regarding the cost estimates of this particular piece of legislation. The proposed amendment is offered as a compromise revision of H. R. 7886. I might say to the membership that there are copies of the Dorn amendment on the committee tables at either side of the House for your examination if you would like to look at it and follow it as I make this explanation of it.

Title I in the Dorn proposal corresponds to Title I in H. R. 7886 in that it deals with nonservice-connected pensions for veterans and for their widows and for their orphans and also with the problem of increases in pensions for Spanish-American War widows.

Title I, section 1, continues the principle which already has been written into law that all war veterans who are permanently and totally disabled to the extent that they cannot follow a substantially gainful occupation shall be entitled to a pension, subject to income limitations, and further provides that a war veteran, age 65, who has income below a certain annual figure—those figures remain at the present level of $1,400 without dependents and $2,700 with one or more dependents—shall be qualified for such pension. The proposal establishes rates for these pensions at $75 or at $90 when the veteran has received the pension for 10 consecutive years or is 65 years of age. Now, that is a change from $66.15 in the case of the $75 figure, and from $78.75 in the case of the $90 figure. It further provides for an increase in the pension for helpless or blind veterans requiring attendants from $135 to $150 per month.

It also provides something for which the Veterans of Foreign Wars have been contending for a long time, that otherwise qualified veterans with 30 days or more of overseas service shall be entitled to a pension increase of 10 percent. Now, that is a reduction of one-half from the differential that was provided in H. R. 7886 originally as it was adopted by the committee. It cuts the cost of that particular aspect of the bill in half.

The VA cost estimate of H. R. 7886, section 1, which has been given great publicity and about which I want to comment further in a minute, was $536,150,000 for the first year of operation, to be graded upwards in succeeding years. The VA has supplied to the Veterans' Affairs Committee the first year's cost estimate for the Dorn amendment of $367,958,000, or a reduction in cost of $168,192,000.

Section 2 provides something that most of us have felt for a long time was

long overdue. It places the World War II and Korean war widows and orphans on an equal pension basis with World War I widows and orphans. The VA estimated the cost of that originally at $126,335,000 in the first year. In view of reductions in the succeeding section of the substitute, they estimate the cost under the Dorn amendment at $92,225,000 or a reduction of $34,110,000 on this item under the Dorn substitute. Section 3 increases the rates of pensions for widows and orphans by 10 percent, adjusted to the nearest dollar. The cost of that was estimated by the VA at $106,427,000 on the original H. R. 7886 amendment adopted by the committee. This reduction provided in this substitute is a very substantial reduction. It cuts the increases which were placed in effect by the committee amendment to almost one-fifth the figure provided in the committee amendment, making the cost of the Dorn amendment as calculated by the VA on this particular section $19,857,000, an overall cut for this particular section of $86,570,000.

Section 4 is the Spanish-American War widows section. Originally, the amendment which was adopted in the committee provided for an increase on this particular point of approximately $15 across the board for Spanish-American War widow pensions. The Dorn amendment reduces that to approximately $10 across the board, reducing the cost from $19,473,000 to $12,983,000, or a cut of $6,491,500.

This adds up to a total reduction of title I sections—on the 4 sections in title I, of $295,363,500. Those are the cuts accomplished thus far in the first 4 sections.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to get a figure that I failed to catch. In title I, section 1, what is the reduced cost?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Title I, section 1, cost as estimated by the VA is $367,958,000, a reduction of $168,192,000 below the original figure.

Moving on to title II, which deals with your service-connected disabled veterans, I might say at this point that I doubt very much if there is more than 1 percentage point difference in the cost of this section in the Dorn substitute and the cost of the section as it is supported by the chairman of this committee. If it is more than 1 percentage point, then I have not correctly understood the substitute which the chairman will offer.

The cuts which were agreed to by the veterans' organizations and supported with reference to this title create the following cost figures today as compared with the cost figures when the bill was first reported.

On section 5 and section 7, which operate together to give you a cost collectively, the VA estimated the original year's cost at $250,197,000 for the 2 sections, which include an increase for all of your disabled across the board, whether 10 percent or totally disabled. Originally those increases ranged, under H. R. 7886, from about 10 percent to about 41 percent. Under the Dorn amendment, the range of both of these 2 sections is from about 5 percent to about 22 percent in the case of the totally and permanently disabled service-connected veteran.

The new cost figure for the 2 sections as supplied by the VA is $152,395,000, a cut on those 2 sections of $97,802,000.

Section 6 increases the rates of compensation for so-called statutory awards by average amounts of less than 10 percent. For example, a veteran with the loss of both hands or both feet is raised from $279 to $300. A veteran with the loss of both legs above the knee or of both arms above the elbow, who has lost the use of his arms or his legs for that reason, is increased from $329 to $350.

The cost figures remain the same on this section because they are not changed in the Dorn substitute and I do not believe they are changed in the substitute which the chairman will offer in the course of the reading of this bill.

Section 8, section 9, and section 10 all relate back to section 6 and the statutory awards. No changes have been made in H. R. 7886 as it was originally reported out of the committee and as it now stands in the substitutes, but the total cost estimated by the Veterans' Administration on this combined group of sections is only $14,483,000 in the first year of operation. The $14,483,000 figure remains at that figure in the substitute.

Section 11 is a section on which there has been a substantial amendment. H. R. 7886 provided in section 11 for a far-reaching change in our disability compensation law. It provided that dependents of veterans who were disabled less than 50 percent, at rates of 20 percent or 30 percent or 10 percent, would qualify for certain dependency payments. It added up to a cost in the first year of $143,308,000. The Dorn substitute provides for an across-the-board increase in dependency payments of 10 percent only for veterans who are 50 percent disabled or more, giving a total cost of $9,199,000 in the first year of operation. This is a cut on this section of $134,109,000.

What does this give in the net? There is one more section also eliminated, I believe, in both the Dorn substitute and in the chairman's substitute. Section 12, which has already been covered by H. R. 7089, passed by this House and favorably reported by the Senate, also is eliminated under the Dorn substitute, and I believe eliminated under the chairman's proposal.

Section 13 would also be eliminated under the Dorn substitute, providing for increases in burial allowances from $150 per funeral to $200 per funeral. That adds up to a reduction of $5,500,000 in the first year on that particular item.

This brings us to a total saving on section 1 through section 4 of the Dorn proposal of $295,362,500 on the first year alone. It adds up to a saving on sections 5 through 13 in title II of $318,023,000. The figure which you have on the synopsis which you may be holding does not include the $5,500,000 for the burial allowance, which also is eliminated under the Dorn substitute.

This gives a total saving over the bill H. R. 7886 as it was reported out by the committee of $613,885,000 in the first year of operation, if we accept the Veterans' Administration figures on costs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As far as money is concerned, that reminds me of a wife who, when she sees something and does not buy it, thinks she is saving money. We started out with the bill with $528 million first year's cost. We ended up with a bill that was about $1,282,000,000. What you have done is taken that bill and cut it approximately in half, $681 million. Is that about correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think substantially, if you accept the Veterans' Administration cost figures originally, which I am not convinced that we should, that you do have that end result, yes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us what part of this $613 million goes to nonservice-connected programs?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The nonservice-connected total? The reduction was $295,362,000.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I was not speaking of the reduction. I was speaking about the percentage of the $613 million which goes for nonservice-connected programs? What part of the $613 million goes to nonservice-connected pensions?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of the reduction? Six hundred and thirteen million dollars is the reduction. The figure that remains is a little bit above $613 million.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. How much do the nonservice-connected pensions cost in the Dorn proposal?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have given the items already on that to the gentleman. I do not have a total by items on it. But the first item is $367 million. The second item is $92 million. The third item is $19 million. The fourth item is approximately $13 million. So, the gentleman only has to add those figures and he will have the cost on the nonservice-connected programs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. About $500 million of the total, $681 million, goes to nonservice-connected programs. Is that approximately correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think with the increases that would be pretty substantially correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. $500 million of the $681 million goes to the nonservice-connected programs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Approximately. That is correct.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it true that in both the bill, as reported by the committee, and the Dorn substitute to which the gentleman has been referring, provision is made for a general pension not only for World War I veterans but for veterans of World War II and veterans of the Korean war?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Provision is made for any war veteran who becomes totally and permanently disabled, and in the case of a veteran who reaches the age of 65 and has an income below the figure

of $1,400 a year, if he is without dependents, or $2,700 a year if he has dependents, he would be qualified as a disabled veteran under this provision. Now, if the gentleman wants to call that a general pension, he is entitled to do so. I do not believe he would be technically correct in doing so, but he is entitled to do so.

Mr. HALLECK. I am perfectly willing to be corrected by the gentleman and possibly that is the wrong term. I have just one further question. As we have voted such pensions in years past, have they ever been voted for as many years in advance as we would be doing here in the case of veterans of World War II and the Korean war?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not think we have ever waited until we had fought two additional wars before adopting a pension for the veterans of a previous war. This is the first time, I believe, that the United States has ever fought three wars before it provided a pension for the veterans of any one of those three wars. That is the situation we find ourselves in at this time. We see no reason for discriminating against any veteran who reaches the age and has a limited income and limited ability to follow a gainful occupation. We feel, if his income has fallen by reason of not being able to hold down a gainful occupation, he should be provided assistance by the Federal Government.

Now with regard to the Veterans' Administration estimate on cost, I would like for you, just for a moment or two, to consider some figures. Most figures when they are statistics are not very interesting and it is hard to hold attention with them. But, these particular figures, I believe, are interesting when we consider the accuracy of the Veterans' Administration projections of cost for this legislation. They have given us projected costs under the Dorn substitute of $367,958,000. We were interested in knowing just how they arrived at this particular figure. We asked for details as to how many veterans they would include in this pension and how many veterans would be added under the Dorn substitute. The same legislative liaison section which supplied the figures to the staff supplied some figures to me in this connection. They told me they estimated that 228,000 additional veterans, most of them World War I veterans, would be added to the pension rolls as eligibles under this new substitute proposal. Consider just for a moment, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we have here a group that the Veterans' Administration recognizes and points to the existence of, of nearly one-quarter of a million veterans in the United States whose incomes are at the level necessary to qualify for this particular pension. If you have a question as to the need for this proposal, consider this cold statistic of 228,000 who are supporting themselves on less than $1,400 a year, or supporting their families on less than $2,700 a year, at the age of 65. That is the group that they say would be affected by this proposal.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield gladly.

Mr. ELLIOTT. You say that this will add 228,000 veterans to the list who are now 65 years of age.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLIOTT. But you retain the income limitations of $1,400 and $2,700 per year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What is the difference between that requirement that your bill sets forth and the requirement that is in effect now? Is it not a matter of 10-percent physical disability?

Mr. EDMONDSON. There is no difference in income limitation. There is a requirement under the present law that actual disability be proved.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Of 10 percent.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of 10 percent, and unemployability must also be proved. Those are the factors that many veterans find difficulty in establishing in order to qualify for this pension. If a veteran's income has fallen below this figure, and he is 65 or over, he should be given the presumption that he is disabled and unable to earn more money or he would be earning more money to support himself and his family.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The Veterans' Administration's own figures show a total of 567,117 now on the pension roll, most of them at the rate of $66.15, which would be raised to $75 under this bill.

The next largest number in this group of 567,000 are now on the roll at $78.75 and would be raised to $90. If we give an average increase for this group of 567,000 of about $10 a month, or approximately $120 a year, that would be an increase in cost, by simple multiplication, of $68,054,040, for the increase that would be accomplished in your rate increase for people already on the rolls. Remember that figure—$68,054,000. If we assume in the cases of all the 228,000 eligible that all of them will receive $90 a month under this proposal, or $1,080 a year, multiply the 228,000 by $1,080, and we get a total figure of $246,240,000. If you put the $246 million and the $68 million together, you get a total of $314 million. That is on the assumption that each and every one of these veterans who is eligible will apply for a pension and receive it. I think actual experience with these things shows that there is a very large number of veterans made eligible and determined eligible under the law for pensions who would never have come in and qualified for them and would have never received them. But if you take the figures of the Veterans' Administration, the number potentially qualified, and put every one on the rolls at the maximum amount which they could receive under this bill, you still have a total cost of $314 million, which is $53 million less in your first year of operation than the cost of $367 million which the Veterans' Administration's statisticians say would be the first-year cost on this bill.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder if in the computation the gentleman has just made he has included the overseas service or the pensions for blind or helpless veterans referred to in the substitute that the gentleman is discussing?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Those figures, as I understand, are included in the initial computations which were given to us.

Mr. VORYS. On the 228,000 the gentleman has just multiplied by 90. There would be the possibility of a 10-percent increase for overseas service; would there not? So there might be a percentage that would get $150 a month.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think if we gave the additional 10 percent to every veteran who is qualified in these 2 totals we would not get $53 million additional. If the gentleman will look and see the 2 figures, 240 and 68, if we gave 10 percent to each one we would still be far short of $53 million difference.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Has the gentleman given the statisticians of the Veterans' Administration a chance to look at his figures to see whether or not the administration was wrong in its figures?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have not been able to yet.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman has heard me question them in committee many times as to how accurate they were.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As to these figures, I did not get them until about 20 minutes to 12 today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. So that the House can be absolutely sure, would the gentleman check his figures over with the Bureau and then report back to the House tomorrow?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should be very glad to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am not interested in having incorrect figures, as the gentleman knows. And I am sure the gentleman remembers that I have questioned the Veterans' Administration many times as to whether their figures were accurate.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman from Texas has criticized their cost estimates much more enthusiastically than I have.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But I have never been able to prove them wrong.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will bear with me for just a minute I will cite an instance where they were proven wrong and proven wrong substantially.

In the 82d Congress a bill known as H. R. 3193 was before the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It provided for a substantial increase in the pension rate for World War I and II and for Korean war veterans who were totally disabled, blind, helpless, or who had reached such a scale of helplessness as to need regular aid and attendants. That bill became a public law after a White House veto was overridden by both Houses of Congress, and the law became effective in 1951.

During the hearings on this particular bill, on page 615 of the hearings a representative of the Veterans' Administration made the following statement:

It is estimated that the enactment of H. R. 3193 would affect approximately 400 veterans of World War II, 23,700 veterans of World

War I, and 50 veterans of the Spanish-American War during the first year with an additional cost for that year of approximately $16,700,000.

That was the official testimony of the Veterans' Administration witness before the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

On November 25, 1952, the Veterans' Administration stated that as of October 31, 1952, which was the end of the first year of operation of the pension rates under this law, Public Law 149, the number of veterans who were receiving increased pensions by virtue of the operation of Public Law 149 of the 82d Congress came to a total of 13,440. This represented 10,710 fewer veterans receiving the pension than was estimated by the Veterans' Administration during the hearings on the bill.

Using the same factors of increased pension rates in the Veterans' Administration's computation, the cost for the first year's operation under Public Law 149 of the 82d Congress was $8,709,120, compared with an estimate of $16,700,000 made by the Veterans' Administration at the time of the hearings.

In other words, on this one bill which is within the memory, I think, of many Members of this body, the Veterans' Administraton was in error on estimated cost by in excess of 50 percent; and I say to you that if they could make an error of those proportions in overestimating and overstating the estimated cost on that bill which was passed by the 82d Congress they could certainly be doing the same thing in the present consideration of this legislation for non-service-connected pensions and for increases in disability pensions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows there are a good many famous cases where the Veterans' Adminstration gave estimates to the Appropriations Committee of their needs for the next year and they were away off. That has happened numerous times.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. T. J. Collins, assistant director of research, Richard Mandel Research Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York City, was hired, or at least went to the VA and checked their first year's figures.

Mr. EDMONDSON. He had the 228,000 figure?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is the first-year figure for the bill H. R. 7886, which we are discussing. He came away saying their figures were substantially correct. I think there are a lot of assumptions to be made to arrive at cost, but here is one private organization that has gone down to check the figures in H. R. 7886 and had that to say.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I know Mr. Collins reached the estimate of 228,000 potentially eligible. I was not aware he had reached the other conclusion. I would be very much surprised to see in writing that the gentleman agreed to the conclusion that all 228,000 would go on the rolls in the first year of operation. That is something, I think, the VA has presumed and assumed unfairly with regard to this particular legislation.

Now let me boil it down to the major differences between the Teague substitute or the Ayres substitute. I do not know whether it is the Ayres substitute or the Teague substitute or the Dorn substitute.

Mr. AYRES. I would be very proud to have it as my substitute, but it is the Teague substitute.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to say in connection with the substitute that I think it is good and desirable. I have no criticism to make of what is in the Teague substitute, as I understand it. It is what is not in it that disturbs and leads me to the conclusion it is doing an incomplete job and not measuring up to the problem that we have, which involves a quarter of a million veterans of World War I.

The major differences between the two substitutes can be boiled down to this: Both of them make substantially the same provision for service-connected disability.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Assuming the Teague substitute is adopted, assuming a veteran to be unemployable and meeting the requirements of this bill, not getting more than $1,400 a year. If the Teague substitute is adopted what happens to that veteran who meets all of the requirements? He does not get $1,400 a year, he has no income, he is over 65 years of age. What does he do?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is the question that I do not know the answer to. There is no provision made for him outside of local charity that I know of.

Mr. AYRES. He would come under existing law. I think the gentleman should explain that to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. Which law does the gentleman mean—the income-tax law?

Mr. AYRES. I think the gentleman was here this morning when Chairman TEAGUE went all through what the present program is.

Mr. TUMULTY. I saw the charts, but what happens to him?

Mr. AYRES. Seventy-eight dollars would be the maximum to which he would be entitled.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is not maintaining that a man over 65 years with an income below that figure would be automatically qualified under existing law? I hope he is not trying to present that to the House at this time. Unless he proved actual medical disability and unemployability, he would not be entitled to that.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman assumed a man to be in that position.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I did not understand the gentleman to assume medical disability.

Mr. TUMULTY. If this bill passes, the man would get certain benefits. If it did not pass and in place of it the Teague substitute were passed, he would get nothing.

Mr. AYRES. The Teague substitute does not deal with pensions.

Mr. TUMULTY. What happens to the man which this bill itself tends to help? If we do not pass the bill itself and give him a pension, then he gets no pension and has no job. Where does he get the money to live under the other bill?

Mr. AYRES. I do not think a veteran reaching 65 years has any difficulty in proving 10 percent disability.

Mr. TUMULTY. If he cannot prove that what happens to him?

Mr. AYRES. If a man is not disabled he probably would have a job.

Mr. TUMULTY. At 65 years of age?

Mr. AYRES. We have many of them over 65 working and they make more than $1,400 a year.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am speaking of the man who does not make $1,400 a year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is speaking of the 228,000 as determined by the VA figure who are not able to qualify under existing law, have not been able to qualify under existing law, but who would be taken care of under this bill.

Mr. TUMULTY. If this bill is not passed, what happens to them?

Mr. EDMONDSON. They are forgotten men under existing legislation, so far as I know.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 5 additional minutes? A great deal of my presentation has been taken up with answering questions, and some have not been friendly questions.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted the additional 5 minutes in order to summarize the difference between the two substitute proposals. Both proposals make a liberal provision for your service-connected disabled and for the dependents of the service-connected disabled. The chairman's proposal does not make provision for a needed increase in non-service-connected pensions. The chairman's proposal does not make provision for non-service-connected veterans who are not provided for under existing law. The chairman's proposal does not make provision for needed increases for Spanish-American War widows, World War II, and Korean widows and orphans. It does not make provision for equal treatment for World War II and Korean widows with the widows of World War I veterans. I think what he has proposed is good, it is commendable, but it falls short of meeting our problem in regard to our veterans, the widows, and the orphans of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I think when this House soberly considers and reviews the soundness of the two substitute proposals that it will be a wise thing and a generous thing to adopt a reasonable compromise which will be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina when we read this bill for amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE. To summarize my position as far as the two are concerned, the amendment that the gentleman intends to support costs $681 million the first year; $500 milllion goes to non-service-connected, and $181 million goes to service-connected. My amendment covers only the service-connected, and an increase in the pension from $135.45 to $150 for the seriously disabled pensioners, requiring "aid and attendance," because that is the only possible bill that will go through both Houses and become the law of the land and help the veterans. You might as well send the present bill over to the other body as the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman will concede even with the adoption of this law payment to disabled veterans and dependents will remain substantially higher in total than the non-service-connected.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes; that is true. And I think the House should also remember other veterans' legislation we have passed in this Congress. We passed the survivors benefit bill for service-connected veterans that will cost some $300 million to $400 million the first year. We passed Public Law 7 on education that covers more than a million veterans. We have passed an orphan scholarship bill that will cost $250 million and will benefit 156,000 children.

Mr. EDMONDSON. On the other hand, the gentleman will concede that we are now looking forward to a termination next year of very substantial expenses for educational benefits and also the GI housing bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. These programs are nearly over, there will be only small savings involved, probably not one-fifth of the first year's cost of the Dorn proposal.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So we will have big savings in those areas that could be devoted to pensions.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. When the gentleman speaks of veterans of 65 being in the poorhouse, I think he should also tell the House that according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 80 percent of all World War I veterans will be covered by social security by the middle of this year.

Social security

World War I veterans eligible (percent)	80
World War II veterans eligible (percent)	95
Maximum social-security retirement for single person:	
Per month	$108.50
Per annum	$1,302.00
Maximum social-security retirement for man and wife:	
Per month	$162.80
Per annum	$1,953.60

Year	Total number World War I veterans 65 and over	Number eligible for social security	Average annual social-security benefit
1955	605	443	$785
1960	1,731	1,312	949
1965	2,199	1,715	994
1970	1,582	1,254	1,027
1975	993	741	1,027
1980	423	338	1,027
1985	137	110	1,027
1990	29	24	1,027
1995	3	3	1,027

Ninety-five percent of all World War II veterans are covered by social security and the maximum amount of social security is $108 for a single person. He may receive both social security and a non-service-connected pension. For a married man the figure is $162.50; something like that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course, very few of those veterans will be receiving the maximums which the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is true.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman agree that the payments that are considered for non-service-connected disabilities are probably going to be paid for by the taxpayer, even if the bill is not enacted, anyway, inasmuch as those individuals will have to be on relief in their local communities; and, therefore, in essence, what we are doing is giving them a more dignified way of getting at least a part of their necessary support from the Government which they served in time of war?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman makes a very fine point.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The statement was made that these veterans would be able to draw social security. I think it should be brought out that by a recent ruling of the Social Security Board even someone working for the Communist Party is entitled to social security, and certainly the veteran should be entitled to more than that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I referred previously to amounts we were paying in pensions to persons overseas. I am listing the numbers of nonservice pension checks going to persons in foreign countries.

Number of checks forwarded during August 1956 for non-service-connected pension benefits to dependents of deceased veterans where death was non-service-connected and to non-service-connected living veterans residing in foreign countries

	Deceased veterans	Living veterans
Total	6,360	8,757
Europe	2,730	4,644
Austria	3	2
Azores	3	7
Belgium	45	68
Cyprus	2	5
Denmark	54	90
Finland	13	16
France	147	81
Greece	308	500
Ireland	184	476
Italy	1,166	2,991
Luxembourg	4	13
Malta	4	2
Netherlands	4	8
Norway	93	93
Portugal	8	13
Spain	12	7
Sweden	65	82
Switzerland	7	11
United Kingdom	176	102
West Germany	33	15
Yugoslavia	39	62

Number of checks forwarded during August 1956 for non-service-connected pension benefits to dependents of deceased veterans where death was non-service-connected and to non-service-connected living veterans residing in foreign countries—Con.

	Deceased veterans	Living veterans
Africa	19	18
Algeria		1
Belgian Congo	1	
Cape Verde Islands	3	3
Egypt		2
French Equatorial Africa	2	
Gold Coast	1	
Liberia	2	
Maderia Islands		1
Morocco, Spanish Zone		1
St. Helena and dependencies	1	
Tunisia	2	1
Union of South Africa	7	9
Asia	98	68
British Malaya	1	
China	1	1
Hong Kong, British	39	4
India	3	
Japan	23	9
Jordan	7	9
Korea		1
Lebanon	5	23
Palestine	11	6
Syria	6	11
Turkey	2	4
North America and West Indies	849	906
Bahamas	7	6
British West Indies	9	12
Canada	654	719
Costa Rica	7	11
Cuba	61	43
Dominican Republic	7	2
El Salvador		1
Guatemala	4	1
Haiti	2	
Honduras	1	6
Iceland		1
Mexico	78	102
Nicaragua	7	
Panama	12	2
South America	47	23
Argentina	12	7
Brazil	7	1
Chile	5	5
Colombia	5	3
Equador	1	2
Paraguay	1	
Peru	9	4
Uruguay	2	1
Venezuela	5	
Pacific	2,977	3,098
Australia	18	14
French Oceania	2	1
New Zealand	5	4
Republic of the Philippines	2,952	3,079

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement entered into between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, each is to control one-half of the time. Up to this time the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has consumed 16 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 2 hours and 29 minutes. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts care to yield time now?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I prefer still to wait and yield time later on. However, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, would the lady care to yield time to me, in order to catch up with the chairman of the committee? I am against her position, but I should be glad to take some time now.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree to that at this time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather unusual position today, just as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] who stated that he found himself under rather unusual circumstances.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and was chairman of the committee in the 83d Congress. She has been of considerable help to those of us who came to the committee as new members. I have found her to be one of the most generous persons both with her own money and that which goes to veterans, of any person I have ever met. I think she is to be commended on her humanitarianism and her generosity.

On the other hand, I am quite indebted to the American Legion. In the year 1932, the American Legion started what they called a junior league baseball organization throughout the United States. I was not too smart, but I was a fairly good ball player and was taken on an Ohio State team. The Cleveland Indians came down and scouted us, but I was not good enough to make their farm team. But they stirred up enough interest so that Western Reserve University gave me a scholarship. That is how I happened to get to go to college. So indirectly I owe a great deal to the Legion. Four years ago, my daughter received their award, which they give to the eighth-grade graduates throughout the United States. I have admired and respected the work that they do both from a civic point of view and from a patriotic point of view.

But I regret to report to you here today that it disturbs me no end to see the pressure that has been applied by a few leaders within the Legion and a few lobbyists who are hired and controlled by these leaders.

I come from a pretty rough district for a Republican; 50,000 CIO members, nearly 20,000 A. F. of L. members, about 15,000 unaffiliated. And I want to be perfectly honest with you; I do not dare make too many political mistakes or I will not be returned here. Fortunately the members of these organizations are with me.

This is my sixth year. I am for this Teague proposal not because I think it is the political thing to do but because in my heart I know it is the moral thing to take care of the service-connected disabled veterans first.

I did not suffer the trials and tribulations of combat that the chairman of this committee did.

When I was discharged from the Army we stayed in the barracks that night at Camp Atterbury, and I tell you here this afternoon that I was on my knees thanking God that I had been returned with all my faculties to my wife and three kids. I dedicated myself at that time that if the occasion ever presented itself I would do everything within my power to see that those who had left a leg on Iwo Jima or a hand on some far-distant island or had had their blood spilled on the hills they could not climb, were properly cared for.

I do not believe that here this afternoon we should consider this legislation on the basis of what we can afford, because to the man who lost a hand, the man who lost an arm, or the man who lost a leg, that cannot be replaced with any amount of money. We should not consider this on the basis of what we can afford. It should be considered on the basis of what is needed. If we find the need to be there, then it is our responsibility as the elected representatives of the people to see that the money is provided for that need.

Look what we did on the highway bill. We established a need for a new highway program, and no one stood up and said, "Why, yes, we need the highways but we cannot afford them." We had a special tax bill to raise the revenue, because we realized the highways were needed.

If there is need for such legislation as proposed by this Dorn amendment to H. R. 7886, then those of you who admit or feel in your hearts that the need is there should be proposing legislation that will provide the necessary funds to meet that need.

Personally, I take the position that there is need for help for those with service-connected disabilities and that there is no need at this time for pensions for World War II and Korean veterans.

Here I am, who came out of the Army in better physical condition than I have ever been in my life. I wish I could get back in that same condition. I am 25 years away from being eligible for the pension you propose, and I am 4 years older than the average World War II veteran, which is 36. The average age of the Korean veteran is 27. Yet here today we are being asked to vote on legislation providing a pension for a man 25 to 30 years from now. That is not based on need.

I will tell you what it is based on. It is based on the fact that various veterans' organizations need members, and they have made a terrific drive to get those members. When they meet at their national conventions they have to come up with a proposal. They call it a mandate when they come before our committee, that they have been mandated to do this.

You would be amazed at the pressure they can employ through various individuals, but I honestly do not believe that the commander of any post, whether it be the American Legion, DAV, AMVETS, or Veterans of Foreign Wars, controls any vote other than his own. Sometimes I think he has difficulty in telling his wife what to do.

In order to find out the feelings of the rank-and-file veteran, whom we never hear from, for out of the 22 million veterans there are only a little over 4 million who belong to any organization, I went out into my district and held a full day of hearings. I invited veterans of all walks of life to come in and testify. The hearings were announced a week in advance. Any veteran who wanted to come in and state his position had the right to do so.

I want to give you one case in particular, which proves the point that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and I believe hundreds of other Members of the House, feel should be given consideration first, and that is with regard to the service-connected disabled. Here is a man, a World War I veteran, who lost a leg. He draws approximately $200 a month. That is all he has been drawing in compensation since he lost his leg. Under the law that we are proposing to pass, when that man becomes 65 he is not going to get any added amount of money in the form of a pension. He cannot have both compensation and a pension because his compensation is more than the $1,400. That type of man came before the committee saying, "Why do I not get a little bit extra for having gone 30 years without a leg?"

A young man, a veteran of World War II, came before the committee. He had lost his leg on Iwo Jima. He could hardly walk on crutches because his other leg was also shot up. I would like to read to you his testimony. His name is Harry E. Jenkins. He lives in what you might say is an attic in Akron, because the compensation, he being unemployable, which he receives does not make it possible for him to have a decent home. In fact, for his wife and child and himself, $263 a month is all that boy can ever expect to draw unless we increase his compensation under the Teague proposal. He wanted to get a better house. He made an application for a GI loan. What was he told? They say, "No, you cannot buy a $10,000 home because you do not make $3,400 a year. Furthermore, you would be a pretty bad risk because with that stump you have, your life expectancy is not too good."

When we speak of the inequities that should be corrected, I say to you that those are the boys who should be given consideration first.

The charge has been made here today that under the Dorn proposal we cover all of the various fields that are deserving of attention. It has been my experience that when you try to please everyone, you wind up pleasing no one. That is exactly what you are going to do with this bill. Should the Dorn proposal prevail, we all know it is not going any place in the other body. We all know that the President of the United States is not going to sign it. I have a letter here which he wrote to the chairman of our committee. He sent me a copy of the letter. The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 30, 1956.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your May 22 letter asking my views on non-service-connected pension bills in light of the executive agencies' adverse reports, which I feel are soundly based, and also the recommendations of the Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

The Commission's report and the background data yet to be released represent a substantial investment of time and effort by outstanding citizens and warrant the thoughtful study of the executive branch, the Congress, organizations of veterans, and the public generally. A detailed review of this material is now in progress in the executive branch, and I will submit specific recommendations to the Congress after these studies are completed.

This comment, however, I should like to make now: I firmly believe in the principle of recognizing the special sacrifices of those who serve in our military forces in time of

war or national emergency. I further believe that our first obligation is to our war-disabled veterans, their widows and orphans. This obligation we should meet generously, and the conclusion that we are not now meeting this obligation in all respects is one of the Commission's many findings that give me serious concern.

I am convinced that all concerned—the public, the Congress, the executive branch—should have full opportunity carefully to evaluate these findings, the voluminous background information now becoming available, and especially the basic principles and priorities involved, before such basic and far-reaching pension legislation as you mention is acted upon.

With kind regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Aside from the President's letter, what has been the reaction of many of the other organizations who deal with veterans' affairs? I have here a statement of the VFW which was sent to their national officers and departmental commanders prior to the knowledge that there would be a Dorn substitute. Here is what they said—make no mistake about it, the Dorn substitute is just about half as bad as the original Dorn bill. It does not deal with the people we want to take care of, the service-connected disabled. Their proposal will never be enacted into law.

Here is what they say:

It is difficult, however, for the VFW to be optimistic enough to believe that the omnibus veteran benefit bill identified as H. R. 7886 will win approval, in its present form, from the House, the Senate, and the President. If the bill, by some miracle, should clear both branches of the Congress it is almost certain to meet a Presidential veto.

H. R. 7886, no doubt, will suffer one of two alternatives. First, the bill will fail to win approval somewhere along the three hurdles previously mentioned or, second, it will be substantially amended or emasculated, to the point where there will be little left for any of the intended beneficiaries.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman tell me in what respects, other than the $5 difference on total disability, the Teague substitute is more generous for service-connected disabled than the Dorn substitute?

Mr. AYRES. The Teague proposal stands by itself for service-connected disabled veterans. That is the only type of legislation that you stand a chance of getting into law in this session, in my judgment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman has made the statement that the Dorn substitute does not deal with the veterans that we want to take care of, the service-connected disabled. Will the gentleman correct that?

Mr. AYRES. I will correct it by saying that the Dorn proposal and the provisions contained therein for the service-connected, left in the Dorn proposal as such, would never be enacted into law.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is a little different from the statement that it does not deal with the service-connected disabled.

Mr. AYRES. Now we also have a letter from the AMVETS. In essence, this is what the letter from the national commander of the AMVETS says:

It is inconceivable that the House of Representatives should be asked to grant $105 per month to a nondisabled, 90-day service veteran at age 65 while in the same breath they grant only $100 to the combat veteran whose war wounds are 50 percent disabling.

In my travels throughout the Nation during the past 6 months, I have discussed this subject with thousands of veterans. I am convinced and can assure you that the rank-and-file veteran is not interested in non-service-connected pension liberalizations but does seek equity for the service-connected disabled.

We are hopeful that a substitute measure to grant compensation increases for the service-connected will be offered when H. R. 7886 is considered by the House of Representatives. In the interest of disabled veterans, we respectfully urge that you lend your support to such a substitute.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is evident that the members of this committee are going to be given an opportunity to vote for a proposal that can become law, that will correct many of the inequities that the service-connected disabled, the boys who lost their arms and legs around the world, suffer.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. Did I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], to say that the Teague amendment does nothing for the widows and orphans? If so, do you think that the present provision for those classes is adequate?

Mr. AYRES. As the chairman of the committee said when he had his charts here—and I assume the gentlewoman was here and saw them.

Mrs. CHURCH. No; I am sorry that I did not hear all of his speech.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The bill that passed the House last year, was reported out of the Senate committee recently, and was scheduled for the Senate floor next week, does a lot for our service-connected widows and orphans.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does it do as much as is provided in the Dorn amendment?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It does considerably more.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does the gentleman feel that he could expect the President to sign such a bill in addition to the bill we are discussing today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The President has already expressed his approval.

Mrs. CHURCH. If that provision is embodied in the Dorn amendment and is passed by this House, it would nullify any reason for having the other bill passed by the Senate, would it not?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I believe that particular provision for service-connected widows and orphans has been taken out of the Dorn amendment. I do not believe it is covered in the Dorn amendment. I think the service-connected widows and orphans who are covered by H. R. 7089 that we passed last year are not covered at all in the Dorn amendment. That bill is still in the other body.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would clarify then what he meant by saying that something valuable was contained in the Dorn amendment for the widows and orphans?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The Dorn substitute provided for increases across the board for widows and orphans of World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and the Spanish-American War widows as well.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would that be the equivalent of, or more, or less than the bill now pending in the Senate?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. H. R. 7089, the bill pending over in the Senate has a provision relating to the service-connected widows and orphans which has already been dealt with by the Congress. The other pensioners to whom I have referred are the widows and orphans of non-service-connected pensioners, the non-service-connected veterans.

Mrs. CHURCH. And provision is made in the Dorn substitute for that certainly needy class. I certainly desire such provision for the group so signally affected.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. For that class, yes.

Mr. AYRES. I think the gentlewoman is also aware that all who had 90 days service or more would be covered under that proposal.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman clarify the difference with regard to the service-connected veteran himself between the Dorn substitute and the Teague amendment? I gather that there is more in the Teague amendment for the service-connected disabled veteran.

Mr. AYRES. The only thing in the Teague amendment over and above increasing the compensation payment to those veterans with service-connected disabilities is to increase the amount given to those veterans who are bedridden, who require an attendant.

Mr. KEATING. In the so-called Dorn proposal what is the provision, if any, for the service-connected disabled veteran? Can the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Oklahoma or someone else enlighten me in regard to that?

Mr. AYRES. Under the Dorn proposal as stated in title II, section 5, there are increases in rates of pension of service-connected disabled veterans, 10-percent totally disabled by approximately 10 percent; to some others the increase will be 5 percent; and to the totally disabled 22 percent. There are a few discrepancies, but basically there is not a great deal of difference between what is provided in the Teague bill and what is provided in title II, section 5, of the Dorn proposal.

Mr. KEATING. As to service-connected cases?

Mr. AYRES. As to the service-connected disabled.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. I trust that the members of the committee will realize that they have 1 of 2 things to vote for: Either the Dorn proposal which is a little bit of everything for everybody which can

never become law; and what is fair, what is honest, and what is just for the service-connected disabled veterans of our land, the Teague proposal which can become law in this session of Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the AMVETS letter, the one I have at least, was written on June 21. It was written before the Dorn amendment was even suggested.

Mr. AYRES. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I talked with them this morning and their position is the same toward getting a bad apple half in two as when they were against the whole thing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, I do not know with whom the gentleman talked, but some of the AMVETS have informed me they were sorry this letter was sent and made public.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have a telegram I received this morning reading as follows:

> Have read with approving interest your proposed substitute for H. R. 7886. This measure will provide needed increases in compensation to those who are most deserving of increases, the service-connected disabled and their dependents. Equally important and unlike the measure it is proposed to replace, its cost will not impose an unfair burden upon the taxpayers of this Nation. AMVETS heartily endorse the proposed substitute and urge your continued effort to have it adopted by your colleagues in the House of Representatives.
>
> JOHN R. HOLDEN,
> *National Legislative Director, AMVETS.*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I have great admiration for the veterans' organizations and the work they have done for the disabled and also for their constant effort to keep our country strong. These service organizations are of tremendous value and I know they consider all veteran problems with reason and fairness. On previous occasions they have greatly helped with legislation for the disabled. They have helped the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on many occasions and because of their suggestions quite a volume of sound legislation has been enacted. In the early days after World War I, veterans were not too well organized and particularly this was true regarding the disabled for many of them were still confined to hospitals all over the country. I know, because I visited them and helped them work out their problems. Many who needed to go into hospitals could not get in because of conditions existing at that time. It took organization to work out these difficulties.

Today all types of veterans are organized, and these organzations with their staffs are helping the men get their service connection, helping them with their family problems, and providing this help without pay, without charge, devoting their full time to the service and benefit of the men who served with them.

I am deeply grateful to these service organizations for coming before our Veterans' Committee and giving all of us the benefit of their thinking on all of the constructive and needed provisions of this legislation.

Here in the Congress we have so-called lobbyists come before us for big business, for little business, for the farmers, for the road builders, for everything under the sun so, why should we not have the benefit of the thinking of the veteran organizations, in order to provide fair and just legislation. I have known many of their representatives for years and years, and they are very fine gentlemen. I am personally deeply grateful for all they have done to help us with our work.

Now it is true we have not done what we ought to have done for the disabled veterans. Nobody knows that more than I do. But we have done in many respects all that we could. Although the Bradley report is misleading in many respects it does make some constructive suggestions for some of the disabled. Personally I do not believe the disabled should be placed in a position of constant fear of having their allowances cut. To live in fear surely is not the way of freedom or a democratic grateful Nation. This fear certainly has a negative reaction on the health of the disabled.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay my respects to the veterans' organizations for what they have done for our national defense, for what they have done in the care of the disabled and for what they have done for my colleagues here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her splendid work concerning benefits for veterans and their families. If the gentlewoman will permit me, I would like to comment for just a moment. The gentleman who preceded you, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], made the statement that all the support for this bill was coming from the kingpins of veterans' organizations. I would like to read a letter I received from a World War I veteran. To that letter is affixed a home-made petition, just letters pinned together, containing 275 signatures of World War I veterans. I would like to read just one paragraph of that letter. It states:

> We are too young to die, but still too old to obtain employment. Many of us now are becoming disabled where we cannot work full time at our occupations. Many of us are completely out of work, but still we are forgotten. Between now and the day that we expect to go to the polls and cast our votes you can bet that by then we will well know who our buddies are to be elected to various offices.

This is not a kingpin talking. This petition originated in a small town, Anna, Ill., about 5,000 people, where on Sunday a group of veterans banded together and worked up this petition. This is what they have to say. It is not coming from kingpins. I merely take this time to point out that there is great interest on the part of the rank-and-file veterans. I have had more mail on this legislation from individuals than all other legislation combined in this session of the Congress. I thank the gentlewoman for permitting me to explain that this bill is not being pushed by a group of kingpins, but is wanted by those veterans who are in need and who feel, through what they have contributed to the welfare of this country, they are entitled to a small pension when they become needy. And I think they are entitled to it, too. I compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the great work she has done in supporting this veterans' bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the gentleman that I have not had a single letter against this bill. I have received a great many letters from all parts of the country, and I considered it a compliment to have people feel I am interested in the veteran. I am interested in these great citizens we call veterans who have saved this Nation time after time without considering the cost to them. I have not received a single letter of protest against this bill. Based upon the mail that has poured into my office, I believe the public in general is in sympathy with all this bill will do for the veterans. The public has not made any concentrated protest against this bill. There is no organized or unorganized effort to prevent its enactment. Since I have received no opposition on the part of the public there must be a feeling of justification for this legislation on the part of the American people in general.

From my district, my Commonwealth, and from all over the country, people write to me about every subject under the sun, so there must be an overwhelming belief that this measure in some form should pass. It is a matter of great rejoicing with me, Mr. Chairman, because I think the public is strongly of the opinion that with all that is being given to industry and small business, with all that is being given to the farmers, with all these tremendous amounts that are being given in aid to foreign countries, some of whom are stabbing us in the back, but it is given for a purpose, I know; that certainly something should be done for our own veterans, for those who wore the uniform and fought to maintain and hold fast to all we have here in America and they made their sacrifices without first thinking of cost to them. When there is no fury of war, it is easy to turn away from the cost of war. But when this great country is threatened and challenged in war, no thought is given to the cost in human sacrifice or in material substance. The cost of war does not end when the struggle of the conflict is over, the field of combat calm, and the battle won. The cost of war goes on and on for a grateful nation as long as a veteran remains alive. Let us never forget this fact as a nation even though there are many who selfishly are willing to forget.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Judge FINO, coauthor of the original bill, and I

would like to take a minute myself, Mr. Chairman, to state that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out the bill, so far as I can remember, with only one vote against it, showing how the committee felt regarding the need of some sort of veterans legislation.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I want to say here and now that I am going to support the Dorn amendment to H. R. 7886, which bill I was privileged to cosponsor in this Congress. And I want to say particularly that my cosponsorship of this particular legislation was at the request of the American Legion.

This is the so-called omnibus compensation and pension bill, which I supported in committee, and which was reported out favorably by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs about 2 weeks ago. I have heard a great deal of criticism regarding this bill. Those opposed to this type of legislation have condemned it as a "giveaway program" or "a handout to the veterans," and this kind of talk disturbs me.

I want to make one point crystal clear. If ever there was need for liberalization and humanization of our entire veterans' benefit structure, it is now, when the country is enjoying the greatest prosperity in its history. And yet shamefully we neglect and ignore the desperate plight of our veterans, their widows and children. And what excuse do we offer? We tell them that we cannot afford it. We are telling these veterans, young and old, who sacrificed part of their lives, and the widows of those men who paid the supreme sacrifice, that the cost of this proposal to increase rates for pension and compensation is too great.

Let us take a good look at our World War I veterans who are rapidly becoming old men. It is reliably estimated that they are dying at the rate of 7,500 per month. The survivors are finding it increasingly difficult and almost impossible to compete in the exacting labor market.

How many 65-year-old men do we know who are as well physically as they were at age 25? How many 65-year-old men do not have large doctor bills, hospital expenses, and other miscellaneous expenses caused solely by advancing age or ill health? You can probably count them on your fingers.

Very few, if any, of our veterans have had the thought in mind that this Nation owes them a living. But when conditions do exist, as they do now, it is our duty and obligation to help them, and we cannot and must not evaluate this responsibility in terms of dollars and cents. We have taken care of our veterans in the past and we shall take care of them now.

We oftentimes hear of the age of 65 as the age of retirement. This age, when reached, is one thought of as being the age of unemployability—and believe me, at the rate these veterans are dying, the age of employability is really limited to a selected group of younger and more recent veterans.

In these times of high living costs how many of our veterans' widows can live a normal, self-supporting, and happy life on the pension left them? They may be able to exist, but that they can live comfortably I doubt.

This bill places all widows on the same pension basis and gives them all $75 a month. Is this small amount going to bankrupt our great-grandchildren? But I am willing to go along with the Dorn proposal, which is at least an effort, an attempt in the right direction.

Do your realize how far this small increase will go in supplying the bare necessities which some of these pensioners must have in order to live?

How many of you Members would care to see your own widow and dependents exist on this small handout? However, I am willing to support the Dorn proposal if it is the best we can get out of this House.

The thing that disturbs me most is the objection of some people that the cost of this program, the cost of H. R. 7886, will be tremendous. About 3 weeks ago I did not see many tears in this House, I did not see much hair-pulling when it came to voting on our foreign-aid program, when we were called upon to dole out and give away about $4 billion to our foreign neighbors. Why the terrible concern when it comes to our own people? A large portion of what we have given away, $51 billion since World War II, has been not for military strength, not for economic strength, but for gaining good will. I am sure that a great deal of this aid has been dissipated in attempting to win friends. Examples of the waste of funds to my way of thinking, and as far as I am concerned, can be seen in Yugoslavia, India, and Egypt. All of these countries have clearly shown their pro-Soviet tendencies.

I am sure you know as well as I that these increased benefits are needed. These increased benefits are needed not for extra spending money, these increased benefits are needed not for luxuries, but merely to permit and allow these veterans and their dependents to purchase the bare necessities of life.

The benefits we are providing under this bill are just and fair. Under the Dorn proposal they are less, but at least, as I said before, it is a step in the right direction. In fact, this is a period in the lives of these aging veterans and their widows and dependents when a tribute to their brave sacrifices would be most welcome and appreciated.

We cannot turn down our own veterans and dependents by telling them we cannot afford it. I learned something when I was young, and it has been carried on and on, and I believe everyone knows that charity starts at home. Taking care of our own is but a small tribute for the many sacrifices made by our veterans in the preservation of our American way of life.

There has been talk here this afternoon that if we pass this bill in its present form, if we pass this bill even with the Dorn proposal, it will not pass the Senate, it will not receive Presidential approval.

Let me say this to you gentlemen. We have a responsibility in this House. Our responsibility is to do our job here. What happens outside this Chamber should not reflect on us. I trust and hope that when the Dorn proposal is submitted it will receive the wholehearted support of every Member of this House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to make my remarks brief. This question has been discussed this evening at great length and in all its ramifications.

I am for H. R. 7886. I voted for it in the committee, I will vote for it in the Committee of the Whole, and I only hope I will have a straight chance to vote for it on the floor of the House.

I realize that I am taking in this discussion a side opposite to that of my chairman, but that does not mean that he is not a dear friend of mine and it does not mean that we will not continue that friendship through the days and the years that no doubt lie ahead.

I am going to offer him now the greatest compliment that, as far as I know, I can give a man. I am going to say that when I go to my chairman and ask a question as to what he thinks about something or what he intends to do about it, he gives me a straight answer to that question and I can go on from there knowing that it will be exactly as he said it would be. That is the highest compliment that I know of to pay a friend.

I have a lot of mail regarding this bill, H. R. 7886. In fact, we have tabulated something over 10,000 requests for its passage and we have 2 letters in opposition—2 to more than 10,000. Now they are not from kingpins or anything like that. They are just from veterans and veterans' wives and veterans' widows all over the United States asking when is this House going to pass H. R. 7886. They come in petitions that long signed with a lead pencil. We have tried to reply to all of them, and I think we have pretty well done that. But we have had to take the telephone directories and go through them because some of these names and some of the addresses are undecipherable and some of the mail which is sent to the veterans comes back because it cannot be delivered. We have done everything we could to reply to every one of them. About half of these 10,000 have come to me from the State of Missouri and the other half has come from all points all over the United States. I know they are genuine.

There is one thing that has disturbed me a little here today when a gentleman assured us that unless we did thus and so, the Senate would not take any action. Now, I do not know if there is any rule to bar me from referring to the Senate—maybe I should not refer to them as the upper body or the other body. Well, anyway, you know whom I am talking about. I wonder since when it has become the rule of this House to check a proposed piece of legislation with the other body to see if they approve of it before we pass it. I wonder whether the people who voted for us and sent us up here to represent them sent us here to check with the other body and to see what they wanted. If we believe in a piece of legislation, let us pass that legislation and then let

the other body and the executive department of this Government do whatever they feel the dictates of their conscience and their greater ability, perhaps, demand that they do. I take no stock in that.

Whom do we seek to help here today? We do not seek in the Dorn amendment to H. R. 7886 to enact a general pension bill. We put limitations in that bill as to how many dollars a pensioner can draw and what his income limitations are. Those income limitations are the same income limitations that are written into the law at the present time. They have not been raised. Do not deceive yourself. The whole thing about this debate and all this discussion that is taking place is over section 1 of H. R. 7886. The so-called Dorn amendment and the substitute that will be offered through our chairman are so nearly identical that it would take an expert to tell the difference with the exception of section 1. There is the difference. Shall we assume that a man who is a veteran and has reached the age of 65 and whose income is less than $1,400 a year, if he has no dependents, and less than $2,700 a year, if he has one or more dependents; is he assumed to be entitled to a pension or is he not?

Now that is the thing we are discussing today. That is what we are spending the whole day about. That is what the final vote in this Committee will determine what you are going to do. These men need help. If they are 65 years old and make less than $1,400 or $2,700, they need help. They are entitled to help. We are not seeking to take away anything from the service-connected pensions. We are offering, in the Dorn substitute, to give him almost exactly the same as the chairman of our committee is offering to give him in his substitute. I am glad of that. I do not want to take anything from a service-connected pensioner or his widow or children. I want to give them a raise. I think the raise that is recommended by the chairman of our committee is reasonable. It is in line. It is almost exactly the same as the Dorn proposal. The difference is in that assumption of disability at age 65, and nothing else. That is tied down under income proposals until it is fair and just, and I hope this House will enact it.

A friend of mine said to me today, "How are you going to justify a vote for that when you go back home to your district?"

I would rather justify a vote for the assumption of disability, with that income limitation, than I would to try to justify a vote I gave the other day for foreign aid, even with enough money taken out of the request for foreign aid, $1.1 billion, to pay the cost of this Dorn substitute, H. R. 7886, for 2 years. I would much rather. In fact, I do not know just how I am going to justify my vote for foreign aid. We have had foreign aid for a long time, and it looks like we may have it for a still longer time. Perhaps it is justified. I do not know. It has never been my privilege to visit Europe or Asia. I have no first-hand information. I have to take the word of other folks in great measure, regarding whether it is justified. But the House voted $35 billion for the military. It voted over $3 billion for foreign aid, and will probably wind up voting for a conference report that will be in excess of $4 billion for foreign aid. We vote for subsidies for almost everything. I cannot go home to my district and stand up and make a speech if I look back and see a World War veteran sitting back there, a man who is in debt, who is without employment, who is without income, 65 years old or older, who could not get any assistance, and I would expect him to get up and ask me how I voted on H. R. 7886. I know how I am going to vote on it.

These two letters that I have in my possession opposing 7886, one of those said, "It is all right to think of the vets, but think of the country first." That gentleman missed the point. If it had not been for the vets, we would not have any country to think about. We had to whip Germany the first time or she would have realized her dream of ruling the world. Since then the sons of those World War I veterans had to cross the Atlantic and whip Germany again under Hitler. If they had failed there is a good chance that the swastika would be flying above the place where the Capitol now stands instead of the Stars and Stripes now floating above this great city, the Capital of the world.

There is no politics in this bill. These veterans are Republicans, they are Democrats; and their fathers and mothers are Republicans and Democrats; and this House is made up of Republicans and Democrats. This is a nonpartisan piece of legislation and I want to ask the Members on both sides of this aisle to stand up and be counted and do not let section 1 of H. R. 7886 be taken out by any substitute, because if you do you have cut the heart out of it.

One Member said on the floor of the House that Spanish-American War widows' pensions would cost a tremendous amount of money, and it was projected to the year 2000. I wonder how ridiculous we can get around here. The average age of the Spanish-American War widow is 68 years. This century has about 44 years to go; 44 added to 68 makes 112. Maybe there is 1 widow in 10,000 who lives to be 112, but there are not going to be any Spanish-American War widows in the year 2000.

Another gentleman spoke about the turnover on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It is a committee with a tremendous lot of responsibility, a statement in which I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out; but it is also a committee that offers opportunities. I am new on the committee, but if I come back to this House again, which I trust and hope will be the case, I will not ask to be reassigned to some other committee.

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

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I asked the gentleman to yield because the gentleman from Ohio, in speaking in support of the Teague substitute, read a letter of support from the commander of the Amvets. I hold in my hand two telegrams addressed to me just received this afternoon which I would like to read. The first one reads:

> Veterans of Foreign Wars approves revision of H. R. 7886 as proposed by Congressman BRYAN DORN. Amendments by DORN will cut original cost estimates in half but will retain fundamental principles. Bulk of payments will go to widows, orphans, and service-disabled veterans. Urge you support Dorn amendments.
>
> TIMOTHY J. MURPHY,
> *Commander in Chief.*

The second one, also addressed to me, reads as follows:

> Reference H. R. 7886 under consideration today. Pleased to advise American Legion strongly supports substitute proposals of Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, which substantially reduce costs and still achieve bill's major objectives. They are product extensive conferences between members of Veterans' Affairs Committee and representatives major veterans' organizations. Respectfully request your support. Regards.
>
> J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
> *National Commander, the American Legion.*

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I wish to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for reading these telegrams. The Members who were listening will do well to study those amendments.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. A page has just brought me a third telegram as follows:

> Spanish War veterans everywhere are grateful to you for your understanding of the problems facing our widow class. They are unable to exist in decency on the small pension they now receive and unlike other widows are too old to be acceptable even as baby sitters. Age is most important factor in treating with this condition. Urge you implore House to include a pension increase for them in any legislation approved this week. Amount asked is in line with Bradley Commission proposal and would doubtless be acceptable to the President.
>
> WILLIAM J. OTJEN,
> *Chairman for Legislation,*
> *United Spanish War Veterans.*
> HATTIE B. TRAZENFELD,
> *Cochairman, Auxiliary Committee.*

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, continuing, I want to say that a gentleman at this mike said a while ago that his sympathies went out to the man who lost a hand or a leg or an eye or both legs. I want to say to the Members of this House that my sympathy goes out to him, too, and if this bill sought to take a single dollar away from him I would be against it. If it did not seek to give him a raise in the pension he is presently drawing, I would be against it. But the Dorn amendment instead of taking money away from that sort of man gives him more and if it is not enough I hope that subsequent Congresses give him a still greater increase. I would not be a party to taking a single dollar away from a service-connected veteran. I am glad to help him get more compensation for the great loss that he suffered. The Dorn substitute for 7886 does give him more money. That is the reason I like that bill.

I am proud to say before this House that I am in support of 7886.

I do not believe the President of the United States will veto 7886. That is just a personal belief, it has no evidence in the world to back it up, but I still believe that. I did not vote for him but he is my President and I do not believe that of him. I think he is a finer man than one who would veto this bill if we passed it.

There are some 900,000 World War I veterans still alive at this time. They constitute the remnant of that once proud army which left our shores to the accompaniment of blaring bands and waving flags to fight the war to end all wars. They beat the Kaiser to his knees and ended his dream of world domination, but it probably never occurred to them their sons would later be called upon to cross the same ocean to prove to Hitler and Mussolini that they were as wrong as the Kaiser had been before them.

Death is fast thinning their ranks and whatever measures this Government takes to show appreciation of their heroic deeds, the unselfish way in which they offered their lives and bodies on the altar of their country, must be done soon. Seventy-four thousand of these veterans died in 1953; 78,000 in 1954; and 82,000 in 1955. It is estimated by the Veterans' Administration that death will claim at least 87,000 more during the coming year.

Now, I have the report of the Veterans' Administration calling my attention to their estimate that if this bill should become a law it would cost over a billion dollars a year. This report further states that the bill is not in accord with the program of the President. I am amazed that the President, who was himself a career military officer entitled to the many varieties of financial security that type of career provided, would permit anyone in his administration to go on record as not being in accord with the idea of helping improve the financial condition of World War I veterans—men who risked their lives in behalf of their country. I just find it difficult to believe.

It is just not true that all World War I veterans would be eligible for assistance under this bill. Some of them are well-to-do and would not be eligible because their incomes are more than $1,400 if single or $2,700 if married or with dependent children. Moreover with the death rate running to nearly 90,000 per year, the payments would soon become less and less. While there are many who would not qualify for assistance under this bill, there are others who, at age 65, are in real need.

Industry hesitates to employ men past age 65 and those who must work for a living past this age find it difficult to obtain employment at a wage which will allow them and their families to have a decent standard of living. The maximum income set up in this bill is $1,400 or $2,700. Many World War I veterans are living, or rather existing, on much less than that amount and it is these veterans who are in grave need for which I plead today. Those whose incomes are below the level of the minimum for decent food and shelter.

These are the men who marched through the mud and crouched in the shellholes and craters. These are the men who crossed the Atlantic in face of the German submarine peril and exposed themselves to bombs and poison gas in order that we might remain free. We should be glad we still have the opportunity to help those who, at age 65 though no fault of their own, I am sure, find themselves in need of assistance.

A request was made to this Congress to appropriate $4,900 million for foreign aid. I have always supported appropriations of this type, but I am fast reaching the breaking point. At least a part of this gigantic appropriation is to be used in the countries over which these veterans had to fight. This Government has already given, since the close of World War II, $92 billion to Europe and Asia in carrying out our foreign aid program.

Our foreign aid program has been building hydroelectric dams, irrigation projects, and God only knows what other improvements over most of the world and yet when someone proposed to help our own when they are in need, we are immediately reminded it will cost money. I seem to remember it is written in a book read all too seldom:

> He that provideth not for his own, especially they of his own household, is worse than an infidel and has already denied the faith.

H. R. 7886 seeks to provide for our own and is limited to the needy among the remnant of a proud army who fought our wars to victorious conclusions.

Christ was not crucified because He preached the fatherhood of God. He was crucified because He broke bread with sinners; scourged the moneychangers out of the temple at Jerusalem, saying "My Father's house is a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." He was crucified because He preached the Gospel to the poor and taught the universal brotherhood of man. I wonder if He should return today as a member of the family of a lowly carpenter and should preach on the banks of the Potomac the same Gospel He preached on the shores of Galilee if His reception would be any different.

We are a great Nation, a proud Nation, but I sometimes wonder just how proud we would be if we should all sit down in the seclusion of our chambers and commune honestly with our own souls, if we should try to see ourselves as God is going to see us when we stand at that final judgment. It is written, Then shall He say to those on His left hand, I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink, I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat. I was homeless and ye took me not in. Then shall they answer and say unto Him, When saw we Thee thirsty, hungered, or naked and ministered not unto Thee. Then shall He answer and say unto them, Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, ye did it not to me.

Today I say to the members of this committee, charity should begin at home. However, I would remind you that H. R. 7886 is not charity, it is even-handed justice—justice which should have been provided long before now. Many of these veterans have died after reaching age 65. There is nothing we can offer those who are dead but a grateful remembrance. We still have time left for the privilege of helping those needy who are living and H. R. 7886 seeks to do just that. How can you, on your knees, ask God to bless you and yours until you prove that you love your needy neighbor as yourself? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and I take this time merely to direct 2 or 3 questions to the chairman of the committee and also to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] if I may.

First of all to the chairman of the committee: As I understand it, one of the basic objections to the committee bill and also to the Dorn substitute which has been raised by the gentleman is in reference to the automatic disability provision at 65; am I correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is very correct. That is one part of the objection. May I say just a little bit more in that connection. We have reached a point in our overall non-service-connected program that we certainly ought to stop, look, and listen. We are drafting boys today who serve 2 years anywhere and who come out as nonveterans. Are we going to keep on doing that? Are we going to give World War II veterans who stayed in this country, that did not do as much as the boys are doing now, benefits? I think it is time to look at the whole program.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am not debating the matter with the gentleman. I am leading up to a question that I think the gentleman will appreciate the purpose of in a moment. As I understand it, a further objection that has been raised is with respect to World War II and Korean veterans. There is a lapse of perhaps 20 or 25 years before the average age of those veterans will reach 65 years. This provision of automatic disability at 65 is legislating a long way in the future with respect to the veterans of those two wars; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That was expressed. I did not express that thought.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman share that opinion?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think it is a part of the overall picture.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman consider any merit at all to the possible consideration of the First World War veterans in a separate category with respect to automatic disability at 65 on the basis of a perhaps more readily demonstrable need for such automatic total disability for a group now at or near that average age?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, the World War I veterans came earlier before our committee in behalf of that type of bill. The VFW came in and testified in behalf of that type of bill also. Are we setting a precedent with World War veterans in that respect? It seems to me it is an overall question. You cannot separate World War I, II, or any other war. The group of World War II and Korean veterans have to be considered as a group in your non-service-connected class.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would you say that the problem of the two groups, World War I veterans, on the one hand, and World War II and Korean veterans, on the other, are identical without regard to the possible changes or expansion of social security or other economic changes which may occur in the next 20 to 25 years? I am asking not contentiously.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Certainly it is a good question, and a question that we went into. There is no question but what the World War I group are an older group, and I was very surprised to learn from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that 80 percent of the World War I veterans today are covered by social security and 95 percent of World War II veterans. So there is some difference in that group; some drawing $108 social security and $66 or $78 as far as pensions are concerned.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I gained the impression that possibly there would be a greater number of World War II veterans and Korean veterans drawing social security and probably drawing it more adequately at that time, presuming that it has not gone bust.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will understand one statement I made today as trying to determine the need of older people in our country. There is no question but that the problem of the older people is increasing all the time. But, we did call in the representatives of all the veterans' groups and asked if they would help us get the names of people turned down for pensions. Just what efforts they have made I do not know, but we received about 150 to 200 names, and my big fear is, in piling up the cost of this program—nearly everything is nonservice connected—that you are going to hurt the service-connected program, and certainly our problem is to deal with the service-connected disabled.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma to comment on the same line of questions.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would care to comment only in this way: The gentleman from Texas made the statement that 80 percent of these veterans are drawing social security of $108. I wonder if the gentleman has any figures to show how many of these veterans are drawing the maximum of $108 under social security. Do you have any figures on that, sir?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would be glad to read the letter from the social security agency.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am aware that they are eligible for drawing up to the maximum, but it is my information that the great majority of them are drawing far less than the maximum under social security.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Well, the average that I have is $75 now; $949 in 1960; $994 in 1965; $1,027 in 1970 and from then on.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Then the average at the present time, rather than being $108 maximum, would be somewhere around $60 to $70 on the average; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is close.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I direct this further question to the gentleman from Oklahoma as to whether or not he would be willing under any consideration—I want to be entirely fair in my question—to consider the possibility of applying this principle of automatic total disability at 65 to the World War I veterans exclusively at this stage.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, I will say to the gentleman that that matter was given very serious consideration by the group supporting the Dorn substitute, and there were some members of the group who were very strongly in favor of that position. It was not the majority view of the group that it would be a fair and consistent position to take in line with the amendment appearing elsewhere in which we equalize the pension opportunities for the widows of the veterans of World War II and Korea with World War I. It was our feeling that in the sense of consistency and of fairness that any pensioner, no matter whether he was a veteran of World War I, or World War II, Korea, or one that we all pray is not fought 5 years from now but could very well be, that any one of those veterans, when he reaches the age of 65 and becomes disabled to the point that he cannot gain substantial employment and earn enough money to support himself, should be eligible for this pension.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am acutely aware of the significance and the implications of a precedent. On the other hand, I am toying with the thought from the standpoint of crawling before we walk or walking before we run, since we are actually venturing into a new concept here, if I understand this aright.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would say to the gentleman, and I believe the Chairman will support me in this, that I do not believe the cost effects of such a limitation in the bill would be felt in any substantial way for a good number of years, if you were to adopt the proposal the gentleman is speaking of.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think that may be true, but at least we might gain that much experience, and it is the cost effects with respect to the application of this principle, in 15 or 20 years, which is a matter of honest concern, I am sure, to many Members.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It certainly is. But on the other hand, we would face this situation immediately, and while the number is small, there are some veterans of World War I who already are over the age of 65 and who could qualify for this pension. Most of them are Reservists or National Guardsmen or men who had spent a long period of time in the service before World War II was fought. But they are, nonetheless, men who would qualify for this pension and who would be forgotten if we limited it as has been suggested.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one final question? Were there any figures developed in the hearings, or is there an estimate of the number of World War I veterans, for example, who are not now eligible for total and permanent disability but who would become eligible if we adopted this principle of automatic eligibility at age 65?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will say to the gentleman that one of the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at present has a request with the Veterans' Administration which he has had in since early today for such an estimate. It has not been supplied. We do not have a breakdown of the 228,000 figure which has been supplied to us as the number who would be qualified as eligible under this new proposal in the Dorn substitute.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking with much emotion. I have been listening to the debate this afternoon and wondering why always when legislation for veterans of our wars is presented there is raised the cry of economy. There always have been those who would place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the last shot was fired and the danger was gone.

It was so many, many years ago when the ragged and hungry veterans of Washington's army marched on the Congress of the Confederation petitioning for the payment of arrears of wages for services during the Revolutionary War. All they sought was money that was due them and that had been earned in battle service, money for clothes to wear against the biting cold and food to keep the spark of life alive.

Three members of that early Congress, resentful that veterans should dare to petition their lawmakers, demanded that the guns of the State militia of Pennsylvania be turned on the petitioners. They were among the first Congressmen in the history of our country to place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the last shot was fired and the danger ended.

Not unrelated is the fact that the leader of the trio, later to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, passed the years from Valley Forge to Yorktown as a member of a committee supervising expenditures. He was far away and safe from the suffering and fighting of campaigns. Sentiment to him was something to be measured by the tables in books of arithmetic, and to gratitude he applied the table of 0×0.

Not unrelated, either, is the fact that in the Constitutional Convention he had advocated "power given to the few to save them from being destroyed by the many" and bitterly opposed the abolition of the foreign slave trade. People who place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the danger is over are that way.

Three voices in that early Congress were raised to give to Washington's veterans not money for food but bullets for liquidation. But only three, Mr. Chairman. It always will be that way as long as our country remains the land of the free and the home of the brave. In the veins of a tiny minority in any generation there may course unnaturally ice water instead of red blood, but the overwhelming majority of our lawmakers and

of our people will be responsive to instincts of sentiment and to the impulses of gratitude.

ECONOMY TALK A SMOKESCREEN

There are many places to effect economy. There are many ways of balancing the budget. I suspect that in all the turmoil that always attends the suggestion of something for the veterans is a smokescreen to cover the places where there should be economy and there is none and the ways where the budget should be balanced and is not.

The cruel fact is that there is no balancing the budget in the homes and in the lives that have been affected by war. When we wage war we do not weigh the cost and count pennies. We then do not talk of economy, even in the economy of human lives when military strategy requires the attaining of an objective at any cost. When we wage war instead of balancing the budget we make it a patriotic gesture to knock the budget into a cocked hat.

I know there are people, and good God-fearing men and women, who when the war is over want to forget it and get back to normal lives. There are people who when a tornado is over and their homes have been torn to the ground think in the same vein. It is a workable program when there is another home ready for occupancy, utterly unworkable when there is no other roof to find for protection. How do you get back to normal living when your home has been destroyed and there is no other home to which to go?

Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic. This Committee is composed in large part of war veterans, many with outstanding combat records, among them the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the great chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We know that no soldier, sailor, or marine with any length of service returns after a war to exactly the same home, the same life, the same normality. War where the training is to kill and to protect against being killed is in violent conflict with the concepts of kindliness that are woven into the training of youth for normal living in a world of peace.

DISABLED VETERANS COME FIRST

First consideration always must be given our disabled veterans. The time I hope never will come when any decent American would deny them anything within our means and power.

But our moral obligation does not end with caring only for our war-connected disabled veterans. That would be the easy way out for those who wish to discharge an obligation with a maximum of economy and a minimum of honor.

Every day that I have been in the Congress, batting my head against the concrete VA wall trying to get for a constituent veteran that which I believe to be his due, I have had less respect for the usage of the term "nonservice connected." Judging from my own experiences, and those related to me by my colleagues, I feel conservatively safe in saying that in a large percentage of the cases where veterans have been turned down as having ailments classified as nonservice connected those same veterans would not now be suffering with the same ailments if they had never been called to war. It seems to me silly and stupid and worse in so many, many cases to try to fix the blame away from the place where ordinary commonsense would place it.

In far too many cases, and every member of this committee knows what I am saying is true, the term "nonservice connected" is used as a device to cheat a veteran who is actually a casualty of war to make a record of economy for someone who holds to the ice-cold rule that the termination date for gratitude is the moment the danger is gone. There are modern prototypes of those early Congressmen who demanded liquidation by bullets of the petitioning veterans of Washington's army.

PENSIONS BASED ON AGE AND NEED

There are other ways of liquidating veterans than by the fire of musketry of the militia. Starvation is one. The veterans of World War I are getting old. Pray, tell me, where can a man or woman at 65 find gainful employment? Everyone knows that it is getting increasingly difficult for a person past 40 to get even an interview in the personnel offices of most large employers. When industry slams the door in the face of a World War I veteran who has to work in order to live I suppose the prototypes of those early American Congressmen I have mentioned with shame would demand that Uncle Sam do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that the American people ever will take kindly to the suggestion of liquidation of veterans as the proper solution of the veteran problem. When any nation is run on the rule that the termination date of gratitude is the moment the danger is ended something fatal has happened to the moral fiber of the people of that nation and its decline and fall are inevitable.

The argument is advanced by many good and sincere men and women that in fairness to the other aged we cannot give pensions to our war veterans based upon age and need. They point out that the veterans of World War I and the veterans of World War II, who in time will reach the age of 65, constitute a large segment of our population. That is true, and the establishment of veteran pensions based upon age and need will open the door eventually for coverage of all aged persons. War veterans who gave the years of their youth to the defense of the Republic should be the first to be protected against want in their old age. That in honor and in gratitude having been done, the door will be opened for later legislation giving pensions to all citizens who are aged and in need. The first step is to discharge our moral obligation to the veterans. The rest will follow as day the night.

PENSIONS TO WAR DOLLARS

I have listened to much talk in the debate today from my colleagues who oppose liberal pension provisions about the staggering and impossible cost. I have not been impressed. I have not been impressed because I have before me some figures that have not been mentioned in this debate, some figures that are so hush-hush they never are carried even in a bill of appropriation. You will not find them in Public Law 467, the 1957 appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office, but they are referred to in the report, which of course few of the American people ever see, let alone read. The figures are in what is described as the permanent indefinite appropriations.

These figures show that in 1957 about $7 billion of the taxpayers' money will go, not to paying for services and goods, but to paying interest on the national debt. I have not heard anyone say that $7 billion in meeting the legal obligations of war was fiscally unsound, that it would wreck the country. All the fire has been on the cost of meeting the moral obligations, and that cost would be tiny indeed compared with the $7 billion we pay as pensions to war dollars.

That is exactly what the $7 billion represent—pensions to war dollars. It was the material cost of World War I and World War II that plunged us so badly into debt. When war came we had to have both men and money. The men we drafted or accepted through enlistments; the dollars we borrowed. Inasmuch as both the men and the dollars served the purposes of war in the period of hostilities, both in a very true sense are war veterans. We pay $7 billion a year in pensions to war dollars, and you call it fiscal responsibility. When it is suggested that a very small part of $7 billion be paid in pensions, the charge of fiscal irresponsibility is hurled at those who think human war veterans are no less important than dollar war veterans.

TWO-FACED FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Sometimes I think fiscal responsibility is a term someone invented to condone follies and condemn virtues. They hurl the charge of fiscal irresponsibility at the supporters of this bill for pensions for veterans, their dependents and their widows. But the providing of pensions for dollars to the tune of seven billion a year they call fiscal responsibility. Funny, is it not, how publicized respectability digs into the dictionary for a big word or two to blind commonsense?

Let us face the facts. Gratitude to veterans reflected in pension legislation is not threatening the Nation with bankruptcy. The cost of all now proposed, and more, would not make a dent in our wealth and our prosperous economy. The danger is in the seven billion a year that goes into paying pensions to war dollars. Someday the Congress will listen more attentively when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], admittedly the foremost authority on money in the Nation, talks on that subject. Meanwhile I hope our consideration of the bill now before us will proceed on a level of commonsense.

PRESERVING PRECIOUS TRADITIONS

Mr. Chairman, I have been speaking with great emotion. In my youth in the Northland were the boys in blue, in the Southland the boys in gray, the aging veterans of a war that ended 17 years before my birth. They were revered and beloved. No one in the North would have wished a veteran of Grant's army, who had given of his youth to preserve this Union, to suffer in his age from a want that in some measure at least

could be relieved. In the South in every community and in every State there was similar concern for the veterans of Lee's army who in their youth had fought for the cause in which they believed.

It was in the very air of the world in which I grew up that this country of ours was a land where the virtue of gratitude was implanted in the Government itself as well as in the hearts of the people. I want to go to my grave in the assurance that our United States of America, now in the will of providence grown into world leadership and responsibility, will go on and on and on holding in all its acts of government to the virtues of a good man. And of those virtues that mark all good men and all good governments none is more enriching of character than that of gratitude. Honor and good conscience demand favorable action on the bill reported out by the committee.

WIDOWS OF SPANISH WAR VETERANS

I have spoken from the heart and from the experiences of one who has lived through 3 major wars, in 2 of which I have had the privilege of participation. I have spoken for the cause of the veterans of all our wars. But now I wish especially to make some observations on the provision in the pending bill affecting the widows of the Spanish-American War.

The committee amendment providing increased pensions for Spanish War widows is the bill introduced by me at the request of and designation by the national legislative committee of the United Spanish War Veterans. The Spanish War veterans ask nothing for themselves. Their concern is for the widows of their comrades who have departed this life.

The number of Spanish War widows is small. It is growing smaller every month. Soon there will be none remaining. They are indeed aged. For the most part they receive no social-security coverage. They are called upon to make heroic sacrifice of comforts and necessities to eke out existence on their piteously small pensions. Often they are forced to go without medicine so badly needed in the illnesses and the frailty of age. It is hard, my colleagues, in these days of high prices to find a corner under any roof and to buy the very minimum of food on pensions very slightly over $50 a month. I hope and pray that these widows have not looked in vain to the 84th Congress to vote an increase of their pension to $75 a month.

VA SAYS OLD WOMEN NEVER DIE

Upon what did the Veterans' Administration base its opposition to a pension increase to this handful of aged women? Let me read from VA's letter of disapproval:

> Since it is believed that this pension roll will be basically static for the next several years.

Mr. Chairman, that is plain asininity. Basically static? That is that women 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, some 80 and over need no attention and can wait for several years because, unlike all other humankind including the smart little brain in VA that thought up the idea of "basically static," they will go on just the same today as they were yesterday, the same tomorrow as they are today.

What VA says is that old women never die, never are ill, never have needs, just go rolling along. The fact is that in a few years there will be no Spanish War widows. There is nothing basically static in a pension roll composed of persons past the allotted threescore and ten. The Veterans' Administration owes an apology to the Congress of the United States for maintaining otherwise. I can assure VA there is no one in this or the other body so stupid as to fall for its argument that no relief should be given widows all past threescore and ten because they constitute a class "basically static." It was an affront to the intelligence of the Congress that VA should have assumed such stupidity, and a public apology should be immediately forthcoming.

I regret that in the substitute bill of the great and beloved chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], there is no provision for Spanish War widows. I know how he feels personally. He has always shown a warm friendship for the Spanish War group and I wish him to know my deep appreciation of the many courtesies and helpful services he has given me. He is a great American and is respected and beloved by all his colleagues. Whatever were the legislative reasons that impelled him to omit the provision from his substitute bill I know if the decision were left to him whether these widows should receive the pension increase to $75 a month the prompt response would be "Yes."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the great chairman of a great committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There were a lot of things in the substitute when it was prepared, which I thought should be in it. But, this is a substitute which I think could become law.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Sometimes for expediency we barter away principle. Sometimes we trade the shadow for the substance. I should hate to feel that because the bill provides for these old women, these widows of the men who fought in the Spanish-American War more than half a century ago, it if passed would be vetoed or that it would not be passed by the other body.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As I said earlier today, being chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not an easy job. But do you not think that our veterans' groups should have come in and made their No. 1 project legislation of that kind instead of coming in with a non-service-connected feature which is the least desirable of any kind of legislation that is before our committee? You know and I know that if they came in supporting this thing that you are talking about, it could have gone through without even a whistle. Do you not think that these veterans' groups should have come in before our committee and helped us to decide on the priority of these things and pick out the legislation which was needed the most, regardless of whether it was the smallest group, and try to get that legislation through?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Well, I do know, Mr. Chairman, that the veterans' groups going way back into the history of our country have done a great service for our Republic. Without them there never would have been any pension legislation for any soldier. They have done a great job. They make mistakes now and then, but all during the years they have been fighting for the veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Certainly I recognize the fact, and I know it is true. I think that this particular piece of legislation was not passed by convention. It was decided by a small group. I do not mean the group here in Washington. The group here in Washington represents every veterans' group, and they have a job. But, so far as I am concerned as chairman of the committee, the people representing the American Legion, the DAV, and the AMVETS, and the VFW, all have been fair, and they have done everything they could to be fair to me as chairman of the committee. But I think the American Legion came before our committee with 180 mandates. As far as I am concerned, they took the least desirable of all the mandates for their No. 1 piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I have some additional time?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such time as he may desire.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what has the top priority in the recommendations of the veterans' organizations. I understand that the American Legion has been concerned in getting a pension for veterans of World War I based on age and need. I think that is a perfectly proper position to take. Now, I also believe in the high principles of, and have great respect for the membership of the AVC. I am an active member of that organization, which is doing an outstanding job in good citizenship. I might say that while I understand AVC does not agree with me on the subject, no member of AVC has ever questioned the consistency of my position that, as a Spanish-American War veteran, I think the veterans of World War I on reaching 65 should receive the same kind of pension as is received by Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Am I to accept that as a compliment? Does the gentleman wish to get me an audience?

Mr. LONG. That was the idea.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very grateful to the gentleman, whose friendship I deeply prize. I have had this thought, Mr. Chairman, that today when we are discussing this legislation for the veterans—and a great majority of the Members of this body are ex-servicemen—that if when we come here we get away from our buddies at home, if we are thinking of those buddies who served with us and to whom fortune may not have been as kind, and who are looking for us to help them, if we have forgotten them. That is my reflection when I look over this Chamber and we are discussing legislation in their behalf, and most of the chairs have no occupants.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Dorn substitute. I am not satisfied with it. I do not think it goes far enough, but it seems to be the best compromise that can be worked out, and it does give some recognition to these old women in the Spanish-American War widow group. I trust that the Dorn substitute will be adopted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois, a former member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, since having made a commitment I must keep, and which requires my absence from Washington tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, I regret that it will be impossible for me to be present to vote for the veterans bill, which is before the House today, and will be voted on tomorrow.

For that reason, I wish to make a short statement for the benefit of the record:

During the many years I have served in this House, I have always supported all legislation that has come before the House in the interest of the veterans, including the GI bill of rights.

In this particular case, if it were possible for me to be here tomorrow, I would support H. R. 7886, or the bill as amended, that would render the greatest help to the veterans that is finally agreed upon and passed by the majority of the Members of this House.

I am sure the majority of the Members of this body realize, as I do, that World War I veterans, both service and non-service connected, and their dependents, are entitled to greater benefits with their increasing age than are now available to them.

In addition, the disabled veterans, and their dependents, are entitled to an increase over their present rates of compensation, and I feel certain that the Members of this House will show their continued interest in all of the veterans and their dependents by passing the bill tomorrow that will give them the relief to which they are so justifiably entitled.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House (H. R. 7886) is of great importance to all veterans and their widows. The purpose of the bill is to increase rates and liberalize the basis for payment of service-connected compensation and non-service-connected pensions. I am in full accord with the purposes and objectives sought to be attained.

The provisions of the bill have had wide publicity and discussion. Much of the talk in opposition to the bill has been somewhat exaggerated. It is true there may be some few instances, however, that may be justified. It is always difficult to deal rightly or adequately in all particulars with every conceivable type. In the discussion that has followed the introduction of this legislation, certain instances of this kind have come to light. An effort will be made to correct these conditions before this proposed legislation is finally adopted.

The most generally expressed reason advanced against the bill now before us relates to the cost. It is true that it does increase the cost of existing benefits, but if it did not do so, then it would fail in fulfilling the need that exists for new legislation. The principal cause for this revision of present law is to correct the inequities that exist under the present law. To accomplish this it is necessary in most instances to increase the allotted amount for the conditions intended to be provided for with benefits. However, the opposition that has been most loud has come against any increase in benefits whatsoever. This opposition has been most unreasonable. In most cases it comes from those who rendered no war service or who are so financially well fixed that they do not need the benefits provided and therefore cannot appreciate, as fully as they otherwise could, the need that exists among those who do need the benefits. The high cost of living and the increase in cost of living that has occurred since the benefits were last adopted give sufficient reason to justify the passage of legislation at this time that will increase both service-connected and non-service-connected benefits.

The basic reason for the passage of all legislation of this character is to care for the men who served their country in its hour of need and who are now in need. In other words, as they served their country in the hour of its need, there is an equal obligation upon their country to render aid to them in the hour of their need. A recognition of this obligation is just as necessary as it is for the individual to assist his Government in the time of its necessity. Whatever obligation exists upon the part of this country to render assistance to those nations located abroad, who were our allies, equally exists to give aid in the hour of necessity to our veterans and their dependents. I have very strong feelings in support of the principle that it is the duty of our Government to be helpful when our veterans, their survivors, and dependents are in need. And, this applies where the veteran has made the supreme sacrifice or whose need arises from disabilities incurred through war, or as the result of advancing years.

The bill, as reported by the committee, provides as follows:

TITLE I. PENSION

Authorizes a non-service-connected pension for veterans of World War I, II, and Korea of $85 a month if the veteran is less than 65 years of age and meets specific disability requirements, is unemployable, and has an income of less than $1,400 if single and $2,700 if with dependents; at age 65 establishes presumption that the veteran is totally disabled and unemployability requirements removed, the rate is $105; if the veteran is so helpless or blind as to need the regular aid and attendance of another person the rate is $150. The above rates are increased by 20 percent for any veteran who served overseas for 30 days or more. In addition the bill provides:

First. Increases the rate of pension payable to widows of Spanish War, World War I and II, and Korea to $75 a month.

Second. Places widows of World War II and Korea on the same basis as World War I widows for pension eligibility purposes.

TITLE II. COMPENSATION

Increases the rates of service-connected compensation for veterans of all wars ranging from $20 for 10-percent disability to $250 for a total disability. Overall ceiling on compensation is raised from $420 to $450 and statutory award rates are increased from $47 to $55; the rate for arrested tuberculosis rises from $67 to $75 monthly.

Makes veterans with service-connected disabilities rated 10 percent to 100 percent—present law applies to those rated 50 percent and above—eligible for increased compensation for dependents and also increases the rate available for this purpose. For example, a veteran totally disabled and having a wife would receive $25 additional in lieu of the present $21 additional. A veteran 10-percent disabled would receive 10 percent of $25.

Increases the rate of widows from $87 to $125 monthly with proportionate increases for widows with children.

TITLE III. BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Increases the rate for burial allowance from $150 to $200.

Since the bill (H. R. 7886) was reported, further consideration has been given to the possibility of decreasing the overall cost of the bill without doing an injustice to the great body of beneficiaries provided for therein. The group that gave this further consideration included members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and representatives of the major veterans organizations. After full consideration this group approved amendments to H. R. 7886 and its conclusions are embodied in what is known as the Dorn amendment. The original bill was also introduced by Mr. DORN of South Carolina. The major provisions of the so-called Dorn amendment are as follows:

Title 1, section 1: Continues the principle that all war veterans who are permanently and totally disabled, to the extent that they cannot follow a substantially gainful occupation, shall be entitled to a pension, subject to income limitation, and further provides that war

veterans of the age of 65 with income below certain annual figures—$1,400 if without dependents, $2,700 if with one or more dependents—shall be qualified for such pension. Establishes rates for pensions at $75, or at $90 when veteran has received pension for 10 consecutive years or is 65 years of age, and further provides increase in pension for helpless or blind veteran requiring attendant, from $135 per month to $150 per month. Further provides that otherwise qualified veteran with 30 days or more of overseas service shall be entitled to pension increase of 10 percent.

Section 2: Places World War II and Korean war widows and orphans on equal pension basis with World War I widows and orphans.

Section 3: Increases rates of pensions for widows and orphans by 10 percent, adjusted to nearest dollar.

Section 4: Increases rates of pensions for Spanish-American War widows from average rate of $60 to average rate of $70.

Title II, section 5: Increases rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veteran, for 10 percent disabled to totally disabled, by approximately 10 percent increase to the nearest dollar on some ratings, by approximately 5 percent increase on some others, and by approximately 22 percent for totally disabled.

Section 6: Increases rates of compensation for so-called statutory awards by average amounts of less than 10 percent. For example, veteran with loss of both hands, or both feet, is raised from $279 to $300; veteran with loss of both legs above knee, or of both arms above elbow, is increased from $329 to $350.

Section 7: Sets forth the basic rate of compensation for disability as outlined in section 5, and increases basic rate for total disability from $181 to $220, and for partial disability to $190—making it the basis for figuring disability compensation from 10 percent to 90 percent.

Section 8: Increases rates of compensation for disabled World War Veterans Act of 1924, to same general level provided by section 6. For example, veteran with loss of use of both eyes is increased from $231 to $300; with loss of both eyes and one or more limbs, from $347 to $400.

Section 9: Increases additional sum payable under World War Veterans Act of 1924, from $70 to $80, when the disabled veteran is in need of a nurse or attendant.

Section 10: Final statutory award increase, under 1924 act, raising monthly rate for arrested tuberculosis from $67 to $75.

Section 11: Increases rates of payment for dependents of service-connected disabled veterans receiving compensation by 10 percent where disability is 50 percent or more.

In support of the Dorn proposal I am in receipt of the following telegram from J. Addington Wagner, national commander, the American Legion. It reads as follows:

Reference H. R. 7886 under consideration today. Pleased to advise American Legion strongly supports substitute proposals of Hon. W. J. BRYAN DORN, which substantially reduce costs and still achieve bill's major objectives. They are product of extensive conferences between members Veterans' Affairs Committee and representatives major veterans organizations. Respectfully request your support. Regards.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, the American Legion.

I consider it a duty upon my part and a very pleasant one to perform, of giving my support whenever and in whatever way I can to promote the welfare of our veterans, their survivors, and dependents. Consequently I shall give my vote and my very best endeavors in behalf of this legislation now before us and any other that may come before the Congress for approval.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, when amendments are in order on H. R. 7886 I propose to submit for myself and for several of my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a series of amendments. These amendments are the result of most careful and prayerful consideration of the problems involved by my colleagues and representatives of the major veterans' organizations.

We recognize that H. R. 7886, as reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, involves a series of benefits for both the service-disabled and the non-service-disabled, as well as the survivors of service-deceased and widows and orphans of veterans who died without proving service-connected disabilities.

The committee, in reporting H. R. 7886, was seeking to do justice to a large segment of our veterans and the survivors of deceased veterans. The bill is a good one, and I believe that it was justified and that this Nation can afford the cost of such a bill. However, a nationwide attack in the daily press has been made upon the estimated costs of this legislation and I know that many of our colleagues not on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs are somewhat concerned about this furor over the estimated high cost of this legislation as reported from the Veterans' Committee.

Consequently, those of us who are primarily responsible for reporting the bill have been studying the reaction of the press and our colleagues, and we came to the conclusion that because of the costs and the concern over Federal expenditures that we should take another look with the view of seeing if some moderation and a reduction in cost could not be effected. At about the same time the representatives of the major veterans' organizations who are in favor of many phases, if not all, of this legislation also became concerned over the public clamor and approached members of our committee with the suggestion that consideration should be given to modifying the bill.

Inasmuch as the thinking of the responsible officials of the major veterans' organizations closely parallels the thinking of many members of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, a series of conferences began with the representatives of the veterans' organizations who ascertained what moderations could be effected without destroying the basic purpose of the legislation. It did not take long to discover that the members of your Veterans' Committee were thinking along similar lines with the veterans' organization representatives and that we could see eye to eye on several aspects of this legislation where a reasonable reduction could be achieved without seriously affecting the real purpose of the legislation.

As a result of this series of conferences, on behalf of my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, when amendments are in order tomorrow, I shall propose a series of amendments that have been approved in their entirety by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in part by the Disabled American Veterans and the United States Spanish War Veterans. These amendments apply to both compensation and pension and will substantially reduce the original estimate of cost made by the Veterans' Administration. We are not in complete agreement with the cost estimate by the Veterans' Administration and during this discussion on the floor today evidence will be submitted to indicate that estimating costs is a most speculative venture and that the Veterans' Administration could be as much as 50 percent wrong in their estimates. Assuming for the purpose of example that the estimate of the Veterans' Administration on this original bill as reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is reasonably accurate, the substitute amendments which I shall propose shall cut that estimate almost in half or, in round figures, over $600 million.

It seems to us that cutting the cost of this bill in half or a savings of over $6 billion in the estimates submitted by the Veterans' Administration should be carefully considered by the Members of this House. It should answer the concern of many newspapers which have devoted considerable editorial space to attacking the magnitude of the legislation and those who have sponsored it. It has been necessary to reduce needed benefits all along the line to achieve this saving and I might add that many of our colleagues on the committee were disturbed over reducing proposed payments to elderly widows who have no other source of income in order to balance the range of benefits all along the line. We have tried, and I believe successfully, in modifying this bill to achieve a balance and to prevent more emphasis upon the non-service-connected disabled and their widows and orphans over those who have suffered disabilities incurred in the service. We believe a most careful and deserving compromise has been worked out on a give-and-take basis by the representatives of the major veterans' organizations and our colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Let us examine somewhat in detail what we shall propose in a compromise substitute for the bill as reported out by the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

First, we have reduced the original proposed rate of pension payments to the

non-service-connected disabled and aged veterans from $85 and $105 to $75 and $90. This represents a substantial savings in the cost of the pension feature. We have, however, retained the increase from $135 to $150 per month for those veterans who are blind or so helpless as to require attendance. In addition we have reduced the extra allowance for overseas service from 20 percent to 10 percent with a further reduction in cost. We have, however, maintained an important principle involved in the bill concerning which the major veterans' organizations were not willing to yield. That principle establishes age 65 as a pensionable age subject only to a modest income limitation. We recognize there is a sharp difference of opinion in and out of the Congress over the establishment of this principle of pension eligibility at age 65. We believe that the history of pension and retirement programs in private business and industry, as well as Government retirement program, supports the theory upon which we have proceeded.

We have also retained in this proposed compromise the existing income limitations of $1,400 per year where the veteran has no dependents and $2,700 where the veteran has one or more dependents. In effect, the main benefits of the pension program, with the exception of reduced rates, have been preserved in this modified version of the legislation.

Next, we have substantially reduced the proposed rates of pensions payable to the widows and orphans of World War I, World War II and Korea as well as the widows of Spanish-American war veterans below the rates originally proposed in H. R. 7886. The rates included in our compromise bill amount to approximately 10 percent adjusted to the nearest even dollar and will effect substantial savings in the cost of the bill. We have maintained, however, an amendment which meets the approval of all veterans' groups and most of our colleagues including some who were displeased with other features of the bill. This amendment would place the widows of World War II and Korean veterans on an equal basis for pension purposes with the widows of World War I veterans.

Next, in an effort to give prior and major consideration to those who have suffered disabilities by reason of their service we have retained to large extent the compensation rates contained in the original bill with some very minor reductions. We have followed a principle advocated by the Bradley Commission in granting a larger increase to those who have a lesser rating. We have deleted provisions contained in the original bill for the granting of benefits to the survivors of those who were killed or died in the service. The survivors benefit bill, which has been approved by the House of Representatives and reported out of the Senate Finance Committee, to a large extent provides substantial improvements and increase for the survivors of the service-deceased and to retain such benefits in this bill would create a duplication.

In the interest of economy we have deleted that section of H. R. 7886 which would extend the principle of dependency allowances to the families of service-disabled veterans who are rated below 50 percent. Under existing law veterans with disability ratings of 50 percent or more are entitled to a prorated additional allowance for wife and children and originally it was believed that this privilege should be extended to those veterans who are rated below 50 percent. While we have authorized an increase in the dependency allowances, for the time being we have taken out the language which would authorize dependency allowances to veterans rated less than 50-percent disabled. This effects a substantial saving in the bill.

In a further effort to reduce the cost my colleagues on the committee and representatives of the veterans' organizations were agreed that the increase in the burial allowance benefit provided in the bill as originally reported should be deleted. Removal of this section further adds to the savings established by our compromise legislation.

The foregoing constitutes a rather hasty explanation of the substitute amendments which I propose to offer for myself and my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee with amendments are in order. We believe our proposals represent the very minimum which this House should consider if we are to do justice to our veterans and the dependents of deceased veterans. When you stop to consider that the cost of this legislation for the first year as we propose to amend it, is less than one-fifth of what is proposed to be expended for foreign aid in 1 year, I am sure that the Members of this House will not begrudge this money to our needy and disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of our deceased veterans.

Charges have been loosely made that this bill represents boondoggling, a handout to able-bodied veterans, and is a general service pension. On behalf of my colleagues let me emphatically deny that this represents a handout to veterans or closely approaches a general service pension. The pension feature of this bill is closely safeguarded by age, disability, unemployment, and income-limitation requirements. No able-bodied, well-to-do veteran could receive a pension under the provisions of this bill. In fact, more than one-half of the estimated cost of this legislation will go to widows and orphans and to those who have been disabled by reason of service in the Armed Forces. This legislation is a far cry from being a handout or boondoggling.

In answer to those who have been frightened over the specter of national bankruptcy because of our veterans' benefit program, let me point out that the cost of pension and compensation today takes a smaller slice of our national income and of our Federal tax receipts than was used for this purpose many, many years ago. In 1931 compensation and pension payments absorbed over 30 percent of the total Federal tax receipts while today expenditures for this purpose absorb less than 4 percent of Federal tax receipts. These facts are all the more significant when you consider that veterans represent approximately 14 percent of our total population today as compared with approximately 3 percent when compensation and pension payments absorbed a larger slice of our national income and a larger percentage of our Federal tax receipts.

You will hear many arguments and pleas for economy and for other amendments to this bill, but may I again emphasize that the proposals which I intend to submit represent the most serious thought and has the approval of the major veterans' organizations and many of my colleagues on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the House the usual way propaganda is spread over the country when veterans' legislation comes up.

Members of the House of Representatives should not permit themselves to be misled and become confused over the widespread editorial publicity with respect to fantastic projected cost estimates made by the Veterans' Administration on legislation, particularly pension and compensation legislation, affecting veterans and/or the dependents of deceased veterans. Projection of estimated costs on veteran legislation, even for the first year, are most unreliable. The Veterans' Administration has frankly admitted that attempting to project estimated costs for several years on an annual basis and for as much as 50 years on an accumulative basis is not guaranteed to be more than speculation based on some ascertainable factors. It is believed that if an accurate comparison could be made on all projected estimates of cost, with actual costs after a few years of operation, the facts would reveal that the estimates in every case are unreasonably high.

It has been possible to make such a comparison on one piece of legislation which met a veto at the White House and later passed over the veto by both branches of the Congress. Reference is made to Public Law 149, H. R. 3193, of the 82d Congress. This bill provided for a substantial increase in the pension rate for veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea who were otherwise eligible and who were so blind or so helpless or so nearly blind or so nearly helpless as to need regular aid and attendance. This bill became public law after a White House veto was overridden by both branches of Congress and the law became effective in November 1951.

During the hearings on Public Law 149, H. R. 3193, on page 615 of the hearings, a representative of the Veterans' Administration made the following statement:

> It is estimated that the enactment of H. R. 3193 would affect approximately 400 veterans of World War II, 23,700 veterans of World War I and 50 veterans of the Spanish-American War group, during the first year, at an additional cost for that year of approximately $16,700,000.

In a letter dated November 25, 1952, the Veterans' Administration stated that as of October 31, 1952—which was the end of the first year of operation of the pension rates under Public Law 149—the number of veterans who were in receipt of the new pension rate provided by Public Law 149, 82d Congress, as amended, came to a total of 13,440.

This represents 10,710 fewer veterans receiving the pension than was estimated by the Veterans' Administration during hearings on the bill. Using the same factor of increased pension rates which was used by the Veterans' Administration to arrive at a cost estimate for the first year it is apparent that the first year's cost under Public Law 149, 82d Congress, was $8,709,120 compared to an estimate of $16,700,000 made by the Veterans' Administration during the hearings.

Consequently, one accurate test of a comparison of estimated costs with actual costs where only the first year of operation is involved reveals that the projected estimate made by the Veterans' Administration fell short of the mark by almost 50 percent in the number of veterans to be affected and the amount of money to be expended.

The Veterans' Administration recently estimated that a veterans' pension and compensation bill identified as H. R. 7886 would cost over $1.2 billion the first year; $1.8 billion the fifth year; with a total cumulative cost of $148.2 billion to the year 2000. I submit to you that if the cost experts in the Veterans' Administration could miss by nearly 50 percent the number of veterans and the cost involved on a simple bill which became Public Law 149, 82d Congress, why should we accept the fantastic estimate of cost for the first year, the fifth year and the cumulative total cost to the year 2000 of a pension and compensation bill so technical and involved as is H. R. 7886?

It is unfortunate that a representative section of the American press has seized upon this fantastic projection of estimated cost with respect to H. R. 7886 and is trying to frighten the economic wits out of the American taxpayers. Not only is the press publicizing the fantastic projected estimate of costs made by the Veterans' Administration but, in some instances, the press is adding exaggeration to exaggeration to create an estimated future expenditure that is not only incredible but impossible.

For example, the Evening News, of Harrisburg, Pa., on Tuesday, June 19, in a 2-column editorial, running almost the full length of the editorial page, attacked H. R. 7886, as well as its sponsors and advocates. Included among the many charges made in this editorial is the following:

> The result is a real grab-bag piece of legislation which the Veterans' Administration estimates will cost about one and a quarter billion dollars in its first year and over $148 billion annually by the end of the century.

This Harrisburg newspaper, not content to go along with a fantastic Veterans' Administration estimate of a cumulative cost of $148 billion to the year 2000, decided to go "whole hog" and charge the veterans' organizations and members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs with attempting to put over a veterans' grab bag which would reach an annual cost of $148 billion. It is significant to note that in the editorials which are conjuring up horrible visions of national bankruptcy where veterans' benefits are concerned, failed to point out that the great bulk of the potential expenditures involved in H. R. 7886, as approved, would be paid to widows, orphans, dependent parents and veterans with disabilities incurred in the service. The impression given to deliberately frighten the American taxpayers is that this legislation is a pension handout to all veterans regardless of their physical condition and/or need.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I want to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], for his fairness, for his patience, in the consideration of this particular bill, H. R. 7886.

I would like to express my appreciation to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], for her concern and for the work she has done with reference to H. R. 7886.

Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily to discuss for a moment or two the second section with reference to widows and orphans. I would assume from the things we have heard here today that tomorrow the House will be called upon to choose between two substitute bills to H. R. 7886, one the so-called Teague substitute, and the other the so-called Dorn substitute.

I was under the impression, and I think I am still correct, that the chairman of the committee, Mr. TEAGUE, was in favor of an amendment which I offered to the bill to place World War II and Korean widows on an equal basis with the widows of World War I veterans.

I am quite concerned about this particular matter because I think it is only just and only fair. In view of the fact that that particular provision is included in the Dorn substitute and is not in the Teague substitute, then, certainly, it means that so far as I am concerned I would have to support the Dorn substitute.

I feel that the amendment for the placing of these widows and orphans of World War II and Korea on the same footing with the widows of World War I is just. Actually it would seem to me that if there are any widows of war veterans who are entitled to consideration and who are in need of consideration today it is those widows of World War II and Korean veterans with small children, children they are attempting to educate, to send to school, to care for; and it would seem to me to be only justice and to be only fair that they be placed on an equal footing with the World War I widow; also I want to comment for just one moment on the figures that have been given as to the cost of this particular section. It is my understanding that the cost is indicated as about $84 million. Is not that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SISK. Certainly. I know a number of cases in my district and I know the same is true with other Members of this House, that they have a like situation, where these widows and children are today receiving public welfare and various types of State and local assistance. I have some grave doubts about this figure of $84 million being added because of the passage of this legislation or this amendment. I think probably what would happen to some considerable portion of that $84 million is that it would simply come out of one pocket instead of the other; whereas today it is represented by a burden on the State, county, and local people, it would probably be transferred to the Federal level through a pension which they would be entitled to as the widow of a war veteran. Certainly to me I think that in itself would be good, because I think they are entitled to the dignity that would come with qualifying them as widows of war veterans. And certainly it seems to me that before this legislation is passed, irrespective of which substitute may be adopted, that consideration be given to this particular problem.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I shall be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would like to see some particular veterans' group make this goal their project next year. Certainly it seems to me that when we pass this piece of legislation here which corresponds to about a $13,000 or $14,000 insurance policy that we are helping both the widow and the veterans. It is certainly legislation that should prove very helpful.

Mr. SISK. I certainly appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Texas. This is a proposition which should receive fair consideration on both sides of the Capitol. One other thing, which has to do with a statement by the gentleman from Illinois a little while ago regarding Spanish American War widows. They are reaching that age of life when they have very few years to look forward to in most instances. There again, in my own district I know of a few cases which I feel warrant our sympathetic consideration. Certainly it would be my hope that these elderly women, the widows of Spanish-American War veterans, will receive consideration tomorrow with reference to such legislation as we may pass through this House at that time.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with me that a wife or a mother who sends a husband or son to war deserves the protection of this Government as much as the man who goes?

Mr. SISK. I certainly agree with the gentlewoman on that and I appreciate very much her statement. I do feel that the widows and the orphan children of our war veterans are entitled to consideration in any type of legislation we pass dealing with pensions, and it is my hope that the Members of this House will give it earnest consideration in the passage of any pension legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY AND DEATH PENSION

That paragraph I of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is amended by striking out subparagraphs (e) and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) No pension shall be payable under this part for permanent disability less than total. A permanent total disability shall be taken to exist when there is present any impairment of mind or body which is sufficient to render it impossible for the average person to follow a substantially gainful occupation and where it is reasonably certain that such impairment will continue throughout the life of the disabled person. A person shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled upon reaching the age of 65 years. In addition to the criteria established in the preceding two sentences, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may classify, as permanently and totally disabling, those diseases and disorders which in his judgment are such as to justify such a classification.

"(f) Pension shall be paid under this part at the rate of $85 per month, except that—

"(1) when the disability of the eligible person has been rated as permanent and total for an aggregate of 10 years, or when he has reached the age of 65 years, such pension shall be paid at the rate of $105 monthly;

"(2) when the eligible person becomes, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, such pension shall be paid at the rate of $150 per month."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee and to include charts and tables.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 7886.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the first order of business tomorrow, in connection with H. R. 7886, be amendments to the first section of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair does not have any knowledge of what might happen in the Committee of the Whole or what amendments might be offered. Generally, under the rules of the House, when a section of the bill is read, it is open to amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the Chair.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10003) making appropriations for the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10660) entitled "An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes."

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 9052 and H. R. 9852.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9052) to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. SPENCE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 9852) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 10624.

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

There was no objection.

UNCLE SAM SELLS SONS OBSCENITY—JAPAN, KOREA PX RACKS OFFERING FILTH TO GI's

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, some shocking reports have been received from Japan and Korea concerning the peddling of pornographic magazines to American servicemen stationed in those countries. It is all the more shocking to learn that these pornographic magazines are being sold at post exchanges operated by the United States Armed Forces in those countries.

The chaplains of the various faiths have been fighting a great battle to maintain moral standards among the personnel of our Armed Forces stationed overseas. They know well of the many dangers and temptations that beset our Armed Service personnel stationed overseas and what it will mean to our Nation if we fail to maintain the highest moral standards among the cream of our youth who are defending the cause of freedom in many parts of the world.

But these chaplains see much of the results of their good work undone by the magazine racks of the American post exchanges which peddle literature calculated to incite those who read it to violate the principles of decency without which our Armed Forces will become little more than pagan occupiers.

This is a matter of grave concern to the parents and loved ones of the men and women in our Armed Forces stationed overseas. Many of them have written to me expressing not only their shock at the state of affairs permitted by the Department of Defense, which has jurisdiction over post exchanges, but also a state of grave worry that all the years of training their children to be good Americans, guided by those moral principles to which all the religions of the world adhere, might be turned into a complete loss. All clear-thinking people are compelled to demand action against the peddling of pornographic magazines to American Armed Service personnel stationed in Japan and Korea and elsewhere in the world.

The responsible officials in the Department of Defense should constantly be on the alert to prevent the destruction of the morals of our Armed Forces and the loss of prestige we, as Americans, suffer in foreign lands by allowing the sale or otherwise distribution of indecent por-

nographic magazines or other forms of indecent literature.

I have taken up this matter with the Department of Defense and have conferred with Brig. Gen. Clarence J. Hauck, Jr. I have been assured that the Department is making an investigation of this matter and wherever pornographic literature is sold or distributed to our PX's, it will be stopped immediately. General Hauck assured me that the sale of such pornographic literature is against the policy of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, a very significant feature article appeared in the Catholic Universe Bulletin of Cleveland on June 15, 1956, which merits the careful attention of every Member of Congress. I include the article in the RECORD:

UNCLE SAM SELLS SONS OBSCENITY—JAPAN, KOREA PX RACKS OFFERING FILTH TO GIs

(By Father Patrick O'Connor)

Post exchanges (retail stores operated by United States Armed Forces) are peddling pornographic magazines to American servicemen in Japan and Korea.

From the magazine racks of the offending post exchanges, bawdy pictures and suggestive titles leer up at the soldier or airman customer.

He may have just attended a character guidance lecture given by his chaplain. Now he finds a Government agency trying to sell him literature that incites him to violate the principles of decency that the chaplain upholds.

Here are the titles of some feature articles heralded on magazine covers displayed recently in some post exchanges in Japan and Korea:

"Driven by Wild Desires," "My Evil Love," "Wife Without Honor—The Stark Confession of a Woman Who Was Brutally Assaulted," "Wicked Lover, Innocent Girl," "They Take the Wraps Off Sex Deviation," "What's Behind the Shocking Rise in Female Sex Crimes?" "The Shocking Murder of the Dismembered Blonde," "Billion Dollar Business in Sex Appeal."

There was one article with a title too grossly pornographic to quote in any decent newspaper.

Alongside the publications with the suggestivity titled articles you sometimes see photography magazines that are only thinly veiled essays in pictorial pornography.

Of course, the post exchanges also sell reputable magazines. Along with lurid pocket books, they offer a good selection of worthwhile reprints. Why they haul tons of printed filth across the Pacific to display beside clean wares is hard to understand.

Those in charge of post exchanges cannot plead that they have to meet competition. They have a monopoly. They are, or should be, under no compulsion even to make profits.

If they plead the excuse of customer demand, they can be challenged to prove a demand by any large segment of their customers.

In any event, customer demand does not justify selling anything. If it did, one might find the post exchanges selling narcotics or unlimited gallons of liquor.

The morbid, erotic publications, sold publicly by an agency of the United States Government, lower American prestige abroad while doing moral harm to individuals.

They can be bought only by American military personnel, their dependants and civilians working for the United States Government. But Japanese and Korean youths and girls, salesclerks in the post exchange, must handle and sell these magazines. Japanese and Korean domestics see them lying around in billets.

Most of the copies sold find their way ultimately into Japanese and Korean hands. Many of these Orientals, constantly scrutinizing Americans, read English. The purport of the illustrations in the magazines can escape nobody.

Like the immodest pinups permitted by some commanders in offices and clubs, smutty magazines sold in the post exchanges seem to have official approval. They are therefore all the more damaging to prestige.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include the text of a bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. MCDONALD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 6782. An act 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," July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 7227. 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;

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.; and

H. R. 10660. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3295. An act to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3663. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 101. An act relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H. R. 3693. An act to amend title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

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;

H. R. 5790. An act 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;

H. R. 7227. 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;

H. R. 8493. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.;

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the delayed reporting of births within the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 10374. An act to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10768. An act 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; and

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2016. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of May relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2017. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of its official proceedings for the year ended December 31, 1955, with other information relating to the regulation and operation of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of said Commission, pursuant to an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3163. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for certain air carriers operating in Hawaii and Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 2462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5888. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8817. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the city of Corbin, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9339. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Union County, Ga., for lands within the Chattahoochee National Forest, Ga., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARDY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9660. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey an 11¼-acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Williamsburg, Va., to the State of Virginia; with amendment (Rept. No. 2466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11122. A bill to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade, to encourage the construction of new vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 11554. A bill to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 11799. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11873. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to eliminate delay in the start of projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 2470). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions; with amendment (Rept. No. 2471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11375. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to further extend the special school milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children; without amendment (Rept. No. 2472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1688. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 997. An act to provide punishment for certain confidence game swindles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 10433. A bill to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 2091. An act authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10624. A bill relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2477). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9333. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to give to certain consuming processors of cotton the privilege of buying cotton futures contracts in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 2478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee of conference. S. 890. An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act (Rept. No. 2479). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6997. A bill to include persons engaged in carrying out the provisions of labor laws of the United States within the provisions of sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to assaults and homicides; with amendment (Rept. No. 2480). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9038. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be treated as a State for purposes of district court jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship; with amendment (Rept. No. 2481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11802. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957; without amendment (Rept. No. 2482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10111. A bill to amend sections 657 and 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to include certain savings and loan associations within its provisions; with amendment (Rept. No. 2483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RABAUT: Committee of Conference. H. R. 10003. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2484). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9052. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 3 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports (Rept. No. 2485). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 9852. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2486). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 47. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Agosta; with amendment (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1616. An act for the relief of Sumiko Ariumi Bilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4152. A bill for the relief of Maria Pintos and her daughter, Eugenia Pintos; without amendment (Rept. No. 2442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10088. A bill for the relief of Rupert Waltl; without amendment (Rept. No. 2443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10984. A bill for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov; without amendment (Rept. No. 2444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 531. Resolution to refer the bill H. R. 5461 to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1178. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2008. An act for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2169. An act for the re-

lief of M. B. Huggins, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2240. An act for the relief of James Richard Hogan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of Follett L. Greeno; with amendment (Rept. No. 2451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Joseph Santo; with amendment (Rept. No. 2452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3274. A bill for the relief of the Martin Wunderlich Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8068. A bill for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth; without amendment (Rept. No. 2454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8216. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lidie Kammauf; without amendment (Rept. No. 2455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9029. A bill for the relief of John L. Hughes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9440. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth von Oberndorff; without amendment (Rept. No. 2457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9947. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Edward Wine; without amendment (Rept. No. 2458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10983. A bill for the relief of P. R. Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 2459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11706. A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Hi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 220. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande; without amendment (Rept. No. 2461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 11947. A bill to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 11948. A bill to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 11949. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit organizations from the tax on bowling alleys, billiard tables, and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 11950. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 11951. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of Hammer Field, Calif., to the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 11952. A bill to amend paragraph 909 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to articles of corduroy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11953. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 11954. A bill to provide for the construction of a new stadium for the United States Naval Academy in order to permit the use of the land now occupied by Thompson Stadium for the expansion of needed facilities on the Academy grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 11955. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 and part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to require certain private educational institutions and training establishments to file non-Communist affidavits with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to require disapproval under such act, or such part of any such institution or establishment which fails to file such an affidavit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 11956. A bill to permit a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 and is disabled or whose spouse has attained the age of 65 and is disabled to deduct up to $20,000 of medical expenses incurred in any year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 11957. A bill to provide for the appointment of certain officers in the grade of rear admiral in the Retired Reserve to the grade of vice admiral in the Retired Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 11958. A bill to amend the acreage reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act to permit inclusion of acreage up to 30 days prior to harvest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 11959. A bill to amend section 5 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 to authorize the sale of goods and services by any department or independent establishment to the owner of an aircraft or his agent in an emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 11960. A bill to establish certain qualifications for Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and for judges of United States Courts of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11961. A bill to provide that credit shall be given to Reserve officers for service performed by them with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 11962. A bill to provide for Federal participation and cooperation with States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 11963. A bill to amend the law in force with respect to the display and use of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11964. A bill to establish the principle of a basic single salary wage scale in the Canal Zone for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 11965. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Clark County, Nev., to the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 11966. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation; to provide increases in pensions for persons in need of regular aid and attendance; and to increase dependency allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 11967. A bill to amend Public Law 523 of the 78th Congress entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 11968. A bill to permit the State of New York to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory, at Lorton, Va., gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 11969. A bill to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. H. 11970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 relative to nonrecognition of gain from involuntary conversion of certain real property used for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps to be known as the national liberation stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution accepting without cost to the United States copies of the recording Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and providing for distribution of such copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 555. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 627; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 11971. A bill for the relief of Louisa Der Hacobian Bost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 11972. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 11973. A bill for the relief of Maria Angela Magatelli, Angela Didone, and Irma Valsecchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 11974. A bill for the relief of Peter Alexander Zarcades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 11975. A bill for the relief of Antone Franchehkoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11976. A bill for the relief of Eloise Reyes Viuda de Velasquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 11977. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 11978. A bill for the relief of Francisca M. Jegers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 11979. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jacqueline Terzis and her minor child Nicole Terzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11980. A bill for the relief of Margherita Conca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 11981. A bill for the relief of Jan Baginski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 11982. A bill for the relief of Gaida Murnieks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 11983. A bill for the relief of Alice Selim Nakhla Fakhouri (also known as Denise Fakhouri); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 11984. A bill for the relief of Ursula Kruthoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11985. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 660. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1163. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 180 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit advertisement of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1164. Also, petition of 180 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit advertisement of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1165. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Rev. V. F. Deditius and 19 other citizens of Tillamook, Oreg., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1166. By Mr. TUMULTY: Resolution adopted by Hoboken Chapter of Unico National in praise of the American Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Clare Booth Luce; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Educational Benefits to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in the House to amend Public Law 346, 78th Congress, which grants educational benefits to World War II veterans, and Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which grants educational benefits, among other things, to Korean war veterans.

Certain deficiencies in these two laws should be corrected and corrected at once. These deficiencies came to light early this year when a Senate subcommittee, investigating the Communist ownership of GI schools, discovered that under the existing provisions of these laws the Veterans' Administration is required to expend Federal funds for tuition of veterans attending schools which are Communist-owned. In fact, over $3 million was paid out by the Veterans' Administration to four schools which because of their Communist connections should be ineligible to participate in the veterans' training program. These four schools are the Cartoonists and Illustrators School, Inc., of New York City; the Radio and Television Technical School, of Allentown, Pa.; the Robert Louis Stevenson School, of New York City; and the California Labor School, of San Francisco, Calif.

During the hearings it was brought out that under the provisions of Public Laws 346 and 550, the approval of veteran training schools is left solely to the local State-approving agencies, customarily a local department of education, and unless the local department rules otherwise the Veterans' Administration must pay the tuition for the veteran at these Communist-owned schools or Communist-dominated schools.

In order to correct this situation, my bill requires private schools, below the college level, which are training veterans or seeking approval to train veterans, to submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs affidavits signed by the owner or owners and by the members of the governing body that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

It is estimated that there are approximately 2,400 schools throughout the country that will file affidavits under this proposal. The bill also provides that in the event a school fails to file an affidavit, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will not approve the enrollment of veterans in such school. On the other hand, an individual who has been a member of the Communist Party in the past can comply with provisions of the proposed legislation if he files an affidavit that he has terminated his membership and since such termination is opposed to the doctrines, program, principles, and ideology of such organizations. Obviously this bill does not affect colleges or academic preparatory schools.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will act promptly on this measure so that it can be reported to and acted upon by the House before the 84th Congress adjourns. Passage of this bill will prevent millions of Americn taxpayers' money from being expended to train veterans at Communist-owned or at Communist-dominated schools.

A Strange Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, history teaches that whenever a nation prints an excessive amount of money, first comes inflation; then a depression inevitably follows.

The expression "not worth a continental" was created in Revolutionary days because the dollar purchased less and less of life's necessities, until it was worthless. One citizen, disgusted with the ever-decreasing value of his savings, caught a dog, plastered it from nose to tail with Continental currency, and turned it loose.

Despite subsequent periods of inflation and depression—we had a depression and panic in 1837, another in 1857, another in 1893, one in 1907, in 1920, and again in 1929—we refuse to profit by our experiences. Last week we made the temporary statutory national debt limit $278 billion. It carries an annual interest charge of more than $7 billion.

Annually Congress appropriates more of your dollars than are paid in taxes because pressure groups insist. That is no excuse. It is a reason.

Just remember that this is a government "of, by, and for the people." The Congress is only doing what the people or, more accurately, those who make the most noise, demand.

Greater efficiency and economy in the Government's activities I have always, both by speech and vote—and a vote is what counts—endeavored to bring about. But we will never get lower taxes, a balanced budget, until the people accept a share of the responsibility for Federal expenditures.

I am not making any excuse. Not offering any alibi. I will stand on my record. But attention is called to the fact—and it is a fact—that some of those who elect us have, in recent years, been demanding ever-increasing services from the Federal Government, all of which cost dollars; the payment of ever-greater benefits of all kinds.

Because we have appropriated and spent more money than the Government was able to collect, the national debt has increased, until it more than equals the value of all our property. The value of the dollar has shrunk, until it equals but half of what it was before.

The spenders are not a majority, but they make the most noise. Until those at home who want a sound economy become more vocal, more active, the present procedure will continue. Individuals and pressure groups have been yelling for cake. They cannot get it, eat it, enjoy it, and still keep it. When they call for a particular tune and it is played, they will have to pay the fiddler.

Just as long as the people elect spenders, those who believe that the Federal Government has an unlimited income, can give other nations unlimited billions, meet every demand made for home spending, we will have what I think are excessive taxes, and if we do not mend our ways, ruinous inflation. Make your choice.

A Bill To Oblige the Armed Forces To Issue Honorable or Dishonorable Discharges Based Solely Upon the Performance of the Serviceman While Under Military Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would oblige the Armed Forces to issue their dischargees either honorable or dishonorable discharges, based solely upon the performance of the servicemen while under military jurisdiction. The bill would entirely eliminate unsatisfactory, undesirable, or less-than-honorable discharges based, in most cases, on supposed actions or derogatory information about supposed actions, allegedly performed in civilian life prior to induction.

There has been a steady encroachment by the military into the sphere of civilian jurisdiction. My bill is intended to curb this encroachment. No agency of the Armed Forces should arrogate unto itself the power of punishment for offenses allegedly committed by a civilian in civil life and, most especially, should this not be done when the manner of doing it is such that, in most instances, the victim is seriously hampered in his defense by imperfect knowledge of what he is charged with and no knowledge whatever of who is making the charges.

I am introducing the bill to give ample opportunity for discussion, although I realize that it is too late to get action on it in this session of Congress. It is my hope that my bill will focus attention upon an increasingly unsatisfactory situation and that, when I reintroduce it next year, opinions will have been formed and speedy action will be possible.

The armed services have been promising to do something about this for a long time, and just recently have stated that all undesirable discharges issued of late years will be reviewed. Now, however, we are informed that such reviews will not only take into consideration the man's actual service in the Armed Forces, but will also evaluate the derogatory information previously supplied about him while in civil life. This is exactly what they have been doing all along, and it is exactly what I object to.

If the military has information in its possession which indicates that a certain man would be undesirable in his country's service, they should not induct that man. Once a man is accepted for such service, he should be judged solely on how he carries out his duties while under military jurisdiction. Any other manner of procedure is, at best, an unwarranted encroachment on civil functions and, at worst, a deliberate entrapment.

For the information of the Members, I include the text of the bill:

H. R. 11921

A bill to provide that persons discharged from the Armed Forces who are proffered discharges other than honorable may reject such discharges and receive a court-martial, or if not court-martialed, shall be given honorable discharges; to provide for correction of records in the case of certain persons not given honorable discharges in the past; and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)," and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Any member of the Armed Forces who, at the time of his discharge, is proffered a discharge under conditions other than honorable may reject it, unless such discharge is being proffered to him pursuant to a sentence of a court-martial. When he rejects such discharge, he shall be tried by a court-martial for the offense or offenses on the basis of which he was offered such discharge, unless the military department concerned determines that the evidence in its possession is not sufficient to sustain a conviction of any such offense, in which case he shall be given an honorable discharge. If he is tried by a court-martial and found guilty of any such offense, the court-martial (whether or not a summary court-martial) may prescribe as part of its sentence that he be given a discharge under conditions other than honorable; if he is not found guilty of any such offense, he shall be given an honorable discharge."

SEC. 2. Article 17 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) No court-martial shall have jurisdiction to prescribe any punishment for any person subject to this code for anything done or not done by such person while not subject to this code, or for any exercise of a legal or constitutional right or privilege."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Any person given a discharge under conditions other than honorable before the effective date of this paragraph and after March 21, 1947, may apply to the appropriate board for the correction of his record on the ground that he was given such a discharge solely because of something done or not done by him while not subject to either the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, or the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard. If a review of the applicant's records do not indicate that the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground, the board shall grant the applicant an opportunity for an early hearing, at which the applicant or his counsel, or both, may be present. After such hearing, or opportunity for a hearing, the board shall consider all briefs, evidence, and arguments presented by the applicant, and all evidence in the possession of the military department concerned, and determine whether or not the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground. If, before or after a hearing, the board finds that the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground, the board shall correct the applicant's records in the military department concerned so as to show that the applicant was honorably discharged as of the date of his original discharge, cancel the applicant's original discharge, and issue to him an honorable discharge bearing the same date as the date of his canceled discharge."

Humane Slaughter Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to state my position on several bills which are now pending before the House and Senate. These bills are H. R. 8540, H. R. 9603, and S. 1636, also known as the humane slaughter bills.

While I am sure that the authors of this legislation were prompted by humane considerations, I do not believe that they have taken into account the full significance of what these bills, if enacted into law, would do.

Passage of such legislation would make illegal the ritual slaughtering of beef by members of the Orthodox and Conservative Jewish faith which is now carried on and has been carried on for centuries past. For this reason I am definitely opposed to these measures. I do not think that Congress should pass any laws which would abridge freedom of religion or of religious practices. This legislation would also drive out of business countless numbers of beef and poultry slaughterers.

I intend to continue in my opposition to the passage of these bills so long as they involve these undesirable consequences.

Commencement Address by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, at Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a commencement-day address which I delivered at the commencement exercises of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 7 last.

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

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE LISTER HILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ALABAMA, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE WOMAN'S MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA AT PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 7, 1956

President Gordon, doctors, distinguished guests, graduates, students, and friends, I am happy and honored to be with you on this auspicious occasion. I share your pride in this splendid institution, which enjoys the distinction of being the only woman's medical college in the United States, this institution that has become so important a part of our Nation's great center of medical education, this institution that has made historic contributions in securing for women their rightful place in medicine.

I come as one who has deep roots in the medical history of Philadelphia and I rejoice at the opportunity to nourish them once again.

It was in Philadelphia that my father, a surgeon and practitioner of medicine for more than 50 years, was privileged to study at Jefferson Medical College under the renowned Samuel D. Gross.

It was here that my father acquired much of the foundation as a student and seeker of medical knowledge that prepared him to go forth into the night and by the light of a kerosene lamp in a crude cabin in Montgomery, Ala., perform the first successful suture of the human heart in America.

It was here that he formed warm friendships which endured throughout his lifetime.

And it was from here that he went forth to study under Joseph Lister, whose name I proudly bear, and it was at the time that great benefactor of mankind was enunciating and fighting for the acceptance of the principles of aseptic and antiseptic treatment of wounds, the treatment which gave birth to modern surgery.

Being with you today has a special significance for me—not only because of my father's association with Philadelphia; not only because of my efforts in the United States Senate in the field of health; but as the son of a doctor, the nephew of a doctor, the brother-in-law of two doctors, the first cousin of five doctors, and as one early imbued with a deep and abiding interest in doctors, and in the progress of medicine and medical care in our Nation. I appreciate the more the signal honor of having the opportunity to say to you on this your graduation day that which tens of thousands of men and women and children will say to you through the years yet to come.

Some will say it with their voices, some with their eyes, all in their hearts will say that which I would be the first to say to you:

Thank you for what you have done.

Thank you for what you will do.

Thank you for what you are.

Thank you for becoming doctors; for having taken the hard way; for having fought off the easy; for having worked and studied; for having sacrificed so much. Thank you for having had so early in life the wisdom to know that only in a life of constant study and service to your fellow man can your own lives be rich and meaningful.

We need you as doctors. People—some in fear, some in pain, some in danger—need you and need the art and the science you have learned.

In our society you have achieved a place of stature and of honor. The place you have won carries with it a formidable array of responsibilities. These responsibilities are many; they are varied; some are difficult to discern; too many are easy to forget; all are a challenge.

The first challenge is the challenge which confronts the woman in medicine in her capacity as a citizen. In matters of economics, of sociology, of social welfare, and particularly of the relationship of health and Government, that which you say and do will be accorded a respect unsurpassed by that given to any other member of your community.

In the past few years the revolutionary strides in the field of health have been achieved largely because of the willingness of men and women in medicine to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. Through vigorous leadership and co-operation with professional and lay leaders, and with legislators, doctors have contributed mightily to an ever-expanding pattern of progress in medicine and its related fields.

This progress is attested to by the fact that last year in Congress under our Hill-Burton program, which will celebrate its tenth anniversary in August, we sharply increased the funds for the construction of hospital and health facilities.

The Hill-Burton program has helped States, communities and nonprofit organizations to build critically needed hospitals, health centers, laboratories and expand facilities for medical education. Already more than 2,000 hospitals and health facilities have been built. Hundreds of them are in communities where there had never been a hospital. Almost 900 additional projects are now under construction or will soon be started. Last year for the first time funds appropriated were designated for the construction of rehabilitation facilities, diagnostic and treatment centers, nursing homes and facilities for the care of patients with chronic illness, as well as for research in the management and administration of hospital care.

With the active and indispensable roles played by men and women in medicine, we established the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda and inaugurated the programs for medical research—research through which we have already accomplished so much and which is so vital for the future progress of medicine and the health of our people.

It was through the initiative of members of the medical profession that we discovered to our consternation that the greatest library of medicine in the world, the Armed Forces Library, the library on which so much of our research depends and the contents of which are irreplaceable, is currently housed in a building constructed in 1887 and condemned over 30 years ago. Congress acted promptly, and I think I can promise you that soon we shall have a truly national library of medicine, adequately housed and properly located.

These programs and many others have been hammered out and shaped with the aid of members of the medical profession and such professional organizations as the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association and similar groups. We in the Congress could never have developed such programs without the counsel, the co-operation and the leadership of the medical profession.

In determining the role of Government in the field of health, the leadership of women doctors is all important. The humanitarian concern for people and for their welfare, with which you as women are so richly endowed, coupled with the training and experience you have gained as physicians and scientists, bids you accept the responsibilities of citizenship and exercise the leadership which your position demands. Your determination to do so can mean the difference between an age of progress or an age of stagnation in the field of health.

United in the cause of bringing health and happiness into the lives of our people, we must go forward into a new day of health.

We must continue to carry forward the great programs already inaugurated and already proven so successful.

We must intensify and enlarge our medical research. Through research we will find the keys to unlock the doors to the cause and cure or prevention of so many diseases that have plagued and baffled mankind through the centuries.

We must train more doctors and dentists.

We must meet the crucial shortage of professional nurses, practical nurses and auxiliary hospital and health personnel.

We must provide more protection against catastrophic illness. We must extend voluntary health and hospital insurance to more of our people. We must meet the special and difficult problems involving the aged, the indigent, and the unemployed.

In these and many other fields government at its different levels—Federal, State, county and municipal—can and must do much. I am happy to tell you that last week the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I happen to be Chairman, recommended to the Senate a bill authorizing Federal funds for training nurses and other health personnel, for training doctors in mental health and in public health and for the establishment of research projects in these fields. I hope that we shall soon recommend a bill providing funds to assist in construction of medical educational and research facilities.

As we move forward along the whole front in the battle for better health for our people, we must remember that the doctor is ever the central figure in the drama of medical care. All else is but to assist him, to help him achieve the best possible results. And I hasten to add that I use the masculine "him" in a generic sense only. If the doctor is to do his best, he must remain free and uncontrolled. Only as the doctor finds the inspiration and enjoys the right of individual action that freedom gives—to explore, to inquire, to discover, to serve in his own way—only then can he give his best, only then can we continue the marvelous progress of American medicine.

We must preserve the incentives of our free medical system, the incentives for individual effort, initiative and resourcefulness, the incentives to give the best we have, the incentives that flow from the free choice and personal relationship of the doctor and his patient.

Equally as important as the responsibilities of citizenship is the challenge which will confront you as individuals entering into a noble profession. From the days of women doctors in ancient Greece until little more than a century ago, women were excluded from the medical profession. The belated re-entry of women into medicine—marked by the historic founding of this school—and the skepticism which unfortunately and unjustifiably is still in the minds of many may cause any lapse in meeting your responsibilities to be regarded more gravely than might be the case of a man.

Of utmost importance is constant vigilance in maintaining your intellectual integrity and the high standards which your profession calls upon you to uphold: Thou shall not bear tales but shall guard thy patient's confidence; thou shall not gamble with a patient's life; thou shall scrupulously avoid the temptation to let moneymaking and cupidity supplant ethics—the ethics with which I know you are now imbued. Nourish and hold fast to the ideals which led you to enter the medical profession; the ideals which won for medicine universal recognition as the most idealistic of all the secular professions.

Another challenge to you as individuals is the responsibility of understanding the importance of the cross-fertilization of knowledge and of the necessity for close and continuing contact between practitioner and scientist that is the hallmark of today's medicine.

My father once illustrated the importance of the relationship between doctor and scientist by telling me how in 1864 Joseph Lister, walking home with the professor of chemistry, Thomas Anderson, heard of certain papers on fermentation and putrefaction which had been recently published by a then little-known French chemist, Pasteur. Lister read these papers and found himself convinced that minute living particles floating in the air often turned the surgery of his day into a charnel house.

This casual meeting with Anderson, plus the reading of a newspaper article on carbolic acid, led, in 1867, to Lister's laying down the great principles of the modern treatment of wounds.

A fourth challenge that will present itself to many of you is that of preserving the wonderful missionary spirit that characterizes so many outstanding graduates of your school—to name but a few, Drs. Clara Swain, May Selye, Sara Seward, and Anna Kugler in India; Drs. Coombs, Reifsnyder, Root, and Fuller in China; and Dr. Rosella Sherwood Hall in Korea.

These and other valiant women missionaries, graduates of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, have added splendor to the traditions of women in medicine. They have shown us in this distraught world in which we live today that through personal discipline, through wisdom and compassion, we can win for our people the affection, the understanding, and the loyal support of other peoples.

Through your dedication and devotion to the ideals of your profession you will add years to the lives of our people. And when the time comes for some of your patients to leave this earth, it will be your understanding, your compassion, and your gentle ways which will convert moments of fear and anguish into moments of peace and serenity. Never forget the admonition of the gentle Joseph Lister, "Let not mercy or truth forsake thee; bind them about thy neck."

I hope that you will also accept the responsibility of encouraging more women to enter the field of medicine. I was surprised to learn that last year, out of 28,000 students of medicine in this country, only some 1,500 were women and that the percentage of women students of medicine is now less than 5 percent of the total. We need not fewer men but more women in medicine.

Those who preceded you and passed down through the ages the traditions of women as doctors were few in number. So, relatively speaking, are you few in number. Yet your opportunities to enrich these traditions are as boundless as are the limits of today's ever-expanding world of medicine—the world you are about to enter.

On this your graduation day, as you pass through the portals of your beloved college into a profoundly challenging way of life, I wish you health, goodness, and usefulness as doctors, as scientists, as citizens, and as individuals. I pray that the blessings that befall you may be as abundant as will be the happiness I know you will bring to the lives of others.

It must ever be a glad distinction to have consecrated your lives to serve as those who have gone before have served—healing the sick and making whole the maimed, protecting the mother in childbirth and watching over the infant so newly come to this world, bringing life and health and happiness to your fellow man—following in humility and with faith in the footsteps of Him who nearly 2,000 years ago was called the Great Physician. I salute you, doctors, on the commencement of your service to mankind.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1956

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

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this quiet moment dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in foolish futility in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock. In a day of aggression and of violence, of swift and shifting change, when the angry passions of men are bursting anew into devouring flame, enable Thy servants in this place of governance, in the discharge of great responsibilities of public trust, to be calm, confident, wise, and just, their hope in Thee as an anchor sure and steadfast.

Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood;
And where the sun that shineth is
God's grace for human good.

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 26, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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 the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 21, 1956:

S. 1221. An act for the relief of the estate of Joseph Kelsch.

On June 22, 1956:

S. 910. An act for the relief of Lino Perez Martinez;

S. 1067. An act for the relief of Tibor Horvath; and

S. 2967. An act to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568), and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1956:

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. 2984. An act for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe;

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; and

S. 3857. An act to clarify section 1103 (d) of title II (Federal ship mortgage insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

COMMITTEE AND CONFEREE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations; the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; the Air Force Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee; and the conferees on the transit bill (S. 3073), of the Committee on the District of Columbia, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Marvel A. Randol to be postmaster at Cape Girardeau, Mo., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the